

**Department of Veterans Affairs
Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board**

DATE: 31 March 2022

VCOEB Board Members Present

John Hopper (Chair)
Anthony Allman
Christine Barrie
Dennis Tucker
Hamilton Underwood
Heidi Marston
Jennifer Marshall
Jim Perley
Jim Zenner
Joe Sapien
Joshua Bamberger
Kristine Stanley
Larry Vasquez
Mark Wellisch
Robert Begland
Sarah Serrano

VCOEB Board Members Absent

Dan Rosenfeld
Keith Boylan
Philip Mangano
Shawn Vandiver

VA Employees and Staff Present

John Boerstler
Dr. Keith Harris
Dr. Steve Braverman
Robert McKenrick
Eugene W. Skinner Jr.
Toni Bush Neal
Matthew McGahran
Chihung Szeto
Janet Elder
Carrie Pham
Christy Hagen
Damian J McGee
Adam Ruege
Andrew Strain
Aras Jizan
Darryl Joseph

Kristin Grotecloss
Lori Moore
Marilyn Brower
Regina Griffin
Roberto Marshall
Teroc Meza

West Los Angeles Collective Present

Stephen Peck
Tess Banko

ERPI Contractor Support

Margaret Walsh
Cyndee Costello (Voyage Advisory)

Public Attendees

Janet Turner
Rob Reynolds
Anthony DeFrancesco
Kyle Orlemann
Feras Khatib
Jerry Orlemann
David Loera
Lawrence Loughlin
Francisco Juarez
Dick Southern
Quandrea Patterson
Alden Briscoe
Peter Muller
Janelle Wolves

Meeting Notes

Call to Order, Attendance, Welcome, Pledge of Allegiance, Opening Remarks	DFO Skinner welcomed everyone to the meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Szeto is the alternate DFO.• The meeting was executed using the Webex event teleconferencing platform.• Federal advisory staff are available via email to assist with technical problems at VEOFACA@va.gov• Public comments from 4:25pm – 5:15 pm Eastern or 1:24pm - 2:15pm Pacific.• There were 9 individuals selected in the order of event registration.• Speakers are held to a 5-minute time limit.
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comments can also be submitted via the email VEOFACA@va.gov for inclusion in the official meeting record. <p><u>Rules of engagement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mute your phone lines and silence cell phones. Mute microphones on your desktop. The Chair has requested to please turn on your camera if your system is equipped. Allow DFO/VCOEB Chair to yield the floor to you prior to speaking. The Chair will ask for questions and/or comments throughout the meeting. Please hold all questions until the presentation is complete. Identify yourself prior to speaking. After speaking be sure to mute your microphone and turn your cameras off. A roll call vote will be used for all proposed recommendations. Yay or nay, voice vote will be used for all proposed recommendations. Minimize background noise while speaking. Note: this session is being recorded. <p><u>Admin notes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will not be a VCOEB GLA information exchange on April 5, 2022. Planning is currently underway for an in-person meeting on June 21-22, more information to follow as plans solidify. <p>LTG (Ret.) Hopper welcomed committee members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomed Mr. Boerstler from the Veterans Experience Office and Dr. Keith Harris the Senior Executive Homeless Agent for GLA. Dr. Harris' first meeting where he will be a full board participant in this process. Thanked Dr. Braverman and his staff for his help in putting this particular meeting together and for the work they do helping our Veterans. There will be some changes in the GLA leadership and Dr. Braverman will cover those in his remarks.
VEO Update	<p>Mr. John Boerstler, Chief Veterans Experience Officer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking forward to the in-person meeting in a few months. The VA Chief of Staff, Tanya Bradsher, is planning to join the in-person meeting should her schedule allow. Honored to be a part of the new updated version of the master plan coming out soon.

	<p>LTG (Ret.) Hopper welcomed Mr. Harris to the full board meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Harris was traveling at this time and informed the committee he would be back on camera in about 10-15 minutes, Senior Executive Homelessness Agent for GLA. representing the Secretary's Office on Veteran homelessness in Los Angeles. • Dr. Harris' presentation was moved down the schedule and Dr. Braverman was asked to present.
VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System (GLA HCS) Update	<p>Dr. Braverman...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thanked the board for the opportunity to participate in the meeting. ○ They look forward to hosting the committee for the in-person meeting in June provided there are no new variants of COVID. ○ The last time the committee met GLA was in the beginning of the Omicron surge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 700 of the staff members got infected with 95% of them being vaccinated. None of them were seriously ill. • There was some downtime and they had to go into some contingency and crisis staffing processes at various locations, that included; inpatient, medical surgical care, inpatient psychiatry, CLCs, domiciliaries, and the CTS program they peaked at having about 120 Veterans on station that were COVID positive at one time and more over the course of the surge. • Among the Veterans that came through, unfortunately, there were 8 deaths all of them were either unvaccinated, partially vaccinated or immune compromised. • There is data to support the efficacy, from a healthcare standpoint, of vaccinations. The site has started offering a 4th shot - a second booster shot for those over 50 who had been boosted more than 4 months ago so they will be able to continue with their vaccination status because it is such a life saver. • During COVID and the Omicron surge the CTS and domiciliary programs stayed open during that time despite having some COVID infections in those areas. It was determined that the risk to those Veterans was lower than staying out on the street, especially for the city and county of Los Angeles where almost all of the shelters were closed, and all the programs were closed because of COVID.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CTS program expanded from 70 to over 100 Veterans. No one got seriously ill since that's an outdoor program. A separate floor was established for isolation of domiciliary residents with COVID, and to our knowledge, the only county-wide Psychiatry ward for COVID patients. So, GLA HCS was able to continue operations during that time. • The GLA HCS is in a much better place now with very few staff absences. There are still 4-patients in the inpatient service that have COVID, so it is not over and won't be over for some time. But GLA HCS is back to routine medical operations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Executive Leadership team change, two in the primary care health care system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Marcia Lysaght last week as the Associate Director for Patient Care Services Nurse Executive. She will be moving on to a promotion in the private sector to be the Nurse Executive for Ascension Health in Wisconsin. • Associate Director for Resources Ms. Asher has been promoted to the Deputy Medical Center Director in Pittsburgh and will be departing April 15th. • For both departures there are interim replacements who will start. The recruitment for permanent replacements is out on the street and closes in USAJOBS on Friday. • A third departure is Mr. Robert McKenrick who has been the Deputy Director and Executive Director of the service and the master plan program for the last couple of years. He is getting a promotion to become the Medical Center Director, Executive Director of the VA New Mexico Healthcare System in Albuquerque, his last day will be tomorrow. Dr. Braverman wished him the best as he goes out to New Mexico and tackles the challenges of being a director of his own facility and healthcare system. ○ Dr. Braverman highlighted some of the successes or progress that has been made in this program since working together with Mr. McKenrick over the last couple of years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening of the CTRS program in April 2020 when they started with a few tents on a parking lot which has now expanded to over 120 tiny shelters on the great lawn and has been a very good program as a low barrier to entry opportunity for Veterans to come
--	--

Master Plan 2022	<p>off the street and start getting engaged in healthcare and housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening of the Uxbridge Home Shelter in conjunction with the partnership from the city and county of L.A. • Began construction on buildings, 205, 208, 207 by the end of 2020, beginning of 2021 which will bring 180 units or so to the West L.A. campus by the end of this year. • Selection of the principle developer team, a revision of the Master Plan. • Metro easement in the beginning of the construction of the Metro station to be up and running by 2017. • Secured funding for the utility infrastructure and parcel readiness needs that was identified in order to move forward with construction and renovation of many of these buildings. Previously, there was no official plan. • Overall, the Master Plan is back on track for many of the promises that the VHA has made. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The staffing of Master Plan 2022 is complete, it has gone through VA staffing. A few changes were made based on information that was provided through additional consultation with stakeholders via Dr. Harris and is waiting for the Secretary's signature which is expected to happen in the next few weeks, as they're putting together the plans for the public roll-out of that Master Plan. ○ There was a request to answer a few supplemental questions prior to the formal presentation. So, Dr. Braverman summarized them verbally and a written copy will be sent to Mr. Skinner for inclusion in this meeting's documents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question</u>: Can a Veteran, including homeless Veterans at CTRS and those being seen in the emergency room, receive transportation to other parts of the campus without a scheduled medical appointment? • <u>Response</u>: VHA provides mileage for medical appointments in terms of reimbursement, they will coordinate shuttle transportation for those appointments. When people need shuttles outside of those appointments the VHA has community partners who run shuttles that operate on the campus and serve Veterans residing at CTRS buildings 209 and other service programs. Brentwood school provides an onsite transportation Monday through Friday, 3-times a day starting at 9:00 AM, with stops at the Eisenhower gate by the CTRS, the golf course, Welcome Center and building 402. The Disabled
------------------	---

	<p>American Veterans (DAV) also provides a shuttle, operated by Butterfly, that runs between the West L.A. campus Federal Center and over to the Ambulatory Care Center. Metro, as part of our Metro contract, operates a daily shuttle that continuously runs 24-hours a day, every day between the South campus parking lots, lots 7 by Wadsworth Chapel and building 500. So, individuals from CTRS can access that shuttle by walking less than a quarter-of-a-mile to parking lot 7. There is also a shuttle for CalVet residents which individuals can also use as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Question:</u> Where does the decision that VA employees cannot hold someone for a psychiatric hold? Does this rest with legislation or VISN administration? • Dr. Bamberger interrupts to address the previous question regarding the transportation. This was something that was great concern for the Services Subcommittee and asked Jim Zenner if the transportation question was sufficiently answered or did, he have any follow-up questions to see if the transportation needs of the Veterans on campus were being met. Jim Zenner had no follow-up questions but did state that “there might be a gap there” that he would be happy to discuss at-a-later-time. • Dr. Braverman continued. The Brentwood shuttle is a new shuttle that started around Thanksgiving time. So, that is a newer opportunity for individuals and that is running 3-times-a-day in that particular area. • Dr. Braverman reiterated the second question. Where does the decision that VA employees cannot hold someone for a psychiatric hold does this rest with legislation, VISN, OSP, etc.? • <u>Response:</u> VA employees may hold someone for a psychiatric hold they must have proper training and certification by the local government agencies locally in West L.A., that’s L.A. County. Police officers don not have that authority per the VA’s Office of General Counsel, and the VISN 22 senior security officer has a team working on some other procedure there. There are currently psychologists and psychiatrists on staff who are trained and authorized to place patients on psychiatric holds. • <u>Question:</u> Are there any local concerns at the medical center level around VAPD having hold authority or LPS designation? • <u>Response:</u> Generally, they do not have any concerns, but there is a plan for increased access and some
--	---

	<p>improvement with the process. For those who are not familiar with LPS it refers to Lanterman–Petris–Short (LPS) Act of 1967 which establishes the legal basis for detaining and treating psychiatric patients. And that is administered here on the county level where they reside. The inpatient facility is also designated as an LPS facility so that means they can receive and treat patients with the various forms of involuntary detention. Two major ones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A 5150 which is a short-term 72-hour hold, ▪ and 5250 which is a two-week hold. <p>And then after that, it gets into conservatorship through the courts and that is based on whether somebody is a danger to self or others, or grave disability as defined as being unable to provide for themselves. Psychologists and psychiatrists currently have that availability within the VA GLA privileging services here once they take the county coursework and pass the exam right now when VAPD is called to an address a situation involving such an individual they make contact with one of VA GLA’s privileged clinicians who are on call, in order to place a hold. If for some reason no one is available, they may also call the Mental Evaluation Team with LAPD to assist. They have approval and funding to stand up their own Veteran Mental Evaluation Team, as previously discussed, then, social workers who will be part of the program will also receive the training. Once they pass the exam, they will be able to apply those 5150 holds in association with our police department with the VMET. Currently, one police officer serving in that VMET capacity, a part-time social worker as a temporary detail while recruiting for two social workers to join that team on a permanent basis. That will enhance capability, but they are able to do those as needed now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Bamberger expressed the concern of the Services Committee that if a Veteran was at risk for coming to significant harm, either to themselves or others, because of their severe mental illness. If the system that is presently in place would be responsive enough to be able to keep them safe, or if there would be a gap between identifying someone in a serious situation and then having to go through this derivative of calling somebody. It sounds like Dr. Braverman has recognized that gap and is working towards resolving that with the VMETs. He then asked:
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Are you content where things are at this stage, or, do you feel like you’re still working to find a gap that needs to be filled?” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Braverman responded. Probably less of a gap than a timeliness issue. Having social workers as part of the VMETs will be important and improve the timeliness. He was not aware of any situations where they did not have availability of clinicians that resulted in any kind of negative outcome because of a short delay in order to contact somebody. There are individuals brought into the emergency departments on 5150s frequently and he has not seen a big gap. He did acknowledge that there is always a little risk that they can mitigate by putting this VMET program into place and that is the goal. ○ Mr. Zenner asked Dr. Braverman if there was a hesitancy to expand it to social workers beyond the VMET team because there is probably a lot more availability of the social workers than there are of psychiatrists and psychologists. ○ Dr. Braverman informed Mr. Zenner that he would not call it a hesitancy, they had not identified that as a need prior to this. It is not currently in the social work scope of care but that is something that they are looking at as they prepare for the VMETS, as well as if they need to have other trained individuals in order to expand the capability they will certainly look at that. ○ Dr. Bamberger thanked Dr. Braverman for answering the questions out of cycle. ○ Dr. Braverman turned it over to Mr. McKenrick for the next presentation. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper thanked Dr. Braverman and asked if he know who the interim replacement for Mr. Kenrick might be. ○ Dr. Braverman provided the information that he was aware of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because Mr. McKenrick is an SES they must go through CMO and OPM protocols. So, Dr. Braverman can designate somebody for up to 30 days as an interim. • Alan Trinh will be serving in that capacity for the first month or so of April. • Sometime either tomorrow or next week they expect a recruitment, both for an interim as well as a permanent replacement, to go out through CMO to find someone for a longer period of time. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper thanked Dr. Braverman again. ○ Dr. Bamberger asked if they had considered putting a person with a homeless expertise component in the job announcement as they recruit the position. He was wondering if this was on their radar and an expectation of it. ○ Dr. Braverman responded. Yes, that is part of the job description as well as for strategic planning.
--	--

- LTG (Ret) Hopper checked to see if Mr. McKenrick was on the line. Then asked if Dr. Harris was ready to make some comments.
- Dr. Harris thought much of his content would be covered between Dr. Braverman, Mr. McKenrick and Mr. McGahran. What he wanted to share with the group was that he has been in his new position for a little over 3 months, and deeply appreciative to the VCOEB and the many board members that he has met with on both subcommittees. He came with substantial experience on the homeless services side much less so on the Master Plan campus development side. He appreciated the expertise of this board. He has met with dozens of different groups, and agencies and just recently meeting with key VSOs who have been involved with the work here on all aspects of it for many years. Their perspectives have been valuable Dr. Braverman referenced that he was able to take some of the feedback he received and worked with the team at GLA to incorporate that into the final version of the Master Plan. He wanted to share on the services side of things.
 - They have technical assistance providers here on grounds this week, reviewing a series of recommendations on how to improve homeless services for Veterans across the board and it touches nearly every aspect within the continuum
 - Outreach and identification of homeless Veterans through the process of referring Veterans to the programs at VA GLA,
 - Moving Veterans rapidly through into permanent housing.
- All of this in support of the goals that the Secretary recently announced with the central one being the goal to house 1,500 Veterans into permanent housing during this calendar year. They will be able to share the services improvement work underway right now with the group in the coming months.
- Dr. Harris then asked if there were any questions from the board specifically for him.
- LTG (Ret) Hopper asked the group if there were any questions for Dr. Harris.
- LTG (Ret) Hopper thanked Dr. Harris and welcomed him aboard. Then turned it over to Mr. McKenrick.
- Mr. McKenrick presented the Master Plan agenda; the items were based on the questions they had received. The intent is to answer the questions and have dialogue where appropriate.

1. *Master Plan 2022 Approval Status*

	<p>Background:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Master Plan 2022 was finalized – beginning the concurrence process on January 7th, 2022.• Package cleared concurrence process with hardcopy delivered March 21st, 2022.• Pending SECVA signature. <p>Concurrence Process: VAGLAHS to VISN to VHA to VACO to SECVA</p> <p>Dr. Harris mentioned that he was able to provide some feedback and they were able to “tweak” a few things in the master plan that remained concerns for some of the VSO entities that Dr. Harris had met with. So, it is at the Secretary’s level, at this point they are reviewing the “Forward” and finalizing any other edits, but they believe they have the final for signature and will be working on that over the next few weeks.</p> <p>Mr. McKenrick continued the discussion.</p> <p>2. <i>FY22 Budget – Does the budget fully support the Master Plan 2022?</i></p> <p>VA GLAHS has an approximately \$1 billion operating budget that supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approximately 5,600 employees,• 87,000 enrollees,• Large 1A integrated HCS over 20,000 sq. miles, <p>Across 5 counties the majority of LA county. Long Beach ducks into the southeastern corner of LA county, Ventura, and up into Santa Barbara. The Santa Maria area, San Luis Obispo and across Kern county, Bakersfield and Lancaster.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eleven sites of care; 1 x VAMC, 2 x ACCs, 8 x CBOCs,• WLA VAMC sits on 388+ acres, Sepulveda Ambulatory Care Center sits on 144+ acres. A very large area, over 200,000 Veterans,• 604 operating beds,• Large affiliated academic programs about 2000 students per year,• Extensive research program. <p>When talking about the budget the first differentiation is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Master Plan and the efforts here to build 1200 permanent supportive housing units and all those additional activities that go into a Veteran community,• the building of the Master Plan on the North campus,• the turnover projects for the parcels,
--	--

- upgrading of the utilities.

These are a different budget, there are some slides that will show these projects and budgets, but they are not part of the \$1 billion health care budget that is dedicated for the health care system.

The health care system budget also serves the mission for the homeless as well as personnel and their efforts these are appropriated funds. They are working on moving the Care Treatment and Rehabilitative Service (CTRS) from an initiative to a validated program that can then use appropriated funds. So, a little bit of crossover in the budget, but the service budget is adequate for the mission they are doing. They are changing around some of the ways that service does their mission and adding additional emphasis, some additional positions, and adjusting the positions in some areas that will allow them to ramp up their activities. He wanted to put this up first as an answer to the question #2, the overall budget.

3. What are the shortfalls? What are the impacts? What is the VA doing to mitigate?

Master Plan 2022 is outside the VA GLAHS operating budget. To understand the budget impact of Master Plan 2022 and mitigate the risk of shortfalls, VA is:

- Collaborating across the agency and with senior VA leadership to phase the turnover of parcels to the EUL program in alignment with developer financing strategies, advance the development of VA major healthcare facility projects, and integrate community amenities.
- Contracting engineers to develop projects to upgrade infrastructure for the turnover of parcels to the EUL program.
- Working with VISN, OAEM, HEFP, VHA, and senior VA leadership through VA's Strategic Capital Investment Process (SCIP) to allocate funding arrangements specific to these Master Plan activities that fall outside of the healthcare operating budget.

Funding Request Process:

VAGLAHS Integrated Project Team (IPT) to VISN to HEFP to VHA

The Chief of Staff has taken the leadership role as the executive sponsor. There are monthly budget updates, detailed review of material as well as other supporting aspects, goals and efforts with the IPT members. Meetings with Mr. Brett Sims from the Office of Asset Enterprise Management, legal counsel, VHA leadership and other entities around the IPT to tackle challenges such as budgeting costs,

things that need to happen for sequencing, so there are no surprises. If there are issues identified there is an integrated team to resolve those issues outside of the normal GLA budget process.

The IPT underlies the integration of staff and efforts on these projects,

- Construction and facilities management officer their engineers and several of their people are integrated,
- A few people from OAEM and others visiting this week.

VA's Strategic Capital Investment Process (SCIP) program is the way the VA focuses across the nation to prepare for the Secretary funding requests by specific projects that are approved and that they want to go to Congress and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to show what they are budgeting in the out years for these projects.

The types of projects that are included:

- Major construction, like the new bed tower,
- Some minor constructions such as:
 - Rehab of particular buildings, interior or exterior, or a smaller project. These would need to get into the SCIP process.
- Non-Reoccurring Maintenance (NRM) projects, some of the upgrade activity on the north campus fall under the NRM efforts. These would need to get into the SCIP process.

They have already worked with the VISN, the regional CFM and through OAEM to identify some fast track potential and a different area that they can move some of these projects to, because when they get into a building or the building's called for, or like parking lots 38 and 48, they were moved forward on the schedule by a year or more. They had to move quickly, and they were not able to go through the two or three-year SCIP planning process. So, there is acknowledgement that the work they are doing is unique and they need to move the project faster. They have the support of the VISN to develop a contracting team to develop the project contracts in support of the engineering team to ensure that they move through timely, get to solicitation, bidding and award to get under construction quickly to meet their timelines for the housing. They are starting to realign and advertise for individuals to work on the project contracts team. Currently, there has been no delays because of this process but they are refining how they do this to make sure that the system can handle the capacity that will be needed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ LTG (Ret) Hopper comment/question: the project itself is a mandate from the result of a lawsuit to redevelop this land into a soldier's home is outside the VA GLA's normal health budgeting process. Going into Fiscal Year 2022 did you have a budget? Was it funded? And is it going to meet the requirements of Master Plan 2022?○ Mr. McKenrick responded. The turnover activities were not what had been anticipated. The Office of Asset and Enterprise Management (OAEM) started using some capital funds to start assessing properties to determine what remediation or mitigation activity needed to be done. They were aware that there was some asbestos mitigation that needed to be done in some of the buildings, so a budget was developed for that year. The engineering team was brought on and during 2021 they started flushing out all the other projects in those areas whether it was moving a steam line underground, moving a power line around on a parcel, these were the things that went into that budget. They worked through 2021 with the first budget for the actual turnover activities, and with nearly 30 parcels to be turned over they started assessing what parcels were next on the list to be turned over, and they would need to get the engineers out there to determine what activities would have to be done on each of those parcels for turnover. It was known that an upgrade of the utilities would be needed, there was the short-and-long term water projects, so they were added to the list. So, they asked for and received all the funding for the first year, no shortfall there. Then, they did not go through the normal SCIP process, but they developed a request via memo through the VISN, VHA, and up to VA Central Offices, CFM and OAEM were partners on that, and they made a request for 2022 funds, and all of that has been funded. <p>The budgets for 2021, 2022 have been fully funded, they have a rough budget for 2023. The parking lots came forward in 2022 so they had to adjust the budget a little because they have building 233 on one of the parking lots. Building 233 is a smaller block house building that packages their medical waste that is then sent off-site per contract for appropriate disposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Since they were unaware that the parking lots were coming,• they did not know building 233 had to be remediated. <p>So, the budgets change as they got more refinement, but to answer the question, they have a 2021, 2022 budget and a rough draft of a 2023 budget that they continue to flesh out.</p>
--	--

	<p>Mr. McKenrick then asked if that answered the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper responded: “Partially it does, are there any other VA programs that looks like this soldier’s home?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s reply: Not that he was aware of given the activity that they are doing to develop this. There are other medical centers, Dr. Braverman can speak of the medical center he was at where they had a couple of EUL buildings, there are 2 EUL buildings at Sepulveda but they are very contained and limited. They did not require an upgrade of the utilities across a good portion of a large campus nor did they require this huge turnover activity of land use to clear the land of all uncovered utilities and other things such as the remediation of some hazardous materials like asbestos. So, he was not aware of any other facility across the nation that has the scope or the depth of what they are trying to do here in the Master Plan. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper question: “Do you feel like the budgeting funding process is now caught up with the scope of the program?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s reply: He believes it has and, surprisingly, all the money that has been asked for has been received through the process, whether it came through OAEM as capital investment, or VHA and higher, or through the VISN they have explained why it was needed, how they arrived at the point of that need. Each time funding has been asked for it has been approved so there have not been any funding challenges. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper thanked Mr. McKenrick for his response. ○ Dr. Bamberger comment/question: “It seems we are trying to do a lot with healthcare dollars and turn the healthcare dollars to gold somehow, housing and so forth. As you leave this position do you have any suggestions as to how this could be better from your perspective? Now that you’ve done this for a while and struggled with trying to turn healthcare dollars into housing and other things that have been required and all these complicated partnerships. Any suggestions?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s reply: He agreed that it is outside of the normal healthcare process/system to do a community. He can see where it is reasonable, and it is an effective process. The Office of Asset and Enterprise Management (OAEM) can come online and tell them they have an enhanced use lease process and this is how to do it, they then build or rehab the building,
--	---

	<p>move in, and they may have one or two buildings. It is a cut and dry process that allows for best use of land and keeping Veterans close to healthcare because it is being done on healthcare facility land. The challenge here is it is not just building or a few buildings or adding a couple 100 units of permanent-supportive housing, the current scope is building 1200 permanent-supportive housing units, the land has been assessed for more, so moving forward 3, 5,7,10 years, if the scope needs to change it can certainly adjust on the scope of the land here. But to build a whole community there are so many other things that go into a community.</p> <p>They are integrating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • job training/skills training, • environments for families, • whole health, • a community barber shop and salon, • meeting places, • Veterans canteen services determining how they would like to assist with providing cafeteria or coffee shop environments in one or multiple locations across the north campus. <p>In order to build a community, this is where the principle developer/community development concept like Cabrillo Villages come in. He encouraged those that have not gone to see Cabrillo Village to go see it and it all comes together in that community environment. They may have a CBOC in that area, but they do not own that area as a healthcare system type activity or entity.</p> <p>So, they have a border line in that area of what is best to manage this area and how to develop and maintain this community. Do they eventually have the equivalent of a homeowner's association, or some kind of community entity that really represents the community as it moves forward 5, 10, 15, 20 years out? They are not going to take buildings as is there must be a turnover, and where does that funding come from?</p> <p>It is been a struggle, thinking "outside the box" but every level of VA, VISN, VHA, VACO they have all been supportive in how to get the right answers to drive us forward.</p> <p>A lot of questions about what they are doing, and the capacity to replicate this elsewhere, if they can get it going and prove that it works. They can do versions of this or an adapted version elsewhere where needed across the country.</p> <p>○ Dr. Bamberger thanked Mr. McKenrick for his response.</p>
--	---

- Mr. McKenrick continued his discussion: Moving on to the Housing delivery slide you can see the:

- Rate,
- number of houses being delivered relative to the budget,
- quarters going forward.

They are doing the turnover activities, they also must upgrade the utilities to ensure they are adequate, whether it be the water, sewer or the power for each of the units, so they are scoping out those efforts. The immediate challenge is the water pressure on the north campus:

- They had to go back and forth several times to get the tests redone, it's an under-pressure test, which is a little difficult and having the full pressure for the Fire Marshall test.
- There is a short-term project that is in place to get the adequate water pressure for 205, 207 and 209 up, and that concludes this week.
- Once the short-term project is completed then the Fire Marshall will come out again get it tested and get the occupancy certificate as far as the water pressure is concerned for fire suppression.
- There are also a long-term water use and pressure projects for the north campus that will be out for bid shortly.
- Construction starting September 2022.
- Turnover would be into the end of this year into the next fiscal year.

They are thinking/working through those parcel by parcel. What is very important is the timing for the ask for the parcel to be turned over because this drives our workload effort. They cannot do up to 30 parcels at once they must take them as they are needed and do all the work, get the contracts in place and all the other activities done, so it is a timing effort. Adding the list on the Housing Delivery Budget slide to help answer the question about the budget, the list includes:

- The values,
- number of units coming online,
- expected estimated start dates by quarter,
- estimated completion dates by quarter.

Budget slide FY 21 EUL Infrastructure Projects; Mr. McKenrick explained that what is important on this slide that was not on the other slide is the dollar amounts. In each of these efforts they have:

- Completed assessments by the engineering team.

- Known the scope of the project that has gone out for bid or is going out for bid.

Some of the projects, like the long-term project, even though they are working on it this year, the actual pull for the funding will be next year. So, the \$20 million ultimate expenditure will fall in next year's budget. You do some of the prep work one year, sometimes it takes money to do the prep work to get the contracting packet together that goes out for bid or solicitation but the actual award and the actual expenditure falls into the next calendar year. So, the \$22.32 million here in the FY 21 budget, the pictures on the slide show some of the activity and prep work started.

Budget slide FY 22 EUL Infrastructure Projects; some of the projects they are leaning into:

- Parking lot 38 and 48,
- small HAZMAT medical waste block building previously talked about,
- building 206 and some of the activity there,
- some activities that are being done in support of other things:
 - building 300 current kitchen, a new kitchen is being built on the south campus,
 - delayed approximately 3 months,
 - estimated completion end of October,
 - this means they cannot get out of the kitchen on the north campus,
 - which means they cannot do turnover activities,
 - they cannot get it to the principle developer.

So, there is a little bit of flux, they have been talking with OAEM for several months, they do have the ability to do some things to move quicker if they don't make the timeline so tight that it gets them in a bind. Although the timelines are tight, there is a little bit of flex in there.

- The delay in the upgrade of the south campus is due to Southern California Edison (SCE) power company bringing in enough power to generate the rest of the campus on the south as well as the new kitchen.
Possible causes of delay:
 - It may be parts, there were parts coming in late for the kitchen because of the overall slowing of supply across the nation in other areas due to COVID and other things.
 - Or, possibly work schedule.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anthony Allman question: “Back for the FY22 projects, I assume these are all fully funded, is that correct?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s reply: “They are, we’ve put in an initial request ahead of time based on our initial estimate.” This was so that as they went into the year the VISN and VHA knew what the estimated budget request was. Every time they come to a project, they’ve got the packet developed and it’s either a little under or over what was originally estimated, this is the actual amount. There has been no pushback and the money has been received timely. In the contracting realm you must have the money on hand when the packet is approved for solicitation and ready to go out for award. You cannot solicit or award something that does not have the funds on station. So, the funding that is needed has come in each time ahead of the actual solicitation because that is the law and the requirement for them to operate. There has been some adjustments to the cost for some of the project depending on the scope changes and it was determined there were other activities that needed to be done or some of the activities were a larger effort than originally thought. ○ Dr. Braverman comment: The money is mostly coming from the American Rescue Plan funds, which are 2-year funds. The way this works is there is an allocation of money for them, it comes to them when they need it. If they are able to execute more than this \$42 million worth of work in this fiscal year because they can move something from FY23 into FY22 that money will also be available, where if there is a project that does not get used, it can be put off and funded in the next fiscal year. ○ Mr. Allman comment: It is a lot of money for infrastructure projects and in particular the remaining light utility infrastructure which the slide says is fully funded. ○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: There has been no project that they have run against that has not been funded. And that may be a reflection of the leadership commitment, VISN, VHA and up to the Secretary’s office. They are not restricting their ability to get any of the funds for these projects because they are committed to the project they are doing at VA GLAHCS. ○ Dr. Braverman comment: As described earlier when separating this budget out, this was not the case a couple of years ago, now it is, and that is a separate process. However, the money for the planning team, the local GLA execution team, Mr. McKenrick’s team, the contracting staff putting together the
--	--

	<p>contract packets, and the engineers, those are still coming out of healthcare dollars and those would have come out of the \$1 billion dollar budget but Mr. Fisher, the Network Director, agreed to set aside \$7 million to cover those costs. So, they are trying to segregate funding sources and opportunities so that the plus and minus changes, surpluses, challenges that might have in the healthcare system does not impact their ability to move forward with this program, where it may have before.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Allman comment: This is obviously a lot of money going into the north campus, maybe recommend or ask that VA consider possibly publishing a press release about this. It's a big deal and for people to see that VA's investing the necessary money is a great sign. ○ Dr. Braverman comment: He thanked Mr. Allman. As the Master Plan signing gets rolled out over the next month part of the goal is to identify some of these progress points that have been made. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper follow-up: Is it fair to assume that the principle developers planning, and execution is synced up with the pace from the VA? ○ Mr. McKenrick's response: They are in sync as much as the delivery schedule as they plan for each of the parcels. The challenge becomes, as seen with MacArthur field, that they struggled to get the funding for that in different capacities, or to make the funding timeline to bring that project forward from when it was initially planned, so it slide backwards. What did come forward were the two parking lots, 38 and 48, so they are in sync with the principle developers in that they have a collaboration meeting every 2-weeks, a monthly product that is review that shows everything that is on-time, each of the parcels with the estimated start and completion dates. And that is how they organize their efforts, but at any given time they could have struggles with the funding on a particular project, and it could move backwards. And, therefore, they would look to move another project forward to fill that gap, or there could be a funding opportunity for a particular project type or particular project that would cause it to come forward on its own, and they would make room for that project. They stay in sync every 2-weeks with the meetings and with the monthly product meetings where they are reviewing start, completion and turn over dates. They also have documents between the principle developers as to agreements to meet a turnover date which is signed off on. So, there are agreements
--	---

that underpin the lease arrangements that are ultimately done by the Office of Asset and Enterprise Management.

- LTG (Ret) Hopper thanked Mr. McKenrick.
- Mr. McKenrick continues:

4. *Status of Lease Revenue Funds? How much is available? Estimated Annual Contributions?*

Governance: The West Los Angeles VA Campus Improvement Act (P.L. 117-18) requires use only for:

- Supporting construction, maintenance, and services at the campus relating to temporary or permanent supportive housing for homeless or at-risk Veterans and their families.
- Renovating and maintaining the land and facilities at the campus.
- Carrying out minor construction projects at the campus.
- Carrying out community operations at the campus that support the development of emergency shelter or supportive housing for homeless or at-risk Veterans and their families.

Current Leases: Brentwood School, Regents University of California (UCLA), SafetyPark Corporations, and Veterans Housing Partnership (B209)

	Estimated Annual	
Lease Revenues	Revenue Amount	Total Expenditures
\$6.81 million	\$1.30 million	\$4.97 million

The question asked about lease revenue, they talked about healthcare budget and appropriated funds but lease revenue funds and the Improvement Act called out a different type of funds, which also called out any restitution funds known as forfeiture funds that would come back to them. The lease revenues is \$6.81 million and then forfeiture is \$4.48 million so they are in separate accounts, but both of those accounts in their funding system are “walled off” in that they can only be used per the law for the activities that are associated with the law. They are controlled and managed through the Strategic Facility Master Planning Office, any request to use the funding for projects, whether it is for maintenance in an area, construction support CTRS, minor construction, all those funding requests go through that office, it is validated and confirmed that the project fits this requirement then they would come out of these funds. They only had the one-time forfeiture fund payout of \$4.48 million. There are some activities that they have spent the money on for supporting CTRS

	<p>tiny shelters, so total expenditures \$4.97 million. They have drawn on the forfeiture funds, but that is not to say they have not taken out of both funds. By law, these funds can be kept as “no year money”, so the money does not go away. In FY2017 after the passing of the law in 2016 the leases were redone to put in their lease revenue of a sizeable amount that is now generated. So, \$1.074 in 2017, about the same in 2018, \$1.226 million in 2019, \$1.286 million in 2020. The main providers for the revenue from 2017 to 2019 were UCLA, Brentwood school, building 209 the existing EUL. In 2020 the SafetyPark Corporation was put under lease so that added to the lease revenue. In 2021 it was \$1.327. The COVID epidemic had a negative impact on the utilization of SafetyPark with fewer people going out and generating revenue so the lease revenue fell flat for 2020 and 2021 was also relatively slack. So, they had to spend some of the restitution money during the latter part of 2021 into 2022 total expenditures approximately \$1.5 million:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Electrical, ○ site and infrastructure improvement, ○ tiny shelter comprehensive planning, ○ janitorial services, ○ hygiene trailers, ○ two administrative trailers integrated into CTRS – Veterans meeting space, offices and storage, ○ security stations placed on the 4 corners, ○ paving, ○ other infrastructure improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small electrical sub-station, transformer sufficient to power/support 127 units there now, with capacity to expand. <p>○ Hamilton Underwood question: Wanted to know if there was a drilling lease.</p> <p>○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: There is a 2.5% oil revenue, and that revenue goes directly to DAV for its transportation purposes. ButterFLi Transportation is one of the companies used to provide transportation primarily from the West L.A. to other campuses.</p> <p>○ Mr. Underwood question: “Do we know how much money that is?”</p> <p>○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: The revenue changed significantly when COVID hit because there were less drivers on the road and the oil companies slowed down the drilling, so it went down significantly, it has come back up a bit, but we don’t control which wells the oil company’s pull the oil out of. So, why they may have increased oil production in other wells, the</p>
--	--

	<p>oil production from this well did not get back to its previous volume/output.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Bamberger comment/question: The governance of the revenue expenditure seems like the same strategy as the way that the overall budget for the medical center is distributed. “Are there any rules and regulations as to, who should be making decisions as to how that money is spent? And is there some strategy that could happen so that people who are experiencing homelessness who are the ones who could potentially benefit from this lease revenue could also be part of the decision making process as to how the money is distributed?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: The money is kept in the accounts by the finance office. The Chief of Strategic Facility and Master Planning offers up the use of the funds for a particular activity, if needed. It then comes to the Medical Center Director, and the use of the funds is validated as to whether it meets the legal requirement of what it is to be used for. Legal will also determine if it meets or does not meet the requirement of the law and if it must be done a different way. It is briefed to the Executive Leadership Team (ELT), they do monthly briefings, the strategic facility master planning has a monthly briefing and the SRS has a monthly briefing. So, each of these program areas briefs monthly the budget is reviewed as well as other activities and expenditures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount received from the agreement with the Bureau of Land Management over the last year was between \$5,000 to \$20,000 per month. • The amount received is dependent on how much oil is being pumped out. • DAV had paused their services for about 4 or 5 days possibly due to a financial adjustment error on their part. They were not sure if they had enough funds to continue services. • They worked with the DAV and reconciled the money and they did have enough to continue operation and within a matter of days they were up-and-running again. ○ Dr. Bamberger comment/question: “Within the VA are there any rules or regulations that says it has to be within the administration of VA GLA, or could it be an outside organization or a community based Oversight Committee that is involved in how the money gets expended?”
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Braverman's response: It comes through GLA and goes into one of their financial accounts, that does not mean that they cannot have some internal process that includes input from other sources. They do that in other areas when it comes to prioritizing programs or plans and it is something that can happen here. It would be the same kind of processes that they put in place for short term land use requests, so they can determine a way to get input from the community in regards to potential uses of that land, and that would be administered through them. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper comment/question: He views these funds as belonging to the Veterans, they are generated through the deeded property. "Is there a philosophy about how the lease revenue funds will be maintained in the future? How do you see it playing in the governance as well as the upkeep and repair of the Soldiers Home?" ○ Dr. Braverman's response: A general philosophy is that the money, in accordance with the rules that are attached to it that were enhanced by the West L.A. Improvement Act last year, would be used to cover things that appropriated funds cannot cover. That is the benefit by putting these funds in "no year money" funds, the law says they have to be tied to facility projects that can't be tied to any other appropriation or group of expenditures that would normally accrue to another appropriation. That is why when Mr. McKenrick was describing security, which is not considered a facility appropriation requirement, we could not do it for medical services. The goal is to use it for things that we would not otherwise be able to fund through appropriated funds. That is why it can support housing, renovation of sidewalks and streets on the north campus ground, it can build a therapeutic outdoor area for homeless Veterans and domiciled Veterans to use. It is the money that is being used to support the overall construction facility requirement for CTRS so those are the things that would be prioritized moving forward. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper question: "While the funds are waiting to be used are, they kept in an interest-bearing account or some sort?" ○ Dr. Braverman's response: It is in a regular government account, not interest bearing. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper question: "Do you have any qualms about taking the funds to zero?"
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Braverman’s response: We don’t want to take it to zero because it is also currently being used for CTRS operational expenses that cannot be funded through regular appropriated funds. The goal is to ensure there is at least money that will sustain funds for those kinds of programs like CTRS and if there are other programs that come up in the future that require facility infrastructure costs that are not available through appropriated funds. Besides that, our goal would be to spend the money and get it to zero as long as our annual requirements are met, so there would need to be some surplus reserve to meet those annual requirements if they exceeded the lease revenue. ○ Mr. Allman comment/question: “On the previous slide, I assume the lease revenue funds is the total collected since the lease revenue fund was created?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: The total is from the creation of the fund. ○ Mr. Allman comment/question: “And the additional fund from the restitution, which is \$4.48 million, with regard to the total expenditures is that blended from the two accounts? Or is that from just the lease revenue fund?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: It is from both accounts. ○ Mr. Allman comment/question: “Do we know as far as the percentage of expenditure, how much went to CTRS vs. minor construction type projects?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: Every expenditure is itemized; they want to make sure the tracking of these funds is clear for all purposes of audits. ○ Mr. Allman comment/question: “In the past the Federal Advisor Committee adopted two recommendations regarding the use of the lease revenue funds to support emergency shelters on campus. Recently, we received feedback from our 13th recommendation regarding seismic funding, to summarize, it was major construction dollars that could not be used for anything outside of mission-critical facilities but at the end of the recommendation it discussed that VA would possibly consider minor construction dollars for extra ordinary seismic projects. So, could GLA make a capital contribution to an enhanced use lease? Could lease revenue money be used for seismic corrections?”
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: He would need to go through legal to make sure that the expenditure is appropriate. He consults legal for just about every expenditure, unless it is a recurring one, to make sure it falls within their guidance.○ Mr. Allman comment/question: The Improvement Act included minor construction projects at the campus as an acceptable expenditure. So, is there a bridge between lease revenue fund and potential seismic funding?○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: “It may be challenging when you’re reinvesting in a building that is then turned over through an EUL to do the seismic and then they come in and do holistic construction which is likely to interfere with the seismic retrofit that was just completed.”○ Mr. Allman thanked Mr. McKenrick.○ Mr. McKenrick continued with the presentation.● Status of Lease Revenue Funds/Estimated Annual Contributions: Current West L.A. Leases/FY21 Annual Cash Consideration:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Brentwood School/\$871,250.04○ Regents University of California (UCLA)/\$311,408.49○ SafetyPark Corporation/\$101,680.64○ Veterans Housing Partners (B209)/\$22,285.00Total FY 21 Annual Lease Revenue Generated from West L.A. Leases = \$1,306,624.17.● Procedure for obligating funds to support Master Plan:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Step 1: GLA Service identifies needs.○ Step 2: GLA Service develops concept and presents to Department Leadership for approval.○ Step 3: Department Leadership presents to Executive Leadership Team for final review of approved use of Lease Revenue funds.○ Step 4: Once approved, GLA Strategic Facility and Master Planning Office works with GLA Service and Contracting to solicit and award the project. <p>This is tracking the lease revenue funds and contributions directly available for use under the Enhanced Law. But the oil revenue of 2.5% goes directly to DAV and they monitor that service, they hold them accountable for the expenditure and the overall amount, they do not have access to those funds for anything but that service per the lease agreement made for that.</p>
--	---

	<p>So, this is what feeds into the “no year money” funds, if they were to take it to zero dollars at any given year there would still be those reoccurring maintenance costs, like janitorial service and other things that they would struggle with each year. Since the funds come in monthly one can see the revenue building up again for that year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Bamberger comment/question: “Has anyone done an analysis of the dollar value per square foot? To see if we are talking apples-to-apples across these different participants.” How much is UCLA and Brentwood school paying per sq. ft. of land? This is supposed to be used for housing for Veterans. Is the VA getting a good value for renting out that space? ○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: They can investigate it. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper comment/question: “Are all our lease holders current on their payments?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: “They are.” ○ Heidi Marston comment/question: “What are some of the changes within SRS that are being made to support some of this work?” ○ Mr. McKenrick’s response: “We can certainly take that as a question and have Matt provide an answer and give that out at a later point.” ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper comment: He explained they were going into the public comments’ session. But he thought they would have time to get to Ms. Marston’s question later. Then turned it over to Mr. Skinner for public comments.
Public Comments Session	<p>Mr. Skinner explained the sequence of public comments is based on when the public registered.</p> <p>First Public Comment: Ms. Janet Turner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ms. Turner: “Yes. Good Afternoon. I, uh, I’m happy to give my time to the next person. Thanks so much.” <p>Second Public Comment: Mr. Rob Reynolds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Reynolds: “All right perfect. Um, one of the first things I’m concerned about is, you know, the oil revenue only gives 2.5% that seems incredibly low. And then also this money is supposed to be going to DAV, to provide transportation doesn’t make any sense, why are we relying on Brentwood school to drive a van around to bring Veterans to

	<p>appointments? Why is DAV not providing transportation to the Veterans on campus? That's one of the biggest challenges we have is getting Veterans transportation to their appointments. I know a lot of peer supports end up driving them around. So, if there's money that's actually available to be used for that we should definitely be doing that. Um, furthermore the UCLA baseball stadium, I mean, you see in the recent reports they're paying half a million dollars less than they should be. This, this whole situation on the property is just it's really disgusting what's going on. It's no secret that the VA has definitely prioritized listening to special interest groups like Brentwood school, UCLA at the expense of Veterans and have done it for years. And this Master Plan that talks about pushing housing construction out over the next 8 to 10 years and prioritizing things like a town center makes no sense. You got the purple line metro train, I see it all the time, construction "full speed ahead" you've got crews there 7-days a week. I go up and look at building 207, 205, 208, skeleton crews, barely anyone there just taking forever. I mean, you can see where the will is, and it doesn't look like the will is to get the housing done. It looks like the will is to work with the purple line Metro, work with UCLA, work with Brentwood school while the Veterans stay in tiny shelters. And furthermore, you know, the whole way the situation went down with UCLA's second lease amendment and that practice field. I mean, that was really ridiculous, that should have not happened, that should have not been orchestrated in private. Everyone should have known about that. It's not right what's going on with this property. I think everyone needs to take a step back and realize that the focus needs to be getting the housing built and focus should also be getting these leases off the property. Doesn't make any sense, the OIG says that they're illegal so what's going on here it's, uh, tired of hearing executives defending Brentwood school because what they're defending is someone that's breaking the law. If the Office of the Inspector General says the lease is non-compliant with law, non-compliant with the West Los Angeles leasing act. What are we doing here? Why are you defending it? Doesn't make any sense. And furthermore, Congressman Ted Lieu's office, in 2016 when he passed the West Los Angeles Leasing Act, in his own words he said 'that the legislation was to ensure that all leases on the property principally benefit Veterans and their families. However, that legislation included a 10-year lease for UCLA baseball stadium. It just shows what's going on, there is an effort, behind the scenes to always protect UCLA, Brentwood school, the oil, purple line Metro's interest on the property at the expense of Veterans, and a lot of meetings are held in secret. The VCOEB is getting better with getting input from people but for years</p>
--	--

	<p>you guys weren't getting good input and I believe that the homeless Veterans need to be addressed and they need to be brought into their concerns, what they have going on it's just, there's just a lot of improvement needs to go on. I don't think anyone should sign the Master Plan right now. That should be nothing that we're even talking about the goal should be to get everyone together and get everyone on the same page because that's clearly not the case today. And it needs to be moving forward because this is unacceptable. Los Angeles is the nation's capital to Veteran homelessness and there's enough land enough buildings to get all of them housed. And we need the will there to get the housing built, stop listening to all these groups like UCLA, Brentwood school who have no business being on that property to begin with and let's get the Veterans taken care of. That's all I have. Thank you."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Skinner thanked Mr. Reynolds. He and did not see Mr. Feras Khatib on the line and asked if he was online. ○ Mr. Feras Khatib: No response. ○ Mr. Cory Robichaud: No response. ○ Mr. Raymond Hall: No response. ○ Mr. Lawrence Loughlin: "I'd like to, I'm getting feedback. What's wrong?" ○ Mr. Skinner: "Sir, I believe you have a telephone on as well you have two different sources. What's your name?" ○ Mr. Loughlin: "No I don't have a telephone." ○ Mr. Skinner: "Okay, but we can hear you clear, sir." ○ Mr. Loughlin: "It's very difficult for me to talk with this feedback, but first of all, I want to thank Joshua Bamberger for insightful questioning, very good. Secondly, I don't understand except for the revenue being produced why in the hell the Brentwood school and UCLA are on land that was dedicated, deeded to Veterans, it's against the law as Mr. Rob Reynolds just mentioned. The way you have treated Veterans that had been on Veteran's row since you brought them in, it really is inhuman, you have isolated them from their supporters, you don't feed them, the only food I have ever seen any of these Veterans eating are cold sandwiches. I have asked Matt McGharan to provide them a dayroom, he tells me to go and fill out a 3-page application along with a \$100,000 liability
--	---

	<p>insurance policy that I would have to provide. I told him that was his job to provide a dayroom. Also, I've dayroom listed an exercise room or area, plus the utility the equipment that has to go with exercise. And finally, I've asked him to provide the Veterans with an educational resource area. And I don't know why he has asked me as a Veteran with no official connection to the Department of Veterans affairs to come up with all this 3-page application and a \$100,000 or maybe it was \$1 million insurance policy. It's ridiculous. I told him that was his job. The problem is this isolation with the supporters unable to access the Veterans, the homeless Veterans. We don't know what's going on, now through sources, I've been told that these two 20' X 20' modular are being used, or one of them at least, as a dayroom, so why he doesn't let the supporters know this is beyond me. It's like a game that the VA is playing with their supporters of the homeless Veterans. In these 8' X 8' boxes they might have a door, but no key is provided to the residents, and I was there after a heavy rain and it's impossible for those residents to navigate to the distant mobile showers and these nasty porta potties. With all these empty buildings, standing empty on the northern land I don't know why in God's name the VA put them in these 8' X 8' so called CTRS encampment."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Skinner: Informed Mr. Loughlin his time was up and thanked him for his comments. ○ Mr. Gary Blasi: No response ○ Mr. Skinner: Asked if Mr. Francisco Juarez was there. ○ Mr. Francisco Juarez: "Yes, can you hear me?" ○ Mr. Skinner: "Yes, we can hear you fine, your 5-minutes starts now, sir." ○ Mr. Francisco Juarez: "My name is Francisco Juarez I am a PMI certified project manager in 1988. You cannot deny that many Veterans complain about the appeal of the topography of this land. The metro purple line has violated its own agreement clause. It has negatively affected the environment of this national home for disabled Veterans. For the record, your maps do not take the land of Brentwood school into account for development of housing for Veterans. CNN recently ran the story that described the "tip of the iceberg" of collusion and corruption that voting members may perpetuate today with the wrong advice to Secretary McDonald. Below the waterline America's moral obligation to genuinely care for her defenders
--	---

	<p>is at stake because this “home vs. healthcare expansion” and “mix again”, the goal of which was not properly brainstormed therefore, not properly project managed. While these presentations and loaded questions all sound so formal and professionally planned. How is it the handpicked VSO cronies that the Aldermen’s, Valdez’s, Hernandez’s, McGharan’s, the regularly so called bed reps that you have counted on for support of this land fraud have access to a close meeting in the 1887 fund building prior to this meeting. How does Keith Harris, who was late to this meeting because he was there, first meeting and expected plan endorsement as a senior homeless person come at such a crucial time. Mr. Harris, you have not engaged in the NHDVS coalition, AGIF or what I know of DVA. AGIF, DVA, and possibly AMVETS will not support this plan because there are too many unanswered questions. There’s been too much loss of life, to many mental breakdowns and too much loss of land to the long-term EULs. The VCOEB supposedly solicits input from a full range of stakeholders on how to best use the Greater Los Angeles homeland not campus, for the record, your range is not complete. As an advocate that has followed the willing of the land for decades this so called Master Plan will result in less land to be enjoyed by Veteran residents because the non-Veteran special interest that take control of the north campus do not belong on this land. This is a land racket funded, influenced, lobbied and orchestrated by insiders, speculators, including developers like Thomas Sevron, UCLA, Brentwood school, Maverick energy for profit and nonprofit U.S. Veterans and the so-called VSO representatives I mentioned. Department of Veteran Affairs bureaucrats, including those present have for years squashed the sense of urgency that we feel is required to save lives and make best use of this land to impact Veteran homelessness and do away with exclusive land use policy that favors not better special interests over the un-housed Veterans. This has been a “pay-to-play” operation. Number one, VCOEB is not solicited or engaged with stakeholders. The most vocal, factual group challenging this plan the NHDVS coalition, many of whom live in the outdoor encampment of this homeland. Among its many accomplishments, NHDVS research is responsible for the “emergency powers” that Secretary found to bring Veteran row inside, and NHDVS research is responsible for CNN subjective report. The homeland consists of the inland footprint, and it consists of beach front property that was separately deeded on the same day the first specific and permanent deed was. I have the title research in my possession for the beach front property that demonstrates it as a part of the vision that you will do away with if you vote</p>
--	---

	<p>wrong to maliciously repurpose this land with this flawed plan that your vote can stop would be to render the beach front property given in perpetuity for the “residents” of the “home” as surplus land, like land grabbers want the public to think that portions of this land are and this land racket will then continue to be challenged. Beth, and NHDVS coalition Veteran family member wrote; ‘So, according to our Mayor the Veterans homelessness should have ended in 2015, what would even make him think such a thing much less say it. What’s that he lied, and Brentwood school was actually squatting on Veteran owned land and what you see on our research has and is using the land illegally. Will the real owners of the land please stand-up and begin the eviction process?’ And Ryan, the subject matter expert at VA West L.A. wrote, ‘Despite my continued my continued astonishment over your refusal to extend the Federal Register public comment period regarding the West L.A. VA Soldiers Home purported master and community plan or at least such opportunity for true and critical public comments there about. I remain faithful we can agree that, there may be no good reason suppress public notice or public comments regarding federal document 2022-02796 RAN 2900 AQ 23. Yeah, or is he has excluded from providing input.’ In summary, homeless expert is part of the job description now, 2015 was a goal to end homelessness. Mac’s report is all about the medical centers work in the region your vote will repurpose the land use mandate for house to work. Thank you very much.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Skinner: Thanked Mr. Juarez. “Next public comment is from Ms. Shirrell McCarney Ma’am are you on the line? I’m going to unmute one call-in user to see who this is, I don’t have a name. Call-in user, can you identify yourself please?” ○ Mr. Ryan Thompson: “Yeah, this is Ryan Thompson.” ○ Mr. Skinner: “I don’t have you on the registered public comment Ryan.” ○ Mr. Thompson: “That’s because you blocked me. That’s because you blocked my IP address and you wouldn’t let me sign up because you.” ○ Mr. Skinner: “Sir, that ends the public comments session.” ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Thanked the members of the public that signed up and expressed his appreciation for their comments which they will take under consideration.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ms. Well interrupts: “Is it possible to hear what Mr. Ryan Thompson has to say?” ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper response: “No ma’am, Mr. Thompson did not sign up.” ○ Ms. Well: “Well he can have my” ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Asked who that was. ○ Mr. Skinner: “It’s Ms. Well sir I muted her she was not signed up either.”
Community Solutions Discussion – By-Name-List	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Continued with the agenda, next on the list is By-Name-List presentations by Community Solutions. ○ Mr. Skinner: Community Solutions were not online at the time; it was a little early. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Deferred to Ms. Marston to restate the question she had earlier. ○ Ms. Marston comment/question: Referring to Mr. McKenrick’s presentation. It was mentioned that there were shifts that were happening with SRS to better support the overall strategy on the Master Plan implementation and the work being done on the campus she wanted to hear more on what those changes are and what that looks like. ○ Mr. McGahran: They are working not just on the Master Plan but also on ending Veteran homelessness throughout the Greater Los Angeles area, so, there are a few different strategies they are working on to address that issue. Ms. Marston’s team has been involved in these strategic meetings with their technical consultants along with Dr. Harris and his homeless program office management team. They are working on some system-wide strategies to better coordinate the “By-Name-List” and coordinated entry system, ensuring homeless Veterans have a coordinator, and a data lead so that the data matches up with data that LAHSA has and other housing authorities have. They are looking at a housing locator contract, they just signed the funding today, and hope to get a new housing locator contract to help with finding available units in the community, LAHSA also has a contract now and it is possible these contracts can be compared to see what the most effective ways to use that contract might be.

	<p>There is a number of project-based units in the community that are not filled yet and they are working with those property managers to get those filled as quickly as possible. These are all in connection with the Secretary's goal to permanently house 1500 Veterans by the end of this calendar year and to utilize 75% of the vouchers that are available now to speed up the process of getting Veterans housed within 90-days, or at least house half of the Veterans that receive a voucher this year. This is a work-in-progress and they are taking one-step-at-a-time to get these things accomplished.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ms. Marston: She was aware of the goals but was not sure if there were any concrete shifts being made within the VA scope to make those things happen. ○ Mr. McGharan: They are putting together recommendations from the technical assistance team this week, so they anticipate having more concrete strategies developed next week. ○ Dr. Bamberger: Thanked Mr. McGharan for making headway and wanted to have as much of that information for the Services Subcommittee as they can. How much money is being spent? How many units do they hope to get from the housing locator agencies? All those other things would be helpful to get some details so they can be as aware as possible to see the progress. ○ Mr. McGharan: Agreed to keep them informed and if they have any specific questions to let him know. ○ Dr. Bamberger: Asked that if Mr. McGharan could possibly stay when the Community Solutions people join. Specifically commenting on what they have to say about the fidelity of a "By-Name-List" and how that plays into what they are trying to play out. ○ Mr. Skinner: Announced that Community Solutions was standing by. ○ Dr. Bamberger: Introduced colleagues from Community Solutions, a national organization that has been leading the charge across the country to achieve functional zero for homeless Veterans in many communities. There are many communities that have achieved functional zero for homeless Veterans, L.A not being one of them for which they will discuss, but there has been great success using the same strategies, same playbook, across all these different
--	--

	<p>communities, which includes high fidelity “By-Name-List”, organizing everyone into a similar goal. The McArthur Foundation, a leading philanthropic organization in the country, honored Community Solutions with a \$100 million grant called “100 million in change”, which was a worldwide competition that highlighted Community Solutions as the national agency deserving of this extraordinary funding in the effort toward ending homelessness for Veterans and others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adam Ruegue: Director for learning evaluation at Community Solutions. As a former employee of the VA homeless program office he is familiar with much of the work being done in the Los Angeles VA. ○ Aras Jizan: Thanked everyone for the invitation. Provided an overview of Community Solutions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National, not-for-profit organization, • partner with cities and counties continuums of care, • provide a different approach to the work of ending homelessness, • no charge for technical assistance, • goal and mission are to offer whatever support is valuable to local teams to shift the way they are doing the work. <p>One of the approaches is the idea of the “By-Name-List” or a shift in the way that community’s local teams use data to drive their work.</p> <p>What is a By-Name-List?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A comprehensive list of every person in a community experiencing homelessness, updated in real time. ▪ Using information collected and shared with their consent, each person on the list has a file that includes their name, homeless history, health and housing needs. ▪ Incorporated data from multiple systems (e.g., HOMES, HMIS) to get us a more complete picture and improve care coordination. <p>Comprehensive list as close to real time as possible, that data is being refreshed at least monthly. Why go through the effort of building that data source? What are you doing with it? The data is honoring the client or Veteran consent, but it’s not just a name, it captures the homeless history, health and housing needs, it enables practitioners in the system to have the</p>
--	---

	<p>information necessary to work with the Veteran or client to support them to resolve their housing crisis. It also enables system level individuals to understand who is experiencing homelessness. Who is our system serving well? Who is the system not serving so well?</p> <p>And it takes a bit of information about those individuals or households to be able to answer those questions. The word “list” may be misleading it should be thought of as a composite data source. Communities that are successful in taking this methodology or approach, is that a “By-Name-List” represents data from multiple systems. In the case of Veterans, it’s most likely to include data from HOMES and HMIS two different data bases that different entities locally are using to track care coordination and care provision, but the goal is to get a more complete picture and to ultimately improve care coordination so that the experience of the end users of these systems, Veterans experiencing housing crisis, or homelessness, or anybody experiencing housing crisis or homelessness is improved.</p> <p>How are By-Name-Lists Used?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To conduct case conferencing or other care coordination efforts. ▪ To track and communicate progress towards reducing and ending homelessness. Aggregate accountability measure, if we do not know how many people are experiencing homelessness, how can we know if progress is being made towards the goal? ▪ To understand who is experiencing homelessness in a community, (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, gender, income, neighborhood, etc.). Different jurisdictions have different definitions of how they want to be able to place the data. But here are some ways that have been seen to drive systems improvements in good conversations about equity. ▪ To understand trends in system performance. Possibly look beyond the program and project data to think about system wide data or some data source that tells us about every Veteran experiencing homelessness in our community and in order to do that you need to integrate multiple data streams to have that more complete picture. <p>Why Measure By-Name-List Data Quality?</p> <p>The Active Homeless Population depicted in the slide had shown an increase in homelessness from May 2016 (estimate 238) to November 2016 (estimate 313), it’s not a story about homelessness getting worse, in this particular community a</p>
--	---

number of service providers were not participating in data sharing. So, when they were talking about how many Veterans were experiencing homelessness, they had an imperfect picture and were only reporting on 2/3rds of the pie. Then in November 2016 the other 1/3rd started to share data with the system, but because they could not account for, or clearly communicate the improvement in data quality, they were unable to effectively communicate what was going on. So, if the organizations approach is predicated on using data for improvement, then there needs to be a conversation about data quality.

How do we define By-Name-List quality?

- Full Coverage
 - All relevant agencies and programs are represented.
 - List includes people sleeping in shelters, transitional housing, and on the streets.
- Person-Level Data
 - Each person has an entry that includes their name, demographic info, history, health and housing needs.
 - Each person can be followed through the system.
- Regular Updates
 - List is updated monthly, at a minimum.
 - As people's housing status changes, so do their list entries.
- Reliability
 - Data balances month over month, just like a checkbook.

Community Solutions in conjunction with the federal partners and stakeholders on the ground, created a checklist, or scorecard, a self-evaluation tool for teams to use to start to ask and answer some of the questions about coverage, personal data, regular updates and reliability. The full text PDF is available to the group in case this is the direction that the local team in Los Angeles is curious about or wants to pursue. This artifact will help the team to get their bearings about what this approach takes and what the Play Book is for getting to successful quality By-Name-List data.

How do we measure By-Name-List quality?

- By-Name-List Scorecard
- Data Reliability for Aggregate Metrics – e.g., if your system is reporting that 100 Veterans have moved into permanent housing, we should expect that those Veterans should be deducted from the number of

	<p>Veterans who are experiencing homelessness in L.A. These numbers should be reviewed over time which will tell you about participation and data quality or reporting habits.</p> <p>What is the By-Name-List Scorecard?</p> <p>Some of the elements associated with the scorecard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Community Participation & Coverage<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Outreach coverage2. Providers reporting data3. Tracking all homeless individuals▪ Policies & Procedures<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Inactive policy5. Tracking without full assessment6. Timely/accurate data updates7. Data collection best practices▪ Data Infrastructure<ol style="list-style-type: none">8. Tracking homeless status9. Unique identifier10. Tracking newly identified people11. Tracking demographic information12. Tracking returns to system13. Tracking outflow14. Tracking population status15. Tracking population status overall <p>Sharing a case study about complex large jurisdictions like Los Angeles.</p> <p>How does this work in a Large City?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Metro Denver’s sub-regionalization approach: By breaking up a large geography into smaller parts that more closely reflect the experience of stakeholders, solutions and ownership becomes more precise for perceived local problems. These smaller parts improving in parallel towards a shared aim will yield a more efficient and effective regional reduction in Veteran homelessness.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Create a single Veteran By-Name-List across the region.▪ Every Veteran tagged to one of 9 sub-regions based on service provider/shelter of highest engagement and/or Veteran preference.▪ Sub-regions develop local Homeless Coordination Teams and Leads with clear roles and responsibilities.▪ Each sub-region team is responsible for local data quality (using By-Name-List Scorecard), including provider participation, street outreach, and timely data entry.
--	--

	<p>Rather than trying to solve those big problems system-wide they took a more granular approach; they saw a lot of success by splitting it up into these 9 sub-regions. Recommendation for Los Angeles, if they wanted to use the By-Name-List approach, would involve sub-regionalization to take the big complex system down into more operationally meaningful jurisdictions.</p> <p>2. Mr. Jizan: Thanked the committee and opened the floor up for questions.</p> <p>3. Dr. Bamberger comment/question: Los Angeles is a very challenging place to do homeless care because it is so spread out, and relying on agencies who report to HMIS for example, or shelters, other service delivery agencies to report in, is a successful way of getting the By-Name-List populated. But what have other communities, around the country done to try to populate their By-Name-List for people who don't necessarily come in contact with agencies that could report in through HMIS? How do you build an outreach system? What are the components of a high fidelity, outreach system that could make the true number of people who are on the By-Name-List be a true reflection of homeless Veterans across this very large space?</p> <p>4. Mr. Jizan's response: For places like Los Angeles and other communities with large unsheltered homeless populations, outreach is critical for feeling like you have a comprehensive meaningful data source. In the scorecard there are three questions the community needs to ask and answer about outreach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it documented? 2. Is it coordinated? 3. Is it sufficient? (Do we have enough outreach?) <p>Do they know how much outreach is being done today? Is it documented somewhere? There are usually multiple different teams doing street outreach in a place as big as Los Angeles are those teams coordinating where they're going and when? Are they sharing data? This is the place to start. And if it is documented and coordinated, then start to talk about, what would give you confidence that the outreach was sufficient? Some models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No one should be street homeless for _____ days before they're connected to the system, and you can start to test that model. ▪ Draw the line at 7-days or 14-days, or whatever feels like a viable place to start. Then start collecting the
--	--

	<p>data and use that as a signal for whether you have enough outreach in your geography.</p> <p>There are groups that could share approaches they have taken for coordinated, comprehensive street outreach to determine if they have enough street outreach to meet the demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Bamberger comment/question: Ask Mr. McGharan if he wanted to share what they're looking at in terms of outreach and quality and where he feels things are. ○ Mr. McGharan: They are working with community partners and making sure they leverage the outreach teams that are already in the community so that there is more staff. Working to find Veterans and getting them put on the current finding list. But, how do they get information from organizations that do not use HMIS? That is a struggle because there are several organizations that have contact with Veterans and other than calling them up there is no other way of letting them know. ○ Dr. Bamberger comment/question: That goes to the issue of people exiting existing supported housing. They want to keep the number of people who end up cycling from permanent supportive housing to the streets to low single digits more like 1%-3%. "Do you find in your By-Name-List, fidelity efforts that you highlight people falling into homelessness from housing in a specific category that is brought to the attention of your collaborators?" ○ Mr. Jizan: "Absolutely. The ability to differentiate between returns from housing, returns from "inactive status" which is a locally determined designation, but usually corresponds to individuals not having any engagement or enrollments within a set period of time. So, 90-days nobody had seen this individual. They're not removed from the By-Name-List they've just had their status updated. Lastly, individuals who are currently actively homeless or newly experiencing homelessness in the system. Being able to differentiate between returns and people who are new to the system is really crucial." The question of data source, you should bring together the stakeholders in the community and inventory who should be sharing data with you regardless of whether they are in HMIS. To be able to have a comprehensive By-Name-List you inventory them, then add a column to that inventory list that says, "where is their data today?". The first step is getting clear on who are the participating agencies, service providers whose data needs to get integrated and then
--	--

	<p>map this out. Obviously, there will be some considerations around privacy and security of how that data will be integrated, but those are manageable technical challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Bamberger question: “When you compare the By-Name-List to the Point-In-Time count, and you have a comprehensive By-Name-List, Does the By-Name-List usually have more or less people than the Point-In-Time?” ○ Mr. Ruege: It varies depending on the community. It speaks to how the pick count is implemented differently in different communities. In more evolved communities there is a closer alignment. ○ Mr. Jizan: Some of those variables are attributed to the data quality on the Point-In-Time side. Particularly for things like Veteran status for the Point-In-Time, it is usually, using a lumped modeling so “X” percent of people may be Veterans at a point. For example, in L.A. they are not talking to individuals, so people are not self-reporting Veteran status, therefore there is a lot of variability. When they are getting out and talking to the person experiencing homelessness during the Point-In-Time and trying to collect some information about them, this data is often closely aligned to the administrative data and the By-Name-List data. ○ Dr. Bamberger comment/question: When looking at community trends perhaps looking at the Point-In-Time count, since you are comparing the same methodology every other year it is a reasonable thing to do. But if you want to see the impact of investing in housing, for example, the 1500 housing unit on the 388-acre parcel, the By-Name-List is where you need to look. Is that accurate? ○ Mr. Jizan: You get a lot of value from the By-Name-List. But to know the impact of that parcel you would want to know something about who moved into the units and the Point-In-Time count is not going to provide you with that information. How long were those folks experiencing homelessness in the community? What is their demographic profile? Etc. ○ Dr. Bamberger: Thanked Mr. Jizan and Mr. Ruegen for coming and he looked forward to hearing the reports of
--	--

	<p>how headway is being made to improve the lives of Veterans who are living on the streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper and Mr. Skinner: Thanked Community Solutions for the information. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: “Does a By-Name-List exist for L.A? And is there sharing of this information?” ○ Mr. McGahran: A By-Name-List does exist using some of the strategies discussed earlier, it is divided up by their service planning areas in L.A. county and they are developing a By-Name-List for the outlying counties and for other counties in their catchment area. The current By-Name-List differs from the Point-In-Time count, but they are trying to reconcile that data. It’s a work in progress, teams meet on a regular basis to add or remove Veterans when they are no longer homeless or newly homeless. The By-Name-List is also used as a matching system for the coordinated entry team to match it to resources that are available. ○ Dr. Bamberger comment/question: Seeing where the By-Name-List can sit within the scorecard, that was described, in terms of quality would be an interesting exercise. The outreach functions that are available across this large geography is inadequate. The recommendation to the Secretary is to create an outwardly facing dashboard that can track these things. “Matt, other things that you think you would like to use specifically trying to improve upon that we can track to support you in that effort?” ○ Mr. McGharan: “There is much to improve upon, increasing outreach staff is one thing, there are community partners that do outreach that we could leverage those better. Better definition of roles with community partners, who does what, to include our support services for Veterans and grantees. Some of the community partners keep their own lists so that the services go from their street outreach to their rapid re-housing, or to their grant per diem program because they’re all in the same agency and it’s easier for them. Our goal is to coordinate better with them. Connecting with Community Solutions is a good strategy to see what recommendations they can make.” ○ Larry Vasquez comment/question: Given the challenges and timeliness of getting people on board, the strategy of
--	---

	<p>using community partners can be done in a much shorter time. How do you get the information from the By-Name-List into a tool that allows everyone to have access and allows people to take action to help those on that list?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. McGharan: They have regular By-Name-List meetings so that the data can get reconciled as best as they can with the community partners and the VA. ○ Mr. Vasquez: “Is this an electronic record so people can see?” When collecting this information, how do community partners bring it into a tool, like HMIS, if they do not have access? ○ Mr. McGharan: Most of them have access to HMIS so they can get the data from the actual system. One of the questions asked earlier was if partners don’t have access to HMIS, such as food banks, or faith based organizations they are not always in our HMIS system. ○ Mr. Vazquez: Who is helping to populate that By-Name-List? ○ Mr. MGharan: The Coordinated Entry Specialist do that. ○ Mr. Vazquez: How many Coordinated Entry Specialists are there? ○ Mr. McGharan: Three Coordinated Entry Specialist work on the By-Name-List, they run the By-Name-List team meetings. The data is already in HMIS, it has to be presented as a binding list. The Coordinated Entry Specialist do not do outreach. ○ Mr. Vazquez: There are 3 Coordinated Entry Specialist is that sufficient? ○ Mr. McGharan: It is sufficient to generate the list, whether the list is complete or not is the second question. ○ Dr. Bamberger: Asked Ms. Marston if there was anything, she wanted to comment on from LAHSA standpoint about how things are going in terms of sharing information from LAHSA to VA? ○ Ms. Marston: A work in progress in terms of data sharing, but they are making some great progress together with Mr. McGharan’s team. The challenge with L.A. is the scale
--	--

	<p>particularly around the By-Name-List because the area is so large. The right people are in the room to build in the right controls and systems to make sure that they have the best version of the By-Name-List they can get.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. McGharan: Commented that Ms. Marston and her team have been very helpful, and he appreciated that effort.
Services Subcommittee Discussion/recommendation	<p>LTG (Ret) Hopper: Move on to the Services Subcommittee discussion/recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Bamberger: The Services Subcommittee had one recommendation they wished to propose to the group for a vote. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Goal: To try to support VA GLA's efforts to reduce and end homelessness is to create an outwardly facing dashboard that is accessible in real time for anyone to look at. <p>Dr. Bamberger reads the VCOEB Recommendations 16-01 document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excerpt: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Permanent Supportive Housing is the evidence-based solution to ending homelessness for Veterans experiencing chronic homelessness; 2. In 2021, there was a 24.4% reduction in permanent housing placements reported by the VA in greater Los Angeles compared to fiscal year 2017; 3. There continues to be many vacant staff positions in the HUD VASH system of care in VA GLA; 4. There are vacant project-based rental units across the greater L.A. area that are set aside specifically for Veterans experiencing chronic homelessness; 5. Reporting regular progress on filling project-based housing units and utilization of Tenant Based HUD VASH vouchers can be an effective measure to assess progress towards housing Veterans experiencing homelessness; 6. A By-Name-List that reports on the number of Veterans experiencing homelessness, the exits from homelessness, the influx into homelessness, (including from stable permanent supportive housing), and the time Veterans remain homeless can be effective in measuring progress and holding communities responsible for progress in reducing the number of Veterans experiencing homelessness; 7. The Secretary of the VA has set the goal that by the end of 2022 placing "at least 1500 Veterans experiencing homelessness into permanent housing"

	<p>and “increasing the percentage of Housing and Urban Development – Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers under lease to at least 75%;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ RECOMMENDED: The Secretary of the VA instruct the leadership of the Greater Los Angeles Veterans Affairs Administration to create a web-based dashboard available to the general public that reports on progress in providing permanent housing for Veterans experiencing homelessness in the Greater L.A. area. The dashboard should include the following metrics: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly report of available HUD VASH vouchers and utilization for both tenant-based and project-based housing and, 2. Quarterly reporting on progress towards filling vacant HUD VASH staff positions, 3. Monthly reporting on By-Name-List (BNL) that is in coordination with the L.A. homeless services agency and maintains industry standards for By-Name List fidelity, 4. Monthly progress on available housing at the West L.A. campus and, 5. Quarterly reporting on progress towards placement of Veterans in Residential Care Facilities, Board and Care and/or Assisted Living level of care. ○ Mr. Zenner: Need to track those that are falling out of housing because of conditions they want to avoid such as; not getting treatment or not following the rules, etc. this should be part of the dashboard. So that they can see Veterans that are using the vouchers and how the VA and community is doing in keeping those Veterans in their housing and not creating additional wreckage like evictions or financial problems. Also, how they are working with those that are transitioning out of the military to prevent homelessness in the beginning? They lost the GPD that did a lot of work around transitioning Veterans, with 388 acres they have an opportunity to repurpose some of their effort to look at those that are transitioning out. ○ Dr. Bamberger: Repeated Mr. Zenner’s request to the group. Specifically putting into the recommendation section something that highlights reporting of Veterans who leave supported housing and cycle back into homelessness. He tried to incorporate that into the description of a high fidelity By-Name-List so as not to create too much specificity so that they don’t “tie the hands” of the Secretary for concurrence. The concern is that it is possible VA GLA may not be able to get that information in a timely manner, because it’s all
--	--

	<p>dependent on the reporting that's coming into them. His preference would be to leave it as the generalities that it is recognizing that the fidelity that a By-Name-List requires that it incorporates exits from housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Zenner: With the collaboration between LAHSA and the VA and with the relationship with LAHSA and the housing authorities they could leverage that collaboration between the agencies to include information on the Veterans dropping out of housing. ○ Dr. Harris: The nature of exits out of supportive permanent housing, out of HUD VASH in particular, is of interest to them as well. So, whether it ends up being formally laid out here or not, this is something they are pursuing. The HOMES data does not capture the nature of the exit, it only captures an exit from case management and ideally these kinds of move out, moves back in people are staying in case management so they are invisible to them with their data. But if the housing authorities have that information, that's something they will be pursuing either way. He wanted to share this as a means of assurance to the group. He also agreed that it is a critical piece of an active, accurate By-Name-List is seeing that kind of moves in and out of housing. ○ Dr. Bamberger: Supported adding another line to the recommendations that specifically adds to the capturing of exits from supportive housing. Asked LTG (Ret) Hopper if he could take a few minutes to re-write the document with the addition of capturing of exits from supportive housing. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: A re-write may not work out well. ○ Dr. Bamberger: He'll take 5 minutes while the rest of the group will then go on to the Master Plan subcommittee, he'll then circle back and have the one sentence added in and then they can vote. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Agreed and continued to go to the Master Plan sub-committee.
Master Plan Sub-Committee	<p>Rob Begland explained the Master Plan sub-committee did not have an agenda item today. They are waiting to see how the Secretary issues the revised Master Plan before they come up with any recommendations.</p>
	<p>LTG (Ret) Hopper: He wanted to extend apologies for Philip Mangano as he was traveling and unable to join the call today. Discussed the preparation for the meeting in June, they want to show the campus to</p>

	<p>those on the board that have never seen it so they could see what progress has taken place. They want to make sure they lay that out carefully, looking at some of the graphics to visualize what will be seen to help facilitate discussions.</p>
Services sub-committee discussion/recommendation (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Bamberger: The additional information has been added to the bottom of the recommendations, 6. Monthly reporting on the number of Veterans exiting permanent housing. <p>LTG (Ret) Hopper: Asked the group for a motion on this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sarah Serrano: Move to approve. ○ Mark Wellisch: Second the motion to approve. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: “Any further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor say Aye” ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: “Opposed? Hearing no nays, the motion is approved. This recommendation will be forwarded to the Secretary.”
Wrap-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Asked if there was anything that the group wanted to discuss before ending the meeting. ○ Mr. Perley: Was having trouble reconciling the fact that it looks like everything is funded. When they toured the Cabrillo site, they were told there was an \$88 million shortfall and were talking about fundraising and naming rights within buildings and possibly going to Congress to pass a law allowing naming rights on site. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: The principle developer is on the agenda for the June meeting and there can be a discussion about funding and shortfalls and what needs to be done if anything, to fix those. What is the VA’s fiscal year, September 30th? ○ Dr. Braverman: The end of the fiscal year is September 30th and the new one begins October 1st. Some clarification in terms of funding, the money that is for the projects that VA is responsible for should be different from what the principle developer is responsible for. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Thank Dr. Braverman for the clarification and also thought it would be important to get some input from the PD. Asked Mr. Perley if they clarified his question.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Perley: Thanked LTG (Ret) Hopper and felt it was good news from the VA. ○ Mr. Allman: Brought up the issue regarding the funding for utilities but based on this presentation that shortfall has been met. As far as VA's responsibility to fund utility projects on site that appears to have been covered. ○ Dr. Braverman: About 2 years ago there was the potential for an \$80-\$100 million short fall that was associated with all the infrastructure requirements. He believes they are well on their way to meeting the funding requirements with the caveat that they can only speak to 1 or 2 years ahead at a time because circumstances change. But there is a commitment to get it all done. ○ Mr. Allman: For clarification; beyond the short-term solution with the water pressure boosting system, the longer-term solution for wet utilities is funded. ○ Dr. Braverman: "Yes. That was part of the \$40 million and \$20 million package for the last 2 years." ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Asked if there were any other comments. Then asked Mr. Boerstler if there was anything for the good of the group. ○ Mr. Skinner: Informed the group that Mr. Boerstler had to step out. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Asked Mr. Harris if there was anything. ○ Mr. Harris: Appreciated the thoughtful feedback and content throughout the meeting and ongoing contributions. He remains excited and optimistic about how impactful this group can be. He thanked the group. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Asked Dr. Braverman if there was anything else. ○ Dr. Braverman: No additional information. Thanked the group for the opportunity to present this afternoon. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Thanked Dr. Braverman and they understand that he has plenty of things to do but they appreciate him being a part of the being the whole time. He continued with the wrap-up and expressed looking forward to the June meeting and meeting everyone in person.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Skinner: Since this was Mr. McKenrick's last meeting he wanted to thank him for all his support and for all of the interactions with the VCOEB, whether it was full committee meeting, information exchange or just lending his expertise and wisdom to the entire organization. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Thanked Mr. McKenrick on behalf of the entire board and wished him the very best in his new position. ○ Mr. McKenrick: Thanked the group and opportunity. ○ LTG (Ret) Hopper: Thanked the group and ended the meeting.
--	--

Eugene W Skinner
 686906

Digitally signed by Eugene W
 Skinner 686906
 Date: 2022.06.27 13:35:50 -04'00'

Approved

Eugene W. Skinner Jr, DFO

/s/ John D. Hopper, Jr.

Approved

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