1 2 3 4 5	UMHOFER, MITCHELL & KING LLP Matthew Donald Umhofer (SBN 206607) Elizabeth A. Mitchell (SBN 251139) 767 S. Alameda St., Suite 221 Los Angeles, California 90017 Telephone: (213) 394-7979 Facsimile: (213) 529-1027 mumhofer@umklaw.com emitchell@umklaw.com		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10		I	
11	LA ALLIANCE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, <i>et al</i> .,	Case No. 2:20-CV-02291-DOC-KES	
12	Plaintiffs,	Assigned to Judge David O. Carter	
13	V.	Assigned to Judge Duvid C. Cuitei	
14	CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.,	NOTICE OF FILING PRESENTATION	
15	CITT OF LOS IN (GLLES, et al.,		
16	Defendants.	Before: Hon. David O. Carter Courtroom: 10A	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

NOTICE OF FILING PRESENTATION

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF **RECORD:** PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to the Court's request, LA Alliance for Human Rights hereby files the presentation made by Matthew Donald Umhofer at the hearing on October 16, 2024. Dated: October 17, 2024 Respectfully submitted, /s/ Elizabeth A. Mitchell UMHOFER, MITCHELL & KING, LLP Matthew Donald Umhofer Elizabeth A. Mitchell Attorneys for Plaintiffs



Nov. 21, 1985: A sleeping man pulls himself into fetal position for extra warmth before dawn on cold sidewalk on Hill Street in downtown Los Angeles. (Ken Lubas / Los Angeles Times)



LA Alliance v. City & County of Los Angeles enforcing the settlement agreements

1 the city's proposed violation

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into this 0th day of Oribber 2020 by and be and the roles, it (i) peo underp ("Deep to the content of th

City of Los Angeles, and (iii) other vulnerable PEH within the City of Los Angeles. COUNTY and CITY will be referred to herein individually as "PARTY" and together as "PARTIES."

PARTIES agree to the following for purposes of this MOU only:

I. TERM OF MOU

2020 Roadmap Settlement: +6,700

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
~

10

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement is entered into by and between the following Parties:

1) Plaintiffs LA Alliance for Human Rights, Joseph Burk, Harry

2022: "3.1 The City agrees to create a Required Number of housing or shelter solutions"

District of California, Case No. Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES (the "Action")

naming the City and the County of Los Angeles (the "County") as co-defendants

2020 Roadmap Settlement: +6,700

2022 City Settlement: +12,915

Total New Beds: +19,615

2020 Roadmap Settlement: +6,700 -2,500

2022 City Settlement: +12,915

Total New Beds: +19,615

2020 Roadmap Settlement: +6,700 -2,500

4,200

2022 City Settlement: +2,500 +12,915 +10,415

Original Proposed

2020 Roadmap Settlement: +6,700 4,200 2,500

2022 City Settlement: +12,915 10,415

Total New Beds: +19,615 17,115

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
0	

10

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement is entered into by and between the following Parties:

1) Plaintiffs LA Alliance for Human Rights, Joseph Burk, Harry

2022: "3.1 The City agrees to create a Required Number of housing or shelter solutions"

ral

District of California, Case No. Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES (the "Action")

naming the City and the County of Los Angeles (the "County") as co-defendants

city is not creating the required number of additional beds—it is reducing the number of beds created

Original Proposed

2020 Roadmap Settlement: +6,700 4,200

2022 City Settlement: +12,915 10,415

Total New Beds: +19,615 17,115

why?

because the county refuses to continue to fund Roadmap beds

MR. SZABO: I would prefer to speak because I have notes. These are just my notes. But I will -- I will identify some key numbers.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So as we're looking at our financing plan for the remaining 4,252 beds, as I said, I wanted to take just a minute to talk about the Freeway agreement that -- and again, as the Court knows, we had an obligation to establish 6,700 beds. The County contributed for a period of the five years, the period of the agreement, the settlement, \$60 million a year to pay for those services.

9 As the Court knows, the Freeway agreement expires 10 this year, so we have received our last check from the County 11 to subsidize those services. I say subsidize because when we 12 made the agreement, the amount that the County was 13 contributing was about half of what it would cost to provide 14 the services for those beds.

So, number one, we have the expiration of the
Freeway agreement. We will not be getting any more funding
from the County for those. At the same time there is a
conversation and a process ongoing that will likely result in
a very significant increase in the bed rate.

So overnight, at the end of this fiscal year with the loss of the County 60 million and the increase of the bed rate, we could be looking at having to pay out \$150 million to add no beds, no new beds, and to provide no additional services just to keep open what we have open.

So we have a financing plan for 1,752 beds, and I would be making that recommendation to the council. We have identified the funding for that. For the remaining 2,500, our proposal would be to extend 2,500 of those 4,100 Freeway agreement beds under the new regime.

So our request to the Court would be to allow our final calculation of that 12,000 to include preserving 2,500 of our Roadmap beds in addition to the master leasing, the tiny homes, the congregate shelter, and the long-term agreements in the motel.

MS. HASHMALL: Your Honor, so I am hearing the

details of Mr. Szabo's plan that it sounds like he is working

up to present to his council and his mayor. I obviously need

to learn more about that, and I look forward to seeing that

plan in more detail.

L2

L3

L 4

L5

L 6

L7

L8

The agreement between the City and the County was a term of years, so it was always contemplated that it would expire. But I think, as Matt has identified in his proposal, if he is allowed to move those beds to his agreement with the City and the plaintiffs to which the County is not a party, the County would continue to provide resources for those beds.

So I don't think it's an issue of why is the County

stopping. The County has always been committed to providing

resources and, it sounds like under this proposal, would

still be providing resources. It would just be in a

23 different framework.

22

9 As the Court knows, the Freeway agreement expires 10 this year, so we have received our last check from the County 11 to subsidize those services. I say subsidize because when we 12 made the agreement, the amount that the County was 13 contributing was about half of what it would cost to provide 14 the services for those beds.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH REVISED DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH / LOS AMBILE HOMELES BEFORES AUTHORITY REPRESENDED AUTHORITY PROCESSAND

her following (III) programs participations for the Dissipations of Health Securious (1995), Dispations of III on (2004), and the Text Analysis minimises Services Analysis (Juddis), Similaries Introduction (III) of the III of the I

AREA IN Programs. External Biology recently for Worters, External Bridge Hosping for Cities Adults (togge Housing for Persons Eusting Justice Institutions)

WHERE
the respec

WHERE
June 202
its last pa

WHERE City func towards RULES ELECTIONS INTERCOVEDNIMENTAL DELA

"the City Council urges the Board of Supervisors to direct their departments to cover the full cost to operate and service all City beds and units created before and after the Roadmap agreement"

why we need an evidentiary hearing:

- does the city's proposal violate their settlement agreement?
- does the county's refusal to fund beds violate their settlement agreement?

city officials

supervisors

councilmembers

county officials

Why won't the county continue funding for Roadmap beds?



Nov. 21, 1985: A sleeping man pulls himself into fetal position for extra warmth before dawn on cold sidewalk on Hill Street in downtown Los Angeles. (Ken Lubas / Los Angeles Times)

