## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA (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,	<pre>) Wednesday, September 25, 2024 )</pre>
Defendants.	) (9:07 a.m. to 12:06 p.m.) ) (2:40 p.m. to 7:42 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

Plaintiff:

ERNEST J. GUADIANA, 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: RAY CARDOZO, ESQ.

JONATHAN VARAT

ADAM COHEN SKIP MILLER

JONATHAN SANDLER GREGORY BERGMAN TYLER MUNROE THOMAS SAFRAN BRIAN D'ANDRE

STEVE PECK

CHRISTINE BERRY

DR. STEVEN BRAVERMAN

MR. KUHN

CHELSEA BLACK RANDY JOHNSON DR. KEITH HARRIS

BRET SIMMS

## Los Angeles, CA; Wednesday, September 25, 2024; 9:07 a.m. 1 2 --000--THE COURT: Counsel, let's go on the record. In the 3 matter of Case No. 2:22-08357, Jeffrey Powers, et al versus 4 5 Dennia Richard McDonough. And, counsel, just remain seated but if you'd make your appearances again for our record. And we're 6 7 on CourtSmart today, so there's not going to be real time for the Court and so I appreciate you being here with us at the court reporter and with CourtSmart. Thank you. Counsel. 10 MR. SILBERFELD: Good morning, Your Honor, Roman 11 Silberfeld, Robins Kaplan for the plaintiffs. 12 MR. ROSENBAUM: Good morning, Your Honor, Mark 13 Rosenbaum, Public Counsel for plaintiffs. 14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 15 MS. PIAZZA: Good morning, Amelia Piazza, Public 16 Counsel for plaintiffs. 17 MR. ROSENBERG: Good morning, Brad Rosenberg from the 18 Department of Justice --19 THE COURT: Thank you. 20 MR. ROSENBERG: -- on behalf of the federal 21 defendants. MR. KNAPP: Good morning. Cody Knapp also on behalf 22 of the federal defendants. 2.3 24 THE COURT: Thank you, appreciate it. 25 MR. GUARDIANA: Good morning, Ernest Guardiana on

- 1 behalf of Intervenor Bridgeland Resources.
- 2 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 3 MR. CARDOZO: And good morning, Your Honor, Ray
- 4 | Cardozo on -- specially appearing on behalf of the Regents of
- 5 | the University of California who's planning to file a motion to
- 6 intervene in the case.
- 7 **THE COURT:** To intervene?
- 8 MR. CARDOZO: Yes.
- 9 **THE COURT:** All right. When will you do that?
- 10 MR. CARDOZO: As soon as Your Honor is -- by the end
- 11 of the week if we can waive --
- 12 **THE COURT:** I have a pen in hand, so if you want to
- 13 give that to me today, you can participate.
- MR. CARDOZO: Sure. We initiated the meet and confer
- 15 | which under the Local Rule is a seven day requirement so if
- 16 Your Honor --
- 17 **THE COURT:** Don't worry about that.
- MR. CARDOZO: -- can waive that --
- 19 **THE COURT:** Don't worry about that.
- 20 MR. CARDOZO: -- we'll get that.
- 21 This particular motion requires some layers of
- 22 | review, well above my pay grade. It's ready to go. I will
- 23 push that through and get it to Your Honor as soon as possible.
- 24 **THE COURT:** Okay. Will you be able to remain today?
- 25 MR. CARDOZO: Yes, and at any appropriate time,

- 1 there's a representative from UCLA I'd like to introduce the 2 Court to.
- 3 **THE COURT:** Who's that? Why don't you ask the 4 gentleman to come forward.
- 5 MR. CARDOZO: I don't know if you previously former 6 Dean of UCLA Law --
- 7 THE COURT: Well, just ask the gentleman to come 8 forward.
- 9 MR. CARDOZO: -- Jonathan Varat. When the 2016
  10 Leasing Act was passed --
- 11 **THE COURT:** Just a moment. I don't have the 12 gentleman's name.
- MR. CARDOZO: Oh, Jonathan Varat, V-A-R-A-T.
- THE COURT: All right. And I don't know what

  capacity you're acting in. In other words, I didn't have

  jurisdiction over UCLA or Brentwood School, so I've invited the

  Chair of the Board of Brentwood to be present and I've invited
- What I'm concerned about is I may be making decisions today that could affect the University. Is the Chancellor available?
- MR. CARDOZO: The Chancellor is unavailable today,
  unfortunately this comes right at the onset of the semester.
- 24 **THE COURT:** I'm sorry?

the Chancellor to be present.

18

25 MR. CARDOZO: This comes right at the onset of the

1 semester and he had commitments he just couldn't --2 **THE COURT:** Is he available tonight? MR. CARDOZO: 3 Huh? Is he available tonight at 6 o'clock? 4 THE COURT: 5 MR. CARDOZO: We can check on that, Your Honor. THE COURT: Why don't you make a call. 6 7 I will. And if I could just finish the MR. CARDOZO: introduction of --8 9 THE COURT: I'm just concerned about the authority 10 that you may or may not have and I don't want you placed in the 11 position of making representations concerning the University. 12 This apparently or allegedly -- well, I've made a finding 13 literally got to the Chancellor's door before. 14 MR. CARDOZO: Sure, Your Honor, I'll --15 THE COURT: So therefore I think if we're going to 16 have decisions just as in other cases, I appreciate the Mayor 17 being here and she's responder, the Chairman of the Board. I'd 18 like to be dealing with the Chancellor. 19 MR. CARDOZO: Understood, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: My hours are non-ending. So 6 o'clock 21 tonight is fine, 7 o'clock tonight is fine. Why don't you make 22 that call. 2.3 MR. CARDOZO: Understood, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Okay.

This was the Chancellor's designee when

- 1 | this partnership started back in 2016 that the new arrangement
- 2 under the Leasing Act and that's why in the Chancellor's
- 3 absence we sent him.
- 4 THE COURT: I've invited the Chancellor. I'm
- 5 waiting.
- 6 MR. CARDOZO: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
- 7 THE COURT: Thank you very much. No degradation to
- 8 you, sir, it's a pleasure to have you here. I just want to
- 9 have the authority in the room. If I'm going to make decisions
- 10 | I want to hear, you know, from you if you care to share. Okay?
- 11 And I don't want you to have to make a phone call.
- 12 And, Mr. Miller, why don't you come forward, it's a
- 13 pleasure to see you again.
- MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. It's a pleasure
- 15 to see Your Honor as well. We're making a special appearance,
- 16 | we're not a party to this litigation.
- 17 **THE COURT:** Right.
- 18 MR. MILLER: So we're here with a special appearance,
- 19 my client, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Adam Cohen is
- 20 here.
- 21 **THE COURT:** Why don't you ask the gentleman to come
- 22 forward.
- 23 MR. MILLER: He's here because the Court invited him
- 24 and out of respect he wanted to show up and be here.
- 25 **THE COURT:** First of all, let me just thank you.

2 THE COURT: I'm very humbled for you being here. don't have jurisdiction over you. I promise you, you're going 3 to be treated very well in terms of courtesy. Okay? And I'd 4 5 like you to hear these proceedings today and I don't know if you're going to intervene or not, as UCLA may, but I really 6 7 appreciate you being here. And thank you for that courtesy. MR. COHEN: Thank you. 8 9 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: And any time you want to speak, 11 Mr. Miller, just come forward specially if you'd like to. 12 Okay? 13 MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it. 14 MR. SANDLER: Your Honor, just for the record, 15 Jonathan Sandler also on behalf of --16 THE COURT: Nice seeing you. And I saw you out at 17 the schools, good seeing you again. 18 MR. SANDLER: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. 19 THE COURT: Any other persons who want to make their 20 appearance today? 21 MR. BERGMAN: Thank you, Your Honor, Gregory Bergman. 22 You requested that the three entities that are actually 23 building on the VA property at Wadsworth attend and all three 24 are here to assist the Court in any way they can. 25 Okay. Let me start with Safran &

1

MR. COHEN:

Thank you.

- 1 Associates?
- 2 MR. MUNROE: Good morning, Your Honor, Tyler Munroe
- 3 | with Thomas Safran.
- 4 THE COURT: Nice to meet you. It's a pleasure. And,
- 5 | counsel, who's representing Century?
- 6 **UNIDENTIFIED:** I do, Your Honor.
- 7 THE COURT: And who's the gentleman with you, lurched
- 8 forward?
- 9 MR. D'ANDRE: Good morning, Your Honor, Brian
- 10 D'Andre, Senior Vice-President, Century Housing Corp.
- 11 **THE COURT:** Nice meeting you. It's a pleasure. And
- 12 | the next gentleman is with you, Steve Peck.
- 13 MR. PECK: Good morning, Your Honor, Steve Peck, CEO
- of USS.
- 15 **THE COURT:** Yeah, and I'll disclose to you that our
- 16 | friendship goes back many years in the homeless issues. And I
- 17 | also disclosed it to you that Steven called me and I had to cut
- 18 off that conversation abruptly, so I had -- didn't have outside
- 19 | influence. And I appreciate your courtesy in that regard, so
- 20 pardon the abruptness, but I do want you involved in this and
- 21 | the developers today to hear and participate.
- 22 MR. PECK: Absolutely, Your Honor, absolutely.
- THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else want to make an
- 24 | appearance today? All right. Who's the -- I'm sorry?
- 25 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Your Honor, Christine Berry (phonetic)

- 1 | is here for the 1887 Fund. Christine Berry for the --
- THE COURT: Oh, would you ask them to come forward,
- 3 | I --
- 4 UNIDENTIFIED: -- for the Chapel.
- 5 THE COURT: Yeah, I've got some questions later on of
- 6 | the 1887 Fund and also Steve of U.S. Vets for a moment. And so
- 7 | you're not precluded -- so you're not surprised, I'm going to
- 8 be asking you about how much money you've got.
- 9 MS. BERRY: Okay. Christine Berry, 1887 Fund in
- 10 partnership with U.S. Vets, Thomas Safran and Century Housing
- 11 to redo the Wadsworth Chapel.
- 12 **THE COURT:** It's a pleasure and I read about you so
- 13 | it's nice meeting you in person.
- MS. BERRY: Nice to meet you too, Your Honor.
- 15 **THE COURT:** And I know there's also a collection of
- 16 | rabbis, priests, clergy involved in the protestant faith.
- 17 MS. BERRY: There are, there are.
- 18 **THE COURT:** They're invited to be present any time
- 19 because we're going to talk about Wadsworth Chapel today also.
- 20 MS. BERRY: Wonderful, thank you.
- 21 THE COURT: And you know I'm going to ask you how
- 22 much money you've got.
- 23 MS. BERRY: Okay. Thank you.
- 24 THE COURT: Okay? Not right now, but I want to find
- 25 out why we haven't started on certain projects. But let me get

to that in just a moment. Okay?

- 2 MS. BERRY: Thank you, sir.
- 3 THE COURT: Nice meeting you.
- 4 Here's the things I'd like to discuss with you today
- 5 and then anything that you'd like to discuss with the Court.
- 6 First, I haven't written the final injunctive relief yet, but
- 7 | I've given you the strong indication of the -- my findings,
- 8 that the leases are void.
- And that presents a number of problems to the Court.
- 10 | First, you've requested 750 temporary units and 1,800 long term
- 11 | supportive units. The 1,800 long term supportive units you've
- 12 requested to be built out within six years.
- The 750 temporary units you've requested to be built
- out in 18 months. So on the board, I wrote 750 and 1,800. If
- 15 the Court wrote injunctive relief in its final form of 750
- 16 | temporary units and if those were built out in 18 months, what
- 17 | I might be concerned about is how those are sequenced in to
- 18 long term supportive housing units.
- 19 So take the number 1,800 and just put six years by it
- 20 hypothetically. And now take 750 and put 18 months by it.
- 21 What I don't want is 750 units to be built, veterans go into
- 22 | those units and languish over three, four, or five or six years
- 23 while we built long term supportive units.
- So I'm worried about how that would be sequenced. If
- 25 | you're really requesting 750 and if I approve that, then you've

got to match up for me how those people are going to languish
in those temporary supportive units and I assume that you're
either going to request that I shorten the time from six years
to four years or something quicker and then we're going to have
to have a real discussion about that with the developers.

Or that this is going to have to be sequenced in some

Second, I've already made findings that there's more than ample room for temporary and long term supportive housing. And for a moment, I want you to put up 248 because it's the only overview that I have, so Exhibit 248. Can one of you put that up for me?

So that's my first question eventually to each of you.

- MR. ROSENBERG: I have it, but I can only use the Elmo.
  - THE COURT: Sure, the Elmo's fine. All right. Can we work off of any better -- today can we work off of any better exhibit than this photograph or this map? Is there anything that shows Brentwood School, along with the baseball diamond, along with south campus and north campus than Exhibit 248?
- 21 MR. SILBERFELD: I don't think we have anything 22 better.
- THE COURT: Counsel, did you have anything better?

  MR. ROSENBERG: No, in fact, this is the same exhibit

  that we've been formally working off of.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll work off of that today.

I'd also like to discuss how many units must be free from income eligibility restrictions so that the most disabled veterans are not excluded from housing. I'd like to discuss exit strategies for the leasehold with UCLA, Brentwood School, Safety Park, and Bridgeland and when we get to that, the first entity I'm going to want to discuss with you will be Safety Park. The next will be Bridgeland and then out of courtesy because the Chairman's here, Brentwood School would be next ahead of UCLA and we'll wait for the Chancellor.

And any additional points you wish to discuss with the Court but those are minimally the points I'd like to cover today. I want to introduce to you the Court appointed monitor in this matter. I'm going to ask Mr. Hueston to stand and just introduce yourself.

MR. HUESTON: Good morning, Your Honor. Good morning, Your Honor, John Hueston of Hueston & Hennigan to serve as monitor.

THE COURT: John volunteered to serve pro bono, which is a great public service. He has an extraordinary law firm and comes to us by virtue of the background as United States Attorney. He was also the lead prosecutor in the <a href="Enron">Enron</a> case and as far as this Court is concerned, unless you find a conflict of some kind, this will be the Court special monitor. So on behalf of the plaintiffs, any issues?

1 MR. SILBERFELD: No issues, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: You can check and see, just to make sure.

3 On behalf of the VA?

MR. ROSENBERG: No issues, Your Honor.

5 **THE COURT:** HUD?

6 MR. ROSENBERG: For the federal defendants, both VA

and --

4

7

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

publicly for your service.

THE COURT: Are you going to represent VA and HUD?

MR. ROSENBERG: Yes. We represent the United States.

10 **THE COURT:** Okay. On behalf of Bridgeland?

MR. GUARDIANA: Bridgeland's fine with the monitor,

12 Your Honor.

then although there hasn't been an intervening by either UCLA or Brentwood at this particular time or the Safe Parking, you are here as a party on behalf of Bridgeland, but if those parties have a concern, they'll call that to the Court's attention. And I just want to humbly thank you for this public service. I want to do that publicly. I've been able to surround myself with -- the last seven years with people who've absolutely worked because they're concerned and patriotic for no fee. So welcome. I actually encouraged you to charge, he declined to do so. So all that's good and his rates would be normal, which would be expensive. So I want to thank you

- 1 MR. HUESTON: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm pleased to 2 serve. Thank you.
- THE COURT: Okay. He also brings with him a law firm

  in a sense and would you introduce your associate and partner

  s as well.
- 6 MR. HUESTON: Yes. I'd like to introduce Craig
  7 Fligor from Hueston Hennigan who will also be assisting.
  - THE COURT: Okay. Some of the other issues I wanted to discuss with you about if you'd now put up Exhibit 1368 or 1638, I'm sorry. That's a larger exhibit. So 1638.
  - Here, take the Court's copy. That's fine. And also take another blow up which would be -- well, here. But that's the primary one. Put that up for a moment, just so you have a preview of what we're going to discuss today because decisions will be made today.
  - MR. BERGMAN: Your Honor, if I might, Greg Bergman for CHC and the other builders. CHC and the group prepared a large map that might be of assistance --
- 19 **THE COURT:** It would be.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.3

24

- 20 MR. BERGMAN: -- that has been given to the U.S.
  21 Attorney that perhaps can be given to Your Honor and to the
  22 different parties.
  - THE COURT: John, could you help me with that in just a moment? Is it capable of being displayed also on the Elmo so all of us can work off of that? And it does cover the entire

- 1 | south campus, north campus, the baseball field, Brentwood?
- 2 MR. BERGMAN: I think a small focus on the housing
- 3 issues.
- 4 THE COURT: Then I don't want to use it at the
- 5 present time.
- 6 **MR. BERGMAN:** Okay.
- 7 **THE COURT:** I need a map of the entire area. And
- 8 then later on --
- 9 MR. BERGMAN: Save it until we get --
- 10 **THE COURT:** Yeah, later on, you can make that
- 11 presentation, okay. All right.
- Just a couple of other things, I'm concerned about
- 13 | the Waverley Chapel. I don't know how much money has been
- 14 raised, Steve, or Mr. Peck. And I'm concerned that we're
- 15 | letting the perfect get in the way of good and that we're not
- 16 starting a project when we may have some money to start a
- 17 | project. It doesn't have to be Waverley first, but I'm going
- 18 to be asking you, you know, how much, what's the cost, when we
- 19 can get started on that in just a few moments.
- I'm concerned about -- and now if you'd put up the
- 21 exhibit I just gave you, the 2 -- there it is. Okay. I think
- 22 | it caught all of us by surprise that we had this methane issue.
- 23 For the life of me, I don't understand how we go through an
- 24 entire construction project, get to the point of move in
- 25 | supposedly on September 3rd and the VA is absolutely in the

building and we can't put in a hundred plus veterans and then
we can't put in another 70 or 80 veterans in January.

And Barbara Ferrer is an outstanding public service, but I'm baffled by her answer. Her answer is, for those veterans in 209, 208 and 205, they can remain. Although they're within a thousand feet of this methane problem. And methane is supposed to be highly explosive. But for the MacArthur Field projects, they can't move in, even with monitoring.

It seems incongruent that you would leave veterans in a housing unit with a simple explanation that they're already there and not allow veterans to move in with monitoring going on in the MacArthur Field projects. That's why the developers are losing money, it's got to be disheartening. The VA is absolutely in a position of moving as rapidly from their perspective as they can. I frankly don't understand that answer.

So it leaves either vacating hypothetically the veterans in 209, 208 and 205 which is ridiculous or it seems to me the other veterans ought to be moving in with proper monitoring.

And I think what's really happened is bureaucracy again and that is that the 70 letters were sent out to the --well, to different groups. And I'm a little afraid that she can't back off of her present position, because if she does,

- then she's got a whirlwind with 68 or 69 other groups that she sent a letter to creating this exception.
  - I'm just -- before I go further, has there been any further discussion by the VA with Barbara Ferrer? She's very courteous, if we need to get her over here, we will.
- 6 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, Your Honor, we do have an 7 update.

4

5

10

11

12

13

21

22

2.3

24

25

Ms. Ferrer doing?

- 8 **THE COURT:** Have a seat or use the lectern, one of 9 the two.
  - MR. ROSENBERG: We do have an update and I'll note that in addition to the individuals that the Court has asked to attend today's conference from VA, we have brought Ms. Chelsea Black, who has an update that she can provide --
- 14 **THE COURT:** Well, ask her to come up.
- MR. ROSENBERG: -- with some good news.
- THE COURT: Ask her to come up. And I'd like to hear
  this update because what I'm afraid of is that we also start
  losing veterans who also filled out all of this paperwork, that
  that paperwork runs out, that we have to start again. So,

  Ms. Black, it's a pleasure to meet you. How are you and
  - MS. BLACK: Good. So I do have an update from the last time I was here. Our team met with the County team on the 17th and went through different discussion points. One of those being an interim solution that the County proposed to our

- 1 team for our developers to expedite the move ins of veterans. 2 So 401, in particular, the 74 units in MacArthur 3 Field, I think for a period of time we were a little unsure. 4 THE COURT: Yeah, just a moment. 5 MS. BLACK: Sure. THE COURT: Okay. Will one of you come up here and 6 7 put this up on the board for me? Ms. Black, just a moment, I 8 want to show you something. And you can identify the exhibit 9 number in just a moment. 10 And don't mind the handwriting on the side, that's 11 mine. Anyways. Okay. 12 MS. BLACK: Yes. So MacArthur Field --13 THE COURT: And how many -- show me 401 because 14 these -- look over on the building numbers on the left side. 15 So right underneath 208. MS. BLACK: THE COURT: 16 That would be MacArthur Field Phase 1 --17 MS. BLACK: Phase 1. 18 THE COURT: -- by Core (phonetic). 19 MS. BLACK: That is correct.
- 22 MS. BLACK: Correct.

that, 74 move ins.

THE COURT:

20

21

- 23 **THE COURT:** Now how are we doing with that?
- MS. BLACK: We're doing great. So we were able to --

And that would have 74, I've circled

25 | the County was able to provide an interim solution. Basically

- 1 the developers would purchase plug in devices very similar to
- 2 | fire alarms, Co2 alarms to install throughout the development.
- 3 | That would allow a temporary monitoring, make sure that the
- 4 development was safe and allow veterans to move in while the
- 5 developer works on a more permanent methane monitoring plan.
- 6 And, of course, while the VA works on our plan to produce a
- 7 post closure reports.
- 8 **THE COURT:** Okay. When?
- 9 MS. BLACK: So they were able to get their
- 10 | certificate of occupancy, their final, so 401-A on MacArthur
- 11 | was able to get their CO and that was, remember, the Department
- 12 of Public Works --
- 13 **THE COURT:** Right.
- MS. BLACK: -- is the ones who issue the occupancy
- 15 permits.
- 16 They did their inspections. I believe there was some
- 17 | communication possibly with the Public Health Department.
- 18 | Based on our discussion on the 17th, but nonetheless Public
- 19 Works --
- 20 **THE COURT:** Of September?
- 21 MS. BLACK: Correct.
- 22 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 23 MS. BLACK: They were able to grant the final
- 24 certificate of occupancy.
- 25 **THE COURT:** Now, I always expected that you would

- 1 have the certificate of occupancy. And during the trial, it
- 2 | was represented that that didn't seem to be a barrier, that's
- 3 | not the certificate that I'm interested in now. This one comes
- 4 from Barbara Ferrer.
- 5 MS. BLACK: The one that comes from Barbara Ferrer
- 6 | will be the permit hold would be removed.
- 7 **THE COURT:** When?
- 8 MS. BLACK: So our understanding is once the
- 9 developer creates the plan and they install the monitors, they
- 10 | will remove the hold.
- 11 THE COURT: Who's here for Corps? Well, I need some
- 12 developer to help me then. Steve, come on up, I'll put you on
- 13 | the firing line. You're hearing this discussion, it doesn't
- 14 | affect Building 210 which you have nor --
- MR. PECK: Correct.
- 16 | THE COURT: -- or I think it's --
- 17 MR. PECK: That's outside the circle.
- 18 **THE COURT:** Yeah. And any of the developers could
- 19 | join you, but what's being proposed is a temporary alarm system
- 20 or monitoring.
- MR. PECK: Yes.
- 22 **THE COURT:** I don't have any idea how long that
- 23 takes. In other words, I'm going to look for dates today and
- 24 | if I need to get Barbara over, I'll ask her to come over, but I
- 25 | want dates and times. I think the VA deserves that courtesy.

1 I think the developers do because you're losing money quite frankly and I think the veterans do because I'm worried about the paperwork getting old and they have to redo it. 3 Help me. How long do you think that takes to get 4 5 something that I don't understand, some alarm system in? 6 That's not my area of expertise. MR. PECK: 7 Well, look around the room, see if you THE COURT: somebody that is. Mr. Johnson, is this area of expertise? 8 9 Who's an expert out there that can help me? 10 MR. PECK: Can you --11 THE COURT: Ms. Black can, thank you. Another 12 gentleman is going to come forward also. 13 MR. MUNROE: Hello, Your Honor. My understanding is 14 the veterans are moving in tomorrow. 15 **THE COURT:** The what? 16 MR. MUNROE: The veterans are beginning to move in 17 tomorrow. 18 THE COURT: They are? 19 MR. MUNROE: They are. 20 THE COURT: So if I drive out there tomorrow 21 afternoon --22 MR. MUNROE: You should see veterans --2.3 THE COURT: -- at 3 o'clock --24 MR. MUNROE: Yes.

-- I'm going to see veterans there.

1 MR. MUNROE: You should see veterans there. THE COURT: Okay. I'll meet you there. That's 2 3 outstanding progress. Ms. Black, back to you. 4 5 MS. BLACK: So, yes, the plan should be relatively easy to put together. They're going to identify spots where 6 7 these temporary monitors will reside and Home Depot sells them 8 \$50 a piece, it should be a relatively simple strategy to 9 implement. And the County has advised that they will expedite the review and they seem to be collaborative in terms of really 10 11 helping us --12 THE COURT: Right. 13 MS. BLACK: -- get veterans moved in. 14 THE COURT: All good news. 15 So tomorrow we'll have veterans moving in? 16 MS. BLACK: We should. 17 THE COURT: Is that your understanding from the VA? 18 MR. ROSENBERG: I don't have any reason to believe otherwise. 19 20 THE COURT: Well, guess where you're going to be at 3 21 o'clock tomorrow. 22 MR. ROSENBERG: I will change my travel plans. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Guess where you're going to be as 24 plaintiffs tomorrow? Okay.

Now, I may be a little late. I've got a meeting with

- a number of counsel, people tomorrow at 1 o'clock out in the

  Valley, Michelle, that may take till 3 o'clock and I'm driving

  back. But we'll be at the VA tomorrow afternoon to happily

  qreet our veterans moving in.
- I want to compliment you. Oftentimes I'm negative,

  but I want to compliment all parties involved, Barbara Ferrer,

  you especially, the VA working together to get this done. And

  hopefully the developers we're getting some movement now

  because this could have gone on an extraordinary period of

  time, just because we have bureaucracies involved, so I'm

  extraordinarily pleased with that progress.

Anything else that you'd like to say?

MS. BLACK: No. We -- again, we're committed to providing that plan and we're going to commit to an expedited --

THE COURT: Okay. How are we doing then with the next move in, which would be --

18 MS. BLACK: So 404.

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Yeah. 404 we have 72 veterans.

MS. BLACK: 404 is not within a thousand feet of the field, so that's not impacted. The following development, 402 is within a thousand feet. 402 developers have already started to look at the plan for installing these temporary monitors, so they're already ahead of the game on that, so.

THE COURT: So we have the precedents with MacArthur

```
1
    Field --
 2
              MS. BLACK: Correct.
              THE COURT: -- to what we've referred to as 401
 3
    hopefully come January when this is supposed to --
 4
 5
              MS. BLACK: Correct.
 6
              THE COURT: -- have our move in date, we should have
    a hundred -- is 402 118 veterans?
 7
 8
              MS. BLACK: That is correct.
 9
              THE COURT: All right. Now, just a moment.
                                                            Who is
    our -- in 402 --
10
11
                          TSA.
              MS. BLACK:
12
              THE COURT: -- it's PD TSA, are they here?
13
              MR. MUNROE: Yes.
14
              THE COURT: Come on up for just a moment.
                                                          What I
15
    want to hear about is your paperwork. I want to hear what your
16
    occupancy is, because this costs you money every time you don't
17
    get a veteran in. I'm worried about the paperwork being
18
    duplicated, I'm worried about the developers.
19
              MR. MUNROE: Your Honor, we're working right now with
20
    the County Department of Public health and Public Works on what
21
    they've implemented, as Ms. Black has talked about, an interim
22
    measure. But we also believe that the same thing that the
23
    County has done for 401-A MacArthur which is to give occupancy
24
    about a week and a half ago move ins as we talked about
```

earlier.

1 THE COURT: Yeah. 2 MR. MUNROE: We'll also set precedent as you said for 402 as well. So we're doing both in parallel. We have a few 3 more months, so we're ahead of it and we'll continue to do 4 5 that. THE COURT: Excellent. 6 7 MR. MUNROE: Pursue both paths. Now, you'll let the monitor Mr. Hueston THE COURT: 9 know if there's a problem immediately. 10 MR. MUNROE: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. 12 Ms. Black, anything else other than me thanking you? 13 MS. BLACK: No, Your Honor, thank you. 14 All right. Now, I hope you'll stick THE COURT: 15 There's a few more questions that may come up around today. 16 that might involve you, but I'm not certain. 17 MS. BLACK: Certainly. 18 THE COURT: All right. The next area eventually that 19 we're going to cover, you're going to give into the Court about 20 is this issue concerning -- I need you to take that down and I 21 need you to put up the other map, which is a larger map and 22 there it shows the three areas that the methane -- yeah, if

It's not part of this lawsuit but Veterans Barrington

Park is an opportunity along with the contiguous parking lot.

you'd straighten that out, appreciate it.

2.3

24

- 1 And, Mr. Soboroff, for a moment. Come on up.
- 2 I know that you took -- bring Mr. Johnson with you.
- 3 | It's a pleasure to see both of you and I'm going to be relying
- 4 | upon you as well as Mr. Kuner (phonetic) in a couple of
- 5 moments.
- 6 MR. SOBOROFF: Thank you, sir. I'm Steve Soboroff.
- 7 This is Randy Johnson.
- 8 THE COURT: Last time I think we jokingly got into a
- 9 | conversation about this park and there was a little bit of
- 10 reluctance on your part at that time. I know you took a tour.
- 11 | Have you gentlemen actually walked through that park?
- 12 MR. SOBOROFF: Hundreds of times.
- THE COURT: Have you?
- MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, sir.
- 15 **THE COURT:** You did?
- 16 MR. SOBOROFF: I've been Parks Commissioner for --
- 17 **THE COURT:** No, no, have you actually walked through
- 18 that park, that tour that you took, I know that you went by
- 19 bus, have you actually walked through that park?
- 20 MR. SOBOROFF: Oh, before that as Parks Commission
- 21 | for the City of Los Angeles, that park was known for the
- 22 subsurface issues that created all the gopher holes.
- 23 **THE COURT:** Exactly.
- 24 MR. SOBOROFF: And so we were all told, including
- 25 everybody out here from Brentwood, you're going to hurt

1 yourself playing there. So people wouldn't even take their 2 dogs there.

THE COURT: Okay. So we know that. That park and the outfield is absolutely unplayable. And Mr. Hueston was kind enough to convince the Court to go out with him on a Sunday recently and we walked through that park again.

MR. SOBOROFF: How's your ankles?

would be a disgrace concerning that park. This is on a one year revocable lease. If you're going to work with the Court then this is going to come up for consideration in terms of permanent supportive housing. And I'm going to depend upon your input, but when we talk about facilities, we have facilities along Barrington, across the street we have three and four height instead of second height. That park, I'm going to have you walk it with me. I want you to physically see the condition of that park. It's not playable.

So as we go through some of these alternatives today, see you about 3 o'clock tomorrow?

MR. SOBOROFF: Sure.

THE COURT: Good. We'll be down for VA and see how we're doing with the move in, and then we're going to go up to that park and we're going to walk through that park, okay? But this is absolutely on the table although it's not part, you know, the Bridgeland, the UCLA, the Brentwood, et cetera, fair

- 1 enough? MR. SOBOROFF: Are you open to seeing other things that could be on the table that have emerged since? 3 THE COURT: Absolutely. 4 5 MR. SOBOROFF: Okay. THE COURT: Absolutely. Describe to me what those 6 7 are, though. Because we've been out there recently. 8 MR. SOBOROFF: Your Honor, have you ever been to 9 Wrigley Field, Chicago? THE COURT: Yeah. I'll tell a story. One of our 10 11 kids was watching TV and became a Chicago fan, so that's where 12 we went for our summer vacation in August. I've been there and 13 Wave Street is right across and if you want to be cheap, you 14 can watch from the apartments. Okay. I've been there. 15 MR. SOBOROFF: Across the street from the baseball 16 field are apartments. 17 THE COURT: Right. 18 MR. SOBOROFF: Multi-story apartments, basically up to the baseball field, except there's a street in between. 19 20 When, in fact, they built bleachers on the top of those 21 apartments so people can see the game. 22 THE COURT: Right.
- 23 MR. SOBOROFF: There is a strip of land around the 24 Jackie Robinson Stadium --
- 25 **THE COURT:** I'm going to get to Jackie Robinson in

- 1 just a moment.
- 2 MR. SOBOROFF: Okay. But I'm just saying, you
- 3 asked --
- 4 **THE COURT:** Bear with me.
- 5 MR. SOBOROFF: -- me the opportunity, but.
- 6 THE COURT: Yeah, we know that strip of land. We
- 7 know the parking lot, we know the six acres, we know that side.
- 8 Mr. Hueston went through that with the Court on a, let's just
- 9 say, informal tour.
- 10 MR. SOBOROFF: We have some new opportunities.
- 11 THE COURT: Yeah. We're going to get to that, I
- 12 promise you.
- 13 **MR. SOBOROFF:** Okay.
- 14 **THE COURT:** I'm open to all of this in a moment.
- Now, I'm going to drive home, though, do you see
- 16 | those concentric circles?
- 17 MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, sir.
- 18 **THE COURT:** They cover a large part of this park and
- 19 | I don't want any surprises concerning methane. This seems to
- 20 | be resolved in what I'm going to call building 401 or MacArthur
- 21 | Field and 402 eventually and 404. All of a sudden we get into
- 22 | construction and we have a surprise like we had in the court.
- 23 And somebody comes back in and says, you know, these are not
- 24 habitable. How do I resolve that now? And ERI takes an awful
- 25 long time, probably too long, but this park is on our radar.

- MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. I think what you do is you test 1 2 those sites. THE COURT: How do I do that? 3 4 MR. JOHNSON: You hire a methane engineer to go out 5 there and verify what the volume and the concentrations are of 6 methane. Methane is all over LA. So if you know it in advance 7 you can deal with it. THE COURT: Okay. And so I don't need an EIR which 8 9 takes time then, I just need some testing out there. MR. JOHNSON: 10 Yes. THE COURT: And if Barbara is taking the position 11 12 that we can move into MacArthur Field, hopefully she'll take 13 the position that we can move in to MacArthur, but we need to 14 get her in here and show that testing and put in some monitors 15 to be certain. 16 MR. SOBOROFF: These circles seem to be a 17 overreaction to science. 18 THE COURT: Well, I'm not there yet. 19 MR. SOBOROFF: Okay. 20 THE COURT: I don't know. I just don't want us to 21
  - THE COURT: I don't know. I just don't want us to devote this kind of money around the developers in a position that they found themselves in the last time unexpectedly or the VA.
- Who created this landfill? I sent out a notice to you yesterday. I want to know who created this. Landfill to

2.3

1 me means a garbage dump. So I want some history on this. MS. BLACK: Chelsea Black for the record. The landfill was again, 1950 when it was started. 3 Ιt 4 ran through 1968. 5 THE COURT: So 1950s -- let me repeat back to you. 6 1968. 7 MS. BLACK: And then again in 1971 to, you know, various some additional construction debris. The landfill was 8 9 created -- it was common to create this kind of shallow burial 10 area prior to federal disposal regulations. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MS. BLACK: And that's really how it was created and 13 utilized up to that point. 14 THE COURT: Do we have any idea what was put in 15 In other words, normally asbestos doesn't create 16 methane so normally methane is created by garbage quite 17 frankly. 18 MS. BLACK: Correct. 19 THE COURT: So garbage was put in this landfill? 20 MS. BLACK: No. Medical waste predominantly. 21 THE COURT: From Wadsworth Hospital? 22 MS. BLACK: And construction debris. 2.3 THE COURT: So medical waste is there. 24 MS. BLACK: Correct.

And that's what we believe is creating

THE COURT:

1 | the methane?

2.3

MS. BLACK: We don't really believe there is high levels of methane. That's more consistent like you said with organic material that decomposes --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BLACK: -- thus creating the methane. We don't have any firm evidence indicating that there was large amounts of organic materials and that is counter to investigations that we've done over the years.

This really low levels of methane both around the Arroyo and at different sites.

THE COURT: When I say this, I trust you, I trust your representations, so I trust counsel's representations. I don't trust though, I don't trust the simple answer that both of us hope is true and that is, no problem. And that's why I'm asking Mr. Johnson, Mr. Soboroff with their wisdom how we conduct, you know, efficiently, cost-effectively some test out there so that if this property comes on the radar for permanent supportive housing that we don't run into a problem in the future. Fair enough?

MS. BLACK: Correct.

THE COURT: Now, would the VA be opposed in this injunctive relief if I ordered testing on Barrington Park?

MR. ROSENBERG: No.

THE COURT: Okay. The next one we're floating around

and it's a rumor is that there was some kind of biproduct of
some type of nuclear. And I'm going to ask you to come up for
just a moment, Rob. Yeah, come on up for a moment.

2.3

This rumor has been floating around a long time, it goes back quite a few years. I can't afford now to get into a position where developers are developing and we have anything on the horizon that stops the move in because we have new paperwork, the veterans have to generate that again, the developers are losing money, a ridiculous situation.

Fill me in as much as you can about these rumors and if there is a particular location where this might be, because I want to set all this aside early.

unidentified: So my understanding of this is I've heard about this for years. There's some articles that were written in Enviro Reporter and the reporter's name is Michael Collins and he did a lot of studies of that area, the landfill behind MacArthur. And his findings per the articles is that there's radioactive material. And just recently within the last week, week and a half, another attorney had reached out to me through a reporter and said they wanted to talk because they were concerned about what was in those landfills. I haven't had a chance to speak with him yet, but that's on my list to do.

THE COURT: Can Mr. Johnson and Mr. Soboroff come back up again? I don't know how much you know about this kind

- of material, I know very little. This could be a wild fishing expedition. What I don't want is the Court in a position of considering a location and at the last moment we either have a lawsuit or input that causes us to stop.
- 5 How do I deal with this kind of material and where is 6 it located, do you know?

- maps. If you -- let's see. They are the purple circles within
  the yellow.
- THE COURT: So the landfill is the same location that's allegedly producing some amount of methane that I'd have this material?
- MR. JOHNSON: Yes. That there's been articles
  written that there is radioactive material per this --
  - THE COURT: So how do I make certain then that the Veterans Barrington Park or let's say a baseball field by the fence at Brentwood School is suitable for building or do I just let this as a rumor and I take everybody's goodwill that we believe this, and Judge, I don't think we don't want to do that. I think we want to verify now, I think it's inexpensive, so help me, Mr. Soboroff, help me, Mr. Johnson.
  - MR. JOHNSON: So I think what you want to do is the Regional Water Quality Control Board or one of the agencies will have all the bad stuff. They'll tell you where it's at.

    And it'll be -- you know, you can go to the parcel and find out

1	if there's anything there that's recorded.
2	THE COURT: And you can do that for me?
3	MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, sure.
4	THE COURT: And we can do that today? Excellent. I
5	love that attitude.
6	MR. JOHNSON: All right.
7	THE COURT: So we're going to get on the phone, we're
8	going to start tracing it down, we may not reach completion
9	today but I want to verify he location and come up with the
10	best method of taking a look at that so we take it off the
11	board or if we have a concern, we deal with it, when we go out
12	to, you know, monitor this
13	MR. SOBOROFF: And I would think you should have a
14	lot of this information already, don't you?
15	THE COURT: Ms. Black, come on up for a second.
16	MR. ROSENBERG: Ms. Black might be able to speak to
17	some of that.
18	THE COURT: Yeah. What information do you have?
19	MS. BLACK: There have been several studies over the
20	years and I think the there's an All West Geoscience
21	investigation that was done and I don't remember the exact
22	THE COURT: No, no, let's stop now
23	MS. BLACK: Yes, sir.
24	THE COURT: so we're not guessing.
25	MS. BLACK: Yes, sir.

1 THE COURT: Can you help Mr. Johnson, Mr. Soboroff --2 MS. BLACK: Uh-huh. -- start pulling that today? 3 THE COURT: 4 MS. BLACK: Absolutely. 5 THE COURT: And I want to make a docket of that so if people are concerned they know what those concerns are and the 6 7 public can react or there's not an issue. MS. BLACK: Yeah, we have no concerns about methane 9 or any -- there's low levels of radioactive material and have 10 no concern. 11 No, you don't, I do. THE COURT: 12 MS. BLACK: Okay. 13 THE COURT: Because we already hit one road block 14 that caused the VA, you know, not to be able to move in on 15 September 3rd. So I'm not taking that anymore as the gospel, I 16 just need to verify that. We'll work with Mr. Hueston today. 17 If you can start pulling things we'll be here as long as you 18 need, okay.

Now, we may not complete this today. I just want to know with Mr. Johnson's wisdom and Mr. Soboroff what we need to do to verify that there's no issue. And if there are past studies that say that, then I want to make those public, so there's no public concern, but I need a record of that. Fair enough?

MS. BLACK: Understood.

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

**THE COURT:** Okay.

MS. BLACK: Thank you.

MR. SOBOROFF: Judge, sir, we ran into this before at Playa Vista. Different parcels with different situations and a task master on each one would go into a room with everybody and then come out with a solution. They're all different.

In this case you're talking about a couple of hotspots --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SOBOROFF: -- and in those -- within those hot spots there are different methods of remediation and one of the remediation methods, I mean, we've found bombs that were in there from the Howard Hughes, from the war. We found all kinds of issues and they're all dealt with differently.

In this case, that's why the circled map gives me the creeps because there's a couple of hot spots in here and they can be dealt with. But this is a task. And in this project, there's 50 tasks. But in this task, everybody needs to get in one room and come out with an answer and the county has to be a part of that.

**THE COURT:** We're going to do that, believe it or 22 not.

23 MR. SOBOROFF: I believe it.

**THE COURT:** Okay. We're going to do that. I just
25 need to have information initially so I have some idea if there

- 1 | even is a problem because there may have been prior studies
- 2 | that say this has been resolved. And if that's the case, then
- 3 I'm not going to waste your time.
- If not, then I want to make certain we don't run into
- 5 | a last minute issue.
- 6 MR. SOBOROFF: There may be, there may not, but this
- 7 is not the first time I assure you that this has ever happened
- 8 and it is a very simple thing to find out the answer to.
- 9 THE COURT: Yeah. So here's the deal, let's just do
- 10 | it.
- 11 MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, sir.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Let's quit talking about it and do it.
- 13 All right?
- 14 All right. Now, I want to go back to the next
- 15 | subject that'll eventually be discussed and that's Treasury.
- 16 | I'm going to ask you, what progress has been made, in terms of
- 17 Treasury and writing these regulations that have been pending.
- 18 MR. ROSENBERG: We have good news on that as well.
- 19 I'd ask Dr. Keith Harris to --
- THE COURT: Excellent.
- 21 MR. ROSENBERG: -- discuss that.
- 22 **THE COURT:** And I want to thank Dr. Harris for his
- 23 participation. You're very much appreciated. And for the
- 24 record, this is the gentleman who's I think been the forerunner
- of trying to change these policies and frankly I'll put it on

- the record I think you were ignored for a substantial period of time. You can't say that to your employer, but I can. And so your pioneering efforts are very much appreciated.
- 4 DR. HARRIS: Thank you, sir. Nice to see you again.
- 5 THE COURT: Nice to see you.
- DR. HARRIS: We do have very good news on this.
- 7 Treasury released a -- what they call a revenue procedure
- 8 yesterday --

impact.

- 9 **THE COURT:** Yesterday.
- DR. HARRIS: -- adopting HUD's method of calculating income into their low income housing tax credit program. And this was -- we talked about this a little bit before, this was a very necessary step for the HUD guidance to have real world
- 15 **THE COURT:** Have the regulations been written?
- DR. HARRIS: Yeah. And technically it's not
- 17 | regulation, they're able to write an internal procedure that
- 18 then goes to the state offices that administer that program.
- 19 **THE COURT:** So walk through the process then because,
- 20 of course, if this is off the Court's radar, you have the
- 21 ability to make a change that I can't. I can make a change if
- 22 | I feel it's necessary within the parameters of the lawsuit, but
- 23 | what you're doing has nationwide significance, and therefore,
- 24 any time I can back away and be assured or plaintiffs can be
- 25 | assured, I would love to have you resolve this.

musing about many times during the trial was would Treasury take this action without Court involvement and they did.

Treasury has authorized to define income in the low income housing tax credit program in a manner consistent with HUD's Section 8 method. So they can write this as internal procedure, it does not require --

THE COURT: Okay.

DR. HARRIS: It actually doesn't require --

THE COURT: You'll talk to plaintiff's counsel if you have concerns, you're going to raise those concerns. This is still on the table for injunctive relief. If I don't have to write that injunctive relief, obviously if there's some -- I can delay a portion of that injunctive relief to the future, because I'd like to turn this back to a nationwide effort rather than just a local effort, and I'd like to stop further embarrassment.

But I will say but for your efforts and but for this lawsuit, I don't believe that Treasury would be acting expeditiously as they are. Now you can't say that, but I can. And I think this lawsuit has caused attention to make Treasury act finally, but I want to thank you for your efforts. Because I think you are the driving force that made this occur and I think you were ignored for a long period of time, so shame on them. But I'm very glad about that.

Now, I want you to remain. I'm going to be relying on you later today. Okay. Please.

DR. HARRIS: Could I add one more thing?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

2.3

DR. HARRIS: Because you referenced it being a national effort, which it is in this case, there is also a relevant statewide piece to this. The State of California deserves credit. The Assembly passed a bill that would apply the HUD change to other California state programs, importantly such as the veterans homeless and housing prevention.

THE COURT: Excellent. I can't tell you how much I'd like not to write this portion of injunctive relief.

DR. HARRIS: It's a big piece of having this downstreamed.

THE COURT: How much I'd like to back out as a Court and give credit to the agency for doing this and especially to you, but you have to know bluntly that I don't believe that this would have happened without this lawsuit and I think that you were ignored and you're very much to be complimented by everyone involved in this. It's appreciated.

DR. HARRIS: Okay. Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Have a seat.

All right. Congress, what's happening with the Sherman Bill? That's been pending forever a day. Help me. In other words, Congress is sitting over there doing something or

- 1 nothing. And so I'm going to be blunt about that also. How
- 2 | are we doing with the Sherman Bill and do we need to get
- 3 Representative Lu in? Come on up, Mr. Harris, because Congress
- 4 has been asleep and I'll put that on the record.
- 5 DR. HARRIS: My understanding and I cannot swear that
- 6 | this is the Sherman Bill but a bill consistent with it was
- 7 introduced yesterday.
- 8 THE COURT: Excellent. Now, see how things are kind
- 9 of coming to fruition all of a sudden. So our local
- 10 representative is Mr. Lu; is that correct? Is that Congressman
- 11 Lu out there?
- DR. HARRIS: Sherman's --
- 13 **THE COURT:** And I'm not sure he's caught between a
- 14 | hot box and I'll be pretty blunt today and that he's probably
- 15 looking at the West Homeowner's Association and he's got a
- 16 | constituency that don't want the veterans there. And then he's
- 17 kind of looking at the veterans and he shows up for a shovel
- 18 | ceremony. Why doesn't somebody get him on the phone and ask
- 19 | him to come down here? Can you do that?
- 20 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Sure.
- 21 **THE COURT:** Okay. Get him on the phone, ask him to
- 22 come down here today. Let's just find out what his thoughts
- 23 | are and how this bill is progressing so we have first-hand
- 24 knowledge. And I want to thank you again, Dr. Harris.
- 25 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Sir, is it Chad Lu or Brad Shu, which

1 one?

THE COURT: I don't know, he's in the congressional district. I think it's L-E-U, I'm not sure. I looked him up the other day and then forgot it, so.

But I'd like to get that congressional representative down here. I think he's caught between the two hot boxes, one is probably West LA Homeowner's Association which historically and now don't want the veterans to increase capacity and probably his position is hopefully a national leader and taking a position one way or another on behalf of the veterans or not. And that's just not a shovel ceremony that he shows up at.

Okay. The most difficult problem is going to be these leaseholds. And I don't want to destroy facilities if they can be used in a beneficial way. And so for a moment, I'm just speaking, Skip, to you and to your client for a moment. You've got some magnificent facilities out there but nobody needs four baseball fields, period.

And number two, I would hope for some kind of cooperation because there may be some ability to resolve this but these leases are void and you're going to have to talk to me today about it, exit schedule in this. Because whether it's 22 acres immediately which I'm frowning upon, which would leave some of these facilities vacant when I may not need that land, by the same token, you're welcome to address me with any positive thoughts. But we are planning an exit strategy and

- 1 | there's a number of ideas that we can come up with that might
- 2 | maintain these facilities, maybe have the kids still
- 3 participating and using these facilities, but right now, the 22
- 4 acres are coming back to the VA. Okay. So I'll wait for your
- 5 | comments in just a moment.
- I want to start with parking. Is anybody here with
- 7 | parking? All right. Now, let's start with parking. We've got
- 8 | a whole history of corruption involving this parking lot,
- 9 unconnected to the present owner.
- So we've got a VA contracting officer Ralph Gilman
- 11 (phonetic) who for well over a decade bilked the VA, who is an
- 12 innocent party to this, out of over \$13 million, minimally.
- 13 I'm sorry, he's the VA contracting officer.
- DR. HARRIS: Tillman, Your Honor.
- 15 **THE COURT:** Yeah, Tillman, T-I-L-L-M-A-N I think.
- 16 And then we have the West Side Services' owner Richard or David
- Richard Scott who was sentenced to 70 months by Judge Klausner
- 18 and restitution was ordered.
- 19 My comments have nothing to do with the present owner
- 20 | who is a successor in interest, and I want that absolutely
- 21 | clear. This parking lot is on a one year revocable lease or
- 22 | these parking lots, I'm sorry. When does that lease run?
- I've got the best attorneys in the world. When does
- 24 | that lease run?
- 25 MR. SILBERFELD: Apologies, I just don't remember,

- 1 but I can check it out.
- 2 **THE COURT:** Good, look it up.
- 3 MR. SILBERFELD: I'll look it up.
- 4 THE COURT: I'm waiting, look it up.
- 5 MR. ROSENBERG: One moment, Your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: And have you two met and conferred, the
- 7 plaintiff side and the defense side? I may be getting over my
- 8 | skis, so if you two have met and conferred about this, then I'd
- 9 like to know what your thoughts are before I share my thoughts
- 10 | with you.
- 11 **UNIDENTIFIED:** We have not.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Okay. Well, that's a shame. All right.
- 13 MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, I can -- if given a few
- 14 minutes I can pull up the lease --
- 15 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 16 MR. ROSENBERG: -- because it was entered as an
- 17 exhibit.
- 18 **THE COURT:** We're just going to sit here. We're just
- 19 going to sit here.
- MR. ROSENBERG: I'm sorry?
- 21 **THE COURT:** We're just going to sit here until I know
- 22 | the date that the lease ends. Now, remember I may write
- 23 partial injunction action today, I may space that out, I may
- 24 write final injunctive relief today.
- 25 And as you're looking that up, think about the

1 following. Let's assume that the lease ended in December, well 2 even though it's void are we going to take the owner out of business for one or two months? But let's assume that that 3 lease ends in March or April, why is that owner continuing to 4 5 pocket money on an illegal lease? And second, why can't this be transferred back to the VA? Why can't we employ the same 6 7 veterans? And why can't we cause the VA this time not to commingle the money but to set up separate accounts reportable to the monitor so we know what's occurring in each of these

## (Pause)

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

12 MR. ROSENBERG: June 1st.

designated income streams?

THE COURT: June 1st. All right. John, June 1st, so you know what I'm going to do. All right.

This lease is void. Now that party isn't here, but part of this injunctive relief and you can push back on me, and that's why I'm sharing this with you that I'm going to write tonight is that this is void as of now. There is no reason for this owner to continue to take an income stream that properly belongs to the VA and the veterans. This is illegal.

And so therefore, we have to discuss how we're going to go about that and if you want to take that up on appeal and defend the parking lot owner, be my guest. But this is void and this land is full of corruption in its history, it's ridiculous.

So it seems to me that we ought to be able to make the transfer back to the VA in good faith. But this time, I'm going to order injunctive relief a separate account so it's not commingled, because we have a little bit of problems if you look historically back in 2012 of \$40 million we couldn't find. Go back in the history. And so I'm going to want to see from an accounting from that particular asset into a separate account and no commingled.

2.3

Now, push back, and tell me why you're opposed to this.

MR. ROSENBERG: So Brad Rosenberg on behalf of the United States. It may be more appropriate to bring one of our witnesses here, but my initial reaction is, and my recollection is, is that that was a net revenue lease, so that all of the revenues from the lease flow to VA, not Safety Park. And so voiding the lease only has to the effect of depriving VA of those revenues.

THE COURT: If that's the case I just want you to verify that for me. And you don't have to do that right now.

MR. ROSENBERG: Right.

THE COURT: I want certainty here.

MR. ROSENBERG: Right.

THE COURT: Because my intent is twofold. One to make certain that this benefits veterans through the VA, but number two to get a separate accounting stream set up so we

- 1 know exactly what that revenue is from that asset.
- MR. ROSENBERG: I also don't know and again, I would
- 3 | have -- this is something that the Court raised for the first
- 4 | time today about having VA operate the parking lot itself.
- 5 I don't know whether VA would be in a position to do
- 6 that. If the lease is voided it may just be that those parking
- 7 lots sit empty and --
- THE COURT: I'm trying to --
- MR. ROSENBERG: -- there's no revenue at all.
- 10 **THE COURT:** -- save -- Brad, I'm trying to save
- 11 money. Remember, all the way along the way I'm not trying to
- 12 have this cost go up. If you can't do it, then you could see
- 13 | injunctive relief where I simply have the monitor take this
- 14 | over, then I've got to set up a separate entity, I have to take
- 15 | some overhead for that person operating it, in other words, I'm
- 16 | trying to avoid that. So if you can't do that, tell me,
- 17 because I've got another way to go.
- 18 MR. ROSENBERG: I would need to consult with VA on
- 19 | this because I don't know what the position is.
- 20 **THE COURT:** Get on the phone.
- 21 MR. ROSENBERG: No, no, I would need them here.
- 22 **THE COURT:** Okay. Who's from the VA here? Who's my
- 23 | head? Who's making decisions? Come on up here, so you're not
- 24 nameless and faceless.
- 25 MR. ROSENBERG: So in addition to the other -- in

1 addition to all of the other -- in addition to all of the individuals the Court has identified, we've also brought Rob 2 3 Merchant here today. He's the --Nice meeting you, what a pleasure. 4 THE COURT: 5 MR. ROSENBERG: -- medical center director. THE COURT: So you're the one who's going to make 6 7 decisions; is that correct? MR. MERCHANT: Yes, Your Honor, good morning. 8 9 THE COURT: And you have direct contact with Mr. --10 the Secretary of the Department, Mr. McDonough? 11 MR. MERCHANT: I can. 12 THE COURT: Excellent. So what are your thoughts 13 because I'm giving you a hint that I'm going to write 14 injunctive relief almost immediately about that parking lot. 15 MR. MERCHANT: Right. So --16 THE COURT: And that parking lot stream of revenue, 17 if it's going to the owner, it's going to stop, because he is making some profit no matter what you say. 18 19 MR. MERCHANT: Right. So --20 THE COURT: And that stops. 21 MR. MERCHANT: Understood. 22 THE COURT: Number two, I'm trustful with you, but I 23 don't trust the past history concerning these income streams 24 that have come in, that have been commingled, and therefore, 25 I'm going to want a separate account. And if I can do that

1 economically through the VA I'm going to trust you to do that, 2 make a reporting back on the separate account to the monitor, but any renumeration going to this owner has to end 3 immediately. Now, help me. How do we do that cost 4 5 effectively? MR. MERCHANT: So under the current terms of the 6 7 lease or the terms as they existed when signed --You don't have a lease right now, it's 8 THE COURT: 9 illegal. It's gone. 10 MR. MERCHANT: Right. That's why I said --11 Let's get past that. THE COURT: 12 MR. MERCHANT: -- under the terms when signed. 13 So the revenue from that comes into what we call a 14 fund control point, which is essentially an accounting cost 15 center within our healthcare systems operating projects. 16 THE COURT: And you're about to change that because we've been commingling these streams and that injunctive relief 17 18 hint is going to be that this is a separate accountable stream 19 so I can keep track of it. 20 MR. MERCHANT: Yes, we will make sure that that is --21 THE COURT: How are we going to accomplish that 22 without running up the special monitor having to hire somebody? 2.3 MR. MERCHANT: So if we can establish a separate --24 THE COURT: How are we going to --25 -- what we call a fund control point

1 specifically --2 THE COURT: How are we going to --MR. MERCHANT: -- for this. 3 THE COURT: How are we going to accomplish this? 4 5 are we going to accomplish this? Tell me. 6 MR. MERCHANT: That can be done through an 7 administrative process through our chief financial officer in 8 our finance department within our healthcare system. 9 THE COURT: So you don't have the authority to make 10 that and you've got to make a call and that's fine. 11 MR. MERCHANT: No, I have the authority to do that, 12 yes. THE COURT: Okay. Well, can we do that then? 13 14 MR. MERCHANT: Yes, we can do that. 15 So, one, can we set up cutting off this THE COURT: 16 owner from any compensation? In other words, I hear how the 17 lease is working, I'm not that smart. My bottom line is that 18 owner shouldn't be receiving any compensation, any overhead from this point forward, period. Can we do that? 19 20 MR. MERCHANT: I will need to -- we will need to review the terms of the former lease. 21 22 THE COURT: No, your lease is void, it's gone. 2.3 MR. MERCHANT: That's -- right. 24 THE COURT: In other words, get past that, you don't

Can we do that? And who's going to notify this

25

have a lease.

- 1 owner to cut this stream off immediately?
- 2 MR. MERCHANT: So we'll have to work through our
- 3 | contracting office which is --
- 4 THE COURT: And how long is that going to take,
- 5 | because I'm going to be sitting here waiting.
- 6 MR. MERCHANT: Yep, we can do that, we can start that
- 7 process today.
- 8 THE COURT: Okay. Then I'm going to sit here
- 9 apparently until we get that done and so are you.
- 10 **MR. MERCHANT:** Okay.
- 11 **THE COURT:** We're not going to wait for a month.
- Number two, I'm going to trust the VA to set up a
- 13 separate, you know, account for this or I'm going to have to
- 14 have my monitor do that and that gets costly. I'd rather have
- 15 you do that and trust that you can do this and is there any
- 16 objection to setting up a separate account rather than
- 17 | commingling these funds?
- 18 MR. MERCHANT: No. We have no objection to that,
- 19 Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. So that's the easy one. How long
- 21 | would it take you to get in contact with somebody because I
- 22 | want this income stream stopped today? I think we can retain
- 23 our veterans working at that location. But I don't want him
- 24 profiting anymore. This lease is gone.
- 25 MR. MERCHANT: One moment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, John, jump in at any time because you're going to be the Marine on the firing line. The special master is going to give us his thoughts also because I now have help finally, so thank you.

MR. HUESTON: Thank you, Your Honor. My question would be the news going to the parking lot owner, there's no revenue to you. I assume parking lot owner says, I'm not going to operate the parking lot any longer, in which case what would the VA do.

MR. MERCHANT: Prior to VA entering into this lease agreement, there were no gate controls on the parking lots and parking was free and available to anyone who needed a place to park. They were otherwise unmonitored.

MR. HUESTON: Right. But now you have the infrastructure of a paid parking lot, which presumably the VA could run or a third party could be put in place, which would not take the revenue that the parking lot company has, devoting more of the net stream to the VA. The other alternative to generate income, right?

MR. MERCHANT: It could be, yes.

THE COURT: I'd like not to create through the monitor a separate operation independent of the VA because it costs money. So I'm hoping I can work through the VA, get that revenue segmented so we know what it is and keep track of it so it's not commingled. That's the ultimate goal today.

1	MR. MERCHANT: Okay.
2	THE COURT: Now, do you have questions of me because
3	I've cut you off and I want to apologize.
4	MR. MERCHANT: That's quite all right, Your Honor. I
5	think we'll need to have some discussions about how that
6	actually looks, what it would take to be able to operate that,
7	and still derive revenue from it.
8	THE COURT: So how long am I sitting here in
9	continuous session then? You know, when we say discussions,
10	you're no longer in a cork that's run by bureaucratic time.
11	Right now we're going to do this.
12	MR. MERCHANT: Right.
13	THE COURT: And we're asking our military folks to do
14	incredible things, you can do incredible things.
15	MR. MERCHANT: No, I understand that. Chelsea.
16	MS. BLACK: So the vendor who runs the parking lot,
17	when they get the gross receipts in from those from the
18	folks that park there, they subtract out the operating expenses
19	and that's the salaries that go to the veterans that are being
20	employed there.
21	THE COURT: Sure.
22	MS. BLACK: What comes down to it is a \$2,500
23	management fee
24	THE COURT: He gets \$2,500, the owner
25	MS. BLACK: and the vendor gets

1 THE COURT: -- does? 2 MS. BLACK: Correct. 3 THE COURT: For a management fee? MS. BLACK: 4 Correct. 5 THE COURT: I've been out there. Do you know how 6 management that must -- I'm just joking with you, never mind. 7 MS. BLACK: So that's what it comes down to. So is his total profit \$2,500 a month? THE COURT: 9 MS. BLACK: That is a management fee. That's in the 10 lease. 11 THE COURT: I know, that's not my question. 12 I can designate that and put a name on it, that's my management 13 fee. That's not my question. How much is he taking in a month 14 as the owner? I don't care whether you call it a management 15 fee or a whatever fee. I guarantee it's more than \$2,500 a 16 month. 17 MS. BLACK: Per the non-existent lease, that's what 18 it was. Remember Mr. Tillman \$4 million. 19 THE COURT: 20 one time that parking lot was pretty lucrative, which is why 21 I'm having a hard time believing \$2,500 a month is what he is 22 taking in. 2.3 MS. BLACK: Well, the gross receipts are around 60 to 24 70,000 a month.

No, no, you're not there, you're not the

1 owner. My message is clear, this lease is gone. And I don't 2 want him taking in any more money. And that needs to be forthwith and I'm going to sit here until that's done. So you 3 come up with a plan, I'll work with you, if you want to come 4 5 back at 9 o'clock tonight I don't care, tomorrow, fine. MR. ROSENBERG: I would like to add something. You 6 7 know, the record reflects the terms of the lease that it's a 8 net revenue lease to the VA. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. MR. ROSENBERG: Understood that the Court has voided 10 11 this lease as of today and so the VA will take action on that. 12 As for --13 THE COURT: I haven't written --14 MR. ROSENBERG: -- as far --15 Just a moment. I haven't written that in THE COURT: 16 final writing yet. In other words, I'm giving everybody a 17 chance to push back. I voided the lease, but I haven't gotten 18 as far as our discussion today about what to do with the money. 19 MR. ROSENBERG: Well let me push back then for just a 20 moment because the Court referenced -- I'll be blunt, a prior 21 scandal regarding that parking lot. 22 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 2.3 MR. ROSENBERG: But with a different owner or a 24 different lessee, under a different lease. That's not the

And so I think it's fair to

25

lease that's at issue here.

presume that VA in responding to that issue, and which it was a victim, took steps to ensure that something like that wouldn't happen again. And that's presumably why it's a net revenue lease.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSENBERG: Also in terms -- the Court asked about what will happen next. The VA is not in a position or I don't believe that it's in a position to manage a parking lot directly.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSENBERG: And you mentioned the employees.

They're Safety Park employees. I don't believe that the VA would have the ability to bring those veteran employees on board as VA employees. We don't even know if they would want to.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Hueston, just a moment. That means that apparently we may be running a parking lot. Now that gets costly because remember we're trying to hold our costs down, John's working pro bono, so that's your position, you know the injunctive relief I may be writing, you can take that up on appeal. But the end result is there's no reason with a void and illegal lease that this owner continues to profit and you'll say he's innocent, I say he's innocent also, but this is the VA's problem.

MR. ROSENBERG: No, I understood that the Court has

voided the lease. The question is what happens next and in

terms of what at least we understand the Court would like to

accomplish in these proceedings is to try to maximize the

benefit --

THE COURT: To the veterans.

MR. ROSENBERG: -- for veterans. I think everyone is on the same page in that regard. But voiding the lease without the ability to come up with an alternative plan for how that -- whether there will be any revenue or what that would look like would not benefit veterans and there are structural problems that VA would likely face in taking on management responsibilities that are outside of its wheelhouse, it's a healthcare agency at its core, not a parking agency.

And so we would caution the Court that entering further -- we don't -- to be clear, we don't think that there's a basis --

THE COURT: All right. Wouldn't you face this same problem if we just let the lease run? In other words, the arguments you're proposing to me now would be the same in July when this lease runs and that is the VA is not capable of running a parking lot.

In other words, I'm going to face this in July if I just let the lease run and if your position is you can't run a parking lot, you've put me in a box, and the box is, this owner, at some point, whether it's in July or now, is going to

- 1 | cease taking in revenue that belongs to the veterans. And if
- 2 | you can't run it, then I've got to turn to Mr. Hueston and I've
- 3 got to create an entity to run that and I've got to charge
- 4 \$2,500 a month to somebody or whatever for an administrative
- 5 | fee and I'd rather this be going to the veterans.
- So if you can't do that, tell me this afternoon and
- 7 I'll know what to write.
- MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. Understood.
- 9 THE COURT: Okay. Bridgeland, you have a 1956 lease
- 10 and you have ten well sites that go down -- or drills, and I
- 11 get my terminology backwards, I'm not an oil person. I love
- 12 | the gentleman by the way who -- Fat Hog (phonetic), whatever
- 13 | that --
- 14 UNIDENTIFIED: That's Mr. Wangled (phonetic).
- 15 **THE COURT:** That goes down to subterranean I think
- 16 | 761 acres, subterrain out of your acre and a half drill site
- 17 and I could be off a couple of --
- 18 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Between the 1956 lease and the 1969
- 19 | lease. The 1956 lease is 670 acres.
- 20 **THE COURT:** Okay. Not 700, 670 acres, okay.
- 21 The later lease allows you to, I'm going to use the
- 22 | word slant drill, and you can argue with me about my
- 23 terminology, give me another term.
- 24 **UNIDENTIFIED:** No. So, no, the later lease gives us
- 25 additional federal minerals to drill and it allows -- it does

1 allow us to drill those federal minerals from the current drill 2 site that is --3 THE COURT: I understand that. You can correct my terminology. We can be here all day if you want to. 4 5 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. THE COURT: I can swap out Sawtel 2 (phonetic), 6 7 fourth well over, fourth drill site over. UNIDENTIFIED: The 2016 license. Revoke the license 8 9 is for Sawtel 2. 10 THE COURT: I don't care what we call it, I'm going 11 to call it Sawtel 2. 12 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Yes. 13 THE COURT: And that allows you to slant drill. 14 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. 15 THE COURT: You've really said to the Court well, 16 gee, Judge, even if you rule against us we can got over to BLM 17 and we might be able to renegotiate a new lease. 18 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Not exactly. 19 THE COURT: I heard that very clearly. 20 UNIDENTIFIED: That's not the exact terminology. 21 There is the potential to unitize. 22 THE COURT: Why shouldn't I have and order BLM to be

happening here is if I terminate Sawtel 2, which is about 42

intervened in this case? In other words, what's really

2.3

24

well, you still a 1956 lease that you've repeatedly said to the
Court that I don't have jurisdiction over. You're right.

But I also know that that's a field that's drying up, maybe in one year, maybe in 20 years. And for the life of me, I'll say to the VA, I don't understand the settlement between you and the plaintiff bluntly, and I don't understand how we could ever get to the position with this later generation who's suffering from burn pit, lung disease, much greater than Vietnam and I don't understand how we're dealing with deadly and hazardous munitions that are much more potent than the Vietnam era, how would we ever allow housing in an acre and a half contiguous to an oil well?

And maybe BLM is going to vouch for this, but I would love to get them in here and have them explain to me, and this has nothing to do with you, I would love to have them explain to me how they can justify that with veterans who have health issues.

So your prior position was, Judge, basically, in so many words, go fly a kite, because we can get around you and go to the BLM and I'd love to get the BLM in here to explain to us how they can justify this.

Now you have rights to that land, but I have rights to stop your lease on Sawtel 2. Why shouldn't I terminate that lease forthwith?

UNIDENTIFIED: So let me provide some clarification

on all of this. What was noted at trial is that there's a
possibility to unitize through a BLM process, to unitize the
private leases that are where the Sawtel 2 well is bottom holed
with the 1956 lease. There's a process in the federal Code of
Regulations that allows the BLM to kind of create one lease
between these new risk leases.

2.3

- Doing so would then give a royalty, would split the royalty between both the private lessees or lessors, the private mineral owners and the BLM. We have not had that process happen, so you know, I guess if the Court wanted to intervene the BLM in here and order that that would not be proper, it could.
- But let me be clear, the acre and a half has nothing -- the unused acre and a half that we were willing to give for housing which we hear Your Honor loud and clear should not be used for housing, has nothing to do with the 2016 revocable license. That land was granted through the 19 -- well, initially granted north of Constitution Avenue through the 1969 BLM lease and then replaced with this additional acre and a half contiguous with the current drill site when the VA wanted to put the column there north of Constitution.
- Now, I understand that you didn't like our last settlement agreement.
- **THE COURT:** I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.
- **UNIDENTIFIED:** And I have -- I understand that you

1 had numerous issues with out last settlement agreement.

THE COURT: No.

2.3

UNIDENTIFIED: I know that you didn't specifically
rule on it, but you gave us your preliminary comments on it and
we withdrew the motion.

Since that time and during the trial, we have had additional communications regarding a new settlement agreement.

I talked to Mr. Silberfeld about this --

THE COURT: Just share this with me.

UNIDENTIFIED: I'm willing to share this, we were planning on talking to Mr. Hueston about this after the hearing.

THE COURT: No, talk to me openly I want this transparent now. What's this new settlement?

UNIDENTIFIED: So the new settlement would require us to quit claim the acre and a half, require the VA to designate a new site on the campus, away from the oil field of similar size for supportive housing and it would increase the royalty more than what the prior royalty increase did.

Mr. Kolcarney (phonetic) during his testimony noted that Bridgeland doesn't make money if oil is below \$65. So we have the two and a half percent royalty continue when oil is below \$65. When it goes between 64 to a hundred, it's increased to 3 and a half and that's over all of the wells, so it's really more like if it was just on Sawtel 2, it'd be more

1 like a 5 percent royalty. When it goes over a hundred --**THE COURT:** Did you just say 51 percent royalty? 3 UNIDENTIFIED: No. I said it would go up to 3.5 4 5 percent. 6 THE COURT: Oh, I thought you said 51 percent. 7 UNIDENTIFIED: No, no, no. THE COURT: Oh, you didn't say that? Okay. 9 UNIDENTIFIED: I did not say 51 percent, but it is 10 more than 51 percent of the net revenue depending on what the 11 price of oil is. It's very hard to talk about gross to net in 12 the same way. I understand that you think that 51 percent of 13 the gross proceeds should be going to the veterans for this 14 pass through. 15 THE COURT: I didn't say that, I hinted that, but I 16 didn't say that. 17 UNIDENTIFIED: Okay. You hinted that then. 18 realistically, 51 percent of the gross revenue just goes to 19 operational costs. I mean, no one's getting that much profit off of these wells. 20 21 THE COURT: Nonsense. 22 UNIDENTIFIED: Mr. Kolcarney explained when oil is 23 below \$65, Bridgeland gets nothing. They lose money on every

barrel of oil that comes out of the ground.

24

THE COURT: We'll close it down.

2.3

UNIDENTIFIED: We'd like to try to reach an agreement
with the plaintiffs to give additional land on the VA campus
for supportive housing.

THE COURT: My concern to all of you and hear me very clearly about this, if I allowed this kind of agreement, the company could slant drill in perpetuity --

UNIDENTIFIED: We can agree not to --

THE COURT: No, just a moment.

**UNIDENTIFIED:** -- drill more.

THE COURT: They could drill in perpetuity, that means they can put down another slant drill any place they want to as long as these leases are extended. If the goal is to get our veterans away from hazardous issues, why would the Court ever accept that?

Now, I don't have any control over the ten drill sites going down, I understand that, but I do know that at some point those sites are going to become uneconomical in a year or 20 years or 30 years. And I understand that back in the old days that might have worked, but we have a whole new generation of veterans that you should be taking into account, who have much different lung issues than the veterans from Vietnam or Korea or World War II. Because these are extraordinary

- hazardous conditions and the burn pit conditions for these
  veterans are extraordinarily hazardous.
  - So the needs have changed. Now, I respect your right to have the ten drill sites, but I'm prepared to cap your Sawtel 2 because I don't want you to have in perpetuity or one day later if I can avoid it, the ability to slant drill. So your response, because I'm prepared to cap this.
- **UNIDENTIFIED:** We can agree not to drill anymore 9 wells on the entire drill site if that's what you want.
- THE COURT: No, it's not anymore wells, it's Sawtel
- 11 2. That's what I've got control over.
- **UNIDENTIFIED:** Right.

- THE COURT: Now, you're going to push back and saw is the VA in a moment and they're going to probably defend this, but you tell me why I shouldn't cap that well forthwith?
  - unidentified: If we cap that well, the veterans are not going to be receiving the acre and a half of additional land on the VA for supportive housing and they're not going to be receiving the revenue stream that they were previously receiving earlier.
  - THE COURT: From what you offered me before on that acre and a half, it's not habitable. I have no idea what the pollution is next to those wells, as probably the last piece of property because of its condition that would ever be considered by Mr. Johnson and Mr. Soboroff and this Court or the special

- 1 master which may be 20 or 30 years from now. I don't even know 2 that I'd let a dog walk on it right now.
  - UNIDENTIFIED: Well, Your Honor, that's why the VA agreed to designate a --

THE COURT: Well, let's get the VA up here, let's see if they're going to defend your position concerning this oil.

MR. ROSENBERG: Two points that I can think of, Your Honor. Number one, I'm brought back to the analogy that I used at trial that I think only I appreciate it, which was the traffic jammed in, in that one of VA's challenges is that there are on the campus, uses for most of the land, and to find land that can be developed for housing may require one of those uses to go somewhere else.

And so one of the benefits of the revised settlement agreement and it was also in the initial settlement agreement that VA saw was the ability to shift something like parking, for example, to the location that Bridgeland would quit claim back to VA, thus opening up that parking space for development of housing.

THE COURT: Now, just a moment. Let's just pause that.

(Pause)

THE COURT: What acre and a half are you proposing to exchange?

25 MR. ROSENBERG: There wasn't a specific acre and a

- 1 half. The idea is that in order for VA to access the acre and
- 2 | a half that's being quit claimed, VA would first need to
- 3 | identify a comparably sized parcel on the campus that's
- 4 developable. And that could be part of this process that we're
- 5 going to be engaging in here.
- 6 THE COURT: All right. If you'd like to, you can
- 7 | meet and confer with the special master today, but right now,
- 8 | tentatively, I'm going to write injunctive relief capping
- 9 Sawtel 2. If you can persuade me later this afternoon and
- 10 | we'll have a hearing on that, so be it.
- Number two, I'm not too concerned about this revenue
- 12 | stream. It's bounced all the way from 65,000 to 125,000.
- 13 | think the health and benefits by comparison is much more
- 14 important.
- Number three, what you're offering me now is a, let's
- 16 | say inspiration. I don't hear the specific piece of property.
- 17 | I don't know what is going to be traded and I will say to the
- 18 | plaintiffs, tread very carefully with the Court on this if
- 19 | you're entering into this type of agreement. I don't mean to
- 20 embarrass you, but hear me loud and clear, these veterans are
- 21 not going to be at or near an oilwell.
- 22 So if you continue with this, so be it, I'll listen
- 23 to it in good faith, but right now I'm going to be prepared to
- 24 | write injunctive relief tonight that's going to cap this
- 25 | oilwell. Okay. And you can take that up on appeal along with

1 the VA.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

All right. Now, let me pay courteously to -- first of all, sir, I appreciate you being here. And, Mr. Miller, I 3 appreciate you being here.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Have this gentleman come up with you. There's no reason he shouldn't come up. And also, the wonderful lady, she was with me out at Brentwood. I want to have you come up.

MR. MILLER: Yes.

THE COURT: First of all, you should know that her son graduated from West Point and I really appreciate you being here.

Mr. Miller, do you have any comments before I --MR. MILLER: I do, Your Honor. We thought about this a lot. Obviously we read the order, this is very, very important to the school. Read the order, we brainstormed, we're looking for what I'll call for lack of a better word, a win/win for the veterans.

Your Honor toured the facilities, saw the veterans using the facility. We want to make it better. What we'd like to do and what I would suggest is that we sit down with Mr. Hueston outside, you know, maybe in the cafeteria, have a meeting and go back and forth because we have a lot of ideas that we think are viable and that would be positive and well

- 1 | received by the Court and well received by the veterans.
- 2 THE COURT: I'll leave that to you and Mr. Hueston.
- 3 I'll give you some initial thoughts but I'm not dogmatic about
- 4 this.
- I don't want this to be like Vietnam where you
- 6 destroy it to save it. You've got some wonderful facilities
- 7 out there.
- MR. MILLER: Yes.
- 9 THE COURT: I certainly don't want to put sand in the
- 10 | swimming pool, okay. You've got tennis courts out there, for
- 11 | the life of me, I'm going to chide you a little bit, but nobody
- 12 | needs four baseball fields and you can call that a soccer field
- 13 | and a softball field, but you've got four baseball fields out
- 14 there.
- I want you to look at this map for a second. And,
- 16 | counsel, you can put up 248. Now, this is a poor map that we
- 17 | are working off of, but I want you to look at the parcel number
- 18 | 9, it's just above the track. Skip, have you been out there at
- 19 | all, have you walked that?
- 20 MR. MILLER: Yes, yes, I toured it.
- 21 **THE COURT:** Okay. You've seen that?
- MR. MILLER: Yes.
- 23 | THE COURT: From this Court's perspective, that has
- 24 | the infrastructure from the school, it's about 8 to 9 acres.
- 25 | If I take Mr. Soboroff's single story at 40 times 9, what's

- 1 | that, Skip? 360? Excellent.
- 2 MR. MILLER: 360.
- 3 THE COURT: And if I double story that and I go 80
- 4 per acre, what's that, 720?
- 5 MR. MILLER: Yes.
- 6 THE COURT: Excellent. That box alone can take,
- 7 depending on Mr. Soboroff and Mr. Johnson's wisdom, a little
- 8 more or less than 700 units itself. Now, Mr. Johnson, come on
- 9 up for a moment, check my math. And I'm going to take 9 acres
- 10 out there, maybe 7, so I'm not over counting. So let's just be
- 11 | cautious and say 7 acres.
- 12 MR. JOHNSON: 7 acres of permanent supportive
- 13 housing?
- 14 **THE COURT:** Permanent supportive housing.
- 15 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, so we were in the either there
- 16 | levels or --
- 17 **THE COURT:** No, we're still in two.
- 18 MR. JOHNSON: Two levels we could probably get 40 per
- 19 acre.
- 20 MR. MILLER: It's 4.8 acres.
- 21 **THE COURT:** Say again?
- MR. MILLER: It's not 7, Your Honor.
- 23 **MR. JOHNSON:** It is, it's 4.8.
- 24 **MR. MILLER:** 4.8.
- 25 **THE COURT:** 4.8. So let's --

1 UNIDENTIFIED: That parcel did not include the 2 swimming pool. THE COURT: Just a moment. Let's reduce it to 4 3 because -- let me double-check. 4 Yeah, let's just reduce it, so let's be cautious, not 5 4.8, 4. Now, let's take two stories. 6 7 MR. JOHNSON: 160 units. THE COURT: Okay. At 40 per acre times 4 if they're 9 single story, if they're double story, what's that, 320? 10 MR. JOHNSON: No, no, no. We didn't have any single 11 level permanent supportive. 12 THE COURT: All right. We're going to take double 13 story --14 MR. JOHNSON: Double story was 40. 15 THE COURT: No, you told me single story was 40 per 16 acre last time. I'll get the record out for you. MR. JOHNSON: Okay. The single level --17 18 THE COURT: It's not 20 per acre, go back and look at 19 your record. 20 MR. JOHNSON: I will. 21 THE COURT: It was never 20 per acre single story. 22 You started with 40, and we got down to 30 at one point. 2.3 MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I think the purpose of

supportive housing we were just talking about was three story,

24

25

two story, like that.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Now
2	MR. JOHNSON: Right?
3	THE COURT: I'll just take whatever figures you
4	want to propose today and accept those.
5	MR. JOHNSON: All right.
6	THE COURT: 20 per acre?
7	MR. JOHNSON: For a single story.
8	THE COURT: For a single story. So I have 20
9	times
10	MR. MILLER: It's a hundred.
11	THE COURT: Double that, 160, right? Okay.
12	What we're in is a box, because as you take other
13	options away from me like that park that Mr. Soboroff tried to
14	defend, or you take UCLA's baseball diamond away from me, or
15	you tell me all of these problems that we've got, it leaves me
16	no place else to go.
17	And regardless of any negotiations going on, that is
18	a primary piece of property that I want public supportive
19	housing on. Now
20	UNIDENTIFIED: We want permanent supportive
21	THE COURT: for the school, you're not going to
22	exist in your present configuration, no matter what
23	negotiations you enter into. And I'm just curious if you're
24	really the patriots I believe that you are. Now, this is the
25	Rick Caruso pool, right?

1	MR. JOHNSON: Caruso.
2	THE COURT: Two outstanding patriotic people, right?
3	I bet you if Rick was down here, he'd donate that to us. Let
4	me say that again. I think that's a quality of a person, and I
5	think he'd come down here and say you know what, instead of
6	that judge taking it from me, I'm the kind of civic minded
7	person that would like to donate that to us.
8	Skip, what do you think? Why don't we call him?
9	MR. MILLER: I don't want to speak for Mr. Caruso
10	THE COURT: No, just a moment. Why don't we call
11	him? It's named after him, it's named after Mr. Watt.
12	MR. MILLER: Watt and Caruso, yeah.
13	THE COURT: Yeah. I really bet that he's the kind of
14	public servant who would come down here because he cares about
15	veterans and I bet you if he was asked, he would probably
16	donate that 3 and a half million dollars.
17	MR. MILLER: We all care about veterans.
18	THE COURT: Sure.
19	MR. MILLER: He does, I'm sure he does, and I do, and
20	everybody in this room does.
21	THE COURT: Good. Now, why don't we call him. Call
22	Rick up.
23	MR. SOBOROFF: Judge, can I make a clarification?
24	THE COURT: No.
25	MR. SOBOROFF: To talk about

1 THE COURT: No, you can't, Mr. Soboroff, I've got all day and all night. I'm just going to humbly ask you to call him. I've got his phone number by the way. I've talked to 3 him, not about this, I think we've got a quality person out 5 there. Now, you don't have to, I have no jurisdiction, but I'm waiting and I'm just requesting that he come down and see if he 6 7 wants to donate this, along with Mr. Watt.

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MILLER: We want to do a lot more than a swimming 9 pool.

THE COURT: Oh, I know that. We're starting that. In other words, I'd like to preserve this pool, maybe there's something we can work out for the veterans, because remember the school and UCLA were never generous to the veterans. shut them out during COVID.

I bet you if we talk to those veterans that they're willing to work with these school kids and maybe they're willing to work half a day, but not skip from 5:30 to 7:30 with no transportation and you say that there's veterans out there, there's very few of them out there and what they have to do is go up by truck and they don't have any public transportation between 5 and 7:30, so I've got amputees walking up the road and people in wheelchairs and pretty soon, this is going to go from 233 up in number. I would love to see these facilities used.

And that's -- what you just said,

1 Your Honor, is going to get fixed. That's going to get fixed.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm waiting for you. In other words, come back with something positive that we can work

4 | with --

2.3

5 MR. MILLER: Yes.

THE COURT: -- because I don't want to fill it in with sand. Skip, I will fill this in with sand, if I have to if you put me in a box. So I think that this can be donated. I think Rick would go along with that quite frankly, I think all it needs is a phone call. And I think Watt would go along with that also.

And then I think we could go to the veterans in good faith once we have that, because it's already null and void.

I've got two ways of doing this, the hard way, take it up on appeal, or the good way. And the good way is you should be donating this to the veterans period.

Now, how we operate that could be worked out. Maybe your school keeps the upkeep, maybe we take that off of the -you know, see what I mean? Maybe we work this out with the school kids so it's half a day. The veterans are going to have a significant part of this including the weekend, right now it's ridiculous having it 7:30 to -- or 5:30 to 7:30 and it's ridiculous having it during the weekend hours.

So if you put me a box, this is null and void and
I'll take your 22 acres. Am I clear?

1 MR. MILLER: That's not where we're coming from to 2 put Your Honor in a box. THE COURT: I don't think you are either. So come up 3 with me, ask Rick to come down, place a call, that's a request. 4 5 I've got his number if you want. You want it? 6 MR. MILLER: I've got the person here and --7 THE COURT: All right. I'm waiting for a decision from the Board, but I think he should be included. His name's 8 9 on it, out of courtesy, and I'll leave that to you. MR. MILLER: Sure, we'll include him, of course. 10 11 THE COURT: And you take that up with the special 12 master. 13 MR. MILLER: Yeah, we want to sit down with 14 Mr. Hueston and we want to --15 THE COURT: We're going to do that today. 16 MR. MILLER: -- brainstorm this through. 17 THE COURT: We're not doing that tomorrow. And I'm 18 requesting --19 MR. MILLER: Fine. 20 THE COURT: -- you bring down Mr. Caruso and if you 21 don't want to, fine. But if you don't, come up with something 22 positive, that 22 acres is null and void. Am I clear? 2.3 MR. MILLER: Clear. Crystal clear. 24 Okay. Now, you can take that up on THE COURT:

I don't want to destroy it, but if you put me in a

25

appeal.

- 1 box, I'll take that 22 acres forthwith.
- 2 MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor, I understand what the
- 3 | Court's --
- 4 **THE COURT:** Am I clear?
- 5 MR. MILLER: -- saying.
- 6 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
- 7 MR. MILLER: We hear the Court loud and clear.
- 8 THE COURT: Have that discussion with Mr. Hueston.
- 9 All right. Well, Brent -- UCLA, how are we doing
- 10 | with the Chancellor?
- 11 MR. CARDOZO: We're finding out if he's available.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Come on up, I can't hear you.
- MR. CARDOZO: We're finding out if he's available by
- 14 | 7 p.m. tonight, but if he's not, someone who is authorized
- 15 to --
- 16 **THE COURT:** No, no, I want the chancellor. Remember,
- 17 | this made it --
- 18 MR. CARDOZO: Okay.
- 19 **THE COURT:** -- all the way to the chancellor's door
- 20 hypothetically. Let me retrace the findings of fact in this.
- 21 I've got somebody over at the VA, Kendrick, calling to somebody
- 22 | in the VA, saying you know there's a FOIA request out there and
- 23 | we don't want those veterans to know about the new field,
- 24 because they might be opposed to it.
- 25 So then the VA calls over to UCLA athletic department

- 1 and gets an absolutely honest good employee. That employee
- 2 receives this call and he talks to the UCLA athletic director.
- 3 Now, subsequently he's called back in because none of us have
- 4 asked him the critical question, well, what was the further
- 5 | conversation that you might have had and we find out that
- 6 UCLA's strategic department, the communications department,
- 7 | there's 8 to 12 people on the line and guess who else. Chief
- 8 of staff for the chancellor.
- 9 Now, I can imagine how many times we have the chief
- 10 of the staff for the chancellor on a phone call with some
- 11 middle person in the UCLA athletic department. Do you think
- 12 the chancellor might have known?
- Counsel, what's your impression? Does the chief of
- 14 staff normally get on these phone calls, counsel?
- MR. CARDOZO: I actually have no idea, Your Honor.
- 16 The chief of --
- 17 **THE COURT:** Well, my quess is, that I haven't made of
- 18 | finding of that because I don't want to lay out Gene Block
- 19 (phonetic) right now but I'm being pretty blunt about this, we
- 20 | normally don't have the chief of staff for the chancellor on a
- 21 | phone call with a strategic and communications department
- 22 unless hypothetically maybe the chancellor knew.
- MR. CARDOZO: I can't comment on that.
- 24 **THE COURT:** I'm going to keep and -- the chancellor
- 25 down here and sit here until he gets here.

1	MD G177070 II 1 1
1	MR. CARDOZO: Understood.
2	THE COURT: Now how long I sit here is up to you.
3	MR. CARDOZO: I can only tell you
4	THE COURT: I can only tell you.
5	MR. CARDOZO: I've made the call.
6	THE COURT: I can only tell you. I'm sitting here.
7	Am I clear? We're not going to dance around now for another
8	week or another month, I want to get his impressions and if he
9	doesn't care, here's what I'm going to do. I'm going to order
10	the security of the VA to cordon off that baseball field as of
11	today.
12	MR. CARDOZO: Understood.
13	THE COURT: Understood?
14	MR. CARDOZO: Uh-huh.
15	THE COURT: And then when he comes down here maybe we
16	can have that discussion. Do you think that might get his
17	attention? Do it the easy way or the hard way.
18	MR. CARDOZO: You have his attention.
19	THE COURT: It's up to you, counsel.
20	MR. CARDOZO: You have his attention, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: No, I don't, he's not here.
22	I'll leave that to you.
23	MR. CARDOZO: Understood.
24	THE COURT: I'm sitting here waiting.
25	Now, I'm going to take a recess in just a moment.

- You're going to start talking to Mr. Hueston, you're going to
  start talking with Mr. Johnson, Mr. Soboroff and where's

  Mr. Kuhn? I need his help also. I desperately need your help
  and I know you have an opposite viewpoint, come up, and I know
  that you think that this is a disaster, so let me talk to you
  about that because I want you pushing back at all times. In
  other words, I don't want you to be chilled in any way, but you
  know the decisions I've made.
  - I'm concerned about the following. I order 750 temporary housing units and nobody comes. We've created this village where we haven't attracted veterans. That's why the town center is important, but I don't think the town center can be built within 18 months to attract veterans.

2.3

But I was out at the golf course, so I guarantee you veterans are attracted to that golf course out there, might have a swimming pool, depending upon how patriotic we are over at Brentwood School. Might even have some tennis courts.

Might even have a track and might have a weightlifting facility that we don't have to duplicate, because the VA's going to say we don't have these kinds of funds for that kind of activity. And they may not have those kinds of funds for those recreational activities.

So if we have these facilities available, we're not having to recreate through private funding, for instance, and along the way these kinds of facilities. And that means that

1 the center might remain in the town center location as building 41 or whatever, but we've got the facilities in the north part, so as we go from 233, to hopefully, you know, whatever number 3 as this fills over the next two to six years, we don't have to 5 reduplicate all those because part of the town center was that weight room, remember? Now, we've got a weight room. 6 7 waiting to see what Brentwood School does.

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay? Now, it's a disaster, let me ask you this, when I was out there, there was a young male who was kind of a security person walking with us, and we struck up a conversation, he's from Marino Valley. And he'd driven about two hours to get to work. My guess is he's not a wealthy -he's a young black male by the way. My guess he's not very wealthy.

And let's say the Court made an error and I over compensated and I built too many housing units. First of all, how do I attract veterans to come to this location when they may be living in a box or some other location, but they still have a social circle and they still are dependent upon one That's my first concern. another.

Number two, how do I make the transition so that we don't over build that 750 and that's what I'm raising with counsel, the 1,800 doesn't make sense in six years, because I could have 500 people sitting in temporary 400 square foot housing. I don't want that.

Number three, John agrees with me. How far away are we from really being able to use some of the existing buildings as temporary housing? So, Mr. Johnson, come on back up for a moment.

What I couldn't get was a clear indication of the infrastructure. We know we put \$100 million in. But I was told we didn't have present maps that showed me what the infrastructure was. So maps were being introduced to me that had big red lines on it from 2020, when in fact, when we questioned, we found out that they were inadequate, that all of those lines had put in because MacArthur Field had gone in, and it had a red line and now it was green.

I need you to have a discussion with Mr. Hueston about how long it's going to take to build 750. And I need to have you have a discussion whether that's really realistic or not from the plaintiff's position because they tossed out a number which may be meaningless, just a number. How do we sequence that? And I need the developers' help, because Century is going to be knowledgeable, they're going to have some idea of the infrastructure. USS is going to be knowledgeable, so, Steve, I need you in that participation.

And I want to know about the other buildings and how far this infrastructure is extended, because the VA is working off of 2020 maps, which has red lines on them, which are, I don't know how you built \$100 million of infrastructure.

And finally what happens if we overbuild and we have our staff out there, who are near homeless. This gentleman who I'm talking to has got to be paying a huge amount of gas, just to drive from Marino Valley and I bet you, instead of being homeless or making that drive, he would love to spend one night, in case we overbuild and I'm not sure the West LA lease allows that.

We find it's for staff, et cetera, but we don't know if that means nursing staff, subject to interpretation, but even if we overbuild, can't we help our staff out there who's - know I've got the rest of the VA staff living on the land at the hierarchy, the highest administration, why aren't employees living there? Think that should be taking first, it's something called model, take care of your troops, they'll take care of you and you should be the last to go to sleep at night and the last to eat dinner, at least from where I come from the Marine Corps and I'm not seeing that in the civilian world.

And finally, do we have that picture of Georgia? Put that up for a moment. I want to show you what my country can do. I want to show you what you as Americans can do and that's why you're up against somebody who you don't want to deal with in me right now, because our moto is going to be the difficult we do immediately, the impossible it's just going to take us a little bit longer and I'm adamant about that.

All right. This is the Republic of Georgia. This is

- 1 | in 2002. I do a lot of overseas work. That's USA aid, A-I-D,
- 2 | and U.S. money, it's Stalin's birthplace, it's six miles. Do
- 3 | you know how long it took us to put that up? Come on, team,
- 4 how long did it take us to put up this with U.S. money and
- 5 | that's more than 400 square feet and that's for refugees coming
- 6 down from south, streaming across the border.
- 7 You want to try 60 days? And you tell me we can't
- 8 | get up temporary housing in America? Well, we sure did it U.S.
- 9 AID in a foreign country. Look at that and absorb that, and
- 10 | that's why you know when you're dealing with me and you tell me
- 11 | you can't do it, yes, you can and, yes, you will or you can
- 12 take me up on appeal and get me reversed. But we're going to
- 13 do this.
- MR. BERGMAN: Your Honor, Greg Bergman again. My
- 15 three clients, you mentioned them.
- 16 **THE COURT:** I'm sorry, I didn't hear?
- 17 MR. BERGMAN: My three clients who are actually
- 18 | building and have built housing for veterans are here if you
- 19 | want them to give you their --
- 20 **THE COURT:** Yeah, come on up for a moment.
- 21 MR. BERGMAN: Okay. I'll send them up. Thank you.
- 22 **THE COURT:** Because I think what we've got is our
- 23 | bureaucracies bumping up against each other and they're good
- 24 | faith people, et cetera, but this could be done. I've seen it
- 25 done.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, did you want me to respond? THE COURT: Not yet, but I'm going to give you in a moment, because I'm on a roll right now and then I'll be off 3 the roll in a moment, okay, and I'll give this to you. 4 5 No, no, no, I'm going to make lots of mistakes now, 6 you're not going to be applauding in a while, don't worry about 7 I'm not your friend. that. Okay. Look at that, Steve. That's U.S. AID money in 9 some country and that's 60 days, my friend. 10 MR. PECK: Indeed. 11 Now you tell me we can't build 750 THE COURT: Yeah. 12 quickly? I'll give you the parcels, if you can't decide, I'll 13 designate them for you. 14 MR. PECK: I think it is possible. I'm going back to 15 the point you made before, do we need 750? 16 THE COURT: Yeah, I don't know. 17 MR. PECK: And our experience, so I've been doing 18 this for 30 years, for those of you who don't know me, our 19 experience at Inglewood which is ten miles south of the VA --20 THE COURT: Yeah. MR. PECK: -- is that we have about 88 percent full 21 22 of our transitional housing. 2.3 THE COURT: Right. 24 So, in other words, not all the units are MR. PECK:

25

being used.

- 1 THE COURT: Yeah. 2 MR. PECK: And part of that is because of the services that we provide, some homeless veterans don't want to 3 be case managed. That's just real. We can't force them into 4 5 the housing, so we're only 88 percent full. 6 THE COURT: Right. And we've got to attract people, 7 that's why I want that swimming pool if we can get it, that 8 track, those weight rooms, et cetera, otherwise it's going to 9 get bulldozed. 10 MR. PECK: Yes, indeed. And in transitional housing, 11 we are asking for behavior change. It is their behavior that 12 got them homeless. 13 **THE COURT:** You're asking what? 14 MR. PECK: Behavior change. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. PECK: It's their behavior that got them 17 homeless. So we can put them in a 400 square foot unit, and 18 they will continue to drug themselves to death. 19 THE COURT: Yeah. 20
  - MR. PECK: This is not what we want. So we always build according to the need and what I would ask and monitor, is that we look at this on a year-by-year basis and see what the need is.

21

22

2.3

24 **THE COURT:** Plaintiffs built that into their request. 25 If you noticed, what they really asked the Court was 750

```
1
    subject to modification, it's in there. So they're going to
    work with us on that. I'm not sure 750 has any reality, but
    see what I'm not afraid to do is overbuild. Now, how much,
 3
    because I can always use that for staff if I need to. I just
 4
 5
    don't want to overly overbuild on temporary, because the long
 6
    term goal is permanent supportive. That's what we want to get
 7
    to.
              MR. PECK: Correct. And --
 8
 9
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
10
              MR. PECK: -- the 1,200 that we're initially
11
    obligated to build and the 1,694 that we know we can get to is
12
    based on our talking with LASA (phonetic), the VA and everyone
13
    else according to the need.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. Now, watch. See those figures up
15
    on the board, Steve?
16
              MR. PECK:
                        Yes.
17
              THE COURT: What's the top one? 750?
18
              MR. PECK:
                         That's 750.
19
              THE COURT: Now, what's the next one, 1,800, right,
20
    permanent supportive.
21
              MR. PECK:
                        That's 1,800 I'm understanding --
22
              THE COURT: What does that 489 represent?
2.3
              MR. PECK:
                         I'm sorry?
              THE COURT: That's 489. What does that represent?
24
25
                         I'm sorry, I missed that part.
```

1 know.

THE COURT: 489. See it in black down there?

3 MR. PECK: I do.

THE COURT: That's fiction. That's the difference between 1,200 that everybody assumes is going to be built and what's actually going to be built. And just a moment, if you turn -- and you don't have this, but -- no, just a moment.

8 MR. PECK: And the number might be 1,694, so it might 9 be --

THE COURT: Steve, come up here for a moment and put this up on the Elmo. Put that up on the Elmo for just a moment.

Steve, so you see what we're talking about, I want all your builders to see what we're talking about. You don't even have a design right now. You're not even in the go to phase for 489 of the 1,200 units.

So we're all pretending that these 1,200 units are going to occur.

MR. PECK: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, this is my writing, fact finding 73 and 74, and pardon my chicken scratching. As of July 5th, 2024 pursuant to the EULs, 535 permanent supporting housing units and seven separate buildings are currently under construction on the West LA campus. Now, add that to our 233, et cetera.

The remaining 479 supportive units projected for

- 1 | construction under the master plan will not be completed until
- 2 | 2030. Now, hold on. Do you have my document that I gave you
- 3 | and that's going to show the housing units for just a moment?
- 4 Put that up. It's going to show 401, 402, put that up on the
- 5 | screen, Steve, so you see this.
- 6 MR. PECK: I'm not sure what document we're looking
- 7 at.
- 8 **UNIDENTIFIED:** This one?
- 9 THE COURT: Yeah, put that up for just a moment.
- 10 And look at the last -- oops, look at the last five
- 11 | or six. If you add those numbers up and that's my handwriting
- 12 | in the margin, so you can check my math, we don't even have
- 13 | plans, designs, or anything else for 479 units.
- So we really have the following. We have 1,800 units
- 15 to complete and 480 -- I'm sorry, 479, that's the wrong figure,
- 16 | 479 units to complete. You've really got about 1,270 units
- 17 | that we have to complete by 12/30 because if we're completing
- 18 | 1,800 in six years, which we're going to do by the way --
- 19 MR. PECK: Yes.
- 20 **THE COURT:** -- and if we're going to then catch up
- 21 | with the 470 -- it depends on how you add it, it's 489 to 470,
- 22 | we've got 2,200 to complete. And we don't even have plans for
- 23 | the last 480.
- MR. PECK: Can I introduce Brian D'Andre from
- 25 | Century?

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. D'ANDRE: Thank you, Your Honor. The place map
that you're looking at is dated February. I wanted to alert
you to the fact that a number of these buildings are inactive
pre-development, have actually submitted applications for tax
credits, so there is significant progress that has happened.
The buildings
THE COURT: Okay. That's good. Check those off for
me. Just write on this document, put a checkmark by the one
and tell me no, that one I didn't count.
MR. D'ANDRE: Applied for tax credits.
THE COURT: Yeah, that's not my 470 something.
MR. PECK: 408.
MR. D'ANDRE: Applied for tax credits this past
round.
THE COURT: Okay. Just a moment. Tax credits you're
applying for?
MR. D'ANDRE: Tax credits is the last funding source
that is required to
THE COURT: All right.
MR. D'ANDRE: get to the point of construction.
THE COURT: Okay. Why don't you add up the
following. Add up 58, 65, 45, 24, and 94 and 40 and tell me
what that is.

MR. D'ANDRE: Okay. So --

1 THE COURT: Now, we're going to take all your tax credits which take forever and a day, okay, and I'm just going 2 to take the last portion where you haven't checked off, tell me 3 how many units those are. 4 Okay. So we were starting with 5 MR. D'ANDRE: building 300, which is 43; building 408 which is listed here as 6 7 100 but I believe it's -- 100 units. THE COURT: No, you don't even have to count those. 8 9 I'm going to give you the benefit of the doubt --10 MR. D'ANDRE: Okay. 11 THE COURT: -- and say that we're making some kind of 12 progress with these tax credits. 13 MR. D'ANDRE: All right. Also 409 there's progress. 14 We are going to be applying for credits in the first round next 15 year, that's 94 units. 16 THE COURT: No, you're going to follow my direction 17 now. Take building 258, you don't have any plans for 58 -write down 40. 18 19 MR. D'ANDRE: 258 is being released to us next year. 20 We are beginning pre-development and we intend to apply for 21 credits next year. 22 THE COURT: No, I'm going to be at 300 and 408 and 23 that's generous. I'm not giving you --MR. D'ANDRE: 258 is 45. 24

250 -- 256, you've got -- put down 40.

1	MR. D'ANDRE: 256 is 40.
2	THE COURT: You've got 409, you've got no plans for
3	that, 94.
4	MR. D'ANDRE: 409 is inactive pre-development. We
5	are applying for credits first round next year
6	THE COURT: It doesn't matter.
7	MR. D'ANDRE: That is a ground breaking late next
8	year.
9	THE COURT: The way you get credits takes forever a
10	day.
11	MR. D'ANDRE: We've been successful in every credit
12	application we've made.
13	THE COURT: No. Write down 94, I'm giving you a
14	tremendous benefit taking off 143. Write down 94.
15	MR. D'ANDRE: 94 for building 409.
16	THE COURT: Yeah, I don't believe you.
17	MR. D'ANDRE: Which is next year, okay.
18	THE COURT: 13 no, you have to show me now.
19	MR. D'ANDRE: We can demonstrate that.
20	THE COURT: You're going to have to show me.
21	MR. D'ANDRE: Sure, we can demonstrate the progress.
22	THE COURT: You write down 13 and 306, another 24.
23	MR. D'ANDRE: 13 is 14 units.
24	THE COURT: Write down 258, which is another 45.

MR. D'ANDRE: 258, I have 45, yeah.

1 THE COURT: Write down 400 which is lot 49. That's 65 units. 2 MR. D'ANDRE: 65. And write down 58 and 407. 3 THE COURT: MR. D'ANDRE: 60 I think. 4 5 THE COURT: Now, I've being extraordinarily generous with you in giving you 143, which I don't believe by the way --6 7 MR. D'ANDRE: Okay. What does this add up to here? THE COURT: -- just so you know. 9 So let's just take your best scenario because your 10 tax credits take forever and a day, and by the way we're 11 We're going to changing this to give you an opportunity here. 12 have a fair market rate, which allows you to go conventionally 13 and also I'm encouraging the VA to directly fund you. 14 Now, I don't want to get in that discussion with you. 15 You give me that number I just gave you. Otherwise, have a 16 seat. 17 MR. D'ANDRE: Yeah, 68. We're getting to, 336. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 336 to me is fiction and I'm 19 giving you another 143 on top of that, and quite frankly I 20 trust you but I don't believe what you're saying and I want 21 that blunt. Your tax credits are taking too long. There's no 22 problem, it's the financing you've been forced into to chase 23 these federal, state, municipal tax credits, it's not your 24 fault. The Court is trying to give you a lot of different

options and cut through this bureaucratic nonsense and the VA

1 | can directly fund this.

MR. D'ANDRE: And the VA isn't --

THE COURT: Number two, you've got fair market rate, which will take you to 160 percent and you can get back in the conventional market now. And number three, I'm not taking away any of your tax credits. You want to continue with tax credits, be my guest, but it's slow and it's inefficient, but we've had this discussion.

I'm taking a recess, thank you very much. We'll be back in 20 minutes.

## (Recessed at 11:01 a.m.; reconvened at 11:52 a.m.)

**THE COURT:** On the record.

And I saw a lot of conversations taking place, and I didn't want to disturb whatever those conversations were. I'm not privy to those conversations. So I'm simply going to ask the special master, you know, what's unfolding, if anything. And we'll do that transparently. And there's not going to be any backroom discussion.

MR. HUESTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

So I had three separate sets of discussions. So the first with representatives from the Brentwood School. The representatives indicated a desire to try to come up with a package of considerations, land -- had an initial proposal of what appeared to be less than four acres, which seemed to be a non-starter. And we informed them of that and invited them to

1 go back and make a more fulsome offer. They discussed how they would need to convene the board of directors. I encouraged them to do so even in 3 emergency session. And they suggested that they might be able 4 5 to come back with some sort of proposal in about a week's time, which, you know, I stated might not meet with the Court's 6 7 approval, that kind of lapse of time. So that was the discussion with the Brentwood School. 9 THE COURT: Okay. That's as far as we've gone with 10 Brentwood then. Okay. How about Oil? How about Bridgeland? 11 Have you had any discussion with the special master?

MR. HUESTON: We have not yet.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. HUESTON: Yes.

12

13

14

15 THE COURT: How about -- well, we don't have anybody

16 here from what I'm going to call Parking, do we?

17 MR. HUESTON: No.

18 THE COURT: All right. Then I know what to do

19 tonight in terms of that injunctive relief. What about UCLA?

20 Is the chancellor coming down or not?

21 MR. HUESTON: The chancellor is not here. I didn't

22 receive an update on that.

2.3 THE COURT: Okay. I'm waiting.

24 MR. CARDOZO: The chancellor can't make it, but we

25 got an understanding --

1 THE COURT: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you. MR. CARDOZO: The chancellor will not be here today. We've got an understanding of what the plaintiffs are looking 3 4 for. 5 THE COURT: No. 6 MR. CARDOZO: And we'd want to put together a 7 proposal. That's our --8 I'm busy also, just as busy as the 9 chancellor. When is he available? In other words, I'm getting 10 slow walked. So I'm going to say it to you bluntly. When is 11 he available? What I'm really hearing is he's not coming. 12 Now, what am I going to do? What did I tell you bluntly I was 13 going to do today? 14 MR. CARDOZO: I heard you. 15 THE COURT: What am I going to do? So I hear it from 16 you. 17 MR. CARDOZO: You're going to block off the stadium. THE COURT: 18 I'm going to order the VA to take their 19 security forces and cordon off that ballpark. And I'm going to 20 sit here and wait for the chancellor because he's not that 21 busy. And if he has this little interest in those 10 acres, 22 then that's the message I'm getting. 2.3 MR. CARDOZO: What we would like to do, Your Honor --24 THE COURT: Am I clear?

You're clear on that.

I'd like you to

- 1 | consider an alternative.
- THE COURT: And what is that alternative?
- 3 MR. CARDOZO: We'd be permitted to make a proposal
- 4 | similar to what the Brentwood School is doing.
- 5 THE COURT: Well, walk over and tell them what your
- 6 proposal is.
- 7 MR. CARDOZO: That's what we need to huddle with.
- 8 THE COURT: Okay. Step out in the back for just a
- 9 moment. We're going to go through lunch. You two go back
- 10 | there and let's hear his proposal.
- MR. CARDOZO: Okay.
- 12 **THE COURT:** We're not doing this now by a weekly, you
- 13 know, you're not on your time schedule anymore.
- MR. CARDOZO: I was just --
- 15 **THE COURT:** If I have to write the injunctive relief,
- 16 | then I'll write it. Now you've heard what I'm going to do, and
- 17 | I'm waiting for the chancellor. And if this got to the top
- 18 echelons of UCLA's chancellorship before with the chief of
- 19 staff, who we darn well know it went to the chancellor, then
- 20 | that chancellor or the subsequent chancellor needs to be down
- 21 here with that power and authority. And I'm waiting.
- 22 MR. CARDOZO: What I was just told was that the
- 23 proposal has to include ceding back of land. We were hoping
- 24 | when we came here today to have a discussion about more
- 25 services that could be provided.

1 THE COURT: I don't think you understand what's at 2 risk here. I don't think the message is clear. You're about to lose those ten acres. You're about to lose Branca Field. 3 4 And you're about to get a cordon put up around that baseball 5 field. MR. CARDOZO: And how am I supposed to prevent that 6 7 from happening when I have to offer --THE COURT: You were about to come up with some 8 9 reasonable alternative proposal and discuss that, if you can, 10 with the special master, and I'm not hearing anything of value, 11 and I'm not even seeing the courtesy of the chancellor being 12 here. 13 MR. CARDOZO: That's what we'd like to do. That's 14 what we'd like to do, but because it involves giving back of 15 land --16 THE COURT: What's your proposal? 17 MR. CARDOZO: Because it involves giving back of 18 land --19 THE COURT: What's your proposal? 20 MR. CARDOZO: The proposal is to increase services. 21 The giving back of land that was just handed to me five minutes 22 ago, I've got to huddle with people who make those land use 23 decisions and figure out what we can do and what we can't do. 24 We're prepared to do that today. We can't have the chancellor

25

here to do that today.

- 1 THE COURT: Why?
- 2 MR. CARDOZO: He's fully committed -- school opened
- 3 this week.
- 4 THE COURT: So am I.
- 5 MR. CARDOZO: He had a whole series of commitments.
- 6 THE COURT: So am I. I'm getting the message that
- 7 this land isn't very important to UCLA.
- 8 MR. CARDOZO: That could not be further from the
- 9 truth.
- 10 **THE COURT:** Then how long do I sit here and wait?
- 11 I'm available tomorrow. I'm available Friday. I'm even
- 12 | available on the weekends. When will he be here? I want his
- 13 authority. You got to the top chancellorship before. We
- 14 deserve the courtesy of having the chancellor here. How long
- 15 is that going to take?
- 16 MR. CARDOZO: I'll make yet another call.
- 17 **THE COURT:** Make yet another call. I'm sitting here.
- 18 MR. CARDOZO: We'll figure out what proposal we can
- 19 make today.
- 20 **THE COURT:** Okay. John, you want to talk to him later
- 21 on?
- MR. HUESTON: Yes, I'll be available.
- 23 **THE COURT:** Okay. Well, yeah, we're here for the
- 24 duration apparently. All right.
- 25 And now I'm going to look for input from the

- 1 plaintiffs. I'm disappointed that there was no meeting between
- the plaintiffs and VA before this. I didn't intend to be this
- 3 strong or take these positions when I came into this hearing,
- 4 but when I hear there's no communication before we even get
- 5 here, then I'm a little disappointed.
- 6 MR. BERGMAN: Your Honor, may I say one thing before
- 7 (inaudible)?
- 8 The folks that are doing the VA housing have agreed
- 9 and asked to meet with the monitors so we can, together,
- 10 resolve the issues, hopefully.
- 11 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- MR. HUESTON: Yes, and I was hoping to do so today
- 13 with Mr. Soboroff and Mr. Johnson.
- 14 **THE COURT:** Okay. So we can all go to lunch if you
- 15 | want to. What time would you like me back? In other words, if
- 16 | something meaningful is happening, but we're in continuous
- 17 | session now. In other words, we're not going back and having a
- 18 | meeting with Brentwood School, other than an emergency meeting.
- 19 This is an emergency now. And we're not going to go away for a
- 20 | week or two and then come back with a proposal that might be
- 21 | substandard. You need to have an indication in good faith,
- 22 | Skip, if you're going back to your board, whether I'm going to
- 23 accept it or not.
- MR. BERGMAN: Your Honor, (inaudible) Skip --
- 25 **THE COURT:** No, he's Skip back there. Mr. Miller.

- 1 MR. BERGMAN: It's an honor to be named after Skip,
- 2 | who's a great lawyer, but I'm Greg Bergman. Thank you.
- No, when would the monitor or you like housing folks
- 4 back?
- 5 **THE COURT:** Now. Now. Now.
- 6 MR. BERGMAN: We're ready whenever, but I know he has
- 7 many things to do.
- 8 MR. HUESTON: Ready to go. Yeah. No, I'm ready to
- 9 do it now.
- 10 **THE COURT:** Ready to do it now?
- 11 MR. BERGMAN: Okay.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Okay. So, what, 2 o'clock, 1 o'clock?
- 13 MR. BERGMAN: Whatever time the monitor picks, we'll
- 14 be there.
- 15 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 16 MR. BERGMAN: And so I assume will Mr. Soboroff and
- 17 his group.
- 18 **THE COURT:** John, how long -- do you want a couple
- 19 hours with them? 1 o'clock. Do you want me to -- put it this
- 20 way, I'll be available at 1 o'clock. You tell me when to go
- 21 back into session.
- 22 MR. HUESTON: Okay. I will.
- 23 **THE COURT:** Mr. Miller.
- MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. We made an initial
- 25 proposal, and as Mr. Hueston correctly reported, it wasn't well

- 1 received. Okay? So we have to go back. Our process is, I
- 2 | have my chairman of the board here, but he's just the chairman
- 3 of the board. We have to go back to the drawing board. We
- 4 have to redo the proposal, make another proposal, and we can't
- 5 do it today. It's not logistically possible.
- But we understand the urgency, totally connect,
- 7 totally relate to that, and we'll do it -- I'd like to have
- 8 until next Tuesday or Wednesday. I think that's necessary
- 9 here. This problem's been going on for a long, long time, and
- 10 | we want to do this right. Part of our consideration is it's
- 11 | not just giving back land or acknowledging land. There's other
- 12 | components. There's potentially a monetary component to assist
- 13 | with building housing. There's readjusting schedules. It's
- 14 | not a simple-minded process, and we have to do it right. We
- 15 don't want to do it as catch as catch can.
- And I explained that to Mr. Hueston, and he said he
- 17 | was going to talk to Your Honor about that.
- 18 **THE COURT:** I'm concerned that there were -- so let's
- 19 have this discussion openly. I'm concerned that there's a
- 20 position where you're going to propose trading back land,
- 21 | whatever acreage that is. That's not going to be acceptable to
- 22 me.
- 23 The veterans are going to get this land back in terms
- 24 of the 22 acres. The question is I'm hoping to give some
- 25 | control back to you as well and work out some kind of

Ι

- 1 accommodation so we either don't have that land sitting vacant,
- 2 unused for a period of time when we're not using it. That's
- 3 ridiculous.
- 4 Second, I'd like to keep those facilities intact.
- 5 think there's a way to work out the hours because I think the
- 6 veterans will actually be generous with that. And by the way,
- 7 Brentwood School was not, and UCLA was not, for the record, not
- 8 generous at all, especially during COVID when they wanted to
- 9 come in and they can't even get a parking lot at UCLA, and
- 10 Brentwood School is turning them down with four baseball
- 11 fields. It's ridiculous.
- 12 MR. MILLER: I heard all that.
- 13 **THE COURT:** No, I'm going to say -- I'm finishing
- 14 now.
- There won't be a trade out of land, Skip. What there
- 16 | will be, hopefully, is a preservation of these facilities could
- 17 be because it will be good for the veterans and good for the
- 18 | school. And if we can work out those hours somehow fairly, so
- 19 veterans aren't coming up from 5:30 to 7:30, I'm going to work
- 20 | with you. Understood?
- 21 MR. MILLER: I understand.
- 22 **THE COURT:** But as far as trading off the land, no,
- 23 | this land goes back to the veterans either by my order, which
- 24 I've already said the leases are void, or by hopefully, you
- 25 know, some overture that heads me off from writing that final

1 injunctive relief.

MR. MILLER: I understand that. What we need is we want certainty. We want longevity. However it's structured, the land goes back, that's a real estate issue. That's for lawyers a lot smarter than me. We don't want to be back in court litigating this issue in a year or two years or three years, as much as I like appearing before Your Honor. That's just not agreeable to us.

THE COURT: No, no, you don't. But that's fine. No, no, you don't. You don't enjoy me at all. That's fine.

This is solvable. But it's not solvable unless

Brentwood is going to either give that land back voluntarily or

let me -- put me in the hard place where I write this

injunctive relief and I just do this. And I'm going to do

this, Skip. What I'd like to do is I'd like to preserve these

facilities. I think the veterans could use them. We might be

able to work out hours, and I guarantee if we can talk to those

veterans and counsel, they may be generous. Correct, counsel?

We don't want to destroy this if we don't have it.

It's for everybody's benefit. But if you put me in that box, I will.

- MR. MILLER: I'm not putting Your Honor in any boxes.
- THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. MILLER: We're on the same page.
- **THE COURT:** I don't believe your board can't meet. I

don't believe that they can't discuss this. I don't have to be adamant about tomorrow, Skip, but we're in continuous session now and I'm getting tired of slow walk, not by you and not by your client. And I understand your problems. I'm not getting slow walked anymore.

MR. MILLER: Got it.

2.3

THE COURT: And if my country can build what you just saw in 60 days in some country we can't pronounce called Georgia, which is Stalin's birthplace, 10 miles away. By God, we can put this up. This is America.

And so I'm really tired of listening to what we can't do in the civilian world when we demand extraordinary, and I'm saying this to you now because I'm on a wherever I am. I'm saying that the military does things you can't even imagine.

And I've got civilians running around who can't get this done without bumping into each other.

And I can just imagine telling you a story. Steve, stand up. You were in the Marine Corps also. Could you imagine telling your drill instructor when they told you assault a hill at five o'clock in the morning that you might do that at 5:05 and have a latte? I think you'd find yourself flat on your back with your face in the dirt from a rifle butt. So I don't believe that this can't be done.

Okay. And I don't believe that your board can't meet. But I'm not waiting until next Wednesday. Don't put me

- 1 in that position. Now I'll work with you. I'll work with you 2 reasonably, but we're in continuous session and I'm sitting I'm not going away. So I'll leave that to you. 3 here. 4 MR. MILLER: Okay. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. Then why don't we do this, John? I'll be 7 THE COURT: available at, let's say, 1:30. You don't need lunch, do you? 8 No, you don't need lunch. Okay. No, we'll bring you a donut. 10 All right. So if you want to talk to John or 11 whatever, talk to him. But I want concrete proposals. 12 you need to know what I'm thinking so you don't go back to your 13 board and you come back. So I'm being clear. This property is 14 going back to the veterans. Now work with me in terms of 15 hours. Preserve these facilities, et cetera. But my bottom
- 17 MR. MILLER: I understand that. I do not have authority. I'm just a lawyer.

line is, it's not trading out parcels now. Okay?

19 **THE COURT:** Who does?

- 20 MR. MILLER: So I have to get -- before we make a proposal, I have to have proper authority from my client.
- 22 **THE COURT:** I understand that. Your client needs to start treating this like an emergency.
- MR. MILLER: Oh, believe me, they are.
- 25 **THE COURT:** Oh, okay. We'll see. I'm sitting here.

```
1
              MR. MILLER: Believe me. That's why I'm here.
 2
              THE COURT: Okay. I have a continuing session, Skip.
    We're done with the conversation. I'm sitting here as long as
 3
    you need.
 4
 5
              MR. MILLER: Okay. All right.
              THE COURT:
 6
                          Okay.
 7
              MR. MILLER:
                           Thank you.
                         We'll see you at 1:30, counsel.
              THE COURT:
 9
         (Recessed at 12:06 p.m.; to reconvene at 2:40 p.m.)
              THE COURT: We're back on the record. And I want to
10
11
    inform all counsel that Michelle Martinez, who's been a special
12
    master on both the city and the county, has volunteered pro
13
    bono to also work on this case. That would be beneficial
14
    initially because of so many crossover issues that we have with
15
    the city and the county, loss, et cetera. So she brings a lot
16
    of expertise and I want to thank you -- there you are -- for
17
    volunteering your time. I've been surrounded by goodness and
18
    it's very much appreciated.
19
              The second issue I want to raise quickly before I
20
    turn to any progress or non-progress that you've made is the
21
    UCLA chancellor. So counsel, if you'd like to come forward,
22
    I'd like to get the latest input from you if possible.
2.3
              MR. CARDOZO: Yes, the chancellor is planning to be
24
    here at 6:30, Your Honor.
25
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
```

MR. CARDOZO: And there's a proposal we'd like to make before he gets here to all concerned parties. Maybe we could get some progress before he gets here.

2.3

THE COURT: Okay. I was prepared and had written a docket so that you know that UCLA is hereby enjoined from accessing the UCLA baseball fields and facilities on the West L.A. VA campus until the chancellor appears and presents UCLA's position on how the ten acres it currently occupies can be put to the principal benefit of the veterans. The VA is ordered to cordon off and prevent any use of the UCLA baseball stadium and practice field until further notice from the Court. If the chancellor is unavailable to attend, the Court would welcome the chair of the University of California Board of Regents and Janet Riley.

I'd also paid initial tribute, so you know exactly where the Court was, that two weeks ago, this Court had invited the UCLA chancellor's office to today's hearing on injunctive relief, which is Docket 305. The chancellor has not attended. And I apparently -- and I said it initially, counsel, subject to your input now that he apparently is not attending and not intending to attend, despite the Court's offer to remain in session for consecutive days and during evening hours to accommodate his schedule.

The chancellor's office has historically been involved in discussions with the VA regarding the stadium in an

- 1 attempt to shield the VA from scrutiny. Further, UCLA has not
- 2 presented any good faith proposal regarding how the land on
- 3 which UCLA baseball stadium and the Branca practice field might
- 4 be repurposed to principally benefit veterans and their
- 5 families.
- 6 UCLA's failure to come forth with a good faith
- 7 proposal stands in contrast with the Brentwood School and
- 8 | Brentwood School's chairman of the board and trustee, Adam
- 9 Cohen, and counsel, Skip Miller, who've engaged at today's
- 10 | hearing in constructive dialogue with the special master
- 11 | Hueston regarding how the Brentwood School's athletic
- 12 facilities can be repurposed to principally benefit veterans.
- 13 Although the Brentwood School's initial proposal is
- 14 | inadequate, the Court appreciates their appearance and their
- 15 effort.
- 16 I want to hear once again, will the chancellor be
- 17 here or not?
- 18 MR. CARDOZO: The chancellor will be here at 6:30,
- 19 Your Honor, and he looks forward to -- that's why we want to
- 20 make a proposal now because we look -- we very much want the
- 21 very strong and beneficial partnership between UCLA and
- 22 veterans that has existed for --
- 23 **THE COURT:** Does he want to make that proposal at
- 24 | that time? Because --
- 25 MR. CARDOZO: No, no. We will make the proposal now

- offline and then hopefully make some progress by the time he arrives, because they may have some comments on the proposal.
- THE COURT: All right. I'd like to remain in session
  then, just for a moment, and I'm not going to -- I want you to

5 hold up docketing this.

6

7

9

10

20

- Counsel, I think in the breadth, I want to thank you for getting in contact with him. This was going to be docketed in just a few moments. I don't think I have to docket it at the present time with the representation that the chancellor will be here.
- MR. CARDOZO: Yes.
- 12 THE COURT: Okay. I'll hold back this docketing
  13 then, but you have the exact order that I was going to send
  14 out.
- 15 MR. CARDOZO: Thank you, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Now, I've got to contact the chief judge
  here because apparently the courthouse closes at 6 o'clock
  here. The chief judge will not be happy with the court being
  in session because it's overtime.
  - Rose, could you ask the security downstairs if they can let in the chancellor at 6:30?
- 22 **THE CLERK:** Will do, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: All right. And I need to apologize to
  the chief judge for this. And I was planning to meet you at
  Patriot Hall, counsel, at 8 o'clock tonight. If I can stay in

session, I'd like to do that here because I don't have a record at Patriot Hall. Okay.

The next issue is I'd like to hear from plaintiffs about your thoughts concerning the change Treasury announced yesterday that would allow veterans disability benefits -- or that would exclude veterans disability benefits from the definition of income for the low income housing tax credit, which we refer to as the LIHTC program.

First, given the timing of this announcement, it's clear to the Court that this change has been spurred by this lawsuit, by your lawsuit. But I want to continue on the record to profusely thank Dr. Keith Harris, who I hope is here to hear the Court's comments.

As Dr. Harris has been pushing this issue for years and ultimately, however, it doesn't matter what prompted this change to happen as this is a huge milestone and will positively impact veterans or disabled veterans across the country. Given this change from Treasury, I want to hear plaintiff's thoughts because you've been suspicious before, you've been concerned before, and I want to hear if there -- what -- if you would still be pressing for injunctive relief because the benefit to the Court is if this does go nationwide on October 24th, then you've achieved an immense amount far beyond this lawsuit with the West L.A. VA Center. You've accomplished a nationwide change for all veterans.

So what is your position? Because if I don't have to write injunctive relief on this, I don't want to.

And by the way, my compliments to the VA, because I think you started this ball rolling. I think you were somewhat helpless with Treasury, at their whim, and this has been pending over a year. So Dr. Harris and all of you are to be complimented on the VA side.

What's your position?

MR. SILBERFELD: Your Honor, we agree that it's an important change. However, over lunch hour with Mr. Hueston and others, we had a conversation about the final impact of this change. This is a step in the right direction.

13 Obviously --

14 THE COURT: This isn't --

MR. SILBERFELD: -- the same way -- this is a step in the right direction, obviously, as was the HUD change. But there are still state and local impacts that have to be considered.

THE COURT: I understand that, but let's walk through that. Are you requesting that I write injunctive relief in this area? Because you know I'm going to write that injunctive relief.

23 MR. SILBERFELD: Yes.

THE COURT: But by the same token, why are we poking
the VA and Treasury, who's finally, you know, after a year or

- 1 so on the Treasury side, at least, taking Dr. Harris's input?
- 2 You know, is it just exacerbating a situation or do I hold back
- 3 on this injunctive relief? I can hold this in abeyance on this
- 4 | issue to see how this sorts out or I can write this injunctive
- 5 | relief. What are you requesting?
- 6 MR. SILBERFELD: My view is that the prudent path
- 7 | forward is to hold it and let us further explore the impact on
- 8 the state and local aspects of this.
- 9 THE COURT: What's the VA's thought? I would think
- 10 | that you might want the same thing.
- 11 MR. ROSENBERG: One moment, Your Honor.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Yeah. In other words, they're willing to
- 13 hold it to see how this works out on the local level and in
- 14 practice. But if you want injunctive relief to be an issue,
- 15 I'm happy to write that.
- 16 (Pause)
- 17 **THE COURT:** Take your time with it, Brad. Okay.
- 18 Take your time.
- MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, would it be possible to
- 20 get back to you a little bit later today on that issue?
- 21 **THE COURT:** Absolutely.
- MR. ROSENBERG: All right.
- 23 **THE COURT:** Absolutely.
- MR. ROSENBERG: It's complex.
- 25 **THE COURT:** Yeah. And remember, any time that I can

push you now forward as the advocates for this, I would prefer to. I would prefer not to be writing injunctive relief. And if we've finally gotten there, I don't care about the woulda, coulda, shouldas. I'd like to join in commending the VA and

Treasury.

But if, and we need to test this out on the local level, obviously. We could have done it months ago, but so what? We're finally here. But otherwise, you know, basically what I'm going to write, so -- if we have to go forward.

Okay. Next. Would you put this up on the board for a moment? It's document number 320. Have you folks looked at 320 and the royalties that flow from the Bridgeland leases?

There's some check marks, but Una, could you help?

Could you walk over with Will and point out the Brentwood

Homeowners Association, amongst others? And my question is

going to be very simply this. There've been a lot of royalties

flowing from this site, among them, the Brentwood Homeowners

Association, and I will bet a dollar to a donut that you've got

a lot of folks over in the West L.A. Homeowners Association

personally getting royalty from this well site.

And so if you look down, you'll see some who's who that are easily recognized, and you'll see a lot of folks in West L.A. And so I would expect Mr. Johnson and Mr. Soboroff, you're about to get a lot of pushback from the West L.A.

25 Homeowners Association, regardless of your building. But there

- 1 | apparently is a pecuniary interest out there also. And there's
- 2 over a thousand names. I think the Department of Water and
- 3 Power is on that. Various law firms are profiting from this.
- 4 And there's nothing wrong with royalties that were created.
- 5 Bridgeland is not involved in this. So virtuous.
- By the same token, there's a lot of self-interested
- 7 | people out there potentially getting these royalties. And I
- 8 guarantee if you start checking these names as somebody goes
- 9 through it, you'll see a real financial interest out here.
- 10 Has anybody done that? Well, my law clerks and I
- 11 | will. I don't know how to match that up. But that may take
- 12 | some special master time and you may be paying for it. But if
- 13 | we're going to get pushback from the West L.A. Homeowners
- 14 Association, let's find out if there's a financial benefit that
- 15 they're receiving on these leases.
- 16 MR. SOBOROFF: Does it say how much each one's
- 17 | getting?
- THE COURT: I'm sorry?
- 19 MR. SOBOROFF: Does it say how much each one is
- 20 getting?
- 21 **THE COURT:** No, no.
- 22 MR. SOBOROFF: Okay.
- MR. GUARDIANA: It doesn't say the exact amount paid,
- 24 | but it does give the royalty percentage on the very --
- 25 **THE COURT:** You've got a royalty percentage, but you

- don't see what each person is receiving. And you may have very
  wealthy people receiving a small amount that doesn't make a
- 3 difference, but you may have other people who are receiving an
- 4 amount. The point is, how many of these folks are from the
- 5 West L.A. area who are going to push back on any increase in
- 6 | the veterans? Because historically, they push back on the West
- 7 L.A. facility. So let's see what their interest is.
- 8 All right. Now, I'd like to hear, John, if it's 9 acceptable to you, any progress made or non-progress.
- 10 MR. HUESTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- So the parties, veteran representatives and others, did meet throughout the, we'll call it lunch hour, though there really wasn't lunch, and worked diligently. And there is progress to report.
  - So I'll start first with temporary housing, both progress and things to do. So with the temporary housing units to build 750 within 18 months, we discussed and reached some preliminary thinking on how this might best be done.
- So the VA pointed out that if two-story housing were to be used, temporary housing were to be used, in all likelihood, that would require more invasive permanent structures that would then trigger longer, more detailed environmental review processes that would potentially very much delay implementation.
  - So we discussed alternatives and everybody at the

- table discussed the possibility of modular structures that
  would be -- wouldn't be as good as the permanent structures
  that had been discussed, but would be a true step beyond what
- **THE COURT:** So, John, is this on the 750, the 6 temporary?
- 7 MR. HUESTON: 750, just talking about the 750.
- **THE COURT:** Okay. Got it.

is there now, the small --

2.3

MR. HUESTON: So in terms of to-dos, I'm going to be consulting with plaintiff's counsel and defense and VA reps and veterans reps to look at proposed modular structures that could be put up on a faster timeline with a lesser environmental review component. But it's important to the vets that these achieve certain minimum standards of habitability. For instance, I've been told that some of the permanent structures have dwelling units without an oven, without a closet, and that's not acceptable.

And so, you know, we're going to look at these proposed modular structures, see if it meets minimum standards. If not, you know, we're going to have to go back to the drawing board and think about how we can accomplish more suitable housing within that time frame, given the environmental review issues. So that's on the temporary.

With respect to the permanent housing units,

everybody seems to agree that the timeline of six years can be

- met. And the VA says that they're confident that they can accelerate development plans and get everything done within six years.
- 4 THE COURT: John?
- 5 MR. HUESTON: Yeah.
- 6 **THE COURT:** Does that mean the 1,800 plus the 7 approximately 489 because that 489 --
- 8 MR. HUESTON: That's what I understood, but someone
  9 will get up and correct me. But that's what I understand.
  10 It's the 1,800 plus the 489.
- 11 **THE COURT:** Okay.

15

16

17

20

21

22

2.3

- MR. HUESTON: I'll call that the last 1,800. That's what we were talking about.
  - THE COURT: So six years from now is approximately 2,030 when it was represented we'd have 1,200 long-term or long-term supportive housing units. So we're still meeting that 2,030 deadline in six years, correct?
- 18 MR. HUESTON: Right.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Okay.
  - MR. HUESTON: And I asked if the plaintiffs had any changes to Exhibit 248, their proposed plots, the nine plots colored in green, Your Honor. They said no. They had no amendments. However, we went through -- in that exhibit, my understanding is one form of the exhibit had three options.
- THE COURT: Would somebody put up 248?

- 1 MR. HUESTON: Option three?
- 2 THE COURT: Yeah. Just, just wait. Put it up on the
- 3 | Elmo. I've got it.
- 4 MR. HUESTON: Yeah.
- 5 THE COURT: And just a moment, John. I'll refer to
- 6 | you as John because I know you as John, but Mr. Hueston.
- 7 All right.
- 8 MR. HUESTON: Right. So what's depicted on the
- 9 Elmo --
- 10 THE COURT: No, slide that down so we see nine also.
- 11 | I want to see nine up at the Brentwood school. So shrink that
- 12 down. Roman, thank you.
- 13 MR. HUESTON: Right.
- 14 **THE COURT:** Okay, perfect.
- 15 MR. HUESTON: So right now those, those are the
- 16 proposed plots by plaintiff. Those would be sufficient. And
- 17 | we would need all of these to do -- to build the temporary
- 18 | structures. That's what the green indicates on a single level,
- 19 which would be the modular form of the temporary structures.
- 20 And the VA said that they did not -- and again, if I'm mis-
- 21 | recollecting here, someone can correct the record, but I don't
- 22 believe the VA had a counter proposal to that.
- 23 With respect to the permanent -- the permanent
- 24 structures kind of moving to that. Again, it can all be done
- 25 | within six years, but there was a lot of debate because they

- 1 | involve much more permitting and other issues. There were a
- 2 lot of questions from the parties about, you know, cart before
- 3 horse. What possible plots of land are we looking for? Are we
- 4 | working with the map that's in 248 or are there other
- 5 | additional properties?
- 6 So 248, for instance, assumes the entirety. If you
- 7 look at yellow letter B, that's assuming the ball field, the
- 8 UCLA ball field is demolished and all that property is used.
- 9 | So --
- 10 **THE COURT:** Just a moment, B seems to be in existence
- 11 on this?
- 12 MR. HUESTON: Right. Right. It is in existence.
- So it's already assuming that entire UCLA piece of
- 14 property there, which is the ball field and adjacent parking
- 15 lot is already going to be dedicated, I think, to this. And
- 16 again, if I'm misreading the map --
- 17 **THE COURT:** Mr. Braverman, remain for just a moment.
- 18 | I want to have a discussion with you, Mr. Kuhn.
- 19 Okay. I'm sorry, John, please continue.
- 20 MR. HUESTON: Yeah. But -- so the predicate
- 21 questions that were asked both by experts from plaintiffs and
- 22 | the VA was we need to look at what can be demolished, right?
- 23 Which of those buildings will the VA agree can be demolished to
- 24 | create clear land space and then what property, if any, is
- 25 | coming from the Brentwood School and UCLA, and the timing to

- build the permanent supporting housing will, as I think Your

  Honor has commented several times today and through court

  proceedings, is very much going to depend on the proximity to
- 4 existing infrastructure.

6

7

10

11

12

13

21

22

23

- So choosing pieces of property close to built-out infrastructure will vastly increase time for construction. So these are the variables that we're going to need to address quickly to get the plan in place in the contemplated time of six months, you know, for the defendants to create a plan in consultation with plaintiffs' counsel and the monitor to create the permanent supportive housing units.
  - THE COURT: And these are the permanent supportive we're looking at, correct?
- MR. HUESTON: Right.
- 15 **THE COURT:** Now, what do we do then, John, with the temporary? Because Dr. Braverman has taken the position that he would like these temporary in the North Campus.
- Mr. Soboroff and Mr. Johnson took the position that as far as parcel 3, which is lot 6A and 6B, that this might entail an underground parking lot.
  - It would seem that if we have people with acute substance abuse and mental health, that we might want those people, subject to your input and the parties' input in just a moment, closer to that hospital.
- 25 And number two, and we walked that and we discussed

- 1 | that so counsel knows, that we seem to have a significant
- 2 amount of land in parcel number 1 for temporary, parcel number
- 3 | 2 for temporary, parcel number 4 for temporary, and what hasn't
- 4 been drawn in so far is just across the street in what I'm
- 5 going to call the safe parking area, which is another three or
- 6 | four acres.
- 7 So Mr. Kuhn, in just a moment when we have this
- 8 discussion with the special master and the Court openly, I'm
- 9 having trouble with the initial position by the VA that we're
- 10 going to create a community, but we have some veterans out
- 11 | there that are truly psychotic and possibly dangerous.
- 12 I'm not going to be favorable to the VA not taking
- 13 responsibility and segmenting those out someplace on the campus
- 14 | because if not, then they're left on the street corners of Los
- 15 Angeles. And this isn't Los Angeles County or city problem,
- 16 and that cost when we don't find housing for the acutely
- 17 disabled, either mental or physical veteran out there, then you
- 18 | leave that to L.A. to pick up the cost, either the county or
- 19 the city. This is the VA's issue with veterans.
- 20 So I'm going to toss out to you some initial
- 21 | thoughts. You're the expert. You'll get back to me on it, but
- 22 I'd like, and I think it's a ridiculous position after walking
- 23 this, that we need these four areas for what I'm going to call
- 24 a lay down yard.
- 25 If you put me in that position, I'm going to take A

- 1 | and I'm going to take the front lawn of the governor's mansion
- 2 | and that's where your lay down yard will be. But if you walk
- 3 | that hospital ground, you'll see that there's more than
- 4 | adequate space concerning the new renovation for this hospital
- 5 | for lay down yards. I would like to see us consider one and
- 6 two. Those are solar panel at two. You also have a parking
- 7 lot out there. You have another four or five acres in four and
- 8 you have another couple acres across the street.
- 9 So if you go too high, Mr. Soboroff, we've done a
- 10 calculation. You can fit 750 in there very easily.
- 11 MR. SOBOROFF: Judge, we need both sides. Someone on
- 12 both side of --
- 13 **THE COURT:** No, I'm going to take away from you for
- 14 | just a moment, hypothetically, and give the VA all the room
- 15 | that they need temporarily. And if we took the solar panels in
- 16 2, if we took 1, there's also a parking lot out there. If we
- 17 | took 4 behind -- and also what hasn't been designated is just
- 18 across the street where safe parking is, I can move that up to
- 19 Barrington while we're, you know, in this flux, and I'm going
- 20 to give you another two acres.
- 21 MR. HUESTON: There's also the Metro adjacent lot,
- 22 | which I think is on option three of this --
- 23 **THE COURT:** And I'm telling you, we've got plenty of
- 24 | room out there, whether it's two acres or four acres, we can
- 25 create that easily for lay down out there.

Now, in just a moment, Dr. Braverman, I want to talk to you because you have a different concept and you wanted to move some of these folks up to North Campus. But another concept might be that this remains for permanent supportive housing up in the North Campus. So all of this development can take place and this construction can take place.

So why don't you come on up for just a moment, John?

I don't want to interrupt you, but I do want to, and Mr. Kuhn,

why don't you come up for a moment also? I was impolite to you

and I didn't have you answer.

So what happens if we change this concept and we had the temporary in the South Campus? You know, we've got to sequence that in some way. I fully understand overbuilding, okay? But if I've got my most acute who need either substance abuse or psychiatric help closest to you in the hospital, tell me why we couldn't do that and keep the North Campus for longterm supportive housing?

MR. BRAVERMAN: So, Your Honor, the justification for the position that I took before was that the individuals, our veterans, who would be in temporary housing are not necessarily going to be those that require immediate care in the facility. They're not all going to be seriously mental ill.

THE COURT: Okay, now let's stop there and let's play with that. Let's assume that out of the -- hypothetically, we take 750 veterans. Hypothetically, let's say that 250 of them

- 1 | still need acute psychiatric care or substance abuse. I can
- 2 take your concept and move that to North Campus, but once I do
- 3 | that, I'm taking away long-term supportive housing. And there,
- 4 | you know I'm going to go after Brentwood School and UCLA
- 5 because I'm in a box now with what I perceive plenty of land.
- 6 But if you move to a temporary North, then I'm going to have to
- 7 be in a position no matter what of taking that baseball field
- 8 and Brentwood land.
- 9 MR. BRAVERMAN: So there are potentials within those
- 10 green areas on the South Campus that could be beneficial. What
- 11 | I can't speak to with any kind of certainty right now is to go
- 12 | back to the contractor that's required -- you know, that's
- 13 going to get the contract for the tower. There's also the
- 14 | construction of a parking garage there. There's also
- 15 **THE COURT:** Just a moment. Look at the map. I'm no
- 16 taking 3 from you right now. So walk through this with me.
- 17 | Look at 1.
- 18 MR. BRAVERMAN: Right. So what I -- I'm agreeing
- 19 | with you that there's the potential for the southernmost
- 20 locations and plus or minus the solar panel locations if there
- 21 | is an ability to compress the lay down requirements. We have
- 22 to get that verification from the contractor. I don't know
- 23 | that today because we haven't taken it back to the group and
- 24 say where are the alternative locations to put those --
- 25 **THE COURT:** Walk with me just a moment. Let's take

- 1 1. And counsel, just tell me the acreage so I don't have to
- 2 look down. What does 1 have?
- 3 MR. SILBERFELD: Parcel 1 is 1.7 acres.
- 4 THE COURT: Okay. Somebody write down 1.5 just to be
- 5 cautious. Okay?
- Now walk down with me and when you see 2, that's what
- 7 I'm going to call the solar panel yard. And eventually, we
- 8 | already know that that's going to be torn down. So counsel,
- 9 how many acres do we have there?
- MR. SILBERFELD: 3.7.
- 11 THE COURT: Okay. So let's round that off to 1.5 and
- 12 | 3.7. Take 3.5. Okay? Five acres, right? Now let's walk down
- 13 | and what isn't listed here that I see is a parking lot. It's a
- 14 | huge parking lot in this area, and that parking lot fronts that
- 15 new building that we built and I forget, Brad, help me. That
- 16 | building was called a --
- 17 MR. SILBERFELD: It's the IT building.
- 18 MR. ROSENBERG: Or the --
- 19 **THE COURT:** Have you folks -- you folks saw this
- 20 parking lot. We don't need all that parking lot for that small
- 21 | building. And what's not listed here is about two more acres.
- 22 | Now hold on. Let's track this. Hold on. I'm just going to
- 23 | walk now. Two more acres. You've got another acre of parking
- 24 out there for a very small building.
- I'm going to add two acres to that. That's seven,

- 1 | right? Now walk over to what I'm going to call Patriot Hall,
- 2 | number 4. And right behind that, you've got about four acres.
- 3 And I'd like to be considerate of the neighbors, so I don't
- 4 know Mr. Soboroff whether it's a 50-foot setback, but whatever,
- 5 I'd like to get a setback. So four acres.
- Now how many acres do we have so far? About nine,
- 7 | don't we? Give or take? Okay, 11. Now walk across the street
- 8 to safe parking right now and that's about another two acres,
- 9 | but if you go outside that lot, that's a huge area. So I'm
- 10 | just taking the paved area and I'm going to say minimally, just
- 11 to be safe, two more acres. So Mr. Soboroff, what are we up
- 12 to? Roman?
- 13 MR. SILBERFELD: That'd be 13.
- 14 **THE COURT:** Okay, now hold on. You'll have all the
- 15 | time. So 13. Now this is temporary supportive. And when I'm
- 16 dealing with temporary supportive, how many do I put per acre
- 17 | if it's single story?
- 18 MR. SILBERFELD: Twenty.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Okay, so 13 times 20, right? Now I go
- 20 double story.
- 21 MR. SILBERFELD: So it goes from 260 to 520.
- 22 **THE COURT:** Exactly. If we're going to eventually
- 23 sequence this in, you know, and be reasonable about
- 24 accommodating long-term supportive housing, you flipped out a
- 25 | number of 750, you may be right. But by the same token, I want

- to know that that has reality to that number and I could get long-term supportive housing sequentially, and also it helps
- 3 the VA with their costs.

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

- They shouldn't be heaped with a billion dollars in one year. They can fit this into their budget. So I'm going to ask you to really think about that 750, because I don't want to end up with excessive modular homes when we can spend that money on long-term supportive homes, okay? So I question that 750.
- All right. Now, every time we move temporary supportive housing to the North Campus, it decreases the options of a build-out for long-term supportive. Now we're going to walk through this for a moment.
- I want you to look at number 9. Number 9 is on the Brentwood Campus. That is going to be developed. That is a soccer field. It's how many acres, Roman?
- MR. SILBERFELD: 4.8, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Let's just say 4.5. Now I want to go

  over to the Barrington Park for a moment. You've got literally

  between the parking lot there and that, if we can use it, if it

  has no methane, no nuclear issue, how many acres in just the

  parking lot -- and discount the parking lot closest to the

  Brentwood school.
- 24 MR. SILBERFELD: Six.
- 25 **THE COURT:** How many?

1 MR. SILBERFELD: Six.

THE COURT: Yeah, but you've got a parking lot in there that you're not accounting for. You've got almost nine.

MR. SILBERFELD: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, we know that they have facilities along Barrington, so we don't have to wait for facilities for our developers. We've got lots of lights, sewer. So, 9. Plus, what did we have up at Brentwood? Four on the playing field? 4.5?

MR. SILBERFELD: 4.5.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Now, we've got a parcel 8. And 12 how much -- how big is that parcel so I don't have to look 13 down?

MR. SILBERFELD: 4.1 acres.

**THE COURT:** Okay, let's make it four.

Now, next to it, if you look at 7, that parking lot is massive. And that parking lot extends beyond 7 that you've penciled in. Go out and look at that again. What we've done is we've cut number 7 in a third, and for the life of me, that parking lot is absolutely vacant.

MR. SILBERFELD: It is.

THE COURT: Now, I'm not living out there in a tent, but I can tell you I've been out there enough, and I'll vouch to you that that parking lot is not used. And if you want to go out with me, I'm available Saturday and Sunday. We'll go

- 1 out Monday. We'll go out any time you want to, but that
- 2 parking lot is not used. Who's got that parking lot?
- 3 MR. SILBERFELD: That's the National Cemetery
- 4 Association.
- 5 THE COURT: But why can't we get some of that vacant
- 6 parking lot that nobody's using? Now, hold on. So I'm not
- 7 accepting the VA's demarcation between the cemetery when it's
- 8 | not used. This is something that the VA could transfer, quite
- 9 | frankly, because that parking lot is absolutely unused except
- 10 | for special occasions, and I can't imagine what that is except
- 11 | for maybe the Olympic games if we have anything going on in the
- 12 area. So I'm going to take that. How many acres is number 7?
- MR. SILBERFELD: Well, it's roughly two acres as
- 14 | it's --
- 15 **THE COURT:** Okay. So let's add two, and I'm going to
- 16 make that four acres because there's two acres minimally
- 17 | available, and that leaves another acre of parking out there.
- And by the way, if you go down the side, there's even
- 19 more parking out there that isn't accounted for.
- Now, let's just assume that -- we never got to number
- 21 | 6, but let's assume, how large is number 6?
- MR. SILBERFELD: Four acres.
- THE COURT: Okay. So if we have four acres in number
- 24 | 6, we've got 9, 4.5, 4, 4. Somebody add that up. I'll do
- 25 | it for you. 13, 17, 21, 25 acres, 25.5 acres right there.

- 1 This should be roughly 25 acres -- right to begin with, but
- 2 | let's just do the math. Remember, now I'm going to let you
- 3 | build three stories. Before I can find you -- I'm going to let
- 4 you build three stories, and the reason for that is all of the
- 5 other structures there are three stories. I would never
- 6 recommend four stories.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

- So if we're building three stories high, now do the math.
- MR. SOBOROFF: It's 1,500.
  - THE COURT: 1,500. In other words, if we just have 9, 8, 7, and 6, we've got 1,500 towards our 1,800, because I'm assuming that you had plans for the other 489 someplace.
    - In other words, this is easily met, and I haven't even touched or considered 5. I haven't even considered the parking lot up by the Brentwood School. I haven't considered the empty stadium outside the fence at Brentwood School. I haven't taken the baseball field as you enter the Brentwood School. I haven't bulldozed the tennis courts yet. I haven't disturbed the track, which could be facilities that the veterans and the school agree upon, and let the kids, you know, have some facilities out there, and I would hope that veterans would be generous, but this land belongs to you. It goes back to you. That's a negotiation tool from your standpoint.
- In other words, Dr. Braverman, I don't see how we don't have enough land to accommodate this, and I haven't even

1 | started with some other ideas.

What's wrong with having the permanent supportive housing on the North Campus, and if you want me to consider eventually approving or moving temporary supporting north, we can talk about that.

MR. BRAVERMAN: So Your Honor, where I was -- what I was recommending, we agree that there's available land on the north part of the campus to be able to meet the expansion requirements for permanent supportive housing.

THE COURT: Fair enough. Thank you.

MR. BRAVERMAN: That was something that was already discussed with the special master. What we can't do is, or what we believe would be inappropriate to do in order to meet the timeline for temporary housing is to go into multiple level structures because then that would require construction --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BRAVERMAN: -- that gets in the way of some of
the environmental and other services.

THE COURT: Let me repeat that back. Judge, if you ever got to the point of working with, we all were working together, don't do multiple level for temporary because it's harder to tear down, quite frankly. They're permanent structures. If you're going to do that, why not build longterm supportive housing?

MR. BRAVERMAN: It stops being temporary.

1 THE COURT: Yeah, that's a really good point.

2 MR. BRAVERMAN: That's part of the point that we were 3 making.

THE COURT: Really good point.

MR. BRAVERMAN: Where I was going before, too, was that there is a pro and a con to being on the south part of the campus where a lot of construction is ongoing, whether that is an actual construction lay-down site or right next to it with all of the noise and the congestion and everything else that's ongoing.

My concern with the south part of the campus for temporary housing is that, number one, you're taking, I guess we weigh the risk of veterans being separated from where the rest of the community is on the north part of the campus versus the need for less frequent visits to the medical center versus more frequent visits on the north part for community engagement.

THE COURT: I need your help in coming up with some ratio in the future because some of these veterans have an acute state that's going to -- they need to be near the hospital.

MR. BRAVERMAN: And there may be -- that may make it so that it's appropriate to use a couple of these locations and really try to move out and take that risk of moving out some of the construction lay-down areas to a more confined site. We

have to work with the construction company for that.

But my -- part of the concern is with the continued construction of the Metro, which is just north of that parcel 3, with the continued -- or with the new construction of the hospital, with the new construction of a garage, with the new construction of the central utility plant, that just getting around that area, even for our veterans who don't live there but need to get to the hospital, is going to be very difficult.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BRAVERMAN: And I absolutely want to take that into consideration and make sure that we've exhausted the options on the north part of the campus --

THE COURT: Understood.

MR. BRAVERMAN: -- before we start moving to the south part of the campus. That's where that is.

THE COURT: If you notice so far, look at the diagram for a moment up on the -- I haven't touched 3, have I? In other words, I didn't mention in our conversation number 3, which is 6A and 6B, that's that parking lot. See number 3? That's a massive parking lot.

MR. BRAVERMAN: That's the veteran parking lot for -THE COURT: 6A and 6B. Now, I'm not living out at
your facility, but I can tell you that if I walk around by the
Culinary Center and I continue on around, you've got another
massive parking lot on the other side of the hospital. I

- 1 haven't seen that parking lot over 20 percent filled.
- 2 Let me repeat that. And I'll invite you to go out
- 3 | there with me at any time you'd like to, or I'll go with you.
- 4 You can pick a random time.
- 5 That parking lot is virtually available all the time.
- 6 And I've never understood 6A and 6B, but I don't like hearing
- 7 | that I've got to build an underground garage there because that
- 8 takes time, effort, money. It's nonsense. So I don't know why
- 9 6A and 6B aren't available. And you've got plenty of lay down
- 10 room in the back of that hospital. I'll walk that with you.
- 11 It's stunning how much room you have. And you've got plenty of
- 12 parking on the other side of that hospital.
- So I don't understand GSA or whoever coming back and
- 14 representing to you that they need these four or five parcels.
- 15 This is absolute nonsense.
- 16 MR. BRAVERMAN: So some of those lots that you're
- 17 | referencing are actually the sites of where these buildings are
- 18 | going. So -- and I don't have that chart in front of me, but
- 19 | that was part of the exhibit that we had, and I think we were
- 20 discussing that on the last day of the -- or next to last day
- 21 of the trial.
- 22 **THE COURT:** All right. Between number one, number
- 23 | two, and that parking lot that hasn't been --
- MR. BRAVERMAN: So those three -- the one, two, and
- 25 | three are not where the buildings are.

- 1 THE COURT: No, that's right.
- 2 MR. BRAVERMAN: To the right of those, or to the
- 3 | east --
- 4 THE COURT: So you and I are going to work together
- 5 and hopefully come up with this. 1 and 2 are off your charts.
- 6 That's going to be, hypothetically, temporary supportive
- 7 housing. So look at 1 and 2. You've lost those, okay?
- 8 Number -- see number, see that parking lot we have it
- 9 penciled in? It's right next to number 2. That is massive.
- 10 MR. SILBERFELD: I have another picture that shows
- 11 | it.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Now, show that parking lot for goodness
- 13 | sakes. I could take you all out there again, but I don't think
- 14 you want to go with me. It's a massive parking lot.
- Well, you need to bring it up so we see that parking
- 16 lot. There we go. See that light colored green in there?
- 17 | There's your parking lot. How many cars park there?
- 18 MR. BRAVERMAN: Right now, there are no cars parking
- 19 there. It just got resurfaced, but my understanding is that
- 20 | that is for employee parking once all of the construction
- 21 starts that replaces that.
- 22 **THE COURT:** That building is so small in terms of
- 23 personnel that you have.
- MR. BRAVERMAN: No, it's not for that building. It's
- 25 | the employee parking for the hospital.

1 THE COURT: You have so much room in 6A and 6B if I 2 don't touch it, and you have so much room on the other side of 3 that hospital for parking that I'm not accepting that. fact, your parking lots are not filled, and you can take me out 4 5 there any time. Call me on the spur of the moment. 6 not filled. They're not even close to being filled. 7 MR. BRAVERMAN: I accept your assertion. THE COURT: Okay, go with me any time. I'm 9 challenging you to do that. Call me up. They are 10 underutilized, and you have mass -- in fact, you want some 11 pictures? 12 MR. BRAVERMAN: No, I don't need any pictures. 13 THE COURT: Okay. I'll show you how vacant those 14 parking lots are. 15 MR. BRAVERMAN: Right. 16 THE COURT: And, Mr. Hueston, you can pull those up. 17 In fact, why don't you talk to Dr. Braverman and tell him what 18 you saw out there so I'm not -- and, Don, where are you? 19 can also chime in in just a moment. And I'll pull up some 20 pictures of these parking lots at random times, and you tell 21 me. 22 Go ahead, John. 23 MR. HUESTON: Sure. We, I think it was two Sundays 24 ago, walked most of the acreage at the VA property, and there

were -- every single parking lot was maybe 10 percent occupied.

1 MR. BRAVERMAN: Which we would expect on a Sunday. 2 MR. HUESTON: On a Sunday. Well, but I think the Judge has been there other times, and remarked to me that the 3 parking wasn't much different than what he saw on the weekdays. 4 5 THE COURT: Yeah. Could you transfer this team? if you can put this up on the screen. You tell me the day of 6 7 the week you want to go out there. See if you can transfer that over. And we're going to just put up a couple pictures. Okay. 10 MR. BRAVERMAN: Your Honor, I appreciate the pictures 11 that you're giving --12 THE COURT: No, bear with me. Bear with me. 13 MR. BRAVERMAN: You're giving an accurate 14 representation of what is there now. The challenge is that a 15 lot of the existing parking is being taken down as part of the 16 construction and pre-construction phases. 17 THE COURT: No, because remember in our conversation, 18 I haven't taken 6A and 6B from you yet, have I? 19 words, I've been giving you generously all of the parking on 20 each side of that hospital. I haven't even mentioned 6A and 21 6B, which is number 3 on our map. 22 MR. BRAVERMAN: That's right. And typically, the 23 north part of number 3 --24 THE COURT: I haven't taken it from you. 25

-- is filled during the day.

- 1 | what's not always filled is the south part of that. In fact,
- 2 that was a location that we used to build a 25-bed mobile
- 3 | hospital during COVID because it wasn't one that was occupied
- 4 on a regular basis.
- 5 THE COURT: Okay, I'm not going to challenge you.
- 6 I'm just going to invite you to invite me to go out. Anytime
- 7 you want.
- 8 MR. BRAVERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
- 9 THE COURT: Okay, and we'll take some pictures
- 10 together.
- 11 MR. BRAVERMAN: Thank you. So I'm not disagreeing
- 12 | with your information there.
- 13 **THE COURT:** Make sure you put this up on the screen.
- 14 MR. BRAVERMAN: Same thing with the triangular
- 15 | parking lot parcel there that's --
- 16 THE COURT: Okay, you've got a standing offer from
- 17 | me. We can debate this, but these parking lots are little
- 18 used, unfortunately. And that's my impression on multiple
- 19 occasions. So prove me wrong.
- 20 MR. BRAVERMAN: And my point is that we need to
- 21 assess that associated with the construction plan and identify
- 22 | the population where it would be appropriate, where the risk is
- 23 greater if they were on the north part of the campus versus if
- 24 | they're on the south part of the campus in terms of needing the
- 25 | clinical care versus the community care.

THE COURT: I'm just looking at the parking lot closest to the freeway because I get east and west confused.

Okay? So let's call this the east parking lot as you go around the Culinary Center. Do you want to see a picture of 6A and 6B?

(Pause)

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, may I ask a clarifying question?

THE COURT: Please.

MR. HUESTON: So when you say future construction will occupy some of what we're seeing, are you counting your estimation of yardage for projected laydown yards in the way that you presented that at trial? Because that was contested. The notion that the construction would require, instead of what plaintiffs presented, just in time maybe, you know, needing a fraction of what the VA said your, I guess, GSA was estimating in terms of acreage for laydown yards. So I assume it's the laydown yards that is constituting most of what you're describing as an impingement on the parking lots that currently look vacant.

MR. BRAVERMAN: Some of that is. And what -- I mean,
I heard that notion of contesting during our lunchtime meeting
earlier today, and that's why I'm saying that I think it would
be appropriate to take a re-look at that and identify which
parts of that still might be necessary after there's pushback

and say you don't need all of this, and say which ones do we need, and then be able to make those available. So there's a couple of different stages here.

2.3

The first stage is to get agreement on the type of modular units that will be put on, identify what the scope of those are, how long it would take to procure, and then at the same time as we identify the where's, keeping these as potential locations, that gives us a chance to go back to the contractor and say where can the laydown space be shrunk and appropriate to make some of these locations available. So that's where I'm --

THE COURT: Okay. This is a very simple question.

Do we have enough room for 750 temporary, and do we have enough for 1,800 long-term supportive housing on the North and South Campus? And if it's no, then I need the UCLA baseball field, and I need 22 acres or some acreage from Brentwood School.

MR. BRAVERMAN: Well, I believe the answer to that would be, as far as available space, the answer is likely yes.

I think part of that discussion --

THE COURT: So we might be able to preserve

Brentwood's track, we might be able to preserve a swimming
pool?

MR. BRAVERMAN: We would absolutely take a look at that. Part of it is to identify -- so the other piece is that some of this would be in a staged process because we may not

- 1 have --
- 2 THE COURT: Yeah, sure. Yeah, we work together on
- 3 that. Obviously, we're not going to do this.
- 4 MR. BRAVERMAN: We also may not need all of those
- 5 units when it comes, you know --
- 6 THE COURT: Absolutely, and plaintiffs said that also
- 7 | in their findings -- or their request to the Court. They
- 8 recognized that we needed to adjust along the way.
- 9 MR. BRAVERMAN: Yes, but so we believe that
- 10 | there's --
- 11 **THE COURT:** Put that up, would you, Ellie?
- 12 MR. BRAVERMAN: -- there's space. It's the
- 13 procurement, it's the utilities, it's the specific locations --
- 14 **THE COURT:** Now, hold on a minute. What's that?
- 15 What's that?
- 16 MR. BRAVERMAN: So, this is -- yeah, so this is -- it
- 17 | looks to me that this is the parking lot near UCLA, Jackie
- 18 Robinson stadium --
- 19 **THE COURT:** Yeah, just off Jackie Robinson Stadium.
- 20 MR. BRAVERMAN: Right. That's associated with --
- 21 **THE COURT:** And what we've done so far is we've
- 22 | literally cut that minimally in half. That is a huge parking
- 23 | lot. I haven't seen more than one or two cars on that parking
- 24 lot. Contradict me. You tell me how this parking lot is used
- 25 and when I can go out and see even more than five cars on that

1 lot.

5

6

7

9

10

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BRAVERMAN: Yeah, and right now part, and I don't know if it's how much of that lot is designated as Phase 2 for

4 | the -- building the columbarium --

THE COURT: I don't care what it's designated for. I mean, we can change those designations from cemetery over to the other segment. It's not being used by anybody, by the way.

MR. BRAVERMAN: I understand.

THE COURT: If the chancellor was here, maybe he could save UCLA's baseball stadium.

11 MR. BRAVERMAN: I understand. It means that the
12 future use for a columbarium would then have to be --

THE COURT: It's paved. How do we use it for a columbarium? It's paved. It's paved.

15 MR. BRAVERMAN: A columbarium is above ground.

THE COURT: Oh, well, when I walk this, I walked the present columbarium, and this isn't part of your present columbarium, is it? I don't see any plans.

MR. BRAVERMAN: No, it's for the future Phase 2 part of the expansion of the columbarium. So it's the National Cemetery Administration's plan for that. And I --

THE COURT: Okay. Well, it's certainly unused at the present time, and if I have to pick between the living and the dead, I think I'll pick the living.

MR. BRAVERMAN: It's not -- and where I was going to

- 1 go next, Your Honor, is that especially if we're talking about
- temporary housing, then that may be a prime opportunity to use
- 3 that because it would be temporary and then could be removed at
- 4 | that time in which it gets --
- 5 THE COURT: The more property we disqualify, whether
- 6 | it's Barrington Park -- hold on, the more property we
- 7 disqualify concerning Barrington Park, which we have these
- 8 | concentric circles, the more I'm told that we don't have
- 9 property. That just guarantees exactly what I'm going to do in
- 10 terms of Jackie Robinson Stadium and Brentwood School.
- 11 MR. BRAVERMAN: Your Honor, I'm not disagreeing with
- 12 | you here. What I'm saying is that this could be a very good
- 13 | location for temporary housing, because in the event that it
- 14 gets turned over for columbarium use, we may no longer need the
- 15 temporary housing.
- 16 THE COURT: And you may have come up with a solution
- 17 | just in our dialogue today, and I appreciate that.
- 18 MR. BRAVERMAN: Right, and that's on the north part
- 19 of campus, which is consistent with what we were trying to
- 20 do. So my point is that there are locations that we can
- 21 | continue to review to put temporary housing on the north part,
- 22 allow for community access, but there are caveats with all of
- 23 these that we have to examine from parcel to parcel.
- THE COURT: And here's what I'm worried about. I'm
- 25 | worried about getting slow walked, not by you, and I don't mean

- that disrespectfully, but one meeting with somebody, with somebody, who makes this decision? Who do I go to as a decision maker who cuts through this bureaucracy so we move
- 4 these projects? Because I'm not going to get slow walked on

5 this.

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- MR. BRAVERMAN: No, so the Greater Los Angeles

  Healthcare System team will continue to work with identifying

  those locations, and we will continue to work on identifying

  the type of housing, who those manufacturers may be in order to

  get them. We do have to identify the funding source or the

  funding stream for that, and I'm just being honest with you

  there because that's unknown at this point. But all of those

  are concurrent assessments that are part of the process.
- So the approval process for that will rest with the VA Greater Los Angeles team to identify those sites and move forward with the project. So I'm not concerned. I'll just stop there.
- 18 **THE COURT:** Who makes the decision? Who cuts through 19 this bureaucratic maze?
- 20 MR. BRAVERMAN: So the decision I just said would be
  21 made through the VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System
  22 leadership.
- THE COURT: Who?
- MR. BRAVERMAN: Well, Rob Merchant is the director

25 here.

1 THE COURT: Oh, have him come on up.

2.3

MR. BRAVERMAN: And I am the network director that oversees that, and we will forward that information and go through that.

THE COURT: How do we cut through this slow walk and bureaucracy? How can you help us? No, not you. The gentleman next to you. He seems to have Mr. McDonough's ear, so.

MR. MERCHANT: Thank you, Dr. Braverman.

So I concur with everything that Dr. Braverman has said. There are certain things that we need to look at so that we see all the exigencies and make sure that we're making the best decisions, the right decisions for veterans.

THE COURT: How long would that take?

MR. MERCHANT: I think we can do this rather quickly. We made significant progress. I've been working with the --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. How long would that take? A month? A year? I don't know what -- how long would that take? In other words, if we're really working together and trying to come out the same side, as Brad said before, if we're all on the same team eventually, how long would this take?

THE COURT: Yeah. Making a decision about these locations, temporary and long term. And right now, I've got to take away Barrington Park for the moment, which I really don't

MR. MERCHANT: In terms of finding the locations?

- 1 | want to. I'd love to have those nine or ten acres up there.
- MR. MERCHANT: No, I understand that. And one thing
- 3 | I should also point out is that as we are looking at the
- 4 | temporary housing locations, the area adjacent just east of
- 5 | where safe parking is toward the retaining wall, 4405, is the
- 6 anticipated location for our SoCal Edison substation that will
- 7 support the new hospital when it's built.
- 8 **THE COURT:** Okay. Fair enough.
- 9 MR. MERCHANT: So that area is also --
- 10 **THE COURT:** So I'll just take the safe parking area
- 11 | now, which is about an acre and a half, and I'm going to take
- 12 | that all the way. Is that Ohio? I forget the street.
- 13 MR. MERCHANT: It is. Yes, Your Honor.
- 14 **THE COURT:** So I'll take all the way out to
- 15 Ohio. I'm going to have another probably acre there. I've got
- 16 | two and a half acres, and you can have your power station. By
- 17 | the way, you've got a power station on the other side.
- MR. MERCHANT: We do.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Did you know that?
- MR. MERCHANT: Yes.
- 21 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- MR. MERCHANT: Yes, we do.
- 23 **THE COURT:** So I'm giving you everything you
- 24 | want. How long is this going to take? A month? A year?
- 25 MR. MERCHANT: Right now, I would just be

- 1 speculating, Your Honor. I don't want to give you an answer 2 that's just --
  - THE COURT: Speculate then, because I need to draw milestones in an injunctive relief to be reasonable, and I'm trying to get your input right now. But what I'm not willing to do is have undefined good faith period of time.
- 7 Now take your time with this.

- MR. ROSENBERG: Can I ask a clarifying question? You 9 referred to how long will this take. Can you clarify what the 10 "this" is?
  - begin with, in terms of site determination, because I'm not accepting Dr. Braverman's representation about the parking lots. You've got plenty of laydown room out there, and when this was originally presented to me, you took every one of these parking lots on the south side and made them a laydown yard, which is ridiculous.
  - I've also got, by the way, the front of the governor's mansion. I've got plenty of room. I want to know, to begin with, how long will it take for temporary, and assume 750, although I'm really debating that. Let's just say 500, okay?
- 23 MR. ROSENBERG: And again, just to, I hate to -24 clarifying question for the Court.
- **THE COURT:** 500 temporary supportive housing. How

- long will it take to make the determination about what lots these will go in? Write that down.
- 3 MR. ROSENBERG: And is the Court also asking for the completion of the temporary housing with this question?
- 5 **THE COURT:** The decision to be made initially, just to make a bureaucratic decision.
- 7 MR. ROSENBERG: One moment, Your Honor.
- 8 THE COURT: In other words, if I'm going to write
  9 injunctive relief, do I tell you 30 days? Do I tell you 60
  10 days? What's my milestone here?
- And, John, I apologize for cutting you off, but we're going to do this piece by piece.
- 13 MR. MERCHANT: Your Honor, we anticipate 30 days.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay. Outstanding. Let's say 45 days,
- 15 okay? In other words, I'm trying to give you plus.
- 16 MR. MERCHANT: No, I appreciate that. And I want to give you an accurate answer.
- 18 **THE COURT:** You notice I'm rounding off the acreage
  19 in your favor right now.
- MR. MERCHANT: I see.
- THE COURT: Okay? Okay, 30 days. And after that determination, then why would I write injunctive relief today? Why wouldn't I see if this milestone is met working together in good faith?
- 25 MR. MERCHANT: We would appreciate that.

1 THE COURT: Now, in six months, counsel has asked for long-term supportive housing. If I wrote injunctive relief 2 right now, I would simply leave that on the table for six 3 months for a master plan for long-term supportive housing. 4 But 5 right now, I don't have enough information to know what the infrastructure is on some of these pieces of property because 6 7 of all these red lines from 2020.

How do I get the information about the present infrastructure so a Court makes a reasonable determination, along with you, about what's possible? We're working together.

MR. ROSENBERG: One moment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure. In other words, some updated maps without all these red lines going to MacArthur Field, et cetera, which is nonsense. We have all those lines that are green right now.

So, John, 30 to 45 days for initial determination.

MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, one note, if I may, on the Court's indication that it may delay the issuance of injunctive relief until it sees if VA has reached this milestone. Is that milestone, or you've called it a milestone, I think, itself a form of injunctive relief?

THE COURT: I don't know yet. We're discussing that. In other words, I'm trying to work with you and not against you after the initial decision. But if you don't want to that's fine

25 to, that's fine.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 MR. ROSENBERG: I don't know. I'm just trying to 2 understand what is transpiring.

THE COURT: And I'm trying to understand what you're saying. In other words, what I'm not going to do is be slow walked now. Okay? In other words, if we're going to work together, we have milestones that we all work together on.

Sometimes they may be not possible, but we need to have some idea. Otherwise, I just write the injunctive relief, and you can take it up on appeal.

MR. ROSENBERG: Understood.

11 MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, may I make a suggestion on 12 the timeline?

**THE COURT:** Yeah.

2.3

MR. HUESTON: It would also be helpful. Everybody here was present when we talked about potentially different housing and modular housing. It might be efficient if within that first 45 days there is a proposal from the VA on appropriate modular housing that the plaintiffs can then respond to so that we can come to consensus on that.

THE COURT: So have that discussion for a moment.

I'm just trying to get a rough idea if it's even possible to work with you folks, or if we just want to get into an appeal and that's fine.

MR. MERCHANT: No, Your Honor, we agree with that.

**THE COURT:** I'm sorry?

MR. MERCHANT: Yeah, we agree. We concur with that.

THE COURT: Okay. Thirty to 45 days? Okay.

2.3

After that determination is made for temporary supportive housing, whether it's on the southside or on the northside, if we had a disagreement, who actually decides where that housing goes? In other words, up to this time you may get a recommendation from a particular group, the VA may accept it or reject it and back and forth we go. Who makes the final determination? Does the Court make that final determination? In other words, if we have a disagreement with Dr. Braverman and let's say and we say that we think we should have 250 units, hypothetically, or 200 units on the south campus and we accept that we need some on the north campus, how is that resolved? Because so far it doesn't seem to be functioning in the present system because of all of these delays in all of these years. Who makes that final determination?

MR. MERCHANT: Well my hope would be that working together with the plaintiffs' counsel, all the parties together with the monitor, we would be able to arrive at consensus.

THE COURT: And if you don't who makes the final determination so it isn't slow walked?

MR. MERCHANT: I would expect that we would probably find ourselves back here.

THE COURT: Huh?

MR. MERCHANT: I would expect we would probably find

1 | ourselves standing right back here.

THE COURT: Okay. So if I were going to work with you, then I would expect that the Court at some point would have to break that logjam. I'd have to be educated, I'd have to listen more to Mr. Kennel (phonetic), (inaudible) Mr. Kuhn, you, Dr. Braverman. I'd have to listen more to Soboroff and Johnson, et cetera. But I would expect if we're working together at some point, I'm not willing to see a discord occur where there's delay. Okay?

All right. Can we construct 750 units after this initial evaluation of the location within 18 months?

Now hold on, I'm just going to kid you a little bit.

Put up the picture of Gorey Georgia Stallon's (phonetic)

14 birthplace for a moment.

### (Pause)

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

16 | Can we do this?

MR. MERCHANT: Your Honor, I spent five years working in Baghdad on a pervensual (phonetic) reconstruction team, working with USAID.

THE COURT: Probably ran into you up there. Do you recognize me at all? I do a lot of work over there. I'm up north near Silamonty (phonetic) and up near Da Hook (phonetic) in those refugee camps. We had a problem with terrorists coming in and using those camps.

MR. MERCHANT: We do.

1 THE COURT: Yeah, we do.

2.3

2 MR. MERCHANT: So again, I would need to consult with 3 my colleagues from OAEM (phonetic) and other letters.

THE COURT: You know our country can do this, don't you? You know our country. You've seen Baghdad built out, haven't you? You know darn well what my country can do and your country can do.

Sixty days? Those are permanent structures. Those aren't even modular. That's USAID (phonetic). And that's Agory, Georgia (phonetic).

MR. MERCHANT: This is why as we look at the temporary units, we are looking specifically at those that require the least --

**THE COURT:** Exactly.

15 MR. MERCHANT: -- regulatory roadblocks.

THE COURT: And that's why I'd like to work with you because I don't want to build out permanent modular, let's say. I'd like to see that money go into long-term supportive housing and work with you so as we go I think that the plaintiffs are going to start adjusting also. And working together I think we can reach an accommodation along the way when we're not heaping a huge cost on the VA and ending up with empty modular housing. And that's why I like modular, it's movable. Maybe we'll give one to Governor Newsom okay? Just kidding you.

But the point is that this permanent supportive

- 1 housing can get costly for us. So tossing out the offer I'd
- 2 like to work with you.
- 3 MR. MERCHANT: And we would like to work with the
- 4 | Court, with Monitor, with all the parties.
- 5 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 6 MR. MERCHANT: As a veteran myself, that's what I am
- 7 pledged here to do.
- 8 THE COURT: Worst-case scenario, can we put up 750 of
- 9 these, Mr. Soboroff, in your modular housing which is now one
- 10 story? And once you make this one story, then I've got to go
- 11 | into north campus or either take 6-A and 6-B from the VA.
- MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, sir (indisc.).
- 13 **THE COURT:** Come on up here, I can't hear you. And
- 14 | that's part of 6-A and 6-B where you want to cut off the road
- 15 and I'm not going to let you do that.
- 16 MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, sir. But why does it take 45
- days or why does it take 30 days to do something that we could
- 18 do in three meeting?
- 19 **THE COURT:** Well, go over and ask him that. Go over
- 20 and talk to the gentleman.
- 21 MR. SOBOROFF: He might hit me though. What if he
- 22 hits me?
- 23 **THE COURT:** Don't embarrass him. Mr. Soboroff, walk
- 24 over and talk to the gentleman because I can remain in
- 25 | continuous session. I can be here tomorrow, the next day. In

- 1 fact I'm willing to devote the weekend to you.
- 2 MR. SOBOROFF: Well we sat with --
- 3 THE COURT: No, no, quietly. Have that conversation.
- 4 Just go in the back. There's no embarrassment here.
- 5 MR. ROSENBERG: I'd like to listen in on that, Your
- 6 Honor.
- 7 THE COURT: Absolutely. And Roman, if you want to go
- 8 | back there and also listen in, you're more than welcome to.
- 9 He's your witness. And if we can't reach an accord then I
- 10 | write the injunctive relief. If we can work together then
- 11 maybe we delay that in good faith and see what we can do
- 12 | working as a team.
- 13 Let the record reflect half the courtroom is going
- 14 back to join in the conversation.
- John, and I apologize to you for cutting you off.
- 16 | MR. HUESTON: That's fine. Maybe while they're
- 17 | talking we can talk about the Waverly Chapel.
- 18 **THE COURT:** Well, just a moment.
- 19 **MR. HUESTON:** Okay.
- 20 **THE COURT:** I want them to hear the Waverly Chapel,
- 21 yeah.
- 22 MR. HUESTON: Oh right, right, right. Fair enough.
- 23 **(Pause)**
- 24 And John, do you want to go -- just a moment,
- 25 Mr. Johnson. John, do you want to go to the Waverly Chapel

next? I'm happy to because we have folks waiting that might
want to go home. Okay. I'll take that out of order.

(Pause)

And for the record, I meant the Wadsworth Chapel. The Waverly Chapel's in Santa Ana.

## (Pause)

And Mr. Miller, we'll be with you in just a moment as a courtesy. I promise you. If these parties would have met and conferred earlier, including your client, we wouldn't be going through this today. All right? And that's what's taking the time. I'm a little disappointment that this didn't occur during the last two weeks. I don't want to address you right now.

MR. MILLER: I'm just getting some exercise.

## (Pause)

MR. MERCHANT: Judge Carter, what we have agreed with the plaintiffs' parties is that we will stick with the 30-day timeline and agree to weekly check-in calls with the monitor to demonstrate our progress in working together and that we are --

**THE COURT:** Is that acceptable to the plaintiffs?

MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Soboroff, does that

MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, sir.

work for you and Mr. Johnson?

**THE COURT:** Mr. Braverman, does that work for you and

- 1 the VA?
- 2 MR. BRAVERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
- 3 THE COURT: Okay. John, back to you.
- 4 MR. HUESTON: Okay. Just briefly on the Waverly
- 5 Chapel. If I could have --
- 6 MR. SPEAKER: Wadsworth.
- 7 MR. HUESTON: Wadsworth, okay.
- 8 THE COURT: Yeah. I said Waverly and that's in Santa
- 9 Ana, my apology. So Wadsworth.
- 10 MR. HUESTON: Wadsworth. You know I had Wadsworth
- 11 and I said somebody might have I may have mis-transcribed.
- So Ms. Barrow (phonetic) and Mr. Peck, if you could
- 13 | just come up, if we can address this.
- So what my understanding is, the good news is the
- 15 overall estimated budget has come down from original estimates.
- 16 It's now at 22 million. And through wonderful fundraising
- 17 efforts, as well as securing contingent public funds, they're
- 18 within two million of full budget.
- My question was, well then how come you can't get
- 20 | started if you're within two million and my understanding from
- 21 Mr. Peck -- and he'll elaborate -- is that there is some
- 22 | contingent public funding. It won't come or be accessible
- 23 unless the entire amount is raised first. Is that right?
- MR. PECK: That's correct.
- 25 MR. HUESTON: Okay. So that's the holdup. I guess

- some good news is Ms. Barrow tells me and Mr. Peck that there
  is a fundraiser that might actually achieve the final gap of
  two million and that's going to be held on October 13th?
  - MR. PECK: We are hoping so. Bill Omison (phonetic) and the Omison Foundation (phonetic) is one of our key funders so he's agreed to speak at this October 13th fundraiser and we're inviting everyone with a bunch of money. If you would like to come, we'd love to have you.
  - MR. HUESTON: I think the judge --
- **THE COURT:** I'll probably be there if both sides will consent and I'll make a contribution. How's that?
- Now, here's my question.

- On Waverly Chapel, the way you have it presently configured. By the way, you have a wonderful website. I want to compliment you.
- Part of that cost is the addition that the different denominations are asking for in addition to the Waverly Chapel. Go pull up your website. And that's adding a significant amount of cost. So there's a rabbi involved, a priest involved out in Santa Monica. Other denominations are involved. And if you look at the Waverly Chapel, it extends to an addition to the Waverly Chapel that's a healing room. Hold on. That's not part of.
- Now, what happens if we cut that out and added that
  in the future? Now we would have enough money --

1 MR. PECK: If I can explain? 2 THE COURT: Yeah, Steve. 3 MR. PECK: Wadsworth Chapel. Did I say Waverly again? 4 THE COURT: 5 MR. PECK: Waverly is in down in San Pedro I think --THE COURT: For the record, every time I say Waverly, 6 7 I mean Wadsworth. Okay. MR. PECK: Yes. So the 22 million is the pure 8 9 construction cost. We are going to be operating a moral injury 10 treatment program in that chapel in partnership with the VOA. 11 That's a separate budget. That service budget is separate. 12 the 22 million is just to renovate the chapel. 13 THE COURT: Okay. This 22 million is just --14 MR. PECK: And if it said something different on a 15 website, that is out of date. 16 THE COURT: On your website I think your total cost 17 was 27, wasn't it? 18 It was -- it was actually 28 until about a MR. PECK: 19 week ago. We changed general contractors to get a lower price. 20 **THE COURT:** So let me repeat back what I've absorbed. 21 We can't start because we're two million dollars 22 short. 2.3 MR. PECK: Correct. 24 And that also includes the --THE COURT: 25 MR. PECK: That's just the construction.

THE COURT: -- that does not include the healing room.

2.3

MR. PECK: That's just the construction of the chapel which and half of it will be tailored to the Moral Injury

Treatment program.

THE COURT: Now there's a gentleman named Mr. Tillman (phonetic) who was a crook and there's five million dollars sitting over in a fund right now with the VA. Can any portion of that restitution amount of five million dollars be used towards the chapel? Step over and talk to the VA. They're very generous. Just walk over and talk to them.

MS. BERRY: That would be nice.

THE COURT: Well just walk over and talk to them.

Because two million dollars seems like chump change to get this going and we need a beacon out there. Believe it or not, veterans love God because they're in combat and they think they're going to die so let's get this thing going.

MS. BERRY: I'm trying to figure out how to say no.

THE COURT: No? Well go talk to them. I don't believe that, frankly. I think all sorts of bureaucratic things can be thrown up and I think you can get two million dollars. Now you go back and talk to them.

So John, I don't know of any impediment to getting five -- or two million dollars out of this five million dollars left in this fund, although I'm going to be told that they

1 | can't do that in just a moment. Trust me. Nonsense.

And if you need my protection, counsel, I'm happy to order it and that will protect you from the bureaucracy.

Counsel, let me repeat so you're hearing. I'm happy to order it and take the responsibility for this to protect the VA.

MR. ROSENBERG: We're discussing the issue right now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think we can get two million out of the five million that this crook took. And let's get this going so we have a beacon that welcomes veterans, quite frankly, and we have a place for them to pray; otherwise they're going to be out in your community.

### (Pause)

2.3

MR. ROSENBERG: My understanding, Your Honor, is -my understanding, Your Honor, is that the money, the
restriction goes into the Lease Revenue Fund which has
restrictions on its usage under the West Los Angeles Leasing
Act which of course is the statute that Plaintiffs have
primarily relied upon for any -- many aspects of their claim.
So that would be an issue that would need to be examined -THE COURT: What would you do if I just ordered it?
Now go back and talk about that for a moment.

MR. ROSENBERG: No, I will say that like that like other forms of relief that the Court may enter would be something that might ultimately have to be examined by the

- solicitor general as to whether or not that would be an order worthy of appeal.
- 3 **THE COURT:** And how long would that take?
- 4 MR. ROSENBERG: Solicitor general is 60 days from the
- 5 entry of a judgment.
- 6 THE COURT: Okay. So just go back and hypothetically
- 7 just assume that the Court just ordered that. Took the
- 8 responsibility off of the VA, protected the VA from criticism.
- 9 The Court would be criticized for it potentially. Solicitor
- 10 general would look at it.
- 11 MR. ROSENBERG: I can't speak to what decision the
- 12 | solicitor general --
- 13 **THE COURT:** No, I can't either.
- 14 MR. ROSENBERG: -- would or would not make.
- 15 **THE COURT:** But go out and talk to the folks. I'm
- 16 | willing to take a flyer. Go back and talk to them, Brad.
- 17 MR. ROSENBERG: It's not their decision.
- THE COURT: Huh?
- MR. ROSENBERG: Talk to them about what? I'm a
- 20 little bit confused.
- 21 **THE COURT:** If I made that order.
- 22 **MR. ROSENBERG:** If you made the order?
- 23 **THE COURT:** Yeah. Let the solicitor general take a
- 24 look at it. Tell him he doesn't like -- have him tell me he
- 25 | doesn't like --

That would be -- I mean --1 MR. ROSENBERG: 2 THE COURT: -- chapels. MR. ROSENBERG: My apologies. I did not mean to --3 No, my apologies to you. 4 THE COURT: 5 MR. ROSENBERG: -- speak over you. That's ultimately a decision for the solicitor 6 7 general. If the Court were to issue that as a part of its final judgment in this case -- which it has not yet done -- and I can't get ahead of the solicitor general on any decision-10 making process. 11 THE COURT: Oh, I know that, I hear that. 12 back and participate for just a moment. They're trying to 13 raise two million dollars and from my perspective it's 14 ridiculous when we've got 20 million dollars in the bank not to 15 get started. 16 (Pause) 17 In other words, let's find a way to say yes and get 18 this chapel going. 19 MR. ROSENBERG: One other note, Your Honor, is that 20 of course funds in the Lease Revenue Fund can also be used, for example, for the construction of --21 22 THE COURT: Come up. Find me two million dollars, 23 folks. Go back and talk. We've got 20 million dollars in the 24 bank, we can't get started.

I mean I don't --

MR. ROSENBERG:

- 1 THE COURT: They've having a conversation behind you,
  2 Brad. You might want to participate.
  - MR. ROSENBERG: I understand that they're having that conversation. I don't think that there's anything else that we can add at this point.
- 6 THE COURT: Okay. So can I do this, Brad, or not?
  - MR. ROSENBERG: You are an Article III judge, I am not. So I do not -- I would -- Your Honor, I will say this. I don't think that it would be appropriate for you to order that -- those Lease Revenue Funds or --
- 11 THE COURT: Don't worry about that. To kick off this
  12 project I'm willing to be inappropriate.
  - MR. ROSENBERG: It would be taking money that could
    otherwise be used to provide housing for homeless veterans and
    it may become --
- 16 THE COURT: Well --

MR. ROSENBERG: -- and it may become moot if they're able -- if it's only two million dollars -- which is what the Court just said -- then they're awfully close to hitting their target. And they may be able to hit their target on their own and then get the matching funds and the Court need not take that action. And in the meantime there's funds that can be used for homeless veterans to provide housing. And so the efficient use of the funds would be to see if they can make that goal.

THE COURT: It's chump change and here's why. If we're going to provide housing we're talking about 100 million dollars, we're not talking about two million dollars and that's temporary housing. So two million dollars is a small amount of money, frankly.

MR. ROSENBERG: If I may say something on that, Your Honor. It adds up. I mean the Court's -- the Court's opinion imposes enormous financial burdens on (inaudible) VA.

THE COURT: (inaudible).

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. ROSENBERG: And I'll note that VA has currently just received a supplemental appropriation because it's a couple billion dollars in the hole for this year and I believe it's several billion dollars in the hole for next fiscal year. But then when you add on top of that the injunctive relief that the Court has ordered regarding the four land use agreements, that also deprives VA of money that it could be using to support homeless services and construction of housing. whether it's the money from Safety Park which is a net revenue for VA or donations made by Bridgeland or the Brentwood School or UCLA, that becomes real money when you start to add it up. And when you add that to the other financial costs that the Court's order would impose on VA, we would say that we need to tread carefully and efficiently in terms of how those resources are allocated.

25 **THE COURT:** Okay. Any other comments? Roman? Brad?

- You folks over trying to raise this money for the Waiver -- or I'm sorry -- for the Wadsworth Chapel?
- And I'll tell you, there's a tremendous benefit.
- First of all, for the community, you want your veterans on campus praying. You don't want them scattered throughout the neighborhood apparently. Number two, anybody who's been in the military and faced combat knows that they'll all of a sudden find God. It's just as simple as that. Now they may break all of their promises in the future that they made to God but your veterans out there who've seen combat, all found God at one time in a foxhole, trust me. So you need this chapel out

there. Not only as a community center, you need it for the

healing process that's going on. Now I'm not putting religion

MS. BERRY: I'd like to speak to the importance of
the chapel. The chapel, oldest building on Wilshire Boulevard
was built for \$14,000 by the federal government. It is a
microcosm. You went inside, Judge, and I'm very glad that you

out in front but I am saying veterans do need that.

19 did. It is a microcosm of what has happened to the property in

20 general.

12

13

14

21

22

23

24

For 30 years after it was put on the national register, it was allowed to rot. There has been more than one foundation, more than one interested party, trying to put it back together. It's a symbol of the heart of the property.

25 It's a symbol, a beacon of hope for all veterans who drive by

1 | who can see that the property is being put back together.

It is as important as a basketball field. It's as important as a healing garden which is what one person at the VA was going to spend that lease money on. It is probably the most important building on the property, combined with the Center for Moral Injury where soldiers, men and women, can heal from the wounds of war. There is no more important building on the property.

The government let it fall apart. They are looking to private entity and the community to put it back together and we have been trying and we are only two million short and we will do it but to me it is without a doubt the most important symbol of the home that was built in 1887.

THE COURT: First of all, thank you for making this effort.

16 MS. BERRY: Thank you.

2.3

THE COURT: And second, could you cut your costs if lots of volunteers in the military or former military showed up to help clean that place up? In other words I know you've got liability but I guarantee you that I -- see a hand up already and I know Steve just put his hand up and I can probably through Steve and some other sources raise 20 or 30 veterans on a weekend.

MS. BERRY: So could we.

**THE COURT:** And so if we start cutting your costs,

what could you do with 20 or 30 volunteers a couple of weekends?

2.3

MS. BERRY: From the inception of trying to put the chapel back together, Dr. Sharon has always spoken about veterans working on the chapel and we have had so many people offer.

THE COURT: So could we decrease our costs? In other words, could we get this down in good faith to 20 million dollars with a lot of volunteer help? And a lot of us can't show up on a weekday but what about weekends? I mean we can clean that place up. Now you've got liability issues, I understand that.

But number two, how can we have a veterans garden that the VA is willing to pay for and not have a chapel?

MR. PECK: I agree with you completely on that. It is an historical building and has to be put back together the way it was built more than a hundred years ago and there are very stringent rules around that and so we can't -- we can't put a bunch of volunteers in there who really don't know how to do anything but clear stuff out. We can clear stuff out but that's a few hundred bucks but it has to be built from ground up and is rotting from the inside out.

THE COURT: So the real costs isn't cleaning it up, the real cost is just the construction for the 22 million.

MR. PECK: That's correct. We're working on a plan

- 1 now simply to preserve it so it doesn't deteriorate any
  2 further.
- 3 **THE COURT:** John, do you have questions?
- 4 MR. HUESTON: No, I don't.
- 5 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 6 MS. BERRY: No.
- 7 THE COURT: Well --
- MS. BERRY: Thank you.
- 9 THE COURT: I don't know if I'm willing to make the
  10 order but my guess is I'm willing to make that order and stand
  11 the criticism from the solicitor general or being turned down
  12 so we'll see and then you can take me up to the Ninth Circuit
  13 on that, okay? Well let me think about that for a while.
- So John, back to you please.

19

20

- MR. HUESTON: So we had further discussions with the
  Brentwood School representatives and they are prepared to make
  a new proposal and I think Mr. Miller is approaching the
  lectern with that proposal.
  - THE COURT: And I know you, Skip, and I appreciate you being here. By the way, I want that on the record and I appreciate your colleague from the Brentwood School being here.
- 22 MR. MILLER: Likewise, mutual, Your Honor. It's a pleasure to appear in front of you.
- We made a substantially enhanced proposal. It's in
  the nature of a settlement proposal. I'd rather not go

1 public --

6

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: No, I want it public. In other words, I

want to know. I'm done with the backroom discussion. Where

are we at on this thing? If you two don't want to share it

then I'm going to move on.

7 **THE COURT:** No, we're done with all the backroom

8 phone calls. What's the proposal?

MR. MILLER: Well --

9 MR. MILLER: It's not backroom. We emailed it.

10 | Specifically we --

11 **THE COURT:** This isn't the typical settlement. This 12 is public interests now. What is the proposal?

MR. MILLER: Okay. Let me look it up. I have it on my phone. We emailed it to Mr. Hueston and I'll just read it out loud and explain it briefly.

We will recommend -- council and the chairman of the board will recommend to the board of trustees as follows:

Brentwood School will give back the land currently occupied by the back softball field, all the way through the parking lot, including three of the tennis courts.

THE COURT: Skip, show me that on a map. We're going to put a map up there for just a moment so we have absolutely clarity.

24 MR. MILLER: It's roughly four and a half to five 25 acres.

- 1 THE COURT: Hold on.
- 2 MR. MILLER: I don't know if I can find it.
- 3 THE COURT: All right. Now, you'll need to bring
- 4 that down a little bit on the chart.
- 5 MR. MILLER: Maybe I can get some help.
- 6 THE COURT: Now, would you repeat that please?
- 7 MR. MILLER: Yeah.
- THE COURT: Oh, that's excellent. Thanks, Skip.
- 9 MR. MILLER: That's better, yeah.
- Okay. The tennis courts are the right in the middle
- 11 | there's six tennis courts. Now we lost it.
- 12 You see there's right in the middle of the picture
- 13 | there's six tennis courts.
- 14 **THE COURT:** I know where they are.
- 15 MR. MILLER: Okay. So it would be three of the
- 16 tennis courts, then the parking lot below it, and then the
- 17 | softball field below that. It's more accessible and easier to
- 18 build on than the Parcel 9. It's approximately the same size.
- And what we would also do it's more easily accessible
- 20 to the Brentwood Village community.
- 21 We'd also build -- Parcel 9 is kind of an island up
- 22 | pretty far and it's hard to get to Brentwood Village from there
- 23 and the veterans do want to mingle into the village. They do
- 24 | want to go there so we would build steps going up the hillside
- 25 | so there would be easy ingress and egress for veterans who want

- 1 to go to Starbucks or whatever, whatever they want to do to get
- 2 | into the community.
- 3 **THE COURT:** So would that be going up through
- 4 | Barrington Park?
- 5 MR. MILLER: No. It would be?
- 6 MS. SPEAKER: Yes. The steps would lead to
- 7 | Barrington Park which also gives access to the dog park.
- 8 MR. MILLER: Okay. That's why I need some help here.
- 9 **THE COURT:** Yeah.
- 10 MR. MILLER: So that's number one.
- 11 THE COURT: Okay. So you would give back -- let me
- 12 repeat back to you.
- 13 You'd give back the tennis courts, all the way down
- 14 to what I'm going to call the security fencing.
- 15 What would happen to the convention --
- 16 MR. MILLER: It's actually the first three tennis
- 17 | courts, then the parking lot below that and then the field
- 18 below that.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Okay. Keep that up.
- 20 MR. MILLER: We would keep three tennis courts for
- 21 | the school.
- 22 THE COURT: Now just put it back up. Let's do this
- 23 again. I want to see this.
- 24 So you'd keep three tennis courts for the school and
- 25 | you'd retain what I'm going to call that structure that acts as

- 1 | a indoor volleyball court.
  - MS. SPEAKER: Yes, it's referred to as the Pavilion.
- 3 **THE COURT:** And you keep the track, you keep the
- 4 | swimming pool. Is that correct?
- 5 MR. MILLER: Correct.
- 6 THE COURT: And you'd also keep the seven acres up
- 7 above which have the two baseball -- just tap it again.
- 8 MR. MILLER: It's actually 4.8 acres up above.
- 9 THE COURT: You'd keep that. But what you would be
- 10 giving up would be three of the tennis courts, down through
- 11 what I'm going to call the fencing area and also the out -- the
- 12 | acreage that's another ballpark just outside the fence.
- 13 MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor, that's correct.
- 14 **THE COURT:** And how many acres? Four and a half
- 15 | acres?
- 16 MR. MILLER: Between four and a half and five acres.
- 17 | I don't know exactly. It's roughly the same size as the parcel
- 18 up above where the baseball field is. And it's more accessible
- 19 | it's more accessible to building construction. It's much more
- 20 | accessible to Brentwood Village and we'll build a staircase so
- 21 | it's easy for the veterans to go in and out of Brentwood
- 22 Village.
- 23 **THE COURT:** What would be the accessibility of the
- 24 | veterans to the pool and these facilities?
- 25 MR. MILLER: Okay I want to get to that.

- THE COURT: Would it still be 5:30 to 7:30?
- 2 MR. MILLER: I'm going to get to that.
- 3 **THE COURT:** Huh?
- 4 MR. MILLER: I'm going to get to that. Let me I'm
- 5 just going to go down the list here.
- Brentwood School would continue to spend -- it would
  spend the capital necessary to maintain the facilities it uses.
- 8 In other words, we'll maintain them which is no small amount of
- 9 money.
- 10 We'll keep in place -- this is actually a big deal.
- 11 I actually went out there and talked to the veterans about this
- 12 and saw it.
- 13 **THE COURT:** Well just a moment. I'm going to hear
- 14 from the plaintiff in just a moment. I want to hear what this
- 15 offer is.
- 16 MR. MILLER: Okay. We'll keep in place all of the
- 17 | in-kind services. Education, scholarships, recreational
- 18 | services, camps, helping with moving in and out, newly housed
- 19 veterans. We'll keep in place there's very substantial
- 20 interaction between the school, including the students, and the
- 21 | veterans which I'm told is good for mental health. For
- 22 everybody. It's good for the students to see military or ex-
- 23 military and it's good for the veterans. So that continues
- 24 | which is already pretty robust.
- 25 The next thing which is brand new is we're willing to

contribute five million dollars towards a capital fund to be used toward building a rec center or housing, if they want to use it for housing, but our preference would be a recreation center with a pool on the VA campus on this property, if they want, which would be exclusively for veterans. They don't have to share that with anybody. Not primarily or predominantly for the benefit but exclusively for the benefit of veterans.

THE COURT: Where would that go?

MR. MILLER: My thought was it would go on the softball field on that back field below the tennis courts.

**THE COURT:** Okay.

2.3

MR. MILLER: Okay. Moving right along here.

As far as this is Your Honor's question on access to the facilities. We originally went to the veterans and asked when they wanted access. That's how the hours were arrived at. We'll give them more access. We'll give them access from 6:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. during the week. Saturdays and Sundays, we'll give them access from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. We -- obviously we use the football stadium and the track for events but we'll give them full access when they're not being used for just specific events.

And we'll adjust the shuttle so that they can go there during those hours.

We'll rename the facilities as permitted by law to recognize veterans. If they want to call -- you know, if they

- 1 | want to call this part of the campus the memorial -- Veteran's
- Memorial facility like a memorial coliseum or something, we'll
- 3 do that.
- And what we want in return is we want no more
- 5 | litigation, we want certainty. We'd like to have an agreement
- 6 | in place that we can continue to use these facilities for the
- 7 students and for the school for 50 years.

# (Laughter heard in the background)

- 9 THE COURT: Now hold on, hold on. No, no, I'm
- 10 listening to this. Please.
- 11 MR. MILLER: We want certainty. We've laid out a
- 12 | tremendous amount of money. We're proposing to lay out a lot
- more and we want to know that we're not going to be back in
- 14 | litigation, we're not going to be fighting about this or in
- 15 dispute about this. We want to be in harmony with the
- 16 Veteran's Administration.
- 17 **THE COURT:** Well the 22 acres then you're giving up
- 18 | four acres and retaining 18 acres. That's what I'm hearing.
- 19 | Is that correct?
- 20 MR. MILLER: Four and a half, five acres.
- 21 **THE COURT:** Okay let's say five. Let's be generous
- 22 and say five.
- MR. MILLER: Yeah.
- 24 **THE COURT:** You're retaining 17 acres.
- 25 MR. MILLER: And we're giving expanded access to the

- 1 balance.
- 2 THE COURT: Anything else? And I'm not saying that
- 3 | that's di minimis but anything else?
- 4 MR. MILLER: No.
- 5 THE COURT: Okay. Now, were you part of this
- 6 discussion?
- 7 MR. SILBERFELD: I was.
- 8 THE COURT: Have you consulted with your clients?
- 9 MR. SILBERFELD: No.
- 10 **THE COURT:** Well go consult with them. In other
- 11 | words, I'm not saying yes, I'm not saying no, I'm not saying if
- 12 | this is a good idea or bad. Let's see what their reaction is
- 13 | right now. They really control this litigation in a sense.
- And Skip, the problem is we started with 22 acres
- 15 | that I don't think appropriately belongs to the school and now
- 16 | I want to hear from the plaintiffs. Okay?
- 17 MR. MILLER: It definitely does not belong to the
- 18 | school --
- 19 **THE COURT:** I don't want to take a position right
- 20 now.
- 21 MR. MILLER: -- it belongs to the VA.
- 22 THE COURT: Well the VA, I'm sorry. I said the
- 23 | school and I apologize.
- So I don't want to say it's a good idea or a bad
- 25 | idea. Let me hear from the plaintiffs right now.

But what I'm hearing is, I initially said that these 22 acres should be transferred back to the VA and then the negotiations should start from that point and hopefully the veterans would be generous and would accommodate the school children out there at reasonable hours. What I'm hearing now is a switch in terms of property so let them talk for a moment.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Well all we're talking about is use. It's not our property. We were a tenant, Your Honor voided the lease, that's it. It's never been our property. We can't transfer --

THE COURT: Let's see what they have to say.

**(Pause)** 

2.3

THE COURT: So Roman, what are your thoughts? In other words, there's no reason to go back to the board, you know, and give a proposal if you're not in favor of it. And I'm not pushing one way or the other. I've got my own thoughts about this but I'll remain silent and listen to each of you.

MR. SILBERFELD: We are not in favor of it. We would not recommend this. It does not solve the fundamental problem of the illegality of the lease.

THE COURT: Okay. Could I toss out to each of you a suggestion, and that is that this property and the 22 acres has to come back in theory to the veterans. But I can almost guarantee that you veterans would then hopefully be reasonable so we don't have to destroy this property in any way, shape or

form that we're not in a position of cordoning off property in some way and losing a swimming pool, et cetera, but hopefully you'll be kinder in your conversation about the hours of usage, for instance.

And it's already being offered, you know, to split the day or get some compatible hours so that the veterans, let's say, have it from 5:30 in the morning or 6:00 to maybe noon or whatever and that the school children would have it in the afternoon.

And if they're willing to keep up the swimming pool, et cetera, then that should be credited against them. In fact, maybe even a discount in terms of some of the other payments being made.

and under your control as more veterans come in in the future, these could be the very facilities that might be helpful for our veterans as we increase the population with an already existing weight room. Brentwood has volunteered a lot of their efforts in terms of weightlifting to some of these veterans. A few veterans used the swimming pool but very few but we can expect that to increase.

But it would seem to me that either by this court order with the 22 acres being returned to the veterans or by Brentwood volunteering, then I think we could enter into some kind of really good-faith negotiation.

But Skip, I think the bottom line is going to be that
the property probably isn't going to be traded out for five
acres or 17 acres. That it has to come back. And if you're
going to make that kind of offer, you've got to go back to the
board and gain their approval. That, I'll work with you in
terms of time.

But I think it's going to end up being a take-it or leave-it, quite frankly, because I don't think there's going to be a trade out of five acres for 17 acres. That's the bad news.

The good news is I think everybody wants to work with you.

MR. MILLER: I should probably apologize to everybody. It's not our land. Okay? All we want to do is use it. It's their land, it's the veterans land. And if I gave everybody the wrong impression, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Okay, no apology --

MR. MILLER: It's a question of usage. It's critical to the school to be able to use the property during reasonable hours under reasonable circumstances and we're willing to pay for maintenance of what we use.

THE COURT: But let's not divide out the five acres from the 22 acres because it sounds like it's a land tradeoff when you didn't intend that.

MR. MILLER: I understand.

7

8

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

1 THE COURT: Number two --

2 MR. MILLER: And if I confused the issue I'm -- you

3 know, I didn't mean to.

THE COURT: Let's treat the 22 acres on an as-need basis because it doesn't make sense that the Court would just cordon off a particular area.

MR. MILLER: Fair enough.

THE COURT: Like a swimming pool or a track when there can be dual usage for a period of time. That's ridiculous.

Number three, we've got extraordinary valuable facilities for both the children there and extraordinary valuable facilities for the veterans. So it just seems to me that we're all saying the same thing except there's not going to be any transfers of property for five acres, whatever, and then I think what you're doing is you're working out a lease time. And I'm going to suggest this.

Originally you're on a 10-year lease, Skip, till 2026, okay? I'm not going to let that be renewed, by the way. The suggestion's been made on a one-year basis but then you don't have the confidence on a one-year basis. That's something that you and Roman can negotiate with the veterans and give you some kind of sense of three years or whatever but if we ever need the land, I can't be -- I can't have the VA pushing on me and telling me that we don't have land on one

- 1 | hand -- which they are -- or putting up obstacles or
- 2 | roadblocks -- which they have in the past, frankly, or having
- 3 | some surprise like this Barrington Park, which I'd love to get
- 4 | my hands on. So if we need it in the future that's got to be
- 5 available for the veterans.
- But I don't think the Court would ever take the
- 7 | position of just shutting you down arbitrarily and saying you
- 8 | can't use a soccer field or you can't use -- we're not using it
- 9 at the present time but we've got to have -- Skip, we've got to
- 10 | have that ability to get our hands on it and that's not a 10-
- 11 | year lease.
- So between the two of you the negotiations might take
- 13 | this form. Is it a one-year lease? Is it a two-year lease?
- 14 Is it a three-year lease? What's the contribution?
- Some of you veterans come on up here for a moment
- 16 | with Roman. Come on up here.
- 17 MR. MILLER: Maybe it's not a lease, maybe it's a
- 18 usage.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Exactly. I mean it seems to me that
- 20 | we're so close on this but the one thing is it can't be a
- 21 | tradeoff. That 22 acres has to be back to the VA, principally
- 22 used for the veterans, and then what that principal usage means
- 23 is how do we get those hours out there, how do we keep those
- 24 facilities, how do we have them in the future?
- 25 And what I'm not willing to give up, so you know, is

I'm not willing to give up even one acre of that golf course to you because I'm going to create and you're going to create an attraction for these veterans to come in here and part of that attractions might be the use of a swimming pool in reasonable hours, a weight room to help them rehabilitate, a track that they can occasionally walk on. And if that's paid for by the school then maybe even it's less money involved. But let's not destroy it if we don't have to.

But if I pushed, that way it belongs to the veterans.

And if I have to start bulldozing it I will bulldoze it and

I'll start with the fence and I'll work north. Now that's not

a threat, that's a promise. I don't think we have to do that.

So why can't we then work together.

And Skip didn't mean five acres trading out for 18. That's just not going to fly. That's 22 acres but what we're really talking about is the length of that lease. And I've got to have the guarantee that when we need it, it's a reasonable period of time so if we ever in the future really had to kick, you know, Brentwood School out of an additional three tennis courts, we could really sit down and talk about that.

But I can't take the VA's position with all these problems occurring from, you know, methane, et cetera, and have anything other than the most amount of land available to me to choose from. And that may include the use LA Baseball Stadium. So the more I hear that we have a problem with temporary

- housing or supportive housing, or this acreage or that acreage,

  Skip, that's why you're in the position of kind of these -- I
- 3 need that land available.
- 4 MR. MILLER: The only reason I --
- 5 THE COURT: Now that doesn't give you confidence
- 6 because you say you can invest. I say you can for this reason.
- 7 You've already built the facility. In other words, you're not
- 8 making an additional investment, Skip. You're not going out
- 9 there with five or 10 more million dollars. You already have
- 10 | that facility in place. And what they ought to be able to do
- 11 | is negotiate with you over a reasonable period of time but they
- 12 | have to have the ability to get that land back if the VA pushes
- 13 back and says, you know, we don't have temporary housing
- 14 because the more they do that
- 15 | -- or long-term supportive housing, then I've got to go
- 16 | someplace and that's UCLA and Brentwood. So we're saying the
- 17 same thing.
- 18 MR. MILLER: I understand and we're flexible.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Yeah.
- 20 MR. MILLER: We're flexible. We're willing to sit
- 21 down, we want to do it.
- 22 THE COURT: Okay. Now go out back and talk about
- 23 that, Roman. Go back and talk, along with the veterans. Just
- 24 | a suggestion but is there a reasonable period of time that you
- 25 | veterans came come up with so we have access to that property,

1 we have increased hours, you work together and we don't have to 2 destroy a facility or even start to destroy a facility if it's valuable to both entities. 3 Mr. Kuhn, respectfully, you get involved in that 4 5 conversation, okay? Along with Mr. Braverman. 6 And John, hold on. 7 (Pause) So counsel, what we reversed is we want to work out a 9 plan where the school has access to this. Now this is 10 controlled by the veterans, okay? 11 (Pause) And Mr. Soboroff and Mr. Johnson, Mr. Soboroff, if 12 13 you two want to jump in, be my guest. 14 MR. SPEAKER: Here or there? 15 THE COURT: Yeah, go back and talk to 'em. 16 MR. SPEAKER: I'd rather be there. 17 MR. SPEAKER: You'd rather be here. 18 (Pause) 19 THE COURT: Counsel, when you're discussing this, the 20 Court has to be able to build on parcels if we need them and that's why whether it's a one-year lease or a two-year lease, 21 22 whatever, it's not a 10-year lease and it's not for 50 years 2.3 so ... 24 (Pause) 25 One more thing. When you're discussing this remember

1 I'm not buying into the fact that this is going to cost you a You've already put the money into the infrastructure. This is upkeep money so don't come back to the Court and say, 3 gee, we have to do all these things and have to contribute. 5 You may have to but we'll negotiate that some if we get past 6 the first hurdle and that is, when the Court needs that 7 property or the veterans do, in case I don't have enough property out there or run into methane, we get that property in a reasonable period of time. But a reasonable period of time 10 may not be for the next two years unless Mr. Soboroff can build 11 out long-term supportive housing there in the next two years 12 so ... 13 (Pause) 14 Mr. Soberoff, Mr. Hueston is coming out to talk to you (inaudible). 15 16 (Pause) 17 And by the way, the five million divided over 50 18 years is about chump change of what? Fifty thousand a year? 19 Yeah. That'll never be acceptable, okay? 20 (Pause) Okay. Mr. Soboroff, John? In terms of the Wadsworth 21 22 Chapel, you have a fundraiser on October 15th. 2.3 MS. BERRY: 13th. 24 THE COURT: 13th.

Sunday, the 13th.

MS. BERRY:

1 THE COURT: John, how much are the -- or Steve, how 2 much are the tickets? MS. BERRY: Great. 3 THE COURT: No, no, not for me. How much are the 4 5 tickets? How much? 6 MR. PECK: This -- it's not that kind of a 7 fundraiser. It is at Christine Berry's house. We're inviting 8 a bunch of people who can potentially donate money to complete 9 the chapel. 10 THE COURT: How much do you have to donate if you 11 show up? What's the expectation? As a public servant I'd like 12 to know this. 13 MR. PECK: They're -- it's free to walk in the door. 14 We hope that when you leave you'll leave a significant check. 15 THE COURT: Oh I will but I don't know what 16 "significant" is as a public servant. Thousand? 17 MS. BERRY: That would be fine, Judge. THE COURT: You're sure? 18 MS. BERRY: Well I said a million. 19 20 THE COURT: Now if both sides give -- if both sides 21 give me consent to be there, I'd like to be there. 22 MR. PECK: Wonderful. 2.3 MS. BERRY: We would love for you to come. THE COURT: I'd like to make a contribution but I 24

want you to get permission from both sides. I'm a public

1 servant, quite frankly, so I'm not wealthy but I'd like to make 2 a contribution, I'd like to support this but I want both sides agreeing that I can be there without a conflict. Fair enough? 3 And a significant way you can contribute 4 MR. PECK: 5 is to let everyone know how critical it is for us to complete 6 the chapel. 7 THE COURT: Now give me the talk of the Jonathan Club 8 which is a little dangerous and I'd like you to be there. 9 MR. PECK: Huh? Say what? THE COURT: Give me the talk of the Jonathan Club on 10 11 what date, counsel? October what? I'd like you to be there. 12 MS. BERRY: Okay. I would love -- we would be 13 honored to have you come. It's in honor, partially, of my 14 mother --15 THE COURT: Okay. You get permission from both 16 sides --17 MS. BERRY: I will. 18 THE COURT: -- and I'd like to be there. My wife and 19 I would like to make a contribution but we're kind of a 20 thousand-dollar person. We're not --21 MR. PECK: Yes. Thank you. 22 MS. BERRY: Yeah. I understand. 2.3 THE COURT: Yeah. 24 MS. BERRY: We're honored to have you come.

Well, all right.

Now you make sure that

THE COURT:

1 both sides agree though, okay? 2 (Pause) (Court in recess at 4:45 p.m.; reconvened at 5:18 p.m.) 3 Okay, Counsel, then we're on the record 4 THE COURT: and, Brad, someone indicated it was time to resume. 5 6 (Indiscernible voice) 7 THE COURT: Roman? (Pause) 9 THE COURT: So Roman, we're back on the record. 10 MR. SILBERFELD: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: I'm not sure the microphone's turned on. 12 Skip? 13 (Tapping on microphone) 14 THE COURT: Yeah. And I need you to state your name 15 again for the record because we're on CourtSmart. 16 MR. SILBERFELD: Roman Silberfeld for the Plaintiffs, 17 Your Honor. We had a discussion with Brentwood's counsel and the 18 19 leadership who are here. We don't have a detailed proposal to 20 present as a counter to what was presented earlier by 21 Mr. Miller. What we do have though is a tentative agreement on 22 the components of a future agreement with the Brentwood School. 23 The components need to be filled in. We need the authority of 24 our clients, some of whom are here, and we request a day, maybe 25 two at the most, to complete that process and communicate that.

1 THE COURT: We're going to be in continuous 2 session --MR. SILBERFELD: Yeah. 3 THE COURT: -- so there's no issue. 4 5 MR. SILBERFELD: Right. THE COURT: So --6 7 MR. SILBERFELD: So --THE COURT: -- why don't we hear what these 9 components are. MR. SILBERFELD: Well, the components are these: 10 11 There would be a new term of lease with the exact 12 time to be determined. 13 There would be a cash payment made by Brentwood in 14 consideration of getting that additional term. 15 The rent that's paid on an annual basis would be 16 increased. I'm not sure exactly what that would be yet, but it 17 would be much closer to market rent than is currently the 18 rental rate. The hours of use of the Brentwood's facilities by 19 20 veterans would be expanded. All other services that Brentwood 21 currently provides under the lease would continue. 22 Brentwood would continue to maintain the property. 2.3 And lastly, and this is the important part to the 24 Court's point earlier, we'd have a mechanism to recapture some 25 of the leased land if needed for housing on relatively short

- 1 | notice. Days, weeks, and months rather than years.
- 2 So that's the idea.
- THE COURT: Well, Skip's in the position that it's

  got to go back to the Board. And there has to be some kind of

  finality or filling in those blanks, because otherwise he's
- 6 going back to the Board --
- 7 MR. SILBERFELD: Right.
- 8 THE COURT: -- and it puts them in the position of 9 not being able to make a decision.
- 10 MR. SILBERFELD: That's what I wanted to throw in in 11 the next day or two at the most.
- 12 THE COURT: Okay. Well, we're ahead. So how do we
  13 throw that in? In other words, if this really is going to be a
  14 proposal that's acceptable to the veterans and to the Brentwood
  15 School, we need to at some point reach that decision and
  16 there's no better time than now, tomorrow --
- 17 MR. SILBERFELD: Yeah.
- 18 **THE COURT:** -- et cetera. So what do you two need?
- 19 MR. MILLER: We office in the same building --
- THE COURT: I'm sorry, you need to, Skip, use that
- 21 mike.
- And this is Skip Miller, by the way, because we're on CourtSmart.
- MR. MILLER: Roman and I office in the same building
  in Century City. We actually park right next to one another.

1 We'll roll up our sleeves and we'll go to work on this. don't know if we're going to be able to reach an accord. really don't. Because I heard some things that concern me. 3 But we're going to do everything in our power to do it. 4 5 THE COURT: You're going to be here in court, whenever you decide to recess tonight, but you'll be in court 6 7 tomorrow. You won't be in your offices. So .... MR. MILLER: Right. 9 THE COURT: I'll know very shortly if this has any, 10 you know, agreement between the two of you. And this isn't 11 Skip needs to take this to the Board. If you reach an 12 accommodation then you'll need to take this to the veterans. 13 MR. MILLER: Right. 14 THE COURT: But you have to get something or 15 otherwise we're .... 16 So as far as I'm concerned the VA needs to be 17 included in this. 18 MR. MILLER: Can we meet -- since we're in the same 19 office, can we do it -- can he and I meet in my building 20 tomorrow --21 THE COURT: No. 22 MR. MILLER: -- instead of coming to court? 2.3 THE COURT: No. No. No. (inaudible) meet here. 24 MR. MILLER: What time?

You can meet right in the back room.

THE COURT:

1	MR. MILLER: What time do you want us
2	THE COURT: We're in one continuous session now.
3	Don't argue with me. That's it.
4	MR. MILLER: I'm just asking you what time.
5	THE COURT: Nine o'clock.
6	MR. MILLER: Okay.
7	THE COURT: So if you want to and I want to thank
8	the gentleman from Brentwood School. I want to really pay you
9	a tribute. First of all, I really appreciate your courtesy. I
10	want to express that to you. And you can express that back to
11	the Board. You've come in on some very difficult times, but I
12	have to tell you, whether you reach an accommodation or not,
13	this Court really appreciates you being here.
14	MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
15	THE COURT: Okay? And I want you to hear that.
16	So, 9:00 o'clock then tomorrow we'll get back.
17	MR. SILBERFELD: As to those issues, yes, right.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MR. SILBERFELD: We're prepared to stay for other
20	things today
21	THE COURT: No, we have a lot more to
22	MR. SILBERFELD: I realize that.
23	THE COURT: We're just beginning the evening, Roman.
24	MR. SILBERFELD: Right.
25	THE COURT: So, yeah. Okay.

- MR. SILBERFELD: But as to those issues, 9:00 o'clock tomorrow.

  THE COURT: Okav. So Skip, go home. Chairman of the
  - THE COURT: Okay. So Skip, go home. Chairman of the Board, thank you very much. We'll be glad to see you at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow.
- 6 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 7 THE COURT: We'll be here until we make decisions.
- 8 That way we're not talking about it, we're getting down to
- 9 finality.

4

- 10 You needed to place a phone call and --
- 11 MR. SILBERFELD: I do, but there's -- I do want to
- 12 | follow up on this particular point because --
- 13 **THE COURT:** Oh, hold on. Mr. Miller, Roman has a follow-up from the VA.
- MR. MILLER: Oh, I know (inaudible) --
- 16 **THE COURT:** No, no, come up here.
- MR. SILBERFELD: He's heard it. He's heard it in the
- 18 | context of Bridgeland.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Doesn't matter.
- 20 MR. SILBERFELD: First of all, note that I believe
  21 that John Kuhn was involved in some of those discussions that
  22 were taking place regarding this framework. But to the extent
  23 that this is ultimately in the form of a settlement agreement,
  24 I will note, and as the Court is probably aware, that because

- approved by the Department of Justice and there is a process for that.
- **THE COURT:** Understood.

- MR. SILBERFELD: So we will need to be brought in, an agreement will have to be reached at least in principle or a final agreement that I can then raise up my chain in order to get the approval.
  - THE COURT: I understand, but we have to get through the first hurdle, is it even possible to reach an agreement accommodating both sides, and until we get to that point....
  - MR. SILBERFELD: I just wanted to make sure the Court was aware because I'm not even sure of who the settlement approver would be because I don't know the exact contours of the agreement and so it might take just a little bit of time.
- THE COURT: Okay. Now, does that get approved through the Department of Justice?
- MR. SILBERFELD: Yes. Because this matter is in litigation, it -- the VA would be involved, very closely involved in the discussions, but ultimately once an agreement in principle is reached I then need to obtain approval and I'm not the approving authority.
- **THE COURT:** I understand.
- MR. SILBERFELD: It's way above my pay grade. But I
  then need to obtain the approval of the Department of Justice.

  And if the Department of Justice approves the settlement, then

- 1 | we can present it to the Court.
- 2 THE COURT: Well, it just ought to be that you get to
- 3 | be the decision maker. Just kidding you. But, yeah, I
- 4 understand that. I understand you have to make some calls, but
- 5 | we're not even there yet. Let's see what reality is. Let's
- 6 | see if these two can work this out. And if not, there's no
- 7 reason for you to take this to the Department of Justice.
- 8 MR. SILBERFELD: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 9 **THE COURT:** Simple as that.
- 10 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Judge.
- 11 THE COURT: So Skip, we'll see you tomorrow at
- 12 9:00 o'clock. Okay? And I would bring your chairman back with
- 13 you. Okay? I want the decision makers in this room.
- MR. MILLER: Okay.
- 15 **THE COURT:** Thank you very much.
- 16 Okay, John.
- 17 MR. SANDLER: Your Honor, Jonathan Sandler for
- 18 | Brentwood. I just need to tell the Court I will not be here
- 19 tomorrow.
- 20 **THE COURT:** That's fine.
- 21 MR. SANDLER: I'm going to be in front of Judge Alsup
- 22 in Northern California.
- 23 **THE COURT:** Oh, well say hi to Bill. He's my close
- 24 friend.
- 25 MR. SANDLER: I'm not sure he's going to give me the

- 1 chance, but if I get the chance I'll say hello.
- THE COURT: Well, try to wave your hand anyway.
- MR. SANDLER: Thanks, Your Honor. 3
- Okay. Thank you very much. 4 THE COURT:
- 5 Okay, John, back to you.

6

- MR. HUESTON: Sure. So some other items discussed 7 today, there was the parties discussed the Town Center, the 8 construction of the Town Center, and the Court's order was that construction of the Town Center should begin within 18 months 10 and what I heard today, the Town Center as envisioned in the 11 2022 Master Plan will, in fact, begin construction within 12 18 months and in addition Building 306 as of January of 2025 13 will open as a community center with additional resources on 14 top of what is reflected in the 2022 Master Plan for the 15 planned Town Center.
- 16 THE COURT: I need 306 up on the board. Somebody 17 needs to put up 306, just so I see it again.
- 18 So John, why don't you continue.
- 19 MR. HUESTON: That's what I have on the Town Center. 20 There's debate and, you know, some dissent about what else the 21 Town Center may or may not include, but that is the Town Center 22 as conceived that will move forward within 18 months.
- 2.3 **THE COURT:** I read an interesting article yesterday 24 in one of the papers about this alleged conflict going on.

article. A division quite possibly between the Board and the 1 2 developers. I don't think I want to get into that right now 3 but here's the question: The developers and the Board, who 4 eventually would break this impasse? In other words, if we 5 reach an impasse and we can't agree, you know, a Town Center, and I think the headline was something about a bar, how do we 6 7 break that impasse? Because somebody has to eventually make a 8 decision because we've been bouncing around with this with 9 different Secretaries. 10 Good to see you. Would you just state your name 11 again? I know you. 12 MR. SIMMS: Brett Simms. So the Board actually makes 13 recommendations to the Secretary and --14 I understand that. THE COURT: 15 So the Secretary is the decision maker. MR. SIMMS: 16 He is reviewing those decisions right now. But to date he has 17 declined the recommendations from the Board to move in that 18 direction, so we are following the Master Plan 2022 plan. 19 THE COURT: Still with the developers.

20 MR. SIMMS: Correct.

THE COURT: And the developer input concerning --

22 MR. SIMMS: Correct.

21

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Soboroff had the suggestion that this would be a separate Master Plan in the sense that the Town Center would be segmented out because of the complexity,

- 1 but by the same token I don't know how much more study we need
- 2 because we've got the developers here with their position,
- 3 | we've got the Board with their position, the Secretary makes
- 4 this decision eventually.
- I don't know if I can be of any help or not. I mean
- 6 | there's places I'm willing to intrude, but there's places I'm a
- 7 | little bit leery of. And I pay respect to the Secretary in
- 8 that regard.
- 9 Will he be here, by the way? Just joking with you,
- 10 Counsel.
- 11 MR. SIMMS: So he did, the Secretary approved the
- 12 | Master Plan, he signed and approved the Master Plan with the
- 13 current approach.
- 14 **THE COURT:** Now which Secretary? Because, by the
- 15 | way, we may have a change of administration. We may not.
- 16 MR. SIMMS: Secretary McDonough.
- 17 **THE COURT:** And this has been floating around for a
- 18 long period of time. Okay.
- 19 MR. SIMMS: Most recent, Secretary McDonough approved
- 20 that.
- 21 **THE COURT:** Yeah, but he may be out of office --
- 22 MR. SIMMS: Certainly --
- 23 **THE COURT:** -- by the time they get done.
- 24 MR. SIMMS: -- and the Master Plan is the plan.
- 25 **THE COURT:** Or he may be in office. I don't know.

But how -- this has taken a significant period of time without a decision. Or at least at the present time we're following the plan, but this has gone back and forth between different Secretaries for quite a period of time. With different viewpoints, by the way.

MR. SIMMS: Correct. So since 2021 this has been the plan. When we did the Master Plan --

THE COURT: Right.

2.3

MR. SIMMS: -- that was the decision, that is the path we have been following. So from our perspective the recommendations from the Board are just that, they're recommendations for us to reconsider. But we have a plan, that's what we're following. If we deviate and change from that, the Town Center, there is no other plan so it will not be started in 18 months is what we've communicated to the Monitor. This is the path we've been working down for three plus years. There's funding aligned to these buildings. There's a lot of work that's gone into this. A change in that, which is possible, it is a plan, but that isn't the direction we're headed in.

THE COURT: Okay. So explain to me 305. Oh, I'm sorry, 306. Once again, what would that be used as?

MR. SIMMS: I'm going to see if I can get one of my West LA colleagues to explain it. It's a community center.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know what a community

- 1 center means because in the article that I read there was a
- 2 proposal that there would be a more spacious hall, for
- 3 | instance, a hotel, and again a new bar, et cetera, which was
- 4 interesting. But a community center that was being proposed by
- 5 | the Board, quite frankly, was being rejected by the Secretary.
- 6 That's what I understood. What is this going to look like?
- 7 Because Jon Sherin has the connective tissue idea and
- 8 accomplishing some of that through, depending upon what
- 9 Brentwood School does, I mean a pool, track, can be pretty nice
- 10 | connective tissue. But the veterans seem to say through -- and
- 11 | this is all hearsay through Bobby Shriver -- that when I looked
- 12 | at this article, he felt overwhelmingly in this survey that --
- 13 and this is hearsay, by the way -- that the veterans wanted a
- 14 | communal place in terms of a hotel or hall, and I don't know
- 15 how expansive that survey is. And I don't intend to override
- 16 | the Secretary, by the way. I don't think that's the Court's
- 17 prerogative. But by the same token, what does this community
- 18 | center look like? Because if it can't attract veterans we're
- 19 going to lose them.
- 20 MR. SIMMS: The community center, Your Honor, is
- 21 | going to be in Building 306. That's located in the center of
- 22 these housing developments. The idea with the community center
- 23 is that it would essentially be run by peers, other veterans --
- 24 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 25 MR. SIMMS: -- and we want to use that as a magnet to

bring people out of the buildings that they're in and engage in socialization. To that end, we -- this is not simply a VA project, we're working with community partners. The Veterans Collective is part of this, SSTF Grantee (phonetic) is a part of this, the County is a part of this as well.

The idea is to collaborate in a way that we can provide meaningful services. So that could be events, it could be events both on and off the campus. It will be recreational activities. We'll have peers also going into these buildings where they'll be knocking on doors and inviting them to come and join other veterans in a particular event. We are working also with our partners to create not just in Building 306 but support around it, which may include other modules, structures like that, trails even, that would have recreational opportunities. It could be an art center. It could be games. It could be ping pong. It could be any number of things. A movie. But the idea is to create a sense of attractions that people want to gather and do things.

And this, again, will be paired to an active in-reach effort to veterans that are living in the U.S. to where we try to break down that isolation. Larry Williams, I don't know he's here right now, actually spoke eloquently earlier today about how it is so important for those veterans to be greeted by these peers because they're going to respond to them more than they're going to respond to essentially a social worker or

1 a professional. We can have peers knocking on doors and our 2 veterans would be more likely, even if they're a little 3 hesitant, to open the door to a peer and come to an activity 4 and engage with their fellow veterans and not be so isolated 5 and create really this sense of community that we've been talking about. 6 7 THE COURT: It mentioned, I think it was Building 41. I don't know what Building 41 is. Is that four one zero? In other words, it was an art deco building. It had wings off of the facade. I don't know what --10 11 That's Building 13. MR. PECK: 12 THE COURT: Steve, come on up for a moment. 13 MR. SIMMS: I think that's Building 13. So this --14 what we're talking about --Show me on the map, because I'm confused 15 THE COURT: 16 about 41. 17 MR. PECK: This is Building 13 right here. 18 THE COURT: There we go. Thank you. Okay. 19 MR. SIMMS: So what we're talking --20 **THE COURT:** So 13 is really 41, correct? 21 MR. SIMMS: And actually I think Steve can also talk 22 about some of our plans for 306, because the Veterans 2.3 Collective which U.S. vets is very active in is part of it. 24 MR. PECK: So a survey was recently done among

They asked for a

We got 400 and some responses.

25

veterans.

- 1 store, so in Building 13 there will be a store which will 2 include fresh vegetables. There will be a restaurant. grand hall, they will do Veterans Day celebrations, job fairs, 3 Veterans Day dinners --4 5 THE COURT: So it will have a grand hall. It will have a grand hall with an --6 MR. PECK: 7 THE COURT: Can we have the Marine Corps ball there? MR. PECK: Oh, absolutely. 9 THE COURT: How many people will it hold? MR. PECK: Oh, it will probably hold 400, 500 people. 10 11 We're good. 12 THE COURT: So one of the disagreement between the 13 two sides may be a hotel --14 MR. PECK: Correct. 15 THE COURT: -- which I'm seeing the veterans nod 16 their head that they like, and my question would be who would 17 pay for that? 18 And who would operate it. MR. PECK: 19 THE COURT: And the second issue is this bar. 20 it's kind of titillating to read a headline that says something 21 about a bar. 22 MR. SPEAKER: There's not going to be a bar.
- THE COURT: Come on up here. Because we don't want
- 24 our veterans to drink, right? Now, come on.
- 25 MR. SPEAKER: So with 30 percent of our veterans --

1	THE COURT: No, just a moment. Come on. I don't
2	care about a bar. Have you ever been to the American Legion?
3	MR. SPEAKER: It's going to be the VA bar and casino.
4	It's going to be a big attraction.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Now have you ever been
6	MR. SPEAKER: There's not going to be a bar.
7	THE COURT: Have you been to the American Legion?
8	MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me?
9	THE COURT: Have you ever been to an American Legion
10	bar?
11	MR. SPEAKER: I have been to and American Legion.
12	People are welcome to go to the American Legion Post and then
13	go off the grounds and go to a bar
14	THE COURT: And have a drink
15	MR. SPEAKER: but there's not going to be a bar on
16	our grounds.
17	THE COURT: they drink Diet Coke, right? Okay,
18	now, VFW, have you ever been to a VFW bar?
19	MR. SPEAKER: I have been to many VSO
20	THE COURT: Okay.
21	MR. SPEAKER: bars, yes.
22	THE COURT: Is it the fact that we
23	MR. SPEAKER: I shouldn't say many, some.
24	THE COURT: don't want alcohol served to our
25	veterans on VA time, is that the problem here? The image?

1 MR. SPEAKER: We don't want a bar on VA grounds --THE COURT: I see. MR. SPEAKER: -- because many of the veterans, we 3 don't want to put it right directly in their faces if you're in 4 5 recovery. 6 THE COURT: Understood. 7 MR. SPEAKER: It's not fair to them. It's not therapeutic. And it's against the law. 8 9 (Laughter) THE COURT: Well, let's not violate the law. 10 11 So the end result is that's the basic dispute, as I 12 understand it. If you have a business against the law in terms 13 of serving alcohol and the veterans feel like this would be a 14 communal experience, like going to a VFW or American Legion --15 MR. SPEAKER: We can offer many communal experiences that do not involve alcohol --16 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MR. SPEAKER: -- or drugs. 19 THE COURT: And right now the VA Secretary is taking 20 the position of no hotel and no bar. 21 Now, why would the Court get involved in that 22 discussion? In other words, why would I -- I'm willing to 23 intercede in other places, but there's places I'm not willing to intercede in. 24 25 So John, what are your thoughts?

1	MR. HUESTON: I agree, this
2	THE COURT: In other words, there are some places I'm
3	willing to go to bat and take a chance, but some places belong
4	to you and the Secretary of the VA. And so maybe we've got all
5	of our veterans drinking at the local bar, just off campus.
6	MR. SPEAKER: Veterans have lease rights. They could
7	drink in their apartment. I mean no one's saying that they
8	can't pursue
9	THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. They can drink in
10	their apartment?
11	MR. SPEAKER: Yes. It's a legal activity. It's
12	their apartment.
13	THE COURT: They just can't drink at the bar.
14	MR. SPEAKER: Not at a bar that we're not going to
15	open, correct.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
17	MR. SPEAKER: It will not exist.
18	THE COURT: All right. So John, do we want to get
19	involved in this dispute?
20	MR. HUESTON: No, I don't think there are
21	THE COURT: No.
22	MR. HUESTON: findings and bases for that.
23	THE COURT: Yeah. I just read that with interest. I
24	think right now I want to put that by the wayside. It's like
0.5	

being naked and trying to tie your shoelaces. We want focus

right now. I need necessity. I need people coming into this
facility. And if I get involved in these collateral issues the
problem's going to become we're taking the focus off of getting
veterans in. And we may have enough to entice veterans, you
know, a track, swimming pool, recreation, weight training. I
don't know what Brentwood School's going to say. The next
thing is we may have enough accommodation to attract veterans

and I don't want perfect to get in the way of good.

- I don't think that that's the Court's prerogative right now. I think I would be then supplanting the Secretary's decision, whoever that is, and so I don't know if any veterans, if you're going have a bar or not and I don't think I'm going to bat for that right now, or the hotel. So I leave that to the discretion right now of the VA.
- John, do you have any comment or should I intercede?

  MR. HUESTON: No comment, Your Honor.
- **THE COURT:** So I need not say anything further about 18 it. Okay. At the present time anyway.

Now, for the veterans somehow we've got to create an opportunity for you folks to come in, so I don't need a comment from you right now. I don't want a veterans network living in a box on the street where they're enjoying each other's company and camaraderieship, because somehow we have to attract them in. That's why we're not willing to touch that golf course, not even one acre of it. I'm hoping for a swimming pool. I'm

hoping for a track. Hoping for expanded hours. And that may
be what we have to live with. And if we want to have a drink,
if it's against the law, maybe we have to go off campus. Now I
can see the West L.A. Brentwood Association, how happy they
would be to receive you locally. But maybe that's what you
have to do.

But maybe we can continue to attract a, you know, a decent town centership, so let's watch this and let's try to work together on that. But I choose not to intercede in that discussion right now. I don't think it's appropriate for the Court. Okay. But it was a very interesting article.

All right, John.

MR. HUESTON: The next item, I spoke with the VA about the stacking issue that the Court had inquired about. And in terms of the HUD-VASH program and the ability to provide at least 25 referrals to public housing agencies per week, there were representations made that there has been very significant progress and a trajectory to potentially do that. I asked for the actual numbers and really the backing for that and they promised to get me that by tomorrow morning so I can have a more informed discussion on that.

With respect to appropriate street outreach staffing, apparently they have about 11 folks who are not administrators doing all the staff outreach efforts for the entire Cashmin (phonetic) basin. And when the question was put to them, well,

1 what do you think would be adequate to in fact get the job done and the answer was twice that, another 11, and no one dissented from that in the room we were in. So I think they've come up 3 with a number of 11, 11 additional street outreach staff 4 5 members in order to have the appropriate staffing to meet the 6 Court's Order. 7 THE COURT: Any comments by the Plaintiffs? MR. ROSENBAUM: My understanding --9 THE COURT: Just use that mike and just identify 10 yourself because we're on CourtSmart. 11 MR. ROSENBAUM: Mark Rosenbaum for Plaintiffs. 12 recollection, John, is that not all of that 11 actually do street outreach and I --13 14 (Indiscernible voice) 15 MR. HUESTON: Yeah, that 11 was street outreach --16 MR. ROSENBAUM: Oh, okay. 17 MR. HUESTON: -- and there were additional who were 18 admin. 19 THE COURT: And you can push back, but if it's 20 adequate I don't intend to write injunctive relief on it. 21 MR. ROSENBAUM: And so just have Mr. Kuhn confirm, so 22 the number is -- you would want 22 actual street outreach 2.3 individuals, is that right? 24 MR. HUESTON: Right. 25

Who would actually do street

MR. ROSENBAUM:

1 outreach.

4

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

2 MR. SPEAKER: I'll actually have the actual numbers 3 to you tomorrow, but it will be approximately that number.

MR. HUESTON: Okay.

5 MR. SPEAKER: It might be actually a little bit more 6 than that, but I'll have the number by tomorrow.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HUESTON: And so there was the other item in the Order, which was -- and we didn't discuss this expressly, but if you can provide this number tomorrow, the appropriate caseworker staffing as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. And right now it's at 18.91, but I'll have the numbers for the full, the change from last fiscal year to this fiscal year, and the exact number of staffing as well.

MR. HUESTON: Okay, great.

17 **THE COURT:** Okay.

MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, the only other item -well, there were two other items. My understanding is that
UCLA, it's prior to the Chancellor showing up, but the attorney
for UCLA is prepared to share at least some sort of offer and
Bridgeland Oil as well has represented that they have an offer
that has increased from what they represented this morning.

THE COURT: Do you know what that offer is?

MR. HUESTON: From UCLA, I --

No, no. No, not from the Chancellor --1 THE COURT: 2 MR. HUESTON: From Bridgeland? THE COURT: -- from Bridgeland. 3 MR. HUESTON: I do have notes. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay, because I want complete 6 transparency here. In other words, we are negotiating in 7 public, so .... 8 MR. GUADIANA: I'm happy to address the Court. 9 THE COURT: Actually, if he could address the delta, 10 it will be a little --11 MR. GUADIANA: It will probably make a little bit 12 more sense. 13 MR. HUESTON: -- it will save a little time, yeah. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. GUADIANA: So Your Honor, in addition to the 16 terms that I explained this morning, which --17 THE COURT: Maybe a little closer, and just state your name again for the record. 18 19 MR. GUADIANA: Your Honor, Ernest Guardiana on behalf 20 of Bridgeland Resources for the record. 21 In addition to the terms that I noted this morning, 22 which include the quitclaim of the approximately acre and a 23 half replacement drill site, would be a designating on the 24 property of another site of similar size in exchange for having 25 rights to this replacement drill site. The increase of the

- royalty, which I know is not the 51 percent of gross proceeds
  that Your Honor had requested, but that would stay up to

  3-1/2 percent above sixty-five dollars, 4-1/2 percent over a
  hundred dollars, and 5-1/2 percent over a hundred and thirty.
  - But to address your comments earlier regarding that you don't want this slant drilled well to stay on the campus and increase the economics of the field so that the field can't shut down, what my client is willing to do address those specific concerns is (1) agree not to drill any more wells, any more slant drilled wells. So there would be no more wells under that -- under what was previously the revocable license. The only well would be the Sawtelle 2 plant.

Additionally, whenever the BLM production ceases and is plugged, even if Sawtelle 2 is continuing to produce great, we will plug Sawtelle 2 at that time as well. So once --

THE COURT: Just hold on. Repeat that to me. And I apologize.

MR. GUADIANA: Sure. So as I understand what your concern was this morning, when the BLM, when the oilwell that is produced under the BLM leases is no longer economic, we're still going to be drilling, we're still going to have the Sawtelle 2 well producing great or maybe other additional wells --

**THE COURT:** Right.

2.3

25 MR. GUADIANA: -- producing great. And we're going

1 to be utilizing this drill site, even though we don't have the 2 rights to do so under our BLM lease anymore, and that's what I understood your main concern to be. So what we've done to 3 address that is to say (1) we won't drill any more wells, so 4 5 Sawtelle 2 will be the only well that would be drilled; and when we plug the BLM lease wells we would also plug Sawtelle 2. 6 7 So once the BLM lease is dried up and we wouldn't have rights to the campus under the BLM lease, we will plug Sawtelle 2 at 8 9 that time as well. THE COURT: I think I'd (inaudible) that but I'm not 10 11 certain so just remain with me for a moment --12 MR. GUADIANA: Of course. 13 THE COURT: -- let me get some comments from the 14 Plaintiff. 15 Have you ever heard of this proposal? 16 MR. ROSENBAUM: I just heard it for the first time 17 just now. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Well, take you time. What do you 19 think? 20

I'm going to express some concerns so you're not caught by surprise. I've always felt that the 3-1/2 percent that you're offering, and I don't have my notes in front of me, going to 4-1/2 percent or 5-1/2 percent, with no disrespect to you, was a minimum offer. And the reason for that is you have to get above eighty dollars a barrel to kick it up to the

21

22

23

24

whatever percentage and you have to get over a hundred dollars a barrel to get to the 5-1/2 percent. I don't know how I feel comfortable finding that that's a substantial benefit because it seems so di minimis, quite frankly, and historically, if you average it out, maybe seventy-five dollars a barrel or eighty dollars a barrel.

And I'm having trouble with this generation of veterans, who's very different from my generation because they had to deal with extraordinary toxic conditions, and I'm having trouble with burn pits, quite frankly, and the results for this generation that isn't the Vietnam generation, and so philosophically I'm having trouble saying to you that I'm comfortable having oil on this property when I can't see any substantial benefit.

Now from your perspective, you've got other wells and you have other wells in other locations. So you're company is not going broke. I know you've got three or four other locations in the area, so we're not going to break your company. I just have a real concern with veterans in relation to your oil, quite frankly, with these kinds of -- and frankly, I look at the piece of property, and I really respect you, but I recognize that this piece of property is almost worthless to me and here's why. Unless I can find something that may be traded out to even consider that would be contiguous to another piece of property so Mr. Soboroff isn't running around with an

1 acre and a half year -- and acre and a half well which is 2 uneconomical, I've got a potentially polluted piece of property now, that acre and a half that you showed me, and probably the 3 4 last piece of property we looked at, because I don't know what 5 the EIR (phonetic) would show. It's so near the oil that I've got oil fumes coming up, and so that's my hesitancy. 6 7 MR. GUADIANA: Your Honor, we do not propose --THE COURT: Can I have 51 percent? 9 MR. GUADIANA: As I said --10 **THE COURT:** Can I have 51 percent? 11 MR. GUADIANA: -- no one is getting 51 percent of 12 profits from this well. THE COURT: Well, but just a moment. 13 14 MR. GUADIANA: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Let's negotiate now. 16 MR. GUADIANA: Of gross proceeds --17 THE COURT: Let's negotiate now. 18 MR. GUADIANA: Okay. 19 THE COURT: If you lose Sawtelle you've lost 20 42 percent of your profit. 21 MR. GUADIANA: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Now you've got 48 percent left, right, on 23 a pool of oil that's drying up. 24 MR. GUADIANA: Fifty-eight percent, yes.

Yeah, it might be when you're my lifetime

- 1 plus.
- MR. GUADIANA: Yes. Yes.
- 3 THE COURT: You're not in a good position. Can I
- 4 have 51 percent? Because you see you'll still make 49 percent.
- 5 And, yeah, we might find that it's for the benefit of the
- 6 veterans, but not 3-1/2 percent.
- 7 MR. GUADIANA: So hold on, Your Honor. What --
- 8 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 9 MR. GUADIANA: -- what our royalty did was increase
- 10 | it over all of the wells, not just the Sawtelle 2 well, so it's
- 11 | really more of an increase of a 5 percent royalty anytime that
- 12 | Bridgeland is making any profits. Mr. Kolcarney (phonetic)
- 13 early during the trial testified that Bridgeland does not make
- 14 profits when oil falls below \$65. What we're realistically
- doing is changing this from 2-1/2 percent to 5 percent.
- 16 **THE COURT:** Then negotiate with me.
- MR. GUADIANA: Okay.
- 18 **THE COURT:** If I capped your well, what position are
- 19 you in?
- MR. GUADIANA: Yeah.
- 21 **THE COURT:** And let me see you take that to the
- 22 Circuit and have the VA defend you up in the Circuit on an oil
- 23 | well.
- MR. GUADIANA: Your Honor, I've explained if you do,
- 25 | you know, order injunctive --

- 1 THE COURT: Can I get 51 percent?
- 2 MR. GUADIANA: Hold on. So one of the things that we
- 3 have to talk about is the difference between gross and net.
- 4 **THE COURT:** Yeah.
- MR. GUADIANA: No one -- if my client was required to give 51 percent of the gross proceeds from that well, the well would be uneconomic at any price of oil.
- THE COURT: Just a moment. Is the VA in favor of
  this oil well on your -- on the property? Is this where we're
  going to place our veterans? I mean just if so, just state
  you're happy with the oil well and our veterans being near
  this.
- MR. ROSENBAUM: As I think we indicated during trial,
  this is one of several land use agreements that the current VA
  officials have inherited and have tried to figure out how best
  to use that land.
  - THE COURT: Well, you've inherited the 1956 agreement and those ten wells. We're not discussing that. What we're discussing is what we do have jurisdiction over and that's the 2000 -- I'm sorry, is it 17 or 19?
- MR. GUADIANA: 2016 revocable lease.
- 22 **THE COURT:** 2016, because it's negotiable --
- MR. GUADIANA: Which is --

18

19

- 24 **THE COURT:** Ten years, right? And what I worry about
- 25 and am constantly worried about is that if I were to allow you

- 1 to reinvigorate this for ten years, that means that in a sense
- 2 | they can slant drill all day long till they sink a new well. I
- 3 have no jurisdiction to stop that.
- 4 MR. GUADIANA: We are agreeing not to --
- 5 THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. That's the first time
- 6 I'm hearing that now. I've never heard that before.
- 7 MR. GUADIANA: Agreed.
- 8 THE COURT: Am I hearing 51 percent? I haven't heard
- 9 that yet, have I?
- MR. GUADIANA: Not on the gross, no.
- 11 THE COURT: No, I think you might want to make
- 12 | 49 percent rather than nothing.
- 13 MR. GUADIANA: Your Honor, if it is on gross
- 14 production --
- 15 **THE COURT:** I think you might want to make 49 percent
- 16 | rather than nothing.
- 17 MR. GUADIANA: We would prefer to plug the well than
- 18 have --
- 19 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 20 MR. GUADIANA: -- 49 percent of the gross proceeds
- 21 because it would not be economical.
- 22 **THE COURT:** You'll have that opportunity. We're
- 23 going to plug it. Simple as that. Because this would be
- 24 substantially for the benefit and anything less than 50 percent
- 25 is not for the benefit, it's as simple as that.

- 1 MR. GUADIANA: So hold on, Your Honor. The whole 2 fact about us quitclaiming land -- and I advise -- I ask you to ask Mr. Soboroff what his thought is on accumulating additional 3 land on the VA campus. That is a significant benefit to 4 5 That is something that they would not obtain other than through this agreement. 6 7 THE COURT: I get the tradeoff though in terms of the 65,000 to 120,000, which bounces around. That's not worth the health of the veterans. I'd rather have some guarantee out 10 there we're not putting veterans in a situation where their 11 health decreases. I'm not going to do it. Simple as that. 12 And tonight, Counsel, so you know on both sides, I'm 13 going to allow an injunctive relief. I think we're going to be 14 capping this well. Okay? So I want to thank you. That is it. 15 (To the Clerk): You can start writing that up. 16 will go out tonight. 17 Okay, now what are we going to do next, John?
  - I think I've got a parking lot out there.
  - MR. HUESTON: Right. We have the parking lot to address and we could hear the proposal from UCLA prior to the Chancellor arriving, which might allow some thinking and consideration by Plaintiffs as well on that. I'm not sure they've seen it.
- 24 **THE COURT:** On the parking lot?
- 25 MR. HUESTON: From UCLA.

19

20

21

22

2.3

1 THE COURT: Oh.

MR. HUESTON: We have two items yet.

3 THE COURT: Hold on, I've got multiple....

4 MR. HUESTON: But the parking lot is certainly ripe

5 to address and then we could move to UCLA.

THE COURT: Just a moment.

## (Pause)

All right, Counsel, this will be the Order of the Court. I think I've anticipated much of your argument, but it will read as follows:

Bridgeland operates a drill site on three acres of the West LA VA Grounds. In 2017 the VA originally entered into a revocable license with Bridgeland's predecessor in interest that gave them the right to slant drill oil wells that pass through the subsurface of the West LA VA campus to extract non-federal oil from the privately owned land neighboring the West LA VA Grounds. Bridgeland slant drills these private wells from a well called Sawtelle 2 located on the West LA VA drill site. In exchange for the right to operate Sawtelle 2 Bridgeland under the 2017 agreement with the VA donates 2.5 percent royalty to the veterans charity.

In the Court's Post-Trial Order it found that the 2017 agreement between Bridgeland and the VA violated the VA's fiduciary duty to veterans and the 2016 West Los Angeles

Leasing Act because the agreement did not principally benefit

1 veterans and their families. Accordingly, the Court held that the agreement authorizing Bridgeland to operate Sawtelle 2 is void. Bridgeland has represented that since the Court's Order 3 it has ceased extracting oil using the Sawtelle 2 well. 4 5 Bridgeland is hereby ordered to cap using procedures consistent with California law Sawtelle 2 so that Bridgeland 6 7 may no longer drill -- may no longer slant drill private well leases from the West LA VA campus. The Court sets a status conference for Wednesday, October 2nd, 2024, when Bridgeland is 10 ordered to inform the Court of its progress on capping 11 Sawtelle 2. 12 (To the Clerk): You can docket that Order. 13 the Final Order of the Court, so docket it. All right. 14 (Voice heard in background) 15 (Indiscer.) I can't hear you. 16 MR. SPEAKER: Capping the well, we're (inaudible) the 17 soil, the ground water, so people don't get --18 THE COURT: I can't hear you. I've got CourtSmart 19 and I don't have a good recording of you. 20 MR. SPEAKER: Capping the well is one thing. 21 Remediation of the land is another thing. 22 THE COURT: Well, just a moment. I understand that. 2.3 MR. SPEAKER: Remediating wasn't in the Order, was it? 24

But the problem with that is that

No.

they still have a valid case in 1956 and Sawtelle 2 is the
fourth well in, so I don't know how I could order remediation
of the land at the present time when they have a valid lease in

Until it expires, sir.

4 1956 the BLM has granted them.

MR. SPEAKER:

- THE COURT: So I would love to have a fund for
  remediation purposes in the future in case they walk away, but
  I'm going to have to get some guidance from the Plaintiffs of
  how the Court would make that order because I think that you
  have a valid lease concerning your -- if BLM chooses to
  continue that, that's on BLM. Or if you decide to try to go
  around me and negotiate with BLM, I'll (inaudible) in this
  court and explain why they would let you continue on with slant
- MR. SPEAKER: How do we get the land back?
- THE COURT: Well, right now we're not getting that
- 17 acre and a half back.

drilling.

5

- 18 MR. SPEAKER: Right.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Period. Because they have a valid lease.
- 20 But I can stop the slant drilling.
- 21 MR. SPEAKER: Okay.
- 22 **THE COURT:** And we've had this discussion. Thank you
- 23 very much. Have a seat.
- MR. SPEAKER: Okay.
- 25 **THE COURT:** And that's as far as I think that the

- 1 | Court can go within the bounds but I do control the slant
- 2 drilling and I'm not willing to see this continue on. And I
- 3 | never heard 51 percent so this is not substantially for the
- 4 benefit of the veterans.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- 5 That's the Final Order of the Court. I want this 6 documented now.
- 7 All right, parking lot, John.
- MR. HUESTON: Your Honor, we have conferred and I

  think the Court is prepared to make a recommendation. Do you

  want me to frame it out?
  - THE COURT: Why don't you give them the idea that we came up with, that we're discussing, and then I want you to push back about this parking lot. Because, quite frankly, I'm prepared to take the parking lot. My Special Master is proposing something else and I'm not sure that I agree with this right now.
  - MR. HUESTON: All right. So after hearing from several parties, the proposal was to request an accounting because there were representations by the VA today that the existing parking lot operator may have been generating 60 to 70,000 dollars of revenue per month that was going to the VA while taking only \$2500 a month in management fees. I think it's important we see documentation of that and I think that it's also important to open up competition potentially for whether that lot could be more profitably run for the VA and

1 possibly with a lesser management fee.

2.3

It does seem to make sense to allow the parking lot to continue until such time as the land might or might not be used for housing.

**THE COURT:** Explain the auction idea to them and the 6 accounting.

MR. HUESTON: Right. So I think the idea for consideration is to require an accounting. My understanding is that the parking lot operators were supposed to do an annual accounting but only have done so once in the last several years. So we --

**THE COURT:** And 2021 was the last accounting, John.
13 There's been one --

MR. HUESTON: Right.

**THE COURT:** -- in this period of time.

MR. HUESTON: Right. And so within 30 days we would ask for a new accounting so that we can look at exactly where the money's going. And then subsequent to that have the existing operator, if they're interested, and then others who have interest put in bids to run and manage the parking lot. And the winner of the bid would be the one returning the most to the veterans.

THE COURT: And what that does is your position is you really don't want to run a parking lot from the VA's perspective, so we're trying to respect that in some way. But

if it's making 60 or 70,000 dollars a month and the 1 representation is the owner's only pocketing 2500, I don't believe that. Just flat out, I don't believe that.

3

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

And since we haven't had an accounting since 2021, 5 we're trying to avoid running that parking lot, setting up a separate structure, but I need a separate accounting. What I 6 7 need to know is what data is from the parking lot or other -whatever other entity used to exist, separate it out. Because in the past, long before the representation, the VA got in a lot of trouble with money that couldn't be traced. About 10 11 \$40 million if you go back. And nobody could find it. 12 we separate that out, then I want to work with you on that. 13 forget the past. That 40 million's gone. But this has to be 14 an accounting where we know what's coming in.

So also I like the idea of an auction. John's talked me into this, by the way. I was initially against it, but he's very persuasive. Okay? And that would avoid you running it, me running it, and I don't believe that that owner's getting \$2500 in administrative fees.

Now in the meantime though, we don't need that parking lot right away, so I want to retain the veterans who are employed. I want to make money on that while we can. what are your thoughts?

One moment, Your Honor. MR. SPEAKER:

25 Yeah. Take your time with this.

## (Pause)

And Mr. Soboroff, I understand your concerns. I didn't mean to cut you off. But here's the problem. I understand that they could walk away. So if this well doesn't become, the ten wells aren't profitable, what happens if they walk away? What happens to a remediation fund, right? But didn't we hear that they're still operating other wells in the area? I can see that lawsuit coming very quickly in terms of remediation from the VA because they don't want to clean up this meth. So in other words, we have remedies.

In a perfect world, I would cause Bridgeland to set aside a sum now for remediation purposes. But under the lease, they've got a valid lease in 1956 that the BLM issued apparently during the wildcat days. So what do I have control over? I've got control over the slant drilling and I'm going to end that. And I didn't hear 50 percent. Did you? No. No. So if they choose not to make 49 percent, that's it. That's the Final Order of the Court.

MR. ROSENBERG: I'd like to bring Dr. Braverman up
with me --

**THE COURT:** Sure.

22 MR. ROSENBERG: -- to correct me in case I misstate
23 anything.

THE COURT: Brad, you've never misstated, so --

25 MR. ROSENBERG: Appreciate that.

1 THE COURT: -- (inaudible) thinks you're impeccable for the record. 2 So Dr. Braverman. 3 MR. ROSENBERG: Well, there's a first time for 4 everything, so let me see if I can -- let me see if I can 5 6 summarize first. 7 On the issue of accounting, we agree that that's --8 with that proposal. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. ROSENBERG: So that can move forward and I think 11 we can do that within 30 days. Yes. So that should work. 12 (To Dr. Braverman): Do you want to address the --13 THE COURT: Dr. Braverman, can you set out a separate 14 account so we don't have this comingling problem? 15 (No audible response) 16 Good, I love the enthusiasm. I love the yes. 17 DR. BRAVERMAN: I'm sure we can figure that out. THE COURT: 18 Absolutely. 19 DR. BRAVERMAN: That's the only -- I'm not sure it's 20 comingled, it's just that --21 I don't care --THE COURT: 22 DR. BRAVERMAN: -- we're getting it --2.3 THE COURT: -- let's not mince words. 24 DR. BRAVERMAN: -- so we can figure that out. 25 I want that amount designated out so I

- 1 know what's coming from the parking lot and it's not mixed up
  2 with Bridgeland's --
- 3 DR. BRAVERMAN: Oh, no, I understand. And, yes, we 4 can do that.
- **THE COURT:** That would --
- 6 DR. BRAVERMAN: We're doing it on paper so we can do
  7 it in a more --
- **THE COURT:** Okay.

2.3

- DR. BRAVERMAN: -- hard-end fashion. The issue at hand, and there's no objection to in general recompeting a lease to -- recompeting a contractor, if you will, to operate a parking lot.
- **THE COURT:** Sure.
  - DR. BRAVERMAN: The challenge is that whatever the outcome is for us to be able to allow somebody else to manage this property, that operation has to be considered to be in the principal interest of veterans and compliant with the West LA Leasing Act. And OIG has held that money in and of itself --
  - DR. BRAVERMAN: -- is not in compliance. And so the challenge here is if we were to operate a parking lot all we would be getting out of it, at least initially, is money and that wouldn't be compliant with the West LA Leasing Act.
- **THE COURT:** Exactly, and that's why my initial --

Right.

DR. BRAVERMAN: So that's the --

THE COURT:

1	THE COURT: petition was
2	DR. BRAVERMAN: So that's the challenge with this.
3	If and where the VA's position before was because it was
4	veteran run, veterans could park free, and veteran employed as
5	a potential training opportunity, that allowed it to benefit
6	veterans. The OIG said that that wasn't good enough. And
7	that's, you know, why that's a disputed, you know, lease at th
8	moment.
9	THE COURT: Right.
10	DR. BRAVERMAN: So but if we just then made it
11	exclusively money, that would make it worse.
12	THE COURT: So you've got me in a box. Here's the
13	box you've got me in. And I don't mean an intentional box.
14	DR. BRAVERMAN: Right.
15	THE COURT: We and the VA don't want to run this
16	parking lot.
17	DR. BRAVERMAN: We can't
18	THE COURT: Just a moment. Don't say that until you
19	talk to your counsel. Okay? His position's different.
20	We and VA don't want to run this parking lot. So my
21	only option left is either to create a separate entity through
22	John Hueston, you know, with separate accounts and push the VA
23	out, or we give this back to the VA to run and set up a
24	separate account and I trust you in that regard.

But right now I don't believe he's making \$2500 a

month out of 70,000. We have no accounting since 2021. And you're absolutely right on the case law. Just the financial compensation isn't the guidance for the principal benefit of the veterans.

DR. BRAVERMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: So you two talk for just a moment. You have a private conversation. Because maybe Brad's willing to run this parking lot.

MR. ROSENBERG: Well, I once was a -- in high school a valet parker and that job lasted --

## (Laughter)

2.3

-- that job lasted for three days, so I don't think I would be qualified.

MR. HUESTON: Can I ask just a clarifying question if I can? So this is to me a special circumstance where that was not envisioned by the OIG. Namely, a stopgap to allow monies at maximum profitability to go to veterans until such time as that property is repurposed and that money could be designated earmarked for housing, which I think the Court could find is principally for the benefit of veterans.

DR. BRAVERMAN: And that's good. My point wasn't we couldn't do it, my point was that money alone isn't good enough --

**THE COURT:** Right.

DR. BRAVERMAN: -- so we have to have some other

- 1 | reason to say that it's principally benefiting veterans.
- 2 **THE COURT:** So you tell me what you're able and
- 3 | willing to do from the VA's perspective first, after you've
- 4 talked to -- talk to Mr. -- have a conference for a moment.
- 5 Because when we entered this discussion the VA wasn't willing
- 6 to run the parking lot.
- 7 MR. SPEAKER: Your Honor, may I make an observation
- 8 about the accounting, please?
- 9 **THE COURT:** Please.
- 10 MR. SPEAKER: I think there's two parts for the
- 11 | accounting. I appreciate the VA being willing to give us their
- 12 | accounting. But they only know what the parking operator tells
- 13 | them and it could be garbage in/garbage out. No offense meant
- 14 to the VA. What we need is an accounting from the parking
- operator that goes back to 2021 and forward. Because then and
- 16 only then will we understand what's actually being pulled out
- 17 of that 60 or 70,000 dollars a month.
- 18 **THE COURT:** Look around the courtroom. Do you see
- 19 | the parking lot owner here?
- 20 MR. SPEAKER: I do not.
- 21 **THE COURT:** Does that send a message to you?
- MR. SPEAKER: In part.
- 23 **THE COURT:** Number two, what is produced by the
- 24 parking lot owner, very nicely --
- MR. SPEAKER: Right.

1	THE COURT: he really has to take the hit of
2	getting up on the stand and really admitting that these
3	programs haven't been created. That parking lot owner's
4	hiding. So what kind of accountability am I going to get when
5	we haven't even had an accounting since 2021 and am I going to
6	let him exist for the next month or two months or three months
7	representing he's only making \$2500 a month, which I absolutely
8	don't believe.
9	MR. SPEAKER: Right.
LO	THE COURT: So that's why I was starting with just
L1	taking this parking lot, for want of a better word, today.
L2	MR. SPEAKER: We understood what you're asking, I
L3	thought you
L 4	THE COURT: You two have a conversation. I don't
L5	need this on the record for a minute. Okay.
L 6	And John, if you want to enter into it, fine, but I
L7	think we may be taking the parking lot tonight.
L8	(Pause)
L 9	MR. SPEAKER: So we understood the request for the
20	accounting was from the parking lot, yeah, from the parking lot
21	operators
22	THE COURT: Yeah.
23	MR. SPEAKER: so there's no dispute there at all.
24	THE COURT: I do too.
25	MR. SPEAKER: You know, going to the issue of

- 1 principally benefiting veterans, one idea, to reprise one of my
- 2 arguments at trial, is that, you know, VA's fiduciary duties
- 3 are context specific and this context, as the Special Master
- 4 has noted, is unique because you have a parking lot that is on
- 5 | a year-to-year lease that provides revenues that are very
- 6 beneficial to veterans and that everyone would like to see be
- 7 | used to the benefit of veterans. And there's not a lot else
- 8 that can be used with that lot.
- 9 THE COURT: Right. How much do you get a month?

  10 See, we haven't had an accounting since 2021 so you and I can't

  11 trust those figures because nobody gave us an accounting. And
- 12 no matter what you represent today, you don't have any ability
- 13 to back up an amount.
- MR. SPEAKER: We're willing to do the accounting to
- 15 back up the amount.
- 16 **THE COURT:** Excellent.
- 17 MR. SPEAKER: So my point is going to the second
- 18 point that Dr. Braverman raised, which is the legal authority
- 19 and whether this principally benefits veterans, due to the
- 20 unique circumstances of the case this Court could, for example,
- 21 | find that the relief that it ultimately enters, if it's an
- 22 accounting and, you know, the further relief on the parking
- 23 lot, does principally benefit veterans in this context and that
- 24 | could potentially solve the wrinkle that the VA currently has
- 25 | with its OIG. But it would need to be part of the Court's

- findings, and that obviously means that the Court itself would be satisfied.
- **THE COURT:** My main question is who's going to run 4 the parking lot?

- MR. SPEAKER: I think that the anticipation is that if the accounting demonstrates that everything is on the up and up, then, you know, it could potentially be recompeted but it would probably need to include -- that competition would probably need to include provisions, as the current lease does, that whoever runs the parking lot would need to employ veterans, for example, and that might help with the finding that this --
  - THE COURT: That's a given. No matter what. Whether you run it, we run it, or the present lessee owns it, it's going to employ veterans. In fact, I'm trying to make certain that we continue that employment.
  - But I'm caught in a box again. Unless the VA's going to run it, I have to depend upon some fictional accounting or I have to create another entity to just monitor. And federal courts I think, and I'll put it for the record, don't run things very well.
  - MR. SPEAKER: I will put on the record that I think the VA, and I'm on the same page as Dr. Braverman, VA cannot run a parking lot at all.
- **THE COURT:** Okay, so what do we do? What's our

1 | solution here?

2.3

MR. SPEAKER: I think the solution is we order the
accounting, the VA, you know, provides, you know, works with
the Safety Park to provide that accounting, and then we can see
where we are. But if it also wants to order a recompete of
that agreement, we would need to make sure that any
re-competition complies with applicable contracting laws. I'm
not a government contract expert.

THE COURT: Then let's run with that for a moment.

How long is that going to take? Because I don't want this parking lot operator potentially enriching himself. Number two, we haven't had an accounting so we take Roman's advice and go back to 2021? I can just see that parking lot owner, who's not here, come back with, gee, Judge, we don't have any records. And number two, I don't have any authority over that parking lot operator, do I? I have to invite them to come in, just like the Chancellor.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I can issue a subpoena tomorrow for all the books and records of Safety Park and I can provide that to the VA. I can do that --

THE COURT: Okay, so John, would you do that? Would you step over and talk to them? And let's see if we can come up with at least the issue before the Chancellor comes in.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

**THE COURT:** In other words, I'm willing to work with

1 you on accounting, but I'm not willing to let this go, you 2 know, months. 3 MR. SPEAKER: No, no --THE COURT: Okay, so --4 5 MR. SPEAKER: -- it's going to happen tomorrow. 6 Dr. Braverman, enter into this discussion THE COURT: 7 quietly. Okay? And bring your colleague with you. John, if this doesn't work out I'm going to take that 8 9 parking lot, for want of a better word. And guess what you get 10 to run, the parking lot. 11 (Pause) 12 And Counsel, I'm going to bet you anything while 13 they're discussing this that no matter what we say about an 14 accounting, we're not going to get an accounting two or three 15 years ago. I promise you that person's going to come in and 16 say that they don't have records. Or if they do have records, 17 whether I'm supposed to accept them or not. So I want to stop 18 the hemorrhaging. 19 (Pause) 20 (Audio ended at 6:16:03; resumed at 6:23:17) 21 THE COURT: We're back on the record, and I see 22 counsel approaching along with the special master. 2.3 So, John, do I turn this over to you, Mr. Hueston? 24 MR. HUESTON: Yes.

All right.

THE COURT:

- 1 MR. HUESTON: So, Your Honor, we had a discussion 2 between the parties. And everyone is in (inaudible) process. I've been told that the most expedited recompete process would 3 take 90 days to complete so --4 5 THE COURT: Explain that to me. And I'm sorry. I'm going to have to rely on someone 6 MR. HUESTON: 7 from the VA's office to explain why it takes 90 days. They say 8 that government rules require a certain period of notice it's 9 coming in, and that 90 is the shortest period that could be 10 contemplated. 11 And just state your name again. THE COURT: 12 Absolutely. Chelsea Black for the MS. BLACK: 13 record. 14 THE COURT: And move that microphone closer to you. 15 Yes, sure. Yes. So thank you. MS. BLACK: 16 So typically procurements of this nature would take 17 around 90 days. And I say that just because it's usually a 30-18 day notification. 19 So this would be publicized on contract opportunity, 20 government opportunity websites. That typically takes about 30
  - If you take the front end of the process creating the statement of work, making sure that that requirement is sound and putting that package together, getting it to contracting, that front part is about 30 days.

22

23

24

25

days.

1	And that's just contracting process and the
2	requirement, getting it to a point where, like I said, it can
3	be posted. And that's for about 30 days. So right
4	THE COURT: I
5	MS. BLACK: there about 60 days.
6	THE COURT: I think I understand now.
7	MS. BLACK: Okay.
8	THE COURT: I think I do.
9	MS. BLACK: Okay.
10	THE COURT: The point is we need about 90 days.
11	MS. BLACK: Correct.
12	And one more thing we discussed is because this
13	contract really doesn't have a great deal of profit, really any
14	profit at all, it's just basically a contractor running the
15	site and subtracting out the operating expenses
16	THE COURT: How do I know that?
17	MS. BLACK: We have the kind of the accounting
18	information in terms of the operating expenses
19	THE COURT: Oh, we have I haven't seen that
20	before. Have you, on the Plaintiffs' side?
21	MS. BLACK: Not
22	THE COURT: The VA, have you seen this before?
23	(Ms. Black/Mr. Speaker confer.)
24	MS. BLACK: It's not the audit. It's we get
25	THE COURT: You two have a conversation just so

- 1 you're in sync, because I haven't heard this information
  2 before.
  - (Ms. Black/Mr. Speaker confer.)

THE COURT: And what has to occur is no further discussion if this accounting isn't forthcoming. In other words, whatever period of time is, if there's no satisfaction on the Court's part, I terminate this. But that would give us time to make certain the veterans are employed in the meantime.

We don't -- I -- even tonight I wouldn't order a termination tomorrow or the next day. I want those veterans employed. But by the same token, this can't go on until July of next year, so I need that accounting, I need that to go back.

And if he doesn't have that accounting, do you see the parking lot owner here, speaks volumes to me. So that's why I don't know if we even have the cooperation.

MS. BLACK: I'm sorry. So what I was referencing was a monthly list of expenditures.

THE COURT: Pull that closer.

MS. BLACK: A monthly list of expenditures, so insurance, employee costs, that -- those type of expenses, we have that.

- **THE COURT:** You have that now.
- MS. BLACK: That is correct.
- **THE COURT:** Then why wasn't this accounted for

- 1 earlier? In other words, if we have these kinds of accounting
- 2 | records, what happened in -- and help me, it's not you. You've
- 3 | been magnificent. I want to state that on the record. Thank
- 4 you.
- 5 Why didn't we have that in 2022, 2023? In other
- 6 words, if we have these records, why didn't we have an
- 7 accounting?
- 8 MR. SPEAKER: Well, if I can intervene, what I think
- 9 I'm hearing is all they have is some sort of summary document
- 10 | that comes in, --
- 11 **THE COURT:** Oh.
- 12 MR. SPEAKER: -- which is not worth its weight
- 13 because we want to see the documentation and paper behind it.
- 14 That's what an accounting is.
- 15 **THE COURT:** Yeah.
- 16 MR. SPEAKER: And they did that only once. And my
- 17 understanding is they completed in 2022 one for fiscal year
- 18 2021, and not one since then.
- 19 And I'm gathering that you've relied on them to give
- 20 you summary reports of expenses, overhead, and the like on a
- 21 monthly basis.
- MS. BLACK: Correct.
- 23 **THE COURT:** So we've got a summary basically.
- MS. BLACK: Correct.
- 25 MR. SILBERFELD: Right.

1 THE COURT: That's not worth very much. MR. SPEAKER: No. THE COURT: Now, that's not directed at you. Thank 3 I want the record clear how much the Court 4 you again. 5 appreciates you. But that's not worth anything to me. 6 Okay. I want to hear from the Plaintiffs. Are you 7 agreeable to this? 8 MR. SILBERFELD: Completely. 9 THE COURT: The VA, are you agreeable to this? 10 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes. I thought of one clarifying 11 point which we did not discuss. But if -- let's -- the 12 accounting goes forward, and there are two possibilities I 13 suppose that the accounting could reveal, one is that the 14 contract is on the up-and-up, everything's great. 15 THE COURT: Yeah. 16 MR. ROSENBERG: In which case the Court may still --17 and VA may still go forward with the recompete --18 THE COURT: And by the way, I may allow a new lease for a year. If this is beneficial, I can back off my position, 19 20 Brad, if it's bringing income and employment. But right now 21 I'm suspicious. 22 MR. ROSENBERG: I'm just trying to think ahead. I 2.3 believe that contract runs June 1st to May 31st. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 So if the accounting's on the up-and-

- up, presumably VA, even if it were recompeted with a lower

  bidder, presumably the recompete would be for the new contract

  term, -
  THE COURT: Right.
- MR. ROSENBERG: -- unless potentially there as
  something revealed in the accounting that was problematic, in
  which case we would have to address that --
- 8 THE COURT: And from now on --
- 9 MR. ROSENBERG: -- at that point in time.
- THE COURT: -- every year we would have an accounting
  until and unless the Court needed this property. And what I
  have to be certain of is I don't want a wasting asset. But if
  I need that property and if it passes the methane test, then I
  want that property available, okay?
- 15 MR. ROSENBERG: Understood.

occur in parallel starting tomorrow.

No, you don't have to get up, just --

- 16 **THE COURT:** Okay. Now, Roman, are you agreeable with
- MR. SILBERFELD: I am. And just to be clear, what we contemplate is that the accounting and the recompete process
- 21 **THE COURT:** Okay. Brad, are you agreeable to this?
- 23 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes.

17

20

22

this?

- 24 **THE COURT:** -- it's fine.
- 25 MR. ROSENBERG: Yes.

```
1
              THE COURT: You're getting a lot of exercise, okay,
 2
    all right.
              John?
 3
                             (No audible response.)
 4
              MR. HUESTON:
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. Una, Will, write this up. Let me
    see this in writing. We're not leaving until tonight until we
 6
 7
    all read this so there's no catch 22, we see it in writing.
              Roman, you can help with this, or Mark or Brad or
 8
 9
    anybody else.
                   But we see this in writing so there's no
10
    disagreement. And I'm going to docket that so be certain what
11
    you're doing here because this is going to be a public record,
12
    okay?
13
              Is the chancellor here?
14
              MR. SPEAKER: Last GPS info I got was 6:31, --
15
              THE COURT: Okay.
16
              MR. SPEAKER: -- which is right now so --
17
              THE COURT: All right. We're going to --
              MR. SPEAKER: -- he's probably parking (inaudible) --
18
19
              THE COURT: -- take a recess until he's here,
20
    counsel, probably ten or 15 minutes.
21
         (Recess taken from 6:30 p.m. to 6:52 p.m.)
22
              THE COURT: Counsel, we're on the record.
23
    still on CourtSmart this evening. And I understand counsel
24
    representing UCLA, that the chancellor is here; is that
25
    correct?
```

MR. CARDOZA: Yes, Your Honor. I'd like you to meet 1 2 Chancellor --THE COURT: Please. 3 MR. SPEAKER: -- Darnell Hunt. 4 5 THE COURT: It'd be pleasure. Sir, come on up for just a moment. It's a pleasure to meet you. 6 7 MR. HUNT: Great, thank you. THE COURT: I understand you're the interim 9 chancellor. 10 MR. HUNT: That's correct. Starting --11 THE COURT: And then another person takes over in 12 January. 13 MR. HUNT: That's right. 14 THE COURT: Let me just humbly say, first of all, 15 thank you. 16 MR. HUNT: Thank you. 17 THE COURT: I want that on the record. 18 And, second, I'm sorry that you're in the position as the interim chancellor, you know, being placed in this 19 20 position. I wish either Gene Block was here or the future 21 chancellor. So I commend you, and I want to thank you for 22 coming down tonight.

spoken to your counsel. So, counsel, why don't you come up with your client for just a moment.

I know that the special master has spoken to you and

2.3

24

```
1
              And I know that there was a proposal. I think I know
 2
    what it is but I'm not quite certain. So I haven't spoken
    enough in length with Mr. Heuston yet.
 3
              MR. CARDOZA: Yeah, if I could --
 4
 5
              THE COURT: But he said you wanted to make a --
              MR. CARDOZA: -- just summarize it for you.
 6
 7
    basically four --
                         Yeah. But you said you wanted to make a
 8
              THE COURT:
 9
    representation tonight about what a proposal might be.
10
              MR. CARDOZA:
                            Yeah.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. Please.
12
                            So basically there's four provisions.
              MR. CARDOZA:
13
              THE COURT: Come closer to the microphone because I'm
14
    on CourtSmart.
15
              MR. CARDOZA:
                            There's sort of four aspects to it.
16
    The primary one is the housing planners, the people who are
17
    picking what -- how we ideally accomplish this housing
18
    objective select two acres on the site that they think would
19
    work best for what they're trying to do on the whole program.
20
              THE COURT: Come closer to the mic and you just
21
    restate that a little bit slower.
22
              MR. CARDOZA: Yeah. The housing planners select two
23
    acres on the site that's leased to UCLA that they think would
24
    best serve the program that they're trying to build with this
```

housing.

If -- and then the timeline would go based upon when they want it, what they need to do to get there, etcetera.

We would just want to have advance notice so, for example, if they select the parking lot, they say that's the place that we would develop housing, we'd want some time to transition that so that there's still parking.

THE COURT: Of this two acres.

2.3

MR. SPEAKER: Yeah. If they took the -- they said the parking lot's where we -- would be the most productive place to build housing, or wherever they pick it, we'd want to know in advance so if there was a use.

Like right now we'd want the baseball stadium and complex, the facilities that go with it, to remain intact, and so we would want to have parking somewhere where people could park or work something out and a little bit of time to do that.

When that happens, this leasing acts, the 2016 leasing act contemplated that there would be services provided while the baseball stadium use continued in sort of a ratio to the fair market value.

So we'd want the site reappraised at that time to be the site that it's -- now is so that the services obligation would have a benchmark against which.

And then the last thing that we think we should do is have a calculation of -- one thing we were curious about, we're -- haven't mastered the record yet, Your Honor, tried to

read as much of this as I could in sprinting up to this hearing.

2.3

We didn't see any assessment of the hours that are being devoted to these in-kind services versus the hours devoted to baseball but that, you know, the text of the act which refers to the predominant focus of the activities of the regents at the campus, we think that hours assessment is useful because we think it would show that what's currently being done is many more hours than baseball in terms of the activities of the UCLA, the campus.

And it's important to UCLA because we were not at this trial, we did not participate.

The inspector general, each time it examined this, found our leases comply. I know there was findings that other leases were complying in the inspector general's.

And it's important to us arriving at this juncture that going forward the full extent of what UCLA's doing at that campus is (inaudible) to the community, the public, and the orders of this courts because we're a little concerned that the record may not have reflected that. We weren't here at this trial so we don't know for sure.

But our understanding of the extent of the services and the hour commitment and so on, our understanding was it was fully compliant with the lease. So we'd like as a piece of this going forward that those kinds of data be formally

- 1 assessed and part of the solution.
- 2 **THE COURT:** Chancellor, you may not -- you may be in
- 3 | a non-enviable position in terms of information. You're busy.
- 4 I don't want any embarrassment to you.
- 5 The record here and the findings of this Court have
- 6 been in summary that the VA, McKenrick, consulted with another
- 7 VA representative and a tape was played.
- 8 And the basis of that tape was a conversation by VA
- 9 officials that there was a FOIA request actually coming from
- 10 | the Daily Bruin, from one of your reporters, and that the
- 11 | conversation involved the VA's concern that if the veterans
- 12 knew about Braca field at the time, that the veterans would
- 13 push back.
- And what occurred in summary, and I can give you the
- 15 | findings of fact but --
- MR. CARDOZA: No, no, I'm aware.
- 17 **THE COURT:** Yeah.
- MR. CARDOZA: You've --
- 19 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 20 MR. CARDOZA: We've had this conversation --
- 21 **THE COURT:** So --
- 22 MR. CARDOZA: -- earlier today.
- 23 **THE COURT:** I just want to be certain because, --
- MR. CARDOZA: Yeah.
- 25 **THE COURT:** -- first of all, I want to find that once

1 again humbly thank you, okay.

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

2.3

24

25

But then a call was placed to Tony, and I forget his last name.

MR. CARDOZA: DeFrancesco, yes.

THE COURT: By the way, I want to compliment you because he was put in a position of having to answer what any reasonable, credible person would be, and that is that the baseball field was not for the benefit of the veterans.

And it was an unenviable position watching him, who's a loyal, true Bruin, trust me, who has your best interest at heart, be put through that examination and cross examination.

So you really should be proud of the fact that anybody would have had to answer by that time without losing complete credibility, okay.

MR. CARDOZA: Yeah. Absolutely, Your Honor. That --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CARDOZA: -- was part of my point because --

THE COURT: Now, what happened was that a call was placed to Tony in the UCLA athletic department. He then went to the assistant or vice of the -- I don't know the correct

21 name, assistant athletic director.

But then a call was placed so I'm certain you understand over to UCLA. And at that time the strategic planning department was involved, the communications department involved, and the chief of staff to the chancellor, who was

- 1 Gene Block at the time. You have nothing to do with that.
- 2 Okay.
- In a sense, I found that the VA fronted UCLA in a
- 4 | sense, and you were supposed to make this announcement so that
- 5 | the veterans then didn't intercede and didn't cause a pushback
- 6 of Braca field.
- 7 And we've got a lot at stake here. I recognize that
- 8 this is expensive.
- 9 And what I understand is summary, and I want John to
- 10 repeat this to me because you had the actual conversation, is
- 11 that there is -- are two acres being offered that you would
- 12 choose in the future for development.
- 13 MR. CARDOZA: Those who are -- not us, those who are
- 14 deciding what's best for housing, which is not us.
- 15 **THE COURT:** And would that be?
- 16 MR. CARDOZA: The VA and the Plaintiffs I think in
- 17 | conjunction.
- 18 **THE COURT:** So they would choose two of the --
- 19 MR. CARDOZA: Yeah.
- 20 **THE COURT:** -- ten acres.
- MR. CARDOZA: That's just because we're not involved
- 22 to the same degree as the other parties in this whole housing
- 23 program that everyone's been --
- 24 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 25 MR. CARDOZA: -- spending the day talking about.

THE COURT: Now, you'll never understand my position, but my position is that the VA has in the past -- and I think we're reaching a better accommodation. I think we're actually going to be able to maybe work together on this.

2.3

But in the past there's been a claim that various pieces of property, whether it's temporary supportive housing or long-term supportive housing, were off the books in a sense, that for a number of reasons there wasn't land available for either or both.

And what that's caused is that the Court needs to have as much property as available because lo and behold we ran into methane problems in a park called Barrington Park that was unexpected.

And so the less the Court has to offer to Mr. Soboroff, raise your hand, and Mr. Johnson, and the parties over here, the more I'm constrained in terms of trying to make certain that 1800 veterans are housed with long-term supportive housing, or 750 or some lesser amount. And that's still up in the air.

So the more the VA has told me in the past that we don't have property, the more I'm pressing in now on Brentwood or UCLA. And that's the unenviable position you're in. And the veterans come first here. It's their land, period.

MR. CARDOZA: Yeah, absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, --

```
1
              MR. CARDOZA:
                           And that's why we're trying to -- our
 2
    proposal is focused --
 3
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. CARDOZA: -- on the property availability.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Now, this is going to --
              MR. CARDOZA: All I'm saying is --
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Yeah.
              MR. CARDOZA: -- others are better positioned than us
 8
 9
    to say --
10
              THE COURT: Okay.
11
              MR. CARDOZA: -- how to utilize it, how to take that
12
    property --
13
              THE COURT:
                         Yeah.
14
              MR. CARDOZA: -- and run with it. That's all.
15
                         Some place in my hazy memory I recall
              THE COURT:
16
    UCLA purchasing some land in Palos Verdes. And you won't know
17
    anything about this in a moment so this will catch you a little
18
    bit by surprise. You don't need to comment.
19
              So, Don, would you take the lectern, and John if need
20
    be, and would you disclose some independent research you've
21
    done for the special master that's come to my Court attention
22
    about the purchase of UCLA property in the 1970s and 1980s?
2.3
              And so by background, your stadium was built in 1988.
24
    I think that we're going to find that there were 22 acres
25
    available at that time in some videotapes we're going to show
```

1 you.

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

22

So let's just begin, Don, with what you discovered and conveyed to the special master and to me.

And by the way, this is an incredible piece of property. And I know you have two pieces of property, one I'm going to call South Bay, which is a kind of development.

And then we've got what I'm going to represent to you appears to be 22 acres, plus another contiguous 13 acres -- I'm sorry, 12 acres.

So, Don, why don't you take John Hueston and me once again and our -- all of our parties through what you found.

MR. SPEAKER: Sure. So I went out and looked at the property. I also then went and ordered a property profile and a counter assessor of that location of the UCLA South Bay campus.

There was two parcels built or bought, parcel 7564242, which was the first one bought. It was purchased in January 14th of 1976.

19 **THE COURT:** Now how much acreage was that, Don?

MR. SPEAKER: What's that?

21 **THE COURT:** How much acreage was purchased?

MR. SPEAKER: And acreage is 20,874.

THE COURT: How many acres?

MR. SPEAKER: So it's 20 -- over 20 acres. It's

25 | almost 21 acres.

```
1
              THE COURT: And it was represented to me, and I
 2
    haven't been out there yet but I'm about to go out there, that
 3
    you have about 21 acres purchased in 1974. And I think the
    price, Don, you told John Heuston and me was 1.2 million.
 4
 5
              MR. SPEAKER:
                            This was -- it's 1.8 million.
 6
              THE COURT: Okay. Now hold on. Let's freeze it
 7
    there; 1974, our stadium isn't --
                           Seventy-six.
              MR. SPEAKER:
              THE COURT: -- built at UCLA -- 1970 what?
10
              MR. SPEAKER:
                            Six.
11
                          Nineteen seventy-six, our stadium isn't
              THE COURT:
12
    built at UCLA yet. We've got 22 acres in Palos Verdes, okay.
              Now when's the next purchase, Don?
13
14
              MR. SPEAKER: Okay. So the -- so on that, so it was
15
    bought on 1976, January, and then they built on 1991 39,451
16
    square feet of building.
17
              THE COURT: But I want to know the acreage, Don.
18
              MR. SPEAKER:
                            And then so on the second one, that one
19
    was purchased -- it was hard to paper trail because it looked
20
    like it was bought on 1998, but it looks now that Marymount
21
    College bought it and then sold it to Regent of the University
22
    of California on January 25th, 2023.
2.3
              THE COURT: Okay. Now, --
24
              MR. SPEAKER:
                            And that acreage is 12 acres, 12.8 or
25
    12.9 --
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. MR. SPEAKER: -- acres, almost 13 acres. 2 THE COURT: Now what -- you can check in the future 3 if you choose to is we believe that this is contiquous 4 5 property. 6 In other words, believe in 1976 we've got 22 acres in 7 Palos Verdes -- and we're going to show you a couple videos in 8 a moment. Don sent me 70 of them. I'm going to show just two 9 tonight, okay? 10 MR. SPEAKER: Yeah. 11 THE COURT: And then there's a contiguous piece of 12 property we believe purchased. And what was the year again, 13 The second piece of property, what year? 14 MR. SPEAKER: It was on January 25th, 2023. 15 THE COURT: Okay. So that 13 acres wasn't available 16 to UCLA when the stadium was built in 1988, correct? 17 MR. SPEAKER: I believe that stadium was built in 1981. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Now, --20 MR. SPEAKER: And this was --21 THE COURT: -- we know therefore that this land was 22 available -- and could you play the first of a couple tapes? 2.3 And let's watch this together. 24 Well, if you can operate the machinery here.

play it. And we have volume so you can turn up the volume on

1 this. Okay, now play it. 2 MS. SPEAKER: Can they see the screen? THE COURT: Can you see the screen, all of you folks? 3 (No audible response.) 4 5 (Court/Ms. Speaker confer.) 6 So let's play the first tape. And by the way, there's 70 of these so --7 8 MS. SPEAKER: Yeah, I don't know which one. (Pause) THE COURT: They're doing something down there 10 11 (inaudible). 12 (Court/Ms. Speaker confer.) 13 THE COURT: And this isn't on your screen yet, is it? 14 MS. SPEAKER: No. 15 THE COURT: Let the record reflect there's one judge 16 and three law clerks trying to solve this. Okay. You ready? 17 All right. Let's play this. 18 (Video played from 7:09 p.m. to 7:09 p.m.) 19 THE COURT: Okay. And let's put the next one up. 20 (Video played from 7:09 p.m. to 7:09 p.m.) 21 THE COURT: Now, those are only five-second clips so 22 they could be, you know, exported to both John Hueston and me. 2.3 But if these records are correct, it meant in 1976 that UCLA had 22 acres available for a stadium that was built 24 25 in 1981 or after.

So value choice was made at that time to go over to the VA, probably because it's close to campus and you want your baseball team.

2.3

But this is undeveloped property. And it's not my concern how UCLA develops this. But I do know now, subject to your checking on the Court, that at least 22 acres was available and a value choice was made not to use this property.

So when I'm told we don't have property, I respect your decision as counsel and the chancellor. But I know now that we had 22 acres available and a value choice was used not to use it, to take the veterans' property instead.

MR. CARDOZA: Yeah, understood, Your Honor.

The team was playing at a -- at the same location going back to the sixties, and then the site it's on was developed into the Jackie Robinson Stadium in the eighties.

And maybe they could have gone elsewhere.

I think these were the tradeoffs and judgment calls

Congress was balancing when it got to the 2016 leasing act

because it had to deal with that historical record, but then it

had to deal with the fact that you had this facility fully

built out there that serves -- its right by the Westwood

campus, there's a reason to keep that going.

And what Congress concluded was there's a win-win in allowing the baseball stadium to go forward while having these three million a year in services that UCLA's been providing.

It's thousands of veterans receive benefits as a result of that kind of tradeoff that Congress struck in the leasing act.

And they range the spectrum. It's a legal clinic, it's wellness, it's a full spectrum of services that really brings -- you know, when we're talking about trying to get this back to being a community, it's not just housing but the whole thing, what UCLA, the partnership between UCLA and the VA is a really important part of that. It brings so much more in the services.

THE COURT: How about --

MR. CARDOZA: And so --

**THE COURT:** -- the veterans?

MR. CARDOZA: (No audible response.)

**THE COURT:** How about the veterans?

MR. CARDOZA: Exactly. These services are legal assistance to veterans, including housing assistance. As you know, veterans unfortunately suffer more citations and things like that, they get them dismissed; an entire health and wellness program for not just the veterans but their families.

And the full range of services, which I'm not sure if the most recent evidence made it into this court trial. This last year, the in-kind services were 2.9 million, which is considerably above the number that's apparently made it into evidence in this court.

1 And that's the thing that preserving this lease and 2 this arrangement, it's much more than a lease. partnership between an institution that has a lot to offer 3 veterans but -- and but veterans on whose land the stadium has 4 5 been built. 6 It's a good tradeoff from our perspective. 7 We understand the need to make land available, so that was where the offer of our two acres are. But we do think 8 9 the --THE COURT: Well, just a moment. Chancellor, --10 11 MR. CARDOZA: -- other pieces of it --THE COURT: -- if you want to be seated any time, 12 13 there's no reason for you to, you know, --14 MR. HUNT: Thank you. THE COURT: Counsel can come back if we have 15 16 questions but I don't want you to have to stand there, okay? 17 MR. CARDOZA: And so we think this very productive 18 and beneficial tradeoff that Congress struck, with these 19 additions, would give it -- would continue -- because it's also 20 going in the right direction. 21 I know there were concerns at trial about the level 22 of staffing and so on in some of the clinics in prior years. 2.3 That's been augmented. 24 If you look at the most recent numbers, it's gone up. 25 The services program is a very robust and thriving and growing

1 partnership.

And kind of throwing a grenade into it right now I don't think is in the best interest of veterans, your honors (sic). It's not the best thing for the veterans.

And the priority is not the baseball team and the baseball program. But those kids are innocent.

They don't need to be unnecessarily hampered or so on when the benefits to the veterans are prioritized as they are under the deal Congress struck in the leasing act, as they are under this proposal.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's hear from the respective parties. I think the VA may maintain your position, they may not. But I want to hear from the Plaintiffs because they certainly haven't maintained that position.

MR. SILBERFELD: Roman Silberfeld, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Little bit louder.

MR. SILBERFELD: Sure. I haven't heard anything tonight in the last half hour which changes not my view but the view that the predominant focus of the activities of the regents on the campus is baseball. It remains baseball.

The provision of services has been spotty at best.

And when I recount the fact that at trial the evidence was admittedly that the predominant focus was baseball, I don't know that we can get past that, candidly, with respect to this

25 lease.

- 1 That's all I have.
- 2 THE COURT: If the VA has --
- 3 MR. SPEAKER: (Inaudible)
- 4 THE COURT: Just a moment, counsel, just one moment.
- 5 If the VA has a position, so be it. But I'm not
- 6 requiring that. If you want to remain silent, you can. If you
- 7 want to state a position, Brad, --
- MR. ROSENBERG: I'll just note two things.
- 9 In terms of the evidence that was presented at trial,
- 10 and there was evidence on UCLA's lease, we did submit the
- 11 | congressional reports. I think it's Exhibit Number 1293. Let
- 12 me double-check because I just pulled it up.
- Twelve ninety-three I believe was the most recent
- 14 | congressional reports. But you may recall we submitted a
- 15 | series of congressional reports.
- 16 And those reports, just want to highlight for the
- 17 | Court that those reports do identify the financial and in-kind
- 18 | contributions that UCLA makes, in case the Court wants to refer
- 19 to those.
- 20 I will also note that this has been an area of
- 21 ambiguity in this case as to whether Plaintiffs were
- 22 challenging the UCLA lease.
- 23 And my recollection is that Plaintiffs' counsel
- 24 during closing argument amended the complaint, or the amended
- 25 | complaint at that time to include a challenge under the

1 | fiduciary theories of UCLA's lease.

2.3

And this Court obviously took up that challenge in its decision, and also held that Plaintiffs were not challenging the UCLA lease under the APA.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, your response, please.

MR. CARDOZA: Yeah, thank you, Your Honor.

I think it's really important before the very, very significant decisions that are being contemplated that we don't make these decisions based upon a clever lawyer's ability to trip up a witness in cross examination who isn't even a party to the case, doesn't even know that the lease is at issue, etcetera.

You heard from Mr. DeFrancesco, he's extremely dedicated to this program. He's hired a staff that's primarily veterans to do this.

This legalese about predominant focus, the text of the act is the provision of services to veterans is the predominant focus of the activities of the regents of the campus during the terms of the lease.

It was explicitly the baseball stadium can continue and be the primary use of the ten acres, but the activities at the campus be the predominant focus of everything that the regent's doing.

If you measure it in hours devoted to these clinics, if you measure it in dollars, the actual dollar numbers, what's

- in the congressional record supplemented with the last year
  where it goes up to 2.9, this test is met.
- And I was very troubled in some of the discussions

  before what I -- you know, (inaudible) to this trying to figure

  out what's going on, what do people want, what's going to work

  here for a proposal, I was very troubled to hear the

  denigration of the services in that conversation, and then to

  hear it again today.
  - These are a substantial effort put in by people from all over UCLA who are passionately devoted to these veterans.

    And the way it was just described, I don't know -- I'm really concerned.

Are the thousands of people who've received these services, do they have this view? I don't think they do. The very -- all the feedback we get is that they extremely appreciative of these services.

And the whole objective of making this community more vibrant, not just the housing but the entire thing, that's what Congress -- that's why Congress ordered different provision for the regents from all other lessees, because that's what UCLA was bringing to the table.

And that's what UCLA has brough to the table. And I don't think it's right to denigrate the very diligent and passionate devotion of all the people who've contributed all of these hours to these services and the way that it was done.

And I asked Plaintiffs' counsel, so if this \$3 million of services went away tomorrow, your side doesn't care about that. And the answer was something like, no, it's not important, it's insignificant.

And that troubles me, Judge, because everything UCLA's done on this lease, they took this to heart, the predominant focus of the veterans. Their staff is dedicated to the veterans.

I understood my charging orders coming here today was the veterans are first today in this proceeding.

And this poo-pooing of the services that have been delivered and are being, I don't know, put on the chopping block here today, or I don't know what the -- what was meant by they're insignificant, they're meaningless.

I don't think we should make decisions by tripping up people on cross examination. I think we should look at the data of the true value of these services, the full volume, the hours, those things because those will tell you this is an arrangement that needs to be kept enforce.

And when we're trying to build community, collaboration between an institution like UCLA that can do so much for veterans and these veterans, throwing the kinds of grenades into that relationship that are being suggested, that's not how you build community. That's not how you build this partnership for the future.

1 So I think the -- I think it's important that Your 2 Honor enter orders that show the veterans come first, the two acres, that's an effort to do that. 3 But let's not lob a grenade into something that's, 4 5 from UCLA's perspective, working well for the veterans, at 6 least not without hearing from those veterans who are receiving 7 these in-kind services. THE COURT: Counsel, let me turn back to the 8 9 Plaintiffs for a moment and then back to the VA. 10 And I'll need you to identify yourself because we're 11 on CourtSmart. 12 MR. ROSENBAUM: Good evening, Your Honor. Rosenbaum on behalf of Plaintiffs. I want to respond to a 13 14 number of those points. 15 First of all, nobody got tripped up here. 16 Mr. DeFrancesco was the 30(b)(6) witness whom UCLA designated 17 to represent the university. That was a choice that UCLA made. 18 And quite frankly, they made a good chance because, 19 as Your Honor heard, this was an individual who was fully 20 familiar --21 THE COURT: Yeah. 22 MR. ROSENBAUM: -- with all the activities that UCLA 23 was providing on this campus for veterans. 24 Secondly, the baseball program, as Mr. DeFrancesco

testified, is the predominant focus of UCLA's -- of the

- regent's activities on that campus. It wasn't even a close question.
- 3 Everything revolved around that baseball program.
- 4 They pay their coach a million dollars through all the
- 5 benefits. They run for-profit camps. They recruit athletes.
- 6 They get donations which in fact paid for the
- 7 | infield. And there were other donations as well. That was the
- 8 predominant focus of all the activities that took place, and it
- 9 has been.
- 10 And some of those in-kind services -- perhaps you're
- 11 | not familiar with the record, sir -- was they put as their
- 12 | in-kind services the fact that they gave hotdogs and Cokes.
- 13 That number was part of that number.
- 14 They put as part of their in-kind services that they
- 15 | gave free tickets to veterans, not thousands of veterans, there
- 16 | haven't been thousands of veterans anywhere close served by
- 17 UCLA.
- 18 But they would put down to a half-empty stadium free
- 19 tickets that they gave to veterans. They put down as their
- 20 | in-kind services refrigerator magnets and caps that they gave
- 21 to them. That was part of the practice itself.
- As for the other so-called services, Mr. DeFrancesco
- 23 did testify about that. Your Honor will recall that the legal
- 24 clinic, which is resourced by professors who have no background
- 25 whatsoever in military law, that the clinic itself on the

- grounds was not even open to veterans that they could even come
- 2 | in; that it was filthy, that there were trash that was
- 3 maintained there, and that for individuals who had
- 4 disabilities, they could not even get in.
- 5 And Mr. DeFrancesco testified that when he tried to
- 6 bring that to the attention of UCLA and the VA, nothing was
- 7 done about that for all for over a year.
- 8 He also testified that with respect to -- and Your
- 9 Honor has made reference to this -- at the height of the
- 10 | pandemic, when there were veterans on San Vicente sleeping in
- 11 | tents or on the ground, and the prospect was raised, can we use
- 12 | this parking lot to have some temporary housing, at the height
- 13 of the pandemic with veterans living and dying -- and some of
- 14 | them died -- the response by UCLA was, no, because that will
- 15 | interfere with our baseball schedule.
- And as for the amount of money that is being paid
- 17 here, Mr. DeFrancesco honestly testified that the amount of
- 18 | money that was paid was "a very good deal for UCLA."
- Nothing -- I just (inaudible) \$20 million for a
- 20 parcel of property UCLA never evaluated what those ten plus
- 21 acres were worth to UCLA.
- 22 And the reality of it's when we questioned about
- 23 that, was there any other area that could possibly serve to
- 24 | serve this baseball program, a baseball program for student
- 25 athletes, the answer was there wasn't anything.

They looked in Culver City at a college that maybe they could use the baseball field, and they determined of course that they couldn't do that. This was indispensable for UCLA's baseball program.

2.3

And when the coach wanted an infield, an additional infield, the response was, sure, we're going to do that. They did it, as Your Honor pointed out, hiding it from the veterans, not letting them know about that.

If they were so open and so transparent and so concerned about the veterans, why didn't they make that public?
Why didn't they have a hearing on it? Why didn't they say we're thinking about amending the lease?

They didn't come close to that because they knew what the response of the veterans would be, and so they kept that quiet. And then they got donations which they kept for themselves that paid for that land.

And in terms of those other services, look, UCLA could give much more. That's what Mr. DeFrancesco said.

The Luskin School, which is the number eight-rated school in the country for social work, could be providing social workers. Mr. Kuhn said today those social workers could be helpful in terms of outreach to benefits.

And whatever the concern is about these baseball players, these baseball players who are student athletes, they don't come close to the value of one single veteran who has to

- 1 | sleep on the streets.
- And when I hear them say two acres, no, that's not
- 3 | the right answer. It's not two acres. It's whatever the
- 4 | veterans need to get housing.
- No one wants to put a cap on two acres. If there
- 6 | isn't land available after good faith attempts by the VA, then
- 7 | that land should be utilized.
- 8 And the argument that the inspector general blessed
- 9 this, come on. The testimony was undisputed that the inspector
- 10 general didn't know any of this.
- 11 Under the Loper (phonetic) case it doesn't matter
- 12 | anyway. But the evidence what -- the OIG didn't know any of
- 13 | that in fact going forward.
- And your legal clinic, you know what that legal
- 15 clinic did? It submitted an amicus brief to the Supreme Court.
- 16 That's a farce.
- 17 That's how they help benefits, by giving students an
- 18 opportunity to write an amicus brief. Does anyone believe that
- 19 | a single justice of the court read that brief or that it had
- 20 any advantage whatsoever?
- 21 Today -- and Mr. Hueston heard this. Today there are
- 22 veterans being evicted from property on that land. And there
- 23 are no UCLA students assisting them. Shame on that. That
- 24 | should be the first effort of any legal clinic.
- 25 Mr. Reynolds and his team spent days and days and

- 1 days fighting in court to keep individuals from being evicted
- 2 | from the permanent supportive housing. That's the bare
- 3 minimum.
- And the schedule, of course you want it measured in
- 5 hours. But how about in terms of the use of it? How valuable
- 6 is this?
- 7 Take a look at the UCLA website, its sport website,
- 8 and how they promote that baseball program and how that
- 9 | baseball program raises money for them, and how that baseball
- 10 program brings them prestige.
- If it were so easy to be somewhere else, they'd be
- 12 | somewhere else. They've got nowhere else to go.
- 13 This land -- and what are you suggesting now; that if
- 14 you get the two acres, then that's going to reduce the fair
- 15 market value? That's a boondoggle for UCLA.
- 16 And you know when we did Valentini (phonetic), UCLA
- 17 | was paying \$56,000 for that land -- or for that land each year.
- 18 And I said to a lawyer for UCLA, how about going out and seeing
- 19 | what the value actually is. And the answer was, no, we're not
- 20 going to do that.
- 21 UCLA owes so much in the -- UCLA owes the veterans
- 22 | for the use of that land. And if this land weren't so valuable
- 23 for the baseball, does anyone think that what would be done
- 24 would be done here?
- 25 Yes, there are UCLA doctors who are working on this,

- who work on this. But that's how they get their training. And that's not even part of the process itself.
- A healing garden, I don't think so. I don't think
  that's a high priority of the veterans to have a healing garden
  which isn't even tended to, a wellness center which isn't even
  dealt with.
- 7 This is serious business. This is valuable land.
  8 And the first priority should be whatever those veterans need
  9 for housing.
- And the second thing should be whatever the cost,

  whatever that value is to UCLA, that's how much should be paid

  What did they say; one percent a year inflation? I

  wish -- everybody in this room wishes inflation was only one

  percent a year.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

- It is a sweetheart deal. It is all about baseball, it's all about a baseball program. That's great, let them have it. But not at expense of the veterans. That's what a real partnership would be.
- And I am shocked and disturbed that they didn't come in here and say, let's make a fair deal, let's do a recompense in terms of what happened.
- But giving refrigerator magnets and hot dogs and Cokes, that doesn't cut it in terms of what these veterans really need.
- 25 **THE COURT:** If the VA has anything that you wish to

1 state.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

MR. ROSENBERG: Nothing further, Your Honor.

3 **THE COURT:** And, counsel, you have another 4 opportunity. I see you rise to your feet. I want to be

5 | courteous and have you heard.

6 MR. CARDOZA: We do agree on one thing for sure.
7 This is very serious business.

And I just come back to the choice that's here between are we trying to build community and a positive collaboration going forward? That's the question today.

Mistakes were made in the past without question.

Congress took that up. The tradeoff it chose, the policymakers who have the primacy over an issue like this, was the baseball stadium would continue and we'd have the services model that goes with it.

When I hear that kind of -- I'm very troubled by the sort of the state of anger and division in our country, Your Honor.

And when I hear this kind of rhetoric and conflict on a solution when we should be thinking forward in community and collaboration, it bothers me because this kind of hostility and antagonism can impair a partnership that is providing a lot to veterans.

I haven't heard what is going to deliver more to veterans than the combo that Congress chose.

Are we going to just kick them off and bulldoze the stadium out of spite because we're angry about the prestige, the salary of the coaches, all those things?

2.3

Those are part of the calculus Congress had when it said, okay, the program can continue, there's a rationale, it's right there by the campus.

These are undergrad kids, the convenience of being able to come nearby to play baseball is something we don't want to get in the way of when the veterans get a lot out of it.

That should be our focus.

I don't -- I still don't understand the denigration of the service. I don't. The thousands of people being served are being provided a lot more than what was said.

And the question to Mr. DeFrancesco where he supposedly admitted the predominant focus, that's a question of law. It's not for him to say.

The facts about what the services are provided, the hours, and the meaning of those words, that answers that question.

There were mistakes made in the past. But the progress, the additional staff, all of the additional in-kind services, all of the hours, that's what our goal should be.

Let's keep that going. Let's not lob a grenade in there. That does not help the veterans. We do agree on that. That's the top priority here today.

1 THE COURT: All right. Then the last word will be --2 I'm sorry, John, please. 3 MR. HUESTON: Question. 4 THE COURT: Just a question, counsel. Come on up. 5 MR. HUESTON: Counsel, has UCLA --THE COURT: Would you make sure that mic's on and a 6 7 little louder? 8 MR. HUESTON: It may be off. There it is. 9 THE COURT: There we go. 10 MR. HUESTON: Has UCLA recently, in the last six 11 months to a year, conducted a third party assessment of the 12 value of the lease on the VA land? 13 MR. CARDOZA: I don't believe in the last six months. 14 But we'd be amenable to that. 15 MR. HUESTON: Okay, so you haven't. But you'd be 16 amenable to conducting one in conjunction with the Plaintiffs 17 to --18 Yes, yeah. MR. CARDOZA: 19 MR. HUESTON: -- assess what the --20 Yes, absolutely. MR. CARDOZA: -- current fair market value --21 MR. HUESTON: 22 MR. CARDOZA: The current fair market value. 23 -- of that lease is. MR. HUESTON: 24 MR. CARDOZA: Yeah, absolutely.

I think that would be a helpful point

MR. HUESTON:

1 of information.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

- MR. CARDOZA: Yeah.
- THE COURT: Okay. First of all, let me compliment

  you in terms of your university, and that is you're the number

  one public university in the country.
- Number two, for the present chancellor, my apologies.

  You have nothing to do with this and here you are in Federal

  Court.
  - You're not the person I'd like to speak to. I'd like to speak to Gene Block quite frankly because it's obvious that this went to the highest levels when you have the chief of staff for the chancellor on a phone call.
  - And somebody in the chancellor's office, if not Gene Block, or somebody else had to know about this attempt to avoid a FOIA request, and they were going to shut the veterans out from having input.
  - And the sad thing about this is the specter of UCLA being asked to donate a literally vacant parking lot -- counsel, have a seat for a moment. You've had your discussion.
  - A literally vacant parking lot and veterans being denied a vacant parking lot during COVID. I don't know how to phrase that but I can't think of anything more inhumane or colder.
- It has nothing to do with you, chancellor. I want to make that clear.

- That isn't the public university that I think we all cherish.
- Second, before you got here I've set a precedent that

  I'm not going to trade out with Brentwood School five acres of

  land for 17 acres.
  - And I respect the position you've taken through your counsel. But I'm going to ask you to go back and rethink this because it may be an opportunity. But I'm not trading out two acres of land for ten acres.
- I don't know how many veterans you have there but
  maybe there's a possibility in the future for veterans housing.
  I don't know. I'm talking out loud. Maybe there's a way to
  turn this around into a plus.
- But I'm deeply concerned -- and, John, do you have any further comment?
- MR. HUESTON: No, Your Honor.

6

- 17 **THE COURT:** Do you have any further comment?
- 18 MR. SPEAKER: No, Your Honor.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Do you have any further comment?
- MR. SPEAKER: No, Your Honor.
- 21 **THE COURT:** All right. The order of this Court is as
- 22 follows and will be docketed tonight.
- Two weeks ago -- and I emphasize that because there
  could have been an intervening when I sent out notice inviting,
  never ordering, you to come in.

And when I find myself in the position today is going down a road I really didn't plan, I thought minimally before I came in there would have been discussion between all of the parties in terms of the parking lot, Bridgeland Oil, the UCLA facility, the Brentwood School.

2.3

And yet I walk into court today in a much more let's say vigorous discussion than I ever planned. I would have planned, and I think John will represent the same thing, that I was going to lay back today and simply wait for all of you.

But nobody in the last two weeks got together, and so therefore we've had a pretty strenuous hearing today.

And UCLA could have intervened or not. That was UCLA's choice. Brentwood School could have intervened.

So two weeks ago I invited UCLA's chancellor to today's hearing on injunctive relief. I make a record that the chancellor has attended this hearing -- and the Court's very appreciative -- upon request from this Court.

But the chancellor's office has historically been involved in discussions with the VA regarding the stadium in an attempt to shield the VA from scrutiny.

After hearing this proposal and some indication from the special master of what this proposal was regarding how the land on which UCLA's baseball stadium and the Branca practice field might be repurposed, this Court's find that it's inadequate.

1 But the door's not closed. In other words, the 2 door's open for future discussion. 3 But -- I emphasize again I appreciate the chancellor's appearance and effort in this regard. 4 5 But hereby -- UCLA is hereby enjoined from accessing the UCLA baseball fields and the facilities on the West L.A. VA 6 7 campus until and if UCLA proposes a position on how the ten acres it currently occupies can be put to the principal benefit of the veterans. 10 The VA is ordered by this Court to cordon off and 11 prevent any use of the UCLA baseball stadium and practice field 12 until further notice of this Court. 13 And that will take effect at 12:00 noon tomorrow. Ι 14 will be there at 3:00 o'clock to make certain this (inaudible). 15 I leave that to the VA. But if you don't do that, contempt 16 proceedings will follow. 17 Goodnight, and we'll see you at 9:00 o'clock 18 tomorrow. MR. SPEAKER: Your Honor, just quick question 19 20 regarding --21 THE COURT: Counsel, --22 MR. SPEAKER: -- your order on --23 THE COURT: Counsel, goodnight. We'll see you tomorrow at 9:00

24

25

o'clock. And we'll order this docketed on the public docket.

## CERTIFICATION

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

on / Judson

September 27, 2024

Signed

Dated

TONI HUDSON, TRANSCRIBER