UNITED	STATES D	ISTRICT	COURT
CENTRAL	DISTRICT	OF CAL	IFORNIA
(WESTERN	DIVISION	- LOS	ANGELES

) CASE NO: 2:22-cv-08357-DOC-KS JEFFREY POWERS, ET AL,) Plaintiffs, CIVIL)) Los Angeles, California vs. DENIS RICHARD MCDONOUGH, Monday, October 28, 2024 ET AL, (3:10 p.m. to 4:37 p.m.) (4:58 p.m. to 5:37 p.m.)) Defendants.

HEARING RE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

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

APPEARANCES: SEE PAGE 2

Court Reporter: Recorded; CourtSmart

Transcribed by: Exceptional Reporting Services, Inc.

P.O. Box 8365

Corpus Christi, TX 78468

361 949-2988

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

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs: ROMAN M. SILBERFELD, ESQ.

Robins Kaplan

2121 Avenue of the Stars

Suite 2800

Los Angeles, CA 90067

310-552-0130

AMELIA PIAZZA, ESQ.

Public Counsel

610 S. Ardmore Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90005

213-385-2977

For Defendants: BRAD P. ROSENBERG, ESQ.

U.S. Department of Justice

1100 L Street NW Washington, DC 2005

202-514-3374

Also present: CHELSEA BLACK

RAYMOND CARDOZO

TOBIN DALE
RANDY JOHNSON
ROB MERCHANT
JEFFREY POWERS
JONATHAN SANDLER
STEVE SOBOROFF

MR. SOBOROFF: Parcel Magenta B, the UCLA parking lot. We were pleasantly surprised at the extent and the ease to which utilities will be available to the homes, the temporary homes, on the UCLA parking lot. When you stand there, you look and say, well, gee, is that all they can put on

22

23

24

have air filtration.

Now all those things cost money and take time, but our view is that that would be a better answer than trying to relocate the recycling center, if the Court would consider it.

And these units are intended to be temporary.

MR. SOBOROFF: The existing trees up against the freeway, and the existing noise buffer up against the freeway, if we were to take an additional -- if we were to change from 500 feet to 350 or 400 feet, I believe that you could get a series of experts that would say that there is no harm to someone living on that line in that specific location.

THE COURT: I don't know enough to know if there might be exceptions. For instance, it may be that an elevated freeway is far different than ground level.

MR. SOBOROFF: Maybe.

THE COURT: It may be that a wall is sufficient. I just know in the past settlements, generally, after listening to Carol Sable and Brooke Weitzman and the ACLU, that we all had come to the conclusion that the life expectancy of a homeless person was anywhere from 20 to 23 years less than a non-homeless person.

The second is I was told that three things were killing homeless people primarily. First of all, initially, five, six years ago, heart attack. Second, a close second, was narcotics. That's switched, by the way, now. The third was, believe it or not, just getting hit by a car. And that's why I

- disagreement about any time I move to South Campus. But I'm
- 2 trying to take the paved parking lots first, because I don't
- 3 | have to wait for paving. And in many of them, I'm already
- 4 | assuming that we've got lights as we do in 4A. And I know
- 5 Mr. Braverman wanted to move everything north. I don't see how
- 6 that's possible.
- 7 You've taken, by stipulation, Lot 5 away from me, and
- 8 | if you hadn't stipulated, I would not only be in Lot 5, I would
- 9 be paving onto that great lawn, including that parking lot. So
- 10 by stipulation, I'm listening to you now, but I may reverse
- 11 that decision.
- So I'm telling you right now, I'm staying with you on
- 13 | Lot 5, because the domiciliary being too close. But when I'm
- 14 | done with 4A and 4B, or 4A, now I'm starting to look at unpaved
- 15 parcels, right?
- MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, sir.
- 17 **THE COURT:** And that's why I asked the sequence of
- 18 | what you wanted. So when I moved to my unpaved parcels, have
- 19 you had a discussion, Brad, Rob, have you had a discussion
- 20 about, and not that you're stipulating to this, just a
- 21 | preference, let's say, so you're not bound by me coming back
- 22 and saying you agreed to this, okay? But is there a
- 23 preference, and if so, where does the UCLA Baseball Stadium lie
- 24 on this preference?
- 25 MR. SOBOROFF: Judge, the mandate for 106 units,

```
13
1
    which is needed to save people's lives immediately --
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Right.
 3
              MR. SOBOROFF: -- is a difficult mandate when we keep
 4
    having all these issues on all the easy parcels.
 5
              THE COURT: You're going to have an issue, I promise
 6
    you --
 7
              MR. SOBOROFF: On everything.
              THE COURT: -- from the VA or somebody on any parcel
    you choose.
10
              MR. SOBOROFF: But if you were to tell us now, start
11
    looking at some of the unpaved parcels on the North Campus --
12
              THE COURT: That's exactly what I'm telling you to
13
    do. That's why I asked for a sequence now of the unpaved
14
    parcels. That was clear in my last order. What is your
    sequence in the unpaved parcels? Because one of those is the
15
16
    UCLA Baseball Field --
17
              MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, it is.
18
              THE COURT: -- and if we're not using it right now,
19
    then Mr. Cardozo and I may have, you know, some good news.
20
              MR. SOBOROFF: I would think, and I'm going to turn
21
    this over to Randy to give a real granular summary of what we
22
    found utility-wise. But we'd have to go back --
2.3
                          No, no, just 1, 2, 3, 4.
              THE COURT:
24
              MR. SOBOROFF: -- out there with the same people and
25
    pick which site is the easiest.
```

```
1
    you're placing the next best option as the baseball stadium or
 2
    it's the least best option. And that's what Mr. Cardozo needs
    to know also, because right now we're not using it. And I
 3
    don't want to be surprised with one of you saying if you do
 4
 5
    want to use it, then I think both Mr. Cardozo and I need to
 6
    know that and know why.
 7
              Now remember, folks, if you give me 5, I'm going to
    go on from 5 and start paving, because I've got 5 and I've got
    to cross the street, and I'm going to expand that very rapidly,
10
    so fair warning, which would be good, but each of you chose not
11
    to put 5 on the table last time.
12
         (Pause)
13
              THE COURT: Mr. Cardozo, bear with us. If you need
    to use a restroom or get something, I won't go on until I see
14
         So if you want to -- this could take one minute, it could
15
16
    take 30 minutes.
17
              MR. CARDOZO: Thanks, Your Honor. I'm fine.
18
              THE COURT: As long as you're within hearing shot, if
19
    you want to do something and you can hear us all, I won't go
20
    further without you. Okay?
21
              MR. CARDOZO: Great.
                                    Thank you.
22
              THE COURT: In fact, I may get up and wander around.
23
    So you might want to stretch also for a moment. Okay?
24
         (Pause)
```

Folks, can I give you a little bit of

```
1
              THE COURT: Yeah, all of you know where that is.
 2
    Okay. Now I've got a lawn there also. Between human beings
    and a lawn, quess what? My choice is real easy. That lawn
 3
 4
    goes.
 5
              So, Mr. Soboroff, I'll take that into your equation,
    because if I start paving that lot south, and you've got a
 6
 7
    beautiful picture of that. Everybody know what we're talking
 8
    about? I think all of you do.
 9
              MR. SOBOROFF: Yeah.
10
              THE COURT: Yeah. And right across the way, if we
11
    take Lot 5 and we start paving, we've got a lot of room over
12
    there.
13
              MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, sir. The only mistake I made is
14
    that Eisenhower has to -- we can't put parking in the
15
    Eisenhower area. I was wrong. I'll admit it. That because
16
    of -- even if the entrance is never open, it's got to be there
17
    for fire access.
18
              THE COURT: There's no problem. You don't have to.
19
    There's a gate at Eisenhower. It remains closed for emergency
20
    vehicles, et cetera. I still have a huge parking area --
21
              MR. SOBOROFF: Yes, you do.
22
              THE COURT: -- towards Barrington and San Vicente.
23
    And if I am going to get involved with all of you folks in
24
    terms of 5, then it seems to be economical to go across the
25
    street and continue to pave, that partially paved parking lot,
```

All right.

That would be a great start.

25

moment.

```
Now, Brad, do you want to --
```

MR. ROSENBERG: This is Brad Rosenberg from the Department of Justice on behalf of the federal defendants. I appreciate Mr. Soboroff's effort to pre-but some of what I am about to explain to the Court.

And let me start with two or three big picture issues. Number one, regarding the square footage of the units, 450 square feet.

THE COURT: 400.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

MR. ROSENBERG: My understanding is that they are 450, but whether it's 400 or 450 square feet in terms of the specs --

THE COURT: Well, let's get that straight. Ms.

Black, what is the square footage? Now, let's get that right off the bat. How big are they? I heard they were 390 to 400.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 380.

THE COURT: 380. They're 380.

MS. BLACK: Let me verify. I'm pulling --

19 **THE COURT:** Yeah, verify that for us. Brad, just a

20 moment. Let's make sure we're all on the same page.

Mr. Cardozo, in just a moment I'm going to ask the critical question, and that is, are we getting to the stadium, you know, in the next baseball season or not? So hold on for a second.

25 (Pause)

MR. JOHNSON: Roughly 5 by 12, 60 feet.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Please continue.

MR. ROSENBERG: So, Brad Rosenberg from the

4 Department of Justice. That goes to the point that I was

5 trying to make. If the units could be shrunk, that would allow

6 for the placement of more units. And the relevant square

7 | footage for that analysis is the overall square footage,

8 | including the porch, because the porch would be part of this

9 unit.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

And if you're looking at a set amount of land and you're trying to figure out how many units you can fit, obviously the porch needs to be part of that equation. So one method by which the court could work its way through this issue would be to have VA procure smaller units.

THE COURT: Now, just a moment. Is there a difference in cost if the porch was taken out? And number two, if the porch was taken out, you'd still want a nice community. And what I'm worried about is when you start taking out porches, are we going to have trees? Are we going to have, you know, somebody pay for this? Because if we're just taking out a porch and we're not supplanting it with a community environment, then -- now back to Brad for a moment. I want to listen to him. So think about that for a moment. Now, where do we get the money for the trees? Where do we create a nice community center for taking out porches? And does it cost less

1 or not?

MR. ROSENBERG: Maybe I could walk through the rest of my points, and that would give them an opportunity to think about what their response will be.

THE COURT: Yeah, excellent.

MR. ROSENBERG: One more point on the square footage. And I think it's important to keep in mind, what is the overall goal for the Court here? The overall goal, as we've understood it, is to provide temporary housing. But the square footage of these units rivals the square footage of permanent housing units. And the mission that the Court is trying to accomplish should drive, ultimately, whatever it orders VA to do in terms of procurement, rather than starting with a unit, saying that it looks nice, and then letting that drive the decision-making process.

But on that point, and not to get lawyerly for a minute, I do need to be clear, and as I've said during our many hearings since September 25th or so, the government continues to object to the Court's underlying decision on the merits, as well as the forms of injunctive relief that it has entered. And its discussion of the square footage of these units, or any other issues relating to the placement of these units, obviously, is subject to our objections to the Court entering any form of relief.

notice of appeal, it's our position that the Court now lacks jurisdiction to enter any additional injunctive relief, and can only enforce the injunctions that it's already entered.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSENBERG: With those objections in mind, I did want to discuss some of the other issues that my good friend,
Mr. Silberfeld --

THE COURT: Let's freeze with that for just one moment for you folks on the defense side.

Internally, you may decide how you want to guide the Court, because there may be an opportunity to convert these from what we're calling temporary modulars to permanent supportive units, which would count against our 1,800. And that's why any reduction to 266 square feet may just be an interim, because the cost may not be that much more going to 398, because we've got to put them on the site, hook up the utilities, all of those expenses, whether it's 266 or 400. So I kind of look at this as an opportunity for the VA to potentially move the Court to count these as supportive units if they're good units and that's why I'm trying to stay near the 400 square foot level.

It's an opportunity, I think, for you. I'm trying to stay away from 266 square feet because even if we could put more in, I don't see it happening quicker right now. And I think our utility costs, our hookups, et cetera, is something

```
1 | I'd like not to repeat if we could turn this into a decent
```

- 2 | village. So I'm happy to take away a porch, for instance, but
- 3 | if I do that, then I'd have to see a real community with trees,
- 4 you know, something that attracts veterans. If not, then I'm
- 5 going to keep that porch because I'm not sure where the money
- 6 comes from for the trees. So those are just idle thoughts.
- 7 Put them aside.
- 8 So Brad, continue.
- 9 MR. ROSENBERG: Okay. Subject to the objections that
- 10 | I just laid out, I'd like to turn to some of the particular
- 11 lots.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 13 MR. ROSENBERG: And the problem is once you start
- 14 looking at alternatives, there really aren't any good
- 15 | alternatives, at least from VA's perspective. So once you move
- 16 beyond, for example, 7 and Magenta B, you know, we discussed
- 17 and plaintiff's counsel discussed Lot 5. VA thinks that is not
- 18 an appropriate location for housing because of its location
- 19 next to the domiciliary.
- Indeed, one of plaintiff's own experts, Dr. Sharon,
- 21 | at least as of today or our understanding as of today, holds
- 22 the same view. So that's a problem. And so we would object to
- 23 | the location of housing on that lot as being inconsistent with
- 24 | the goals of helping veterans. And that has to be the overall
- 25 goal of any action that any of us take.

Lot 4A has significant challenges. It would be a terrible location for a veteran to live because it'll be in the midst of a major construction zone.

THE COURT: I'm going to imagine you're going to go through a problem with every one of these lots. And I'm going to focus back on what I'm asking.

You have a chance to participate without binding yourself and give me your best viewpoint of if you had to go through a sequence or preference, what you'd prefer, because I expect to hear a parade of horribles as to any lot that's coming up. So go through the parade of horribles first. And then I'm still going to ask you if you want to participate and lend some help, some wisdom to me, fine. If not, then

MR. ROSENBERG: Let me finish with the legitimate objections that the Government has to these particular lots because they are very real and serious concerns that the VA has.

So Lot 4A is in the midst of a construction zone. It is also, my understanding, and Ms. Black can elaborate on this, has significant challenges in terms of utilities, bringing the electricity in to that lot, for example. So that has serious, serious problems.

My understanding is that there was discussion of the lot that is by the Eisenhower Gate that is next to Lot 5. That is the planned future location for VA's police station. That

would be enormously disruptive to VA to have to scrap its plans
for the police station and, you know, begin that process anew.

You know, we think that the best solution would be to, again, subject to all these objections, is to start by shrinking the size of the units and keeping in mind what the overall mission is and see what units can be fit in, for example, on Lot 7 and Magenta B.

The problem with identifying a preference between

Lots 5 and 4A, for example, is that it's not easy to line up

all of the challenges that those lots face, and it depends to

some extent on what the Court's overall goals are. They're

both challenged in terms of housing veterans, in terms of

conflicts with the domiciliary or conflicts with a construction

site, setting aside the burdens that those lots might place on

VA's and the disruption to its plans, both under the master

plan as well as its plans to develop the South Campus.

But obviously Lot 4A has the additional challenge that it is next to where VA is planning on building a major hospital. So it's hard to figure out, under these circumstances, what the best sequencing would be. You know, we did previously indicate at the last hearing that between Lot 5 and Lot 4A, Lot 4A does not present the same conflict with VA's programs that Lot 5 does.

In other words, it doesn't present a conflict with a medical program at the domiciliary, so that is an advantage of

- 1 Lot 4A, rather. But of course then the Court would be placing
- 2 | veterans in a construction site, and there are significant
- 3 utility challenges that I believe were identified this morning,
- 4 but that are consistent with the record that we created, and I
- 5 believe Dr. Braverman testified to at trial.
- 6 THE COURT: Brad, would you put up this diagram? And
- 7 pardon the marking on it for a moment. Just put it up in the
- 8 Elmo, because I want to know each of your thoughts about 1, 2,
- 9 and 4. We haven't even discussed those yet.
- 10 And eventually I'm going to keep asking, because
- 11 Mr. Cardozo is going to ask if I don't, what about the baseball
- 12 | stadium? Where does that lie in this preference for both
- 13 parties? And if it's first, he needs to hear that. And if
- 14 it's last, he needs to hear that.
- So, Mr. Cardozo, just wait just a moment. Let's have
- 16 | them sort this out, okay? Because we haven't even talked about
- 17 three of the other lots yet.
- 18 (Pause)
- 19 **THE COURT:** Now, don't cut off Mr. Cardozo. Let's
- 20 | see if we can get this up on the screen. There we go.
- 21 I'm going to make it simple. Where does the baseball
- 22 | stadium lie in relation to Lot 4A? Is it your preference that
- 23 | the baseball stadium be raised and that we use this before Lot
- 24 A? Yes or no? I'm going to go through each one of these. Yes
- 25 or no?

```
1
    field was part of the stadium and this would be for a limited
 2
    period of time, let's say -- well, I'm not sure yet, what about
    the other two 20-acre sites? I forget, what were those again?
 3
 4
              MR. SILBERFELD: That was the lot adjacent to the
 5
    Eisenhower Gate, across from 5.
 6
              THE COURT: Okay, the lot across from 5, that's 20.
 7
              MR. SILBERFELD: Call that roughly an acre.
              THE COURT: Yeah, and the other 20?
 9
              MR. SILBERFELD: Was the Brentwood baseball field
10
    outside the gate.
11
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. Brentwood.
12
              MR. SILBERFELD: However, that's within the landfill
13
    zone. We'd have to clear that.
14
              THE COURT: And we'd have to get Barbara Farrar in
15
    here or something, the monitors.
16
              MR. ROSENBERG: VA's position is that temporary
17
    housing does not require permitting from the county. So --
18
              THE COURT: Okay, fine.
19
              MR. ROSENBERG: I mean, that's why we raised the
20
    issue of the Brentwood field. I think it's also referred to as
21
    MacArthur Field, the field that's outside the gate as a
22
    preferred location because VA has previously looked at that
2.3
    location as one that could potentially be suitable for
24
    temporary housing.
25
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
```

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SILBERFELD: However, to anticipate another

question the Court may have, we do want to register our

4 | client's opposition to allow UCLA back on the field.

5 THE COURT: Okay. And that would be as to the

6 stadium and the supporting Branca field?

MR. SILBERFELD: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Pause)

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Would you put up a tentative that we've written for just a moment? And I want to show you what my thoughts were before we came into this hearing and then out of courtesy let you push back with objections from both sides, which I expect.

And I'll read this into the record. Now, this is not a final ruling, I'm going to go slowly, we're going to have to blow this up on the screen somehow. Mr. Cardozo, somehow we're going to put you somehow with my apologies, we're not going to lose you.

MR. CARDOZO: Yeah, I can --

THE COURT: But we're going to put that document up in form so that you can read through it slowly with us, so you can also -- you're going to have to turn it the other way.

Yeah, counsel, you're going to turn it long ways. So we're going to have to shrink Mr. Cardozo so he's still on the

Upon representation by UCLA that it will pay \$600,000

```
to VA within seven days of this order and let me stop. I

didn't know the appropriate time period, 7 days, 14 days,

whatever, so I was going to talk to Mr. Cardozo about that.
```

4 The Court will allow UCLA access to the Jackie Robinson

season, regional, and/or national games.

Baseball Stadium until the end of the baseball season.

And I refer you back to UCLA's modified proposal.

The Regents of the University of California's motion to modify injunction at Docket 333 at 1, the baseball season includes any post-season use, if the UCLA baseball team is engaged in post-

This use/temporary lease shall extend no later than July 4th, 2025. Let me stop as an aside. I didn't know exactly when the baseball season left, I didn't know if UCLA made the regionals and I didn't know if there was a national play off and how long that would extend. Also July 4th is just a wonderful patriotic day.

Now, access will include the small practice field adjacent to the stadium known as Branca Practice Field and all concessions and training facilities within the stadium, because it didn't make sense to the Court to allow access to the stadium, but not the practice field, in other words, they go hand in hand if you've got a baseball team trying to make -- win games. So I didn't see separating them and it's all or nothing and they either went in or they stayed out.

After extensive deliberation with the parties, the

veteran housing on the campus.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Court does not believe that the stadium itself or practice 2 field would be used as a temporary housing location before July 4th, 2025. The stadium and practice field land may be needed 3 in the future if the VA continues to argue contrary to the Court's findings that there is insufficient space available for 5

After July 4th, 2025, the land on which the baseball facility sits may be used for housing. If UCLA is unable to reach a new agreement with the VA by that date, UCLA will lose access. So July 4th is the trigger date.

The Court further orders that the parking areas adjacent to the UCLA stadium, Magenta B and Parcel 7 remain cordoned off by the VA. I refer you to Exhibit 1. The Court has enacted an emergency declaration finding disabled and homeless veterans in immediate need of shelter. All efforts by the parties should focus on providing immediate shelter on the grounds of the campus before approaching winter conditions.

Based on representations by the parties, the two designated parking lots, Magenta B and Parcel 7 will be active construction sites within three weeks with electrical, sewage lines, and placement of modular homes immediately forthcoming.

On site assessments by experts are already underway including one this morning. Once construction has been completed and modular homes have been installed, the Court will reconsider any available parking sites or parking on these

sites for UCLA. The Court is hopeful that these discussions can take place before baseball season begins in March 2025.

Let me stop without reading further. My thought was, if we got the modulars in and we had any available parking on Magenta B or Parcel 7 that there's no reason that UCLA couldn't use it. And I didn't know about the expansion of Parcel 7 northwards towards Sunset and I didn't know if the VA was willing to open up the remaining of Parcel 7 because you almost have two remaining acres of parking where modular homes aren't going. And we can reach that in a number of ways and it would require the athletes to walk about a hundred extra feet literally.

In the meantime, the Court finds there is adequate parking across the street from these lots, as well as almost 2 acres of parking remaining on parcel 7 and more parking to the north of parcel 7, thus access to Lots Magenta B and Parcel 7 at present is for planning and facilities construction purposes only.

In other words, the parking lots are cordoned off and they remain cordoned off because I don't want to have to call you, asking permission for people to go on for site inspection. I consider these now active construction zones and they remain cordoned off, period.

The Court's encouraged by the new engagement of UCLA,
Mr. Cardozo and the veterans, but reminds the parties that in

1 any lease with UCLA the provision of services to veterans must

2 be the predominant focus of UCLA's activities on the campus

3 under the West LA Leasing Act. This is in the post-trial

4 opinion, you'll see it at Docket 302 at 48.

The true value of any lease of campus lands is the land itself. Let me repeat that. The true value, I can't emphasize this enough, of any lease of campus lands is the land itself. The greatest and most urgent use of the land is veteran housing, period.

Now, let me stop for a moment with another thought. First, you have 3 million from Brentwood School, another 2 million, but it goes into a box and it should be used locally, but this land is precious and is needed for housing. So the best use eventually of this whether it's 5 million or 20 million is irreplaceable land for veteran housing.

Now I go on and note and make some suggestions, some thoughts for both of you to think about. The Court encourages the parties and UCLA to continue discussions that have included veteran student housing, might be a possibility, or other possibilities such as the use of vacant lands owned by UCLA, including the vacant over 30 acre Palos Verdes property. And I can put up those parcels again and show you pictures of the 22 acres UCLA purchased in 1978 and another 10 acres plus that they purchased in the 1980s. There's Palos Verdes land up there, it's literally vacant and unused at the present time.

the emergency placement of modular housing.

Now, these are only suggestions. But I'm encouraging the parties to seek a holistic and long lasting resolution.

According to the VA -- accordingly the VA is ordered to continue to cordon off parking lots Magenta B and Parcel 7 for

Based on UCLA's representation of the forthgoing payment or forthcoming payment of 600,000, the Court, and I'll say tentatively because it states hereby, but hereby grants limited and interim access to the stadium at Branca Practice Field as of Tuesday, October 29th, 2024 at 12 noon.

This order advances the primary goal of housing, without unnecessarily keeping the stadium closed until the land is needed for veteran housing. The Court will have a better understanding of which available parcels are needed for housing in the coming months.

Given the emergency need for housing, all vacant parcels on the campus are being considered as potential housing sites. To maintain the availability of land for housing, the Court has precluded VA at present from entering into any long term lease of land on the campus.

This temporary restriction on long term VA leases, such as the unlawful and voided ten year leases originally challenged in this lawsuit is needed to ensure the availability of land for emergency and permanent veteran housing. Again, UCLA may lose access to the baseball facilities after July 4th,

2 2025 if the parties unable to reach settlement that complies with the West LA Leasing Act and this Court's post-trial opinion, findings of fact and conclusions of law.

I anticipate the VA would object and I stated over objections of the VA, the VA is ordered to carry out the order of this Court forthwith.

Now, a couple of other random thoughts. First of all, if one starts destruction, there's destruction on both, if I follow your guidance from the VA, money costs for Branca Field, but there's also destruction costs for -- not for 4-A, but if I move to -- can you put up that. If I move to -- I need that diagram back up. Yeah.

requires destruction of the solar panel lots and when I was weighing this weekend, when I was writing this, what's the respective costs in the immediate future and how is money being spent for destruction purposes and I don't know which is least expensive. But I can feel may cost a lot to destroy or raze, or the solar panels may cost a lot and I don't know how dependent the hospital is on the solar panels at the present time. I don't think that they are. In fact, I think it was represented these were going to be removed anyway pursuant to the hospital construction which is supposed to start next year.

So when I was writing this, my thought was, if I'm going to put money in right now, not my money, but your money,

- 1 then I'd be spending money on destroying something immediately
- 2 and I'd rather have that money go into the emergency housing,
- 3 so the next place I was going to turn after 4-A was going to be
- 4 to 1 and 2, because they're contiguous to 4-A.
- 5 So as I'm looking at 4-A with utilities, I can also
- 6 take 1 and 2 in the same area. Now, those are my initial
- 7 thoughts. So give me your thoughts.
- 8 MR. SILBERFELD: Your Honor, for the plaintiffs,
- 9 three observations about this tentative. One is, just to
- 10 restate our objection to this approach. The veterans, the
- 11 | plaintiffs class members, the plaintiffs class are opposed to
- 12 | allowing UCLA back on the field.
- 13 THE COURT: And to both fields I assume, stadium and
- 14 Branca obviously?
- 15 MR. SILBERFELD: I call it one thing, yes.
- 16 **THE COURT:** They go together.
- 17 MR. SILBERFELD: To both. We appreciate the carve
- 18 out of the parking lot because we're going to use that for
- 19 housing and the lot behind, but as to the field and the
- 20 practice field itself we are opposed.
- 21 **THE COURT:** And you haven't answered the key question
- 22 | for me because it makes a huge difference. Are we going to
- 23 | raze either of those fields, you know, in the sequence at best
- 24 before July 4th?
- 25 MR. SILBERFELD: No.

```
44
1
              THE COURT: Then if we're not going to raze them
 2
    before July 4th, in other words, if they're just sitting
 3
    there --
 4
              MR. SILBERFELD: Right.
 5
              THE COURT: -- and we're walking away from $600,000,
    which is undervalued from your perspective I understand that,
 6
 7
    grossly undervalued. But still, they're sitting there, we're
 8
    not going to raze them. Now, if you're asking me to bulldoze
 9
    them, that's a different matter and if you're telling me today
10
    that that's our first parcel that we should look at --
11
              MR. SILBERFELD: It's not.
12
              THE COURT: Okay.
13
              MR. SILBERFELD: Yeah.
14
              THE COURT: Then that's what I'm asking you, why then
    isn't this going to be accessible until July 4th, with a move
15
16
    out date on that date unless we reach a most holistic
17
    resolution?
18
              MR. SILBERFELD: Well, Mr. Cardozo and I had a
19
    discussion yesterday about a more holistic --
20
              THE COURT: Fill me in.
21
              MR. SILBERFELD: -- possible solution. Well, there's
22
    nothing to fill in at the moment.
23
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
24
              MR. SILBERFELD: But we're going to continue to have
25
    conversations I hope this week about that.
                                                 But part of the
```

```
45
 1
    opposition candidly is that the increase in rent is a pittance.
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Sure.
 3
              MR. SILBERFELD: It doesn't go to anything that
    directly benefits veterans, which was my second point and that
 4
 5
    is I hope --
 6
              THE COURT: Let's freeze on that first point. Let's
 7
    just say that you were hypothetically correct, okay? This
 8
    isn't a final resolution.
 9
              MR. SILBERFELD: Right.
10
              THE COURT: This isn't X amount of money that you're
11
    asking for or something else, this is just a wasting asset.
12
    Now just hold that thought for a moment, now you go on and
13
    think about that for a while, okay?
14
              MR. SILBERFELD: Sure.
15
              THE COURT: All right.
16
              MR. SILBERFELD: The second point, beyond our sort of
17
    general opposition to the idea is that I think the order should
18
    reflect and perhaps the VA can agree to this part, even over
19
    their own objections, is that money will stay local --
20
              THE COURT: Oh, yeah.
21
              MR. SILBERFELD: -- it will go into the lease revenue
22
    fund and at least be used locally because otherwise --
23
              THE COURT:
                          Right.
24
              MR. SILBERFELD: -- it just goes into the ether.
25
              THE COURT:
                           Agreed.
```

MR. SILBERFELD: And the third --

THE COURT: And just a moment, and by the way, let's say you were asking for 10, 15, 20, \$50 million hypothetically and I'm just throwing, you know, out idle sums.

MR. SILBERFELD: Sure.

THE COURT: That's going to go into some -- I'll joke with you, a lockbox, but I'm just joking with you. Instead of going to some place, money is not -- no matter what you're asking for eventually, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 million I'm not going to end up necessarily making a judgment call on the money, because the land may be so much more valuable for housing. Ultimately it's the housing that counts. And I'm not going to let this land run out, which may be worth hundreds of millions of dollars quite frankly and irreplaceable over a money request.

Now, Brentwood had much more to offer. They had facilities to offer. They had things that veterans could never obtain like a swimming pool, a track, weights, you know, people to help them with swimming, et cetera. Both of you thought that was a quote/unquote good deal, I do too.

MR. SILBERFELD: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Okay. But here, those things aren't available. But if we're not going to use it and we've got a move out date of July 4th, unless we can come up with something else, and I don't know if that's student veteran housing or,

```
47
1
    you know, whatever, I'm concerned it just sits there.
 2
              MR. SILBERFELD: Understood.
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. Now, I want all of you to think
    about it back there, because we'll have one more conference
 4
 5
    about this.
 6
              MR. SILBERFELD: I have --
 7
              THE COURT: Now I know you're opposed.
              MR. SILBERFELD: Your Honor, I had one more --
 9
              THE COURT: Go ahead.
10
              MR. SILBERFELD: -- point to make about the
11
    tentative. And that is, it may be implicit, but let's make it
12
    explicit, UCLA has taken steps in the Ninth Circuit and here
13
    seeking emergency or extraordinary relief from the injunction
14
    that's been imposed on it. We have no problem with their
15
    appellate rights, they can pursue their appellate rights.
16
    part and parcel of this, if they get this relief that the Court
17
    is considering giving, if they get this, our view is that they
18
    must cease these extraordinary efforts to get stays in the
19
    Court of Appeal. I think that's implicit in what they've
20
    asked.
21
              THE COURT: I can't -- how as a Judge do I ask them
22
    that though?
23
              MR. SILBERFELD: Well, they can agree to it.
24
                         Well, you have to talk to them about
              THE COURT:
25
```

And you'd have to agree --

that.

```
1 MR. SILBERFELD: Well --
```

THE COURT: -- also, in other words, this would have to be something that you'd give them something as well.

MR. SILBERFELD: Well, they've gotten something if the Court orders it.

THE COURT: No, I know. But the end result is, how does that work in terms of a bargaining. You'd asked them to give up their appellate rights, they would probably ask you in return, Mr. Cardozo, then let us play baseball, you know, from his perspective until the season ends.

MR. SILBERFELD: Those are my observations.

THE COURT: All right. No, I know you're opposed.

MR. ROSENBERG: I have two observations for the Court. Three things. Number one, I think we do need a little bit of time to digest this because this case is also proceeding now in the Ninth Circuit from the Government's perspective. I need to make sure that my colleagues in the civil division appellate staff are also aware of these developments.

Number two, to the extent that we're discussing a \$600,000 payment I think there is agreement that any such payment would need to stay local. And the way that that happens is for it to be a lease payment that goes into the lease revenue fund. How that happens, sometimes the devil is in the details, so we need to give that thought.

The third issue that I will flag is a procedural

```
issue, in that because both UCLA has appealed and the federal government has appealed we do not think that the Court has jurisdiction to modify the injunction that it has already entered as to UCLA.
```

There is, however, a potential workaround on that and that would be, I believe it's Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62.1, which allows a district court to give an indicative ruling on a motion for relief that would otherwise be barred due to a pending appeal. That may be more of an issue for Cardozo to think about, because the relief in many respects flows to UCLA. But that might be something for the Court to consider, because at this point we don't think that it does have jurisdiction to modify the injunction that's already entered.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Cardozo. I think he's been very polite waiting on the line.

Mr. Cardozo, do you have some thoughts?

MR. CARDOZO: Yeah, I -- we believe the Court has jurisdiction to enter a temporary injunction like it just has indicated tentatively that would specify the ground operating rules, while the field continues, just like the way the Court could stay its order pending appeal, it can partially stay its order, it can partially alleviate its order pending appeal, so the Court certainly has jurisdiction to enter a tentative ruling it did. That's not -- it's because it's a temporary and

```
50
 1
    you say provisional injunction how we're going to live during
 2
    pendency of an appeal at least through July 4 is perfectly
 3
    appropriate and fine.
              And then a holistic resolution would either eliminate
 4
 5
    the appeal or if one isn't reached, the appeal would go
 6
    forward. What the Court's done is a perfect way to get a
 7
    better injunction in place for this temporary interval than the
 8
    one that's currently in place which as the Court aptly -- has a
 9
    wasting asset and does not deliver consideration to veterans
10
    that could be delivered under this temporary policy.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. Any other thoughts? Otherwise,
12
    I'll take a brief recess.
13
              MR. SILBERFELD: Mr. Cardozo and I had a conversation
14
    about this topic of they're withdrawing their extraordinary
15
    relief petitions in the circuit. I believe he's agreeable that
16
    they will do so if the Court enters the order that's
```

17 tentatively --18 THE COURT: Would you ask him though? I'm 19 uncomfortable as a Judge --

20 MR. SILBERFELD: Sure.

22

21 -- asking any party to give up a right.

MR. SILBERFELD: Sure.

23 THE COURT: I really --

24 MR. CARDOZO: Yeah, I can attest that, Your Honor.

25 We do not intend to ask the Circuit for emergency relief if

```
there is no emergency. That's an extraordinary ask of an
Appellate Court and with this order we don't see that there
would be an emergency that would require us.
```

There was a procedural order at the Ninth Circuit that took emergency order motion off calendar out of first appeal and instead put it in the second appeal from the final judgment. So, in fact, there is no emergency motion pending before the Ninth Circuit. We would need to refile it and with this order we would not need to refile it.

THE COURT: All right. Any other thoughts? Why don't you talk to your clients for just a moment. Just make sure that they have some input. And why don't you talk to your folks and I'll come back in just a couple of moments, if you have any other thoughts, otherwise, I think I'll hand out a ruling today in some form. Okay? Thank you.

Mr. Cardozo, if you want to use the restroom or get a cup of coffee, why don't you join us in about 15 minutes.

18 | Okay?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

19 MR. CARDOZO: Thank you.

20 MR. SILBERFELD: Your Honor, how long a recess?

THE COURT: About 15.

22 MR. SILBERFELD: Okay.

(Recessed at 4:37 p.m.; reconvened at 4:58 p.m.)

THE COURT: Okay. We're back on the record. All counsel are present and, counsel, I'd given you the opportunity

MR. CARDOZO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- procurement and anything needed concerning the modules, so you're welcome to -- but by the way, this will be docketed this evening. So you can make the representation based on this order. The only substantive change is to the 14 days. Okay?

MR. CARDOZO: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Good. All right. Now, Ms. Black, I'm going to turn to you because I'm going to bring the parties back next week. I don't want us to have an unforeseen problem even if you believe that all of the things you need are in place. Because if three weeks go by and then there's something that's come up, that causes further delay.

Is there anything further you need for these procurement?

MS. BLACK: As stated earlier, the procurement that we've been contemplating up to this point has been the units and that is the commodity purchase that I have the information for as far as the specifications, the assembly.

The second part of this is the scope of works that will have to be done to do the actual construction. So it's concurrent work and we can do it concurrently but there are technically two separate contracts that will have to be done, construction and then the purchasing of the units.

THE COURT: Define that out for me. First of all

4

6

8

13

14

17

18

20

25

back next week.

```
54
 1
    concerning the, I'm going to call it the purchase of the
    modules for want of a better word. Is there anything else you
 3
    need for your purposes for procurement?
              MS. BLACK: At this point I still need -- I got the
 5
    information this morning from the plaintiffs. So my team is
    looking at that right now. From my standpoint right now, we're
 7
    good for the modulars. I'll have some more information if
    something comes up, we'll let the plaintiffs know what
 9
    information we need.
10
              THE COURT: Okay. As far as facilities are
11
    concerned, is there anything else you need right now?
12
              MS. BLACK: Facilities as far as the construction or?
              THE COURT:
                         Yes.
                         Yes. We need to put together a scope of
              MS. BLACK:
15
    work to do the site prep and the utility work.
16
              THE COURT: And you can work on that --
              MS. BLACK:
                         Concurrently, yes.
                          Okay. When would I bring the parties
              THE COURT:
19
           I'm not willing to wait for three weeks, but what would
    be convenient next week? What's the best date?
21
              MS. BLACK: Any date, any day next week is good.
22
    We're getting started right now on the work to get that.
23
              THE COURT: I know that but I'm trying to be
24
    courteous and ask you what's the best day because we're coming
```

And on behalf of the plaintiffs, you might

	#:18063
	55
1	consult with them or is any day acceptable?
2	MR. SILBERFELD: Any day, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Soboroff, any
4	particular day?
5	MR. JOHNSON: Well, we one week should be fine.
6	THE COURT: How about Wednesday of the following
7	week?
8	MR. JOHNSON: All right. All right.
9	THE COURT: That means if you're running into trouble
10	later this week or Monday or Tuesday, you have time to sort it
11	out.
12	UNIDENTIFIED: That'd be the 6th?
13	THE COURT: The 6th?
14	MR. JOHNSON: Judge, just to be clear so we're all
15	THE COURT: Wait, wait, is that election day?
16	MR. SILBERFELD: It's the day after.
17	MS. BLACK: Day after.
18	THE COURT: Oh, you'll all be in great form.
19	MS. BLACK: How about Thursday?
20	THE COURT: You know you'll probably be up late
21	watching the results.
22	MR. SILBERFELD: That's still fine. It's fine for
23	THE COURT: That's okay?
24	MR. SILBERFELD: Yeah, yeah.
25	THE COURT: How about you folks coming from the East

```
56
 1
    Coast?
 2
              MR. ROSENBERG:
                               So --
 3
              THE COURT: Just give me a day.
                              The 6th works for us.
 4
              MR. ROSENBERG:
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              MR. ROSENBERG: There's perhaps one other issue that
 6
 7
    maybe we can discuss that might impact that date. As I
 8
    mentioned on Friday, the Government does intend to file a
 9
    motion for stay pending appeal on most of the issues in this
10
    case. And we still plan to file that motion by Wednesday.
11
              THE COURT: Why don't I send you home then to do that
12
    if we have nothing else concerning procurement rather than
13
    simply holding you, you can go home and file that motion and I
14
    can look at it on Thursday and Friday.
15
              MR. ROSENBERG: Well, that's what I wanted to discuss
16
    because we've -- you know, we're willing to forego an oral
17
    argument on that to the extent the Court -- you know, we think
18
    the motion obviously has merit.
19
              THE COURT: Why don't you step over and talk to the
20
    other side, give me a schedule. I just know for procurement
21
    purposes we're coming back the following week. Now, if you can
22
    combine that on the emergency stay, you two give me --
23
              MR. ROSENBERG: That's what I was thinking.
24
              THE COURT: Yeah.
25
          (Pause)
```

```
1
    right to file its own protective appeal. In light of the
 2
    conversation that took place in this court last Friday,
    Brentwood is potentially looking at intervening into the case,
 3
    discussed it with plaintiffs, haven't discussed it with the
 4
 5
    Government yet, part of what I'm here to do today, so I'm just
 6
    giving you the heads up that they may come -- we may want to
 7
    participate. I don't know yet.
              This would obviously have to be a Board decision.
 8
 9
    Because it's a significant change in circumstances --
10
              THE COURT: Okay.
11
              MR. SANDLER: -- but I wanted you to know up front, I
12
    also discussed it with your special master.
13
              THE COURT: Yeah. And you know the Court's inclined
14
    to go forward on the dates that are set for the consideration
15
    of final approval.
16
              MR. SANDLER: That's Brentwood's desire.
17
              THE COURT: So I'm not hearing anything changed from
    perspectives, positions or the -- Brentwood's position; is that
18
19
    correct?
20
              MR. SANDLER: That is correct, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: And from the veterans' position?
22
              MR. SILBERFELD: No change, Your Honor.
23
              THE COURT: And I know that there's still opposition
24
    from the Government, so let's plan on keeping that date and
```

Okay?

we'll have a final approval hearing on the 13th.

25

1 | which buildings might be subject to a tear down because

2 Mr. Soboroff is much more aggressive about that. He would have

3 more buildings torn down because it's much more economical to

4 | build new structure unless time consumptive, but you may take a

5 position of refurbishment. So I'd like to hear a little bit

6 more about that.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Number two, I'd like to really have you consider although I don't know how I -- right, because I expected you to come back to me with what I call final injunctive relief. In other words, I always thought that there might be a second phase of this, where I could set forth some other reasoning and thoughts with you.

I'm worried that the Town Center is going to, in a sense, impede our housing. And all the way from the survey and whether this hotel was included or not to the bar issues and alcohol being served to the different, you know, inputs in terms of what it's supposed to look like.

I'm just wondering why this isn't a separate master plan frankly. So, Mr. Soboroff, if you have any thoughts you're more than welcome or, Mr. Johnson, to share them now. But I'm going to be coming back and asking instead of impeding the housing progress that we're going to make and getting tied up in this, I don't see why we can't move simultaneously and separately with a different master plan for the town and just keep the master plan for housing. But, Mr. Soboroff, I need

1 | your help on this.

MR. SOBOROFF: Okay. Judge, two things, let's talk about the demolition first. You've been out to the site and you've walked the site. And today we were out to the site and walked the site with groups of people. We need to have a group of people, we could give you the list of who they are, to walk every one of those buildings and make a determination if they're three different parties, including the historical people, including the VA, et cetera, and decisions can be made, but it needs to happen with that kind of -- it's tennis shoe time, it's time to do what you did with those buildings, otherwise it's going to take years.

We did it at Playa Vista with Howard -- with all these Howard Hughes' national historic registered buildings, they can be done here. Very few of these buildings on any registers.

THE COURT: When do you want to do it?

UNIDENTIFIED: Next week?

MR. SOBOROFF: Well, I think that we need --

THE COURT: You decide, consult with the other side.

MR. SOBOROFF: And we need to give -- we need to

22 agree on the list of the people that need to do the walk.

THE COURT: Well if any building right now is occupied by let's say VA personnel, but we don't have housing inside that building then I would wonder why that isn't

```
63
1
    suitable for housing purposes because it's already partially
 2
    occupied.
              There might be other buildings that aren't occupied
 3
    at all, they're so decrepit that they need to be torn down.
 4
 5
    That's why, where's my laser --
 6
              MR. SOBOROFF: Some may be and some may not, but
 7
    we've got to go look.
              THE COURT: Well, that's what we're going to do.
 8
 9
              MR. SOBOROFF: Yeah.
10
              THE COURT: So, Don, would you help me? And I don't
11
    want to hit you with this laser.
              Yeah, no, it's the other one. Don, would you help me
12
13
    with this one? That's actually more readable. I don't know
14
    these buildings in the master plan area either.
15
              MR. SOBOROFF: Okay.
16
              THE COURT: And I agree with you, I don't see how we
17
    make a decision on paper without looking at the condition of
18
    each of these buildings with everybody present.
19
              MR. SOBOROFF: You take three stickers, a red one, a
20
    white one and a blue one.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Yeah, yeah.
22
              MR. SOBOROFF: And when you're done with it, you
23
    stick a red one on the buildings that come down, a blue on the
24
    buildings that don't come down and a white on the buildings
```

that need more work.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: How are those decisions going to be made, though, Brad? I see you're shaking your head so who makes them and do -- who's my central authority here? Rob, are you? MR. MERCHANT: Rob Merchant for VA. In most parts, those decisions have been made and made some time ago. sure precisely which buildings that you're speaking of, but there are very few buildings remaining on the campus that don't have a purpose identified for them. I can probably just off the top of my head, not precise measure at all, but think of five. THE COURT: Well, but --MR. MERCHANT: So --THE COURT: -- do me a favor, hold that. Just put that on the chair right here so you folks can see it, yeah. Here. Would you give him this pointer? You're not held to what you say because I don't -- I can respect that. You can tilt it more towards the folks. UNIDENTIFIED: Folks from the Navy you --THE COURT: That's fine. Thank you. I'll just start here. MR. MERCHANT: on the north campus the things that immediately come to mind is this building right here, 264. 264, this building is currently vacant, it's in very bad shape and needs to come down. This building 236 is our current police headquarters.

When the new police station is built and relocated here, this

67 1 up? 2 MR. SILBERFELD: Thank you, sir. 3 THE COURT: Put it down there. I'm going to share a mic with you, Chelsea. 4 5 Okay. Is the bottom portion, so move it up on the There we go. That should add up to 426 of 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 screen. 7 5, 6, so we're two-thirds approximately through the 1,200 by 8 2030 and what I'm asking is, how are the decisions made about where those go because if they're in the present master plan 10 area, I know that I'm hoping that all of you will target parcel 11 9 eventually which will be a longer term and Barrington Park. 12 And that's going to give us some amount I'm going to ask 13 Mr. Soboroff and Mr. Johnson to calculate for me before our 14 next meeting, I'm hoping about 500 to 700, in that range. 15 MR. SOBOROFF: We have other opportunities too, maybe 16 we can bring them up next week. 17 THE COURT: Yeah, I'd like that. 18 Number two, there's a lot of rumors floating around 19 about some nuclear medical disposal around or near the 20 Barrington area. I haven't seen the report on that. But I'd 21 certainly like to make certain that there's a monitor or 22 something so that there isn't a later disqualification. 2.3 MR. POWERS: My understanding is behind the baseball 24 field --25 THE COURT: Come on up.

```
68
1
              UNIDENTIFIED: Can you introduce yourself,
 2
    Mr. Powers.
              MR. POWERS: Jeffrey Powers, plaintiff.
 3
              THE COURT:
                          Yeah.
 4
 5
              MR. POWERS: It's my understanding that the landfill
    that is by that baseball field down by where the Brentwood --
 6
 7
    it's part of the Brentwood deal that that landfill is the one
 8
    that's got the nuclear waste.
 9
              THE COURT: It's out by the stadium?
10
              MR. POWERS: No, not by the stadium, by the other
11
    baseball field where the gate is that goes into Brentwood.
12
              MR. JOHNSON: It's one of the three sites, Judge.
13
              THE COURT: Is that the back road that we went up by
14
    the Koi pond?
15
              MR. POWERS: Yes. It's --
16
              MR. JOHNSON: Underneath the --
17
              MR. POWERS: It's the same landfill that's causing
18
    the methane issue.
19
              THE COURT: If you walk up to what I'm going to call
20
    the back gate, not the gate off of Barrington.
21
              MR. POWERS: Correct.
22
              THE COURT: As we walk by the pond, that that's where
23
    we believe that that material might be.
24
              MR. POWERS: Yes.
25
              THE COURT:
                           So we're not wasting time, how do we get
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
69
a report about that or even if we have a report, how do we take
this off of our worry list and get a monitor there? Can you
think about that between now and the next meeting?
          MR. SILBERFELD: I'm shocked they don't have one.
          MR. MERCHANT: We do. We do.
                                        So we'll bring that to
our next meeting.
          THE COURT: Okay. Bring that with you. And then
number two, just to double-check so we don't run into a problem
like we did with Barbara, can we get some kind of monitor out
there just to make certain, and set these rumors to wait?
          MS. BLACK:
                     So as part of the post closure land use
plan that we have to produce for the county we are actually
contracting for monitors to monitor the perimeter of the sites
for methane and also, you know, doing that phase 1, phase 2.
          THE COURT: But I'm switching that for a moment.
         MS. BLACK:
                     Right.
          THE COURT: I know methane, I expected that, because
we don't want the same problem. What I'm saying is that
there's a whole set of rumors floating around about this
allegedly nuclear medical material. I just want to have the
veterans at ease and I'm at ease if we're going to pursue this,
so at the next meeting would you bring the report?
         MR. MERCHANT: We will bring that.
          MS. BLACK: Yes.
```

Yes, Your Honor.

MR. MERCHANT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
The other buildings that I wanted to draw attention
to were building 212, which is currently vacant. This building
right here. It is part of a VA major construction project to
be rehabilitated into units of what we are calling sub-acute
mental health. This is largely for geriatric veterans who
can -- do not acute care in the hospital but cannot live
independently. And this would be Building 212 right here.
          In the FY '26 budget this is the -- one of the
priority projects for the department to get funded.
          THE COURT: And what would that hold, how many
people?
          MR. MERCHANT: It's about 40 roughly.
          THE COURT: Okay.
          MR. MERCHANT: I can get you a more precise number,
Judge Carter.
          Also important I think to note, the buildings here 1,
13, 14 and 15, part of our research complex, this is where our
research activities are largely located. These buildings will
be vacated if and when we get appropriations from Congress for
construction of a new research center, which would be located
adjacent to Building 500 on the south campus.
          So once we have that building up, we can vacate these
buildings and the plan is likely to tear these down and use
this land for housing.
                      So, Rob, let me ask you this and I'm not
```

```
1 | holding you to it, if we had hypothetically with parcel 9 and
```

- 2 | Barrington 5 to 700 long term supportive units, and we know
- 3 | we've got 400 that we still have to account for and let's say,
- 4 let's be cautious 500 minus 1,800, 1,300, let's say we had
- 5 1,700. Does it fit in here? Just think about it, you don't
- 6 have to answer it now.

10

11

12

13

14

- 7 MR. SOBOROFF: Okay.
 - with all of you folks in trying to make a sequential decision about this baseball and this practice field because as of July 4th, right now UCLA's leaving. It'll give us time to sort out how they're going to leave but that's right back to us on July 4th. And I want you to start deciding if this is going to be
- Because if you stay with modulars, I'm using a lot of land. If you're going with long term supportive, I'm letting
- 17 you go three stories. And the folks who are going to push back
- 18 to you along Barrington, just have to step out and look at

temporary or it's going to be long term supportive.

- 19 where they're living. They're living in three story condos,
- 20 one of them is a two story by the way, if you drive out there,
- 21 | those are all three stories right up against Barrington.
- 22 You're actually being an awfully good neighbor, because if you
- 23 | take Barrington Park --
- MR. SOBOROFF: It's set back.
- 25 **THE COURT:** Yeah. You take Barrington Park and we

trying to create land here so you can build housing.

25

THE COURT: I think you've got an abundance of land 2 quite frankly.

MR. SOBOROFF: Pardon me?

THE COURT: I think you've got an abundance of land. The question is how far we go with these modulars, that's why I want to get to about 200 plus and I want to stop for a moment because the modulars can get converted to long term supportive, in fact, it may be a preferable community when you don't have a next-door neighbor, but by the same token it's taking up land. And so I need to be cautious and not just impose 750 and move with modulars along the way and that's why I'd like to get 200 in this first 106 emergency, come right back and then maybe, and UCLA's on fair warning right now, that they're expected to come up with some plan to exit on July 4th.

MR. SOBOROFF: Judge, you're talking about a master plan. We're doing this piece-meal in real time and when we think it out, we can meet what you're talking about, but nobody is doing this as a master plan. There's an existing master plan that keeps getting updated, but it's ignoring all these issues.

We talked to a representative of the ULI about your very concern, which is my concern because I know retail really well and that is the location of the town center. And one of the things that we thought about was if you use the Wadsworth Theatre as one side of it, an anchor, and use the cathedral --

1 what's it called, the chapel as the other side, you can create

2 | something very special, create a lot of -- you don't have to

3 | worry about all this land you're displacing and all the stuff

4 they're talking about up into the campus. And it's possible we

5 can get some tenants in there.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: But what do you do with 210? I thought the 210 right now was part of the development of the town center. And what I was perplexed about was this, we've got a recreational center to the north, which is an amazing complex for the veterans, swimming, life guards, weights, okay, been there.

And then we have 210 being developed and then we're down here with Wadsworth and meanwhile we're talking about a hotel whether it was put on the survey list or not, whether we're going to have alcohol or not, although you can bring it to your room, whether the hotel is even viable here because you've already got Patriot Hall down here that serves right now as a semi-hotel.

MR. SOBOROFF: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: You know that, don't you? They've got kind of what I call, unfortunately kind of a more hospice oriented establishment across the street.

I'm not sure what your town center is supposed to look like yet.

MR. SOBOROFF: Usually you create them by what the

1 demand is and where they should sit to create some demand to 2 serve the people you're trying to serve. That hasn't been done 3 here and when we went back to the ULI, basically with your concern saying well it's in the middle here and everybody says 4 5 here and then everybody says well, we've already got this 6 building and we're putting in residential here, and then some 7 people we're not. Why not put it where -- why not allow us to 8 come up with an idea where it should be and float it? You 9 asked me to say my name, Steve Soboroff. 10 MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah, I just want the record to 11 reflect for clarity that the last three exchanges with the Court and speaker has been with Mr. Soboroff. 12 13 MR. SOBOROFF: Steve Soboroff, friend of Brad's. You 14 said I was your friend, right? 15

MR. ROSENBERG:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: But there's the complexity. That town center should be its own separate master plan and I don't see why we're redoing the master plan that we have in place. think that those decisions that you're making are extraordinarily helpful. Because, you know, Mr. Soboroff's a little bit more aggressive he would tear it down for economical purposes to clear more than you may be wanting to do in terms of refurbishing. I just need to know if we're going to meet that deadline with the remaining 426 or we've got problems along the way. Because it makes a difference on what I do with

Okay?

25

look at it also.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
I think we've had enough of a roundtable so here's
what I expect. You come back to me, Rob, with what buildings
you've already decided on and that would be really helpful.
And then we can make a guesstimate of how much more we need for
the 426 plus the 1,800. Okay?
          Meanwhile I'm representing to you that if we can get
over 106 on the emergency and kick this off, if we can get
another hundred that we're working on on top of that, then I'll
start taking a breath between 200 and 300 and draw back a
little bit and just see if we need anymore, so we're not
overbuilding or extensively overbuilding on our temporary.
          And if it helps the VA and you eventually if those
could be converted to long term and it's valuable, so be it.
Okay? Now, I might consider going to 266 if you got rid of
those tiny shelters down there. Those are abysmal. But when
you're spending money on that, who wants to live in the 266
square foot compared to going into the long term supportive
housing.
          MR. SOBOROFF: They're only -- they're 80, they're 65
square feet, Judge. They're eight by eight.
          MS. BLACK:
                     Eight by eight.
          MR. SOBOROFF: Or eight by ten or something.
          THE COURT: Because you came to me with, Judge, we
want 400 square feet, right?
          MR. SOBOROFF:
                         Yes, sir.
```

```
82
1
               THE COURT: You okay for --
2
               MS. BLACK: Thank you.
 3
               THE COURT: Thank you very much, goodnight.
 4
               MR. SOBOROFF:
                              Thank you, Judge.
 5
               MR. ROSENBERG:
                                Thank you.
 6
          (Proceedings concluded at 5:37 p.m.)
7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION

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

sin / Julson

October 29, 2024

Signed

Dated

TONI HUDSON, TRANSCRIBER