

**Department of Veterans Affairs
Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board (Virtual)**

DATE: December 2, 2021

Committee Members Present:

Anthony Allman
Dr. Joshua Bamberger
Robert Begland
LTG (R) John D. Hopper, Chair
Philip Mangano
Jennifer Marshall
Kristine Stanley
Dennis Tucker
Hamilton Underwood
Dr. Mark Wellisch
Sarah Serrano
Jim Perley
Jim Zenner
Joseph Sapien
Heidi Marston
Shawn VanDiver
Christine Barrie
Larry Vasquez
Keith Boylan

Committee Members Absent:

Dan Rosenfeld

Department of Veterans Affairs Staff Present:

John Boerstler, Chief, Veterans Experience Office
Mr. Keith Harris
Mr. James Wartski
Robert McKenrick, Deputy Medical Center Director
Eugene Skinner, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Chi Szeto, Alternate Designated Federal Officer (ADFO)
Dr Steven Braverman, Medical Center Director
Matt McGahran
Jelessa Burney
MaryEllen Hombs
Carrie Pham
Alan Trinh
Andrew Strain
Toni Bush Neal
Dr. Betty Moseley Brown

Janet Elder
Chris Olson
CJ Cordova
Lori Moore
Darryl Joseph
Marnie Gale
Ron Reyes

Public Attendees:

Brian D’Andrea
Tess Banko
Daylyn Presley
Janet Turner
Jessica Simmons
Latia Suttle
Leah Wang
Nicolas Rodriguez
Noah Fleishman
Roberto Clemente
Theresa Wrzenski
Isabella Dennis
Peter Muller
Roberto Marshall
Colleen Schillmaier
Maggie Walsh

Public Present: Please note that the meeting was virtual and open to the public, full attendance could not be taken or confirmed.

Meeting Notes

Call to Order, Attendance, Welcome, Pledge of Allegiance, Opening Remarks	<p>LTG (R) John D. Hopper, Chair, Eugene W. Skinner Jr, Designated Federal Officer</p> <p>DFO Skinner welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Szeto is the alternate DFO.• VA staff are available via email to assist with technical problems at VEOFACA@va.gov• Public comments from 4:10pm – 5:10 pm ET.• Public commenters are given a 5 min time limit.• Only one person had registered to make a comment.• Comments can also be submitted to the above email address for inclusion in the general meeting record. <p>Rules of engagement:</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mute phones and microphones. • When addressing the committee please turn on your camera. • Allow the Chair to yield the floor or acknowledge you prior to speaking. • Identify yourself prior speaking. • Hold all questions until the presentation is complete. • Role call vote will be used for all proposed recommendations. • Session is being recorded. <p>LTG Hopper welcomed committee members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomed new members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Heidi Marston, Executive Director, LA Homeless Services Authority, ○ Keith Boylan, Deputy Secretary, Veteran Services Division CA Dept. of Veterans Affairs ○ Christine Barrie, 1887 Fund President ○ Sean VanDiver, Senior Manager, Deloitte ○ Captain USN (Ret) Larry Vasquez, City of Los Angeles. • Board working more than five years- more work to be done. • Master Plan is expected to finish in 2038. • New Chair of MP Subcommittee, Rob Begland. • Anthony Allman will continue to contribute to Board
VEO Update	<p>Mr. John Boerstler, Chief Veterans Experience Officer Mr. Jim Wartski spoke on behalf of Mr. Boerstler.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome new and returning members • He welcomed Heidi Marsten and thanked her for all her work. • Asked Keith Boylan to give his and Mr. Boerstler's regards to Vito Angrisani. • Christine Barrie for her work with 1887. • Sean VanDiver with Deloitte-, thankful for the Deloitte partnership, many recovering Veterans at Walter Reed worked for Deloitte. • Welcome Larry Vasquez, thankful for his work with the Mayor of LA attempt to connect with Lt. Col James Herndon in NY working with Mayor DeBlasio. • Under the leadership of LTG Hopper and Eugene Skinner this committee is changing lives.
Opening Remarks Master Plan 2022 Presentation	<p>Dr. Steven E. Braverman, M.D., Medical Center Director/ Mr. Robert McKenrick, Deputy Medical Center Director, Alan Trinh, Chief, Strategic, Facility and Master Planning</p> <p>Dr. Braverman welcomed and thanked new members.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Plan Engagement Status • FY21 Current Project status with timeline • FY22 Budget Request and project status with timeline • Future Infrastructure Projects • Strategy to conduct EUL turnover <p>Master Plan 2016 side by side comparison Master Plan 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What requirements have been, added, modified, or deleted • Housing delivery timeline by type, quantity, location, and date of delivery 	<p>Highlights of overall Master Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY21 ended solvent • At our \$1.1 bill dollar budget. • Cared for 88,000 Unique Veterans • 98% of where we were pre-COVID, so we dropped a little last year, recovery this past year so Veterans are not afraid of returning to the facility for care or to get virtual care <p>COVID Care:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mirror of GLA community • Sustained zero COVID inpatients for past week for the first time since this last surge the summer into the fall. • Many COVID outpatients- several have received the monoclonal antibodies. • 2-3 employees per week acquiring COVID from community exposure • Vaccination and boosters will help with protection. • CDC just announced recommendation of boosters for everyone. • GLA is using Pfizer for all boosters. <p>Sec McDonough visits GLA- two promises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and find housing for Veterans in the San Vicente encampment. • House an additional 500 Veterans over the next couple of months before the end of the year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Since then, housing has been given to San Vicente Veterans including 20 Veterans as a community into our CTRS area. ○ 200 Veterans placed in permanent housing ○ 261 in long-term transitional housing • GLA goal to house 3900 homeless Veterans in LA as soon as possible. • Appreciate outreach work of community partners- LAHSA, Sheriff's team, other public housing authorities. • Progress on Ventura clinic, replacing Oxnard clinic-anticipate open on time summer 2022. <p>LTG Hopper asked Dr. Braverman what procedures are being incorporated in the Master Plan to achieve the SecVA's promise to house 500 Veterans by the end of year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing 500 Veterans does not solve the problem. • Also requested that the presentation start with slide #13. <p>Ms. Marston asked Dr. Braverman for clarification if the 261 Veterans in transitional housing were counted toward the goal of 500 in housing.</p>
---	--

	<p>Dr. Braverman responded that yes, they are counted toward the goal of 500 as of today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be additional not yet been counted. • Total has increased by 61 over the previous week. • 500 is a three-month goal, not the annual goal. • Contractors supporting effort of long-term and short-term housing goals. <p>Dr. Bamberger mentioned that he would like to have more discussion on picking up the pace of housing Veterans in the wake of the SecVA promise.</p> <p>LTG Hopper suggested that they have the discussion now.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger added that the recommendation passed in March set a goal of 212 HUDVASH vouchers per month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SecVA October press conference coincided with the 200 permanent housing slots, to achieve the goal of 500 by end of the calendar year. • Over half of the 500 goals are housed in temporary housing. <p>He asked how the pace is being increased using the existing HUDVASH vouchers, housing locator functions or other strategies that have been presented.</p> <p>Dr. Braverman invited Matt McGahran to answer this question but mentioned that COVID caused delays on processes.</p> <p>Mr. McGahran answered that they are working with the consulting team, community partners, LAHSA and local public housing authorities in Los Angeles city and county, 200 vacant project-based units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing fairs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stand down here and in Curran and Santa Barbara County, ○ Veterans can obtain vouchers and begin process ○ possible same day leases. • Property managers flexibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ waive documentation requirements ○ decreasing processing timeframe ○ relaxing rules to get Veterans in quickly • Exploring options with individual tenant housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ individual landlord/tenant relationship ○ Educating landlords on benefits of housing Veterans • VA Team members incentivized to process applications more quickly- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Working to fill many staff vacancies ○ Using contracted staff to move the process along faster
--	--

	<p>Dr. Bamberger asked why the 264 people were being housed in Grant Per Diem programs and not directly into permanent supportive housing. Is there a bottleneck? Process to slow on the timeframe goal? Number of vacant units? Where can we assist in providing attention and resources to those challenges?</p> <p>Mr. McGahran restated that the goal is to get the homeless Veterans in the area into permanent housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim services for Veterans that are not ready for housing- CTRS program. • Need for rehabilitation before the next phase. • Veterans in the GPD are in process for permanent supportive housing. • Last year 1260 Veterans were given permanent housing last year. • Number will be larger this year as a result of this process/promise. <p>Dr. Bamberger stated that the national standard at VA is “Housing First.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process to move from “housing ready” to permanent housing is outdated. • Not supported by current data in the US and Europe. • Process should be from the street directly into permanent housing. • Why is this process deviating from the best practice? • Where is the bottleneck to the national standard best practice? <p>Mr. McGahran replied that each Veteran is an individual and that housing plan is not for everyone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options are available- some to permanent housing, GPD, or CTRS • Veterans’ choice is also a big part of it, also. <p>Dr. Bamberger commented that the type of housing offered in GPD makes it desirable. If the services integrated into permanent supportive housing met the needs of each individual than transitional housing is unnecessary and a waste of resources. Community Solutions, Brilliant Corners and groups working have proven that the interim model is not necessary, and this is the standard.</p> <p>Mr. Boylan mentioned that he runs the Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention program and he asked if the HUDVASH were project-based or scattered sites. He also asked about barriers in the coordinated entry system, beside Veteran choice with HUDVASH legislation and restrictions in discharge type, etc.? Are there any barriers to placement along discharge status, substance use or other variables as to where those Veterans are placed?</p>
--	---

	<p>Mr. McGahran mentioned that they are working on details obtaining vouchers for Veterans who had other than Honorable discharge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrier to project-based housing- income requirement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ based on funding source that project manager received to build the housing. • Barrier for tenants in individual apartments- housing shortage in desirable areas. <p>Mr. Boylan asked if the recommendation made at the last council meeting regarding specified the vouchers should be project-based or scattered site?</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger replied that SecVA concurred in principle with the recommendation which asked VA to increased pace of usage of HUDVASH vouchers. The number in the recommendation coincided with the number SecVA mentioned in his press conference but it did not specify, and half was to transitional not permanent housing.</p> <p>LTG Hopper recommended they move on to the GLA MP briefing.</p> <p>Mr. MacKenrick commented on the CTRS process and the 50 other encampments of homeless Veterans they are attempting to house. They are going into any form of housing available while they are getting voucher ready, exploring locations with the housing authorities throughout the jurisdiction.</p> <p>Slide #13 FY21 EUL Project updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term fire suppression water distribution effort across North campus • Water pressure boosting measure- tight deadline we think we can possibly get it done by March 2022. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fire Marshall inspection and approval by end of year. • To ready Building 205, 207 & 208- for 180 addition units of permanent supportive housing on the campus. • When efforts reach 35% design, construction begins, not waiting for 100% design. • All EULs projects requested are listed. • Requesting \$50 million of VISN and VHA for turnover projects and infrastructure enhancements across the North campus. <p>LTG Hopper asked for clarification of the term “install” on the first item. Does that refer to the type of project or the type of contract?</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick replied that the ultimate project is to install the fire suppression water distribution system were aware parts of it are inadequate, so we need to install new capacity, upgrading the infrastructure.</p>
--	--

	<p>First step is to design, then bid, then build- a lengthy process. This hopes to move from more than a third of the design and then begin building to expedite process and timeline for design completion tracking for January 2022.</p> <p>Mr. Allman commented that the moving forward with booster pump for 205,207, & 208 is great. For Phase Zero, all wet utilities are accounted for. OIG report indicated need for additional storm water and sewer requirements in addition to fire suppression systems. Does this system installation include storm and sewer?</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick replied no that previous briefings reviewed CFM two-year study on eight utilities, all of which will get upgrades throughout the project. OCFM and OAM are working on construction timeline for upgrade on both sides of campus.</p> <p>Mr. Allman added that the design contract for the fire suppression system based on MP 2022 was awarded. Is there money identified by VA for the installation?</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick stated that a request has been submitted for FY21 funding and \$23 million for FY22. About \$7 million allocated to the VISN has been set aside for services. Another \$5.2 million for this water effort has been submitted.</p> <p>Mr. Allman mentioned that the new members and those on the MP subcommittee need to continue to monitor the utilities moving forward.</p> <p>FY22 EUL Projects Funding Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking lots 38 and 48 • \$5.2 million requested for Parking mitigation for parking lot conversion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Establish alternate parking for Veterans, employees, and visitors to North Campus ○ To start remediation to lots • All project efforts and turnover strategies and timeline • OAEM tells us when the principal developer is looking to have the parcel turned over to them. • Assess activities and needed remediations, etc. • \$50.9 million overall total request. <p>LTG Hopper asked if the projects were listed in priority order?</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick replied that they were not in priority order.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes based on funding availability etc. • PD and VA ability to turn over the property.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water utilities and parking are primary focus. <p>Dr. Braverman added that as funding requests were composed, and expectation of time the objective is to maximize the ability to complete necessities and be able to turnover parcels to Principal Developer (PD) without delay, goal is for VA not to be an obstacle in moving forward with projects. When PD obtains funding and can begin, VA is able to release for construction.</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick believes in a year and a half they will be ahead of the projected timeline and turning over parcels ahead of schedule.</p> <p>FY22 EUL Project Map</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft MP 2022 comments discuss uses for some of the space • Above and underground storage tank remediation • Soil removal and replacement • Staff relocation efforts- building 527, 300, 158 • OIT storage and office space <p>Future Infrastructure Projects- 2023 and Beyond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-recurring maintenance • Parcels impacted and tie-in to MP • Staffing locations • Prepping building for turnover • State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) compliance requirements <p>Comparison of 2016 Draft Master Plan vs. Master Plan 2022 Draft</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link pages from one document to their location in another document. • Compare by zone <p>LTG Hopper commented that he had expected to see a summary of changes, updates, amendments, etc.</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick replied that they do not have that document as they are working through the comments and changes are still occurring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-day session of all offices involved in MP 2022 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ review all aspects of the document ○ ensure everything is addressed, ○ phasing- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ near term -housing (5 years)
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ midterm (6-10 years) ▪ long term (11+ years) ○ suggestions and ideas are conceptual for long term implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ pedestrian bridge, ○ more specific considered mid-term <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RV park. <p>Zone #1: Health Care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bed tower design continues • Building 500 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ambulatory Care- no longer separate ○ Bottom floor still usable- primary care services • Consolidated Research Center and Building 212 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved to move forward • Kitchen almost nearing 50% completion <p>Mr. Allman asked if the research building in the design phase on the initial draft of MP 2022 is a near term project. It is important for Phase 3 housing construction of 113, 114 & 115 to be renovated into housing VA must construct a new research building on South Campus.</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick confirmed that it is a near term project progressing as quickly as possible in design. Many design projects were paused for funding and authorities with the former Under Secretary for Health. The PD does not have turnover of research buildings as a priority.</p> <p>Zone #2: Long-term Care & Auxiliary Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aerial view map of Existing conditions vs. 2016 DMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community Parade ground area ○ Community living centers ○ Cal Vet Home ○ Research buildings converting to housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move to consolidated research center ○ Domiciliary remains ○ Wadsworth Chapel- moral injury center, whole health ○ Multi-use facility- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ meeting space, training- ground floor ▪ EUL Housing- top floor • LTG Hopper asked if the EUL housing on the multi-use building was to meet the required numbers. <p>Mr. McKenrick replied that is part of the required number of units, but it is an EUL building. As part of EUL policy, it is difficult to utilize the space for</p>
--	---

	<p>needed community services. Working with OAEM to navigate acceptable use of EUL space.</p> <p>Mr. Perley asked if part of the issue is with funding. Has the plan for the town center been adjusted due to the funding sources? Alternative financing for non-residential would not compromise the original MP.</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick does not see it as a funding issue. If the floors can be separated, to become EUL than VA could retain the bottom floor and hold leases for the space. Funding for a lease, would have to come from an authority separate from EUL housing. OAEM is working with legal authorities to determine options.</p> <p>Mr. Perley thinks if you provide housing in a building with tax credits, you can get 15-year financing and the PD can continue but if there is no housing, even with a lease, it will not get funding or tax credits- no VASH voucher to cover income. Non-residential income is an issue, not attractive to finance. Must compromise to town center community space due to funding, may not be negative but original MP is more appealing and it is being changed due to funding issues. It will affect the appearance of the community. Must look at alternative methods to finance non-residential to be closer to MP 2016.</p> <p>Mr. Allman asked if building 13, is part of a national historic district although it is not a national historic registered building. In MP 2022 it is designated as “hard”, cannot be demolished. In MP 2016 it was designated for new construction. Is the historic preservation study available to the public? What does VA examine to determine a building should be preserved?</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick confirmed the study is with SHPO and he can look for the specifics to answer the questions. The entire campus is considered an historic district and building 13 contributes to it. All changes made to the campus must be compliant with the historic and environmental authorities. Modernization to the historic buildings is permitted, as in the Cal Vet home. In buildings 205, 207 & 207 the window structures were tied to the historic appearance. The National Historic District has five registered buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hoover Barracks • Trolley Station • Superintendent’s Residence • Governor’s Residence • Wadsworth Chapel <p>Mr. Begland commented that it looks like the PD is offering VA advice on issues outside of permanent supportive housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation to use building 300 to serve as a Town Hall with 25 supportive housing units.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original RFQ requested supportive housing advice • Stated the extent the VA seeks advice from the PD for areas beyond housing needs a modification or separate contract. • Has the PD been formally asked to expand the scope of work beyond housing? • Do you believe VA can take recommendations and advice from the PD on the Town Center concept? • Do you believe the PD is allowed to offer advice on vocational training? <p>Mr. McKenrick replied that the DMP calls for a community to be built with all the aspects that support a housing community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD to provide housing and how it fits into a community plan. • PD draft community plan is an appendix to the MP 2022. • Community plan will help fulfill all the commitments VA is making on the DMP. • VA can take advice from the PD as they want them to provide a community plan. • Community plan concepts are available for review by the community, and they are commenting and making suggestions. • PD is not consulted on whether vocational training should occur on campus but to command a feasibility study as to where it fits into the plan. • Want to make better use of auxiliary areas and have requested their input on how to do so. <p>Mr. Begland disagrees on the appropriate support of the PD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VA is letting the PD dictate the development of MP • VA soliciting advice of the PD. • Not the original RFQ or in the contract. • PD contracted to assist VA with housing • VA should not be getting advice on the town center or Veterans vocational training from PD <p>Mr. McKenrick offered to bring this point to the OAEM and provide further feedback at the next exchange.</p> <p>Mr. D’Andrea with Century Housing on the PD team offered a comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD was tasked to create a supportive and therapeutic community. • Housing one portion, in addition to ancillary services. • Two hubs comprise community plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Building 300- health and wellness hub <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Permanent supportive housing development
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supportive service space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Building 13- Town Center- civic hub <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neighborhood services for everyday living <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cafes, barbershops, restaurants • Vocational training facilities ○ Difference of opinion in scale of commercial activity in that town center. ○ Consistent vision from DMP • Financing is available and not limiting the vision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Low-income housing and new markets tax credits ○ Philanthropy <p>Mr. Begland asked if Mr. D’Andrea believed the PD was chosen to develop a community plan that included the town center and Veteran vocational training.</p> <p>Mr. D’Andrea believes the PD is charged with delivering community- beginning with housing surrounded by the neighborhood services, amenities, and utilities on the North Campus. The enterprise zone on the east lower side of campus is outside the purview of the PD.</p> <p>Mr. Begland restated that he believed the PD is to provide housing advice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community plan not meant to be a comprehensive plan for redeveloping the campus. • Town Center plan is being diluted with a housing emphasis. <p>Mr. Belgand asked Mr. D’Andrea if the PD was given a contract for planning beyond housing.</p> <p>Mr. D’Andrea replied that through the MOU and agreement with VA, the PD task is to deliver a therapeutic and supportive community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Beach project is an example. • Ancillary services are fundamental to creating community. • Living museum and parade grounds as hub to draw Veterans from outside of facility. • Available to review the plan with VCOEB. <p>Ms. Banko commented that the supportive services are important extended to the wider community in addition to those with vouchers.</p> <p>Mr. Perley asked Mr. D’Andrea if funding through philanthropy would be possible without naming rights recognition for the donors.</p> <p>Mr. D’Andrea recognizes the limitations with the naming rights but it is not major constraint.</p>
--	--

	<p>Mr. McKenrick continued discussing Zone 3: Veterans Housing and Community Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparing 2016 plans with MP 2022 revisions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MP 2022 Combines North and South Campus ○ Ideas and concepts from community stakeholders, VSOs ○ Serve Veterans in different ways ○ How to re-use auxiliary services and engineering space as job training with community <p>Zone 4: Northern Campus open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need planning and approval to use land • Was not included in initial environmental inspection- may take years • Out years 8, 10, 12-year plan- consider concepts now for feedback and discussion • Avoid Arroyo there is time to explore alternative options <p>Mr. Allman asked about the elevation in connection to the Brentwood/Barrington Park area. Will Veterans have access by trail or bridge? Those areas are currently not accessible to main campus. He recalled analysis from 2015 showed a connecting road was problematic. It is a distant walk to main campus to reach some of the services located here.</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick explained that DMP 2022 has analysis on terrain and elevation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • includes paths- bicycle, walking, transit and handicapped access. • Not a priority right now, but there is time to explore better utilization of the open space. • Options to connect and establish access North to East. • Existing elevation is steep-significant environmental work to create an accessible route. <p>Housing Delivery- OAEM- Carrie Pham EUL Effort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Parcel Existing Assets being developed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing, new construction, demolition • Developer responsible for that effort • Estimated release date <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ VA to transfer asset to PD for development ○ Arrange financing prior to release • Construction start date <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 18-24 months from construction start to completion • Total housing units for these individual housing efforts including manager units.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline goals/plans up to 2038 – which would be the last phase of completion for the building 257. • Challenges to release for housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Turnover/reallocate services and employees occupying existing buildings ○ Financing prior to release <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction starts 30-90 days from closing ▪ Lease 30-90 days from completion <p>Dr. Bamberger asked if any of the buildings are planned to be an assisted living or supportive housing facility for Veterans to age in place. If not, why not?</p> <p>Ms. Pham responded that it is a good question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VA has explored assisted living through the EUL program • Gap from permanent independent living to a VA nursing home • Need place for those not ready for nursing facility • Issue is funding- stacked financing tiers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assisted living does not have funding identified ○ Exploring funding options readily available to reallocate to assisted living ○ Exploring senior housing with a menu type of services <p>Dr. Bamberger commented that MP 2022 may be the last MP and it should recognize and include the aging epidemiology of Veterans by including assisted living and aging in place in the plan.</p> <p>LTG Hopper asked what needs to happen after construction completion before occupancy? Certificate of occupancy? Timing?</p> <p>Ms. Pham replied that the units must have HUDVASH inspections. Certificate of Occupancy is issued within 30 days of completion. She deferred to Mr. McGahran to provide more specifics.</p> <p>Mr. McGahran offered that once the COO is issued lease ups are dependent on the property manager. The COO is issued by the county but has not been an issue in the past.</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick mentioned this is the Priority of Work list, given to them by OAEM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering, infrastructure, turnover efforts are prioritized from this list. • Lot 38 has moved on the list. • MacArthur field was priority on the list but moved back. • In sync with OAEM.
--	---

	<p>Ms. Banko mentioned they are working on the lease up project, building 207.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (65+) aging in place services, • Following COLMA model and working with the Geriatrics department. • Programs outside of HUDVASH case management. <p>Mr. Tucker asked if there were and Disabled Veterans Business Enterprises (DVBE) on the contract for this project or is the project contracted only to the private sector.</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick replied that contracts are handled by OAEM, and he does not have any of that insight. He mentioned that at previous town halls they discussed the submitted bids and reasoning behind chosen teams.</p> <p>Mr. Tucker added it is a good way to recycle money and put money back into the community.</p> <p>LTG Hopper asked for someone to summarize what was said at the town hall about set-asides for Veteran businesses.</p> <p>Ms. Pham stated that when there is needed development with EUL the office of OAEM distributes a solicitation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Sole Source Sought” for VOSB or SDOSB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No qualified proposals from those businesses. • Then distributed for Open Full Competition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Building 205, 207 & 208 ○ Many qualified proposals • PD and other developers seeking Veteran engagement as well as Veteran owned businesses as subcontractors to these projects. <p>Ms. Banko added that the PD has begun an 8-week vocational training program for homeless and at-risk Veterans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 Veteran students have graduated • Life safety and OSHA construction certifications • Supported by VA • Can submit listing of graduate’s opportunities • PD committed 5%-dollar amount building trade work awarded to VOSBs and SDVOSBs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contracts in process of being awarded • Committed 3% dollar amount non-building trade work awarded to Veterans or disadvantaged businesses. • Building 207 general contractor- Alpha Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Veteran owned; Veteran led
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer Advisory- oversee dry utility infrastructure construction for all 1200 housing units. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marine Veterans- Senior PM and construction inspector • KFA, LLP, Architect- woman-owned business • Local hire policy- best faith effort to hire at least 20% labor force to be within a 10-mile radius. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Housing construction dry utility ○ Dry utility infrastructure <p>Mr. Boylan commented as state advocate for Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The VHHP program awarded 3 grants to the WLA campus for building 404, 300 and others. • Program requires 5% DVB participation. <p>Dr. Bamberger asked if any members of the services subcommittee had any questions about the MP as this may be the last opportunity to ask before the plan is submitted to the SecVA.</p> <p>LTG Hopper apologized to the public waiting to comment for time running over.</p> <p>Ms. Turner stated that she was happy to give up her opportunity for public comment.</p> <p>DFO Skinner stated that the public comment would be omitted and recognized that Chief of VEO John Boerstler had joined the meeting.</p> <p>LTG Hopper welcomed Mr. Boerstler to the meeting and asked if he had any comments.</p> <p>Mr. Boerstler extended best wishes from Secretary McDonough and is looking forward to receiving feedback from the SMEs and leaders on the committee.</p>
Public Comments Session	<p>Mr. Chi Szeto (Alternate DFO)</p> <p>Ms. Turner will forego her public comment</p> <p>5:05 Boerstler joined the meeting during the public comment section but kept it brief. He thanked the committee and is excited to get feedback from the SMEs, leaders, and the committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentioned lots of announcements coming soon and then turned it over for public comment. <p>Ms. Latia Suttle spoke her public via phone</p> <p>So my name is Latia Suttle I am a retired Army Veteran and I'm also the Chair of the Armed Services and Veterans Affairs Committee with the NAACP Beverly Hills Hollywood Branch. This is my first time attending his meeting,</p>

	<p>and I just found out about this meeting today. And I did hear that you all have been in place for 5 or 6 years, so forgive me if you all have heard this before but some of my concerns are with the Veteran homeless issue is that the poverty level income for California is at a level that doesn't, that puts a lot of people at risk for homelessness. For example; a family of two the income poverty level for California is \$1,200 so an unemployed Veteran with a child, getting VA compensation doesn't qualify for HUD-VASH or legal assistance or other stuff, and it puts them in a position that they have to pay full price for things, while they're unemployed. So, for example, myself I've gone through this myself where I was unemployed, 100% Service Connected and receiving VA compensation. I had a family law case and I did not qualify for legal assistance so I'm having to pay full price for an attorney, \$300-\$500 an hour on top of rent that's over \$2,000, you know the average rent around here is over \$1,200 but the poverty income level is \$1,200. So, while I'm unemployed, receiving VA compensation I don't qualify for legal assistance, I don't qualify for HUD-VASH, so it puts a lot of Veterans in a predicament where they will end up homeless. So, I just wondered how or if there is anyone on the board that knows how to request or advocate for this income poverty level to increase. And then also for VA compensation not to be counted as income when trying to get legal assistance and HUD-VASH, you know those are two things that puts a lot of Veterans in a position where they are paying full price for stuff with the high cost of living here in California. And then the other issue, you know you talked a lot about HUD-VASH but there are some other services for Veterans, there's SSVF and there's a lot of people that are in working positions to assist Veterans and whatever their position is, and they are asking Veterans for things that's not even part of the requirement. For example, SSVF they will ask of the Veteran for their bank account information so they can see whether the Veterans check is being deposited, however, a Veterans VA compensation doesn't have to come through a, doesn't have to go to a bank, they can receive a hard copy in the mail and some of those staff at these different organizations either they don't know that or they want to ignore that. You give them this information and they're still requiring that they see that the check is deposited into a bank account. That's one issue that's blocking Veterans from getting assistance. So, another issue is I used to work for a Veterans homeless shelter and just say the Veteran went to the hospital for whatever reason missing for a couple of days didn't have a number to call back to the shelter, they lose their bed and then their stuff is only kept for a certain amount of days before, documents and everything else is thrown out in the trash so then a lot of Veterans end up in the situation where they no longer have birth certificates, drivers license, and all this other stuff. So, my suggestion is there be some type of long-term storage until Veterans get long-term housing because that's an issue, also. Thank you for your time."</p> <p>Mr. Skinner said if Ms. Suttle needed some assistance, he would reach out to help her with the FACA email. LTG Hopper agreed and thanked her for her comments.</p>
--	--

	<p>From the West LA's Veterans Collective:</p> <p>Dear Secretary McDonough:</p> <p>We are pleased to submit a detailed overview of The West LA Veterans Collective's ("Principal Developer" or "The Veterans Collective") Town Center concept to further clarify and elaborate upon our vision. The description contained herein provides more definition and clarity around the Town Center outline that is presently articulated in the Draft Community Plan, which will be updated accordingly with the integration of actionable suggestions following the conclusion of public comment.</p> <p>The Principal Developer's vision for the Town Center has been meticulously planned. The Town Center concept includes significant input from Veterans gathered during more than three (3) years of outreach and engagement, above and beyond initial outreach that was part of the 2016 Framework for a Draft Master Plan. The Town Center vision is holistic in nature. It includes numerous elements including a Town Hall, Town Square, Town Green, mobility plaza, and a "main street" that altogether will function as a "downtown" heart of a therapeutic community as envisioned in the 2016 Draft Master Plan. Along with approximately 341 units of high-quality supportive housing The Town Center includes over 90,000 square feet of non- residential commercial space around a network of outdoor spaces and supportive housing to provide Veteran-serving amenities, recreation, arts spaces, vocational training and socialization opportunities for both resident Veterans and Veterans from beyond. The Town Center will provide opportunities for Veterans to engage with services and resources, socialize and meet friends, participate in events, attend outdoor concerts and other community gatherings, share a meal at a Veteran owned and operated cafe, conduct business, visit the fitness center or library, seek employment or educational opportunities and training programs, or simply to connect with fellow Veterans in a warm and welcoming space.</p> <p>The Principal Developer's Community Plan directly encompasses the vision of a Town Center set forth in the 2016 Draft Master Plan concept. However, others have suggested that the Master Plan 2022, "abandons the vision of a Town Center set forth in the 2016 Draft Master Plan in favor of a "Town Square" concept, with no emphasis on commercial or socialization activities for both residents and non-resident veterans." It has also been suggested that the Master Plan 2022, "relies upon the Principal Developer's suggestion that Building 13 can serve as a Town Hall with a canteen and a "Patriot Store," along with 25 units of permanent supportive housing."</p> <p>These statements are not accurate and are patently misleading. The Veterans Collective has consistently articulated a vision for a far more expansive Town Center in the draft Community Plan that is inclusive of a Town Hall (in Building 13), and a Town Square that is activated on multiple sides with non-residential space (in buildings 306, 407, 408, 409 and 410 that</p>
--	--

	<p>include amenities such as an Arts and Cultural Center and small business incubator) and vocational opportunities together with a mobility hub and a Town Green (for centralized outdoor recreation and events). This vision has not been compromised nor constrained by any legislative or financing hurdles that may exist. The Principal Developer is confident in its ability to execute on this vision and points to its track record of delivering other complex, mixed-use developments throughout the region as examples.</p> <p>The Town Center is a critical component of the redevelopment of West LA VA Campus into a therapeutic community with housing, amenities, and vocational opportunities for the reintegration of homeless and at-risk Veterans and their families into the community, as well as to provide a regional draw for non- resident Veterans to participate in the heart of the campus community. We look forward to continuing this conversation and making the West LA VA Campus the best possible space we can for our Veteran community.</p> <p>Sincerely, Steve Peck, Tyler Monroe, and Brian D’Andrea</p>
Master Plan discussion	LTG (R) John D. Hopper, Chair
Services and Outcomes Subcommittee recommendation brief discussion and vote	<p>Dr. Bamberger: Reads VCOEB Recommendation 15-1</p> <p>Motion:</p> <p>Mr. Allman: Move to approve the recommendation for discussion.</p> <p>Dr. Wellisch: Seconded the motion.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Mr. Allman: The VA does update on a monthly basis the bed capacity which I think is useful. I like this recommendation because it does not just focus on bed capacity but on individual Veterans.</p> <p>Ms. Marston: In terms of a dashboard there are examples of this happening in different communities not just Veterans but something that on a monthly basis looks at how many Veterans are housed what is the utilization of HUD-VASH vouchers, and we could possibly work with the VA to put in vacant units that we know are committed to Veterans, this would provide a good picture. LAHSA is working with VA creating a reconciliation of community data with the VA data to get a better sense of the denominator of who could be experiencing homelessness. From a performance perspective looking at housing placements and the utilization of HUD-VASH makes good sense.</p> <p>LASHA has a dashboard that tracks permanent housing placements across the board it includes placements from VA, but it is not specifically broken out.</p>

	<p>Dr. Bamberger: Ideally when community solutions come in to help end homelessness for Veterans, the key is having the entire system working together. Which includes the county and the housing authorities so ideally the dashboard would be much broader than just for Veterans. We could know how many vacant units there are for homeless people in the GLA area, is there something in the works from the county end?</p> <p>Ms. Marston: Data is available at the community level, it should not be too difficult to put together a dashboard that shows housing placements, and HUD VASH vouchers between the housing authorities and the VA. Tracking the shift from transitional housing to permanent housing would be right.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner: It would also be good to track monthly recidivism of Veterans falling out of housing and why. Seems to be the housing authorities major concern, it may be due to lack of services. Important to have the right amount of social services out there to support Veterans.</p> <p>Mr. Boylan: How to keep an accurate number of currently homeless Veterans would be a best guess. Unless there was a lot of work done on a monthly basis to get out into the community which is a huge undertaking. I think the strength of this ask is it puts the VA on track to start to develop this, the biggest concern is I would ask that they separate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HUD-VASH, • Scattered site vs. project based • Staffing to support those sites • Coverage at scattered site locations • Understanding those staffing numbers that support each of those programs. <p>The front-end undertaking of updating the housing numbers on a monthly basis would be a challenge.</p> <p>Ms. Marston: What are the key indicators to know we are making progress towards ending homelessness? Maybe it is recommending that we collaborate with VA to identify what those key indicators are and then collectively develop that and then build the dashboard to bring the transparency.</p> <p>Dr. Branberger: Point in time count is very a very general estimate the intent is to do trends overtime. The By-Name-List accurately represents the number of people who are on the streets, in shelters at any given time. If you build a robust By-Name-List:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You can report on this each month to show progress. • Communities that have achieved functional zero have relied on the By-Name-List.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed on an almost daily basis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine who is off the list or back on the list each day. Persons off the list identify where they went. What can be learned from that? How can we make more headway? <p>Mr. Boylan: If a person falls into homelessness today, have not sought any services, how does their name get on the list?</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: There is a reporting mechanism from agencies around the county that are required to say if someone comes to your service that they have been added to a centralized database. If they have not sought services and are complete “ghosts” in the system, they are not on the list.</p> <p>Mr. Boylan: Since “ghosts” are not in the system it would still be a best guess. My understanding is the Point in Time count is to try to find those that are not in the system, so both methods would be a best guess.</p> <p>Ms. Serrano: This recommendation is about the existing criteria within the VA systems, and we are asking them not to start from scratch for the Point in time count. We are asking them to curate and cultivate all the data sets that they have automatically updated within their systems routinely. It’s about putting that together in a hub in a dashboard so it’s more of a technological process in building up an infrastructure where they are cultivating all their data sets and data points from their current resources as well in one place so we can access and build measurements.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Process wise several good points, maybe include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some key parameters that would be in the dashboard. Possible make the workload quarterly vice monthly. <p>Reword the recommendation and sent it to the committee for a vote by email.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: Not sure we can do this via email. Perhaps this can wait until next meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Vasquez: There is a dashboard that exists with some of the details discussed today, it stopped at 2019. Should not be difficult to recreate and provided valuable information.</p> <p>Mr. Wellisch: Homelessness is reaching crisis levels, and this will enhance transparency and should be put forward as soon as we can.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Will not be able to vote on this today. The best thing to do is to pull this recommendation back and recraft the recommendation to make sure we know what the history is and what is out there and what the workload will be to put this together. It is important and to get the key</p>
--	--

	<p>parameters together it would be better to reshape and get it to where we want it than sent it forward as it is now.</p> <p>Next meeting will probably be February if we can do this in person based on the COVID restrictions.</p> <p>Dr. Braverman: We agree with the necessity to put together a By-Name-List of Veterans in the community and identify their status we have already identified this as a requirement.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: Agree to put off the voting until the February meeting. Given the timeframe of which the Secretary's office has time to respond to these things, which has typically been 6-12 months, I am hopeful that the dashboard and the By-Name-List will already be well established before this comes out the door. We should get it right and delay.</p> <p>Mr. Skinner: For the record, the VCOEB did not recommend 15-1 to GLA.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: Reads VCOEB Recommendation 15-2</p> <p>Motion:</p> <p>Ms. Serrano: Move to table recommendation 15-2.</p> <p>Dr. Wellisch: Second that motion.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Recommendation 15-2 is tabled.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>The original intent of 15-2 was because we had not gotten a response from our March 2021 meeting. Not sure if we should move ahead with this is because after waiting 8 months, we finally did get a response and there is no evidence that any recommendation would be able to move that process faster.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Waiting 8 months for a response was perhaps an outlier.</p>
Master Plan Subcommittee recommendation brief discussion and vote	<p>Mr. Begland: Reads Recommendation 15-3, reads for the record slide deck that accompanies recommendation compares MP 2016 to 2022.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: Concerned about the complexity of the recommendation the Secretary will have to say concur in principle.</p> <p>Mr. Allman: Not concerned, if the Secretary concurs in principle that is a good thing.</p>

	<p>Mr. Begland: Recommendations Charlie, Delta, Echo it is not going to be concurrent on principle if he disagrees with our decision. There are specific recommendations. In A and B, we are taking a position if the board supports it, that we believe the Town Center concept and the Veterans training as originally envisioned is worth holding on to. We have made it as targeted as we can.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: Given the process as how this works, we do not have an opportunity to amend any of these things. Another strategy would be to have each of these as separate recommendations so that one does not “scuttle the bunch” but we may not be able to do that.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: The recommendations are very dependent upon each other.</p> <p>Mr. Allman: The only thing to add to the intent of the recommendation is it could be a case that VA issues a solicitation in which no one is interested. In which case we move forward with the plan as is. The intent of the recommendation is to see if there are any other ideas out there.</p> <p>Mr. Underwood: Many Veterans want a Town Center vice a Town Hall.</p> <p>Motion:</p> <p>Mr. Wellisch: Motion to move forward</p> <p>Mr. Underwood: Second the motion</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Recommendation passes</p> <p>Mr. Skinner: Based on the two services subcommittees we will have to re-designate this as Recommendation 15-1.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: and 15-4 to be re-designated at 15-2</p> <p>Mr. Begland: Reads Recommendation 15-2 (formally 15-4)</p> <p>Motion:</p> <p>Ms. Serrano: Motion to approve.</p> <p>Mr. Sapien: Second motion to approve.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Mr. Begland: Would like to add two attachments to the document UCLA’s press release and an LA Times article illustrating UCLA’s use of the naming.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Good recommendation with well put together and laid out with examples.</p> <p>Mr. Begland: The statues may have been passed in 1998 and it is specific to VA land, the Jackie Robinson stadium was named decades ago prior to that</p>
--	---

	<p>time. According to the VA we cannot use naming rights to attract investments and yet UCLA is. Why is that the case?</p> <p>Ms. Serrano: Looking forward to the response to this recommendation, it will answer many questions for us on the development side.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: What we want is for them to say we can use the naming rights for generating revenue.</p> <p>Mr. Begland: Maybe one possible suggestion would be to give naming rights for leases, one good suggestion is we give naming rights based on the West LA leasing act. There may be a lot of corporate sponsors out there that would like to be affiliated with Veterans. There is an opportunity here if we can open the door.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Recommendation 15-2 is approved.</p>
Wrap-up	<p>Mr. Skinner: Next month is the first month of the new year, will be sending email documents to be completed with the January 2022 date on them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-certification form • Online Ethics Training completed • FAC 101 training will be scheduled • New members send subcommittee preferences to the Chair for assignment. • Will need a 60-day approval for meeting over 50 due to COVID-19 rules. • Recommend that Jan 4th, be the next GLA VCOEB information exchange. Date is flexible. <p>LTG Hopper: DFOs to put together a contact list of current board with new members and send to this group.</p> <p>Mr. Boerstler: Thanked everyone.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: Thanked everyone and looked forward to additional discussions.</p> <p>Dr. Braverman: While all the recommendations are to the Secretary, we listen and will act on those that are executable in the immediate way whenever possible. Appreciate the dialogue.</p> <p>Mr. Wartski: Thanked everyone and General Hopper for his leadership, looking forward to seeing everyone. Wished everyone Happy Holidays.</p> <p>Mr. Begland: Thanked the board for supporting the two resolutions of the sub-committee and looked forward to meeting the new members. Our work remains vital.</p>

	<p>Mr. Allman: Outgoing MP subcommittee Chair, moving on to Chair the Veterans Advisory committee for LA County. Looking forward to continuing doing good work.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Asked members of the board for any comments.</p> <p>Mr. Tucker: To Anthony Allman I think the commission is in great hands. Thanked Col Skinner on his leadership and your leadership LTG Hopper Happy Holidays.</p> <p>LTG Hopper: Thanked DFOs for the setup and wish all Happy Holidays.</p> <p>Mr. Skinner thanked the public for hanging on.</p> <p>LTG (R) John D. Hopper, Chair</p>
--	---

Eugene W Skinner
686906

Digitally signed by Eugene W
 Skinner 686906
 Date: 2022.02.10 13:35:33 -05'00'

Approved

Eugene W. Skinner JR, DFO

/s/ John D. Hopper, Jr.

Approved

Lt. Gen. (R) John D. Hopper, Chair