

**Department of Veterans Affairs  
20<sup>th</sup> Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board (VCOEB)  
Federal Advisory Committee (FAC)**

**DATE: 21/06/2023**

**VCOEB Board Members Present**

Lt GEN (Ret) John Hopper Jr. (Chair)  
Anthony Allman  
Dr. Joshua Bamberger  
Christine Barrie  
Robert Begland  
Keith Boylan  
Aimee Bravo  
Stephanie Cohen  
Jim Perley  
Joseph Sapien  
Kristine Stanley  
Dennis Tucker  
Hamilton Underwood  
Dr. Mark Wellisch  
Jim Zenner

**VCOEB Board Members Absent**

Philip Mangano (Vice Chair)  
Jennifer Marshall  
Heidi Marston  
Shawn VanDiver

**VA Employees and Staff Present**

John Boerstler	Darryl Darden (virtual)
Dr. Keith Harris	Jelesa Burney (virtual)
John Kuhn	Rika Brown (virtual)
Alan Trinh	Angell Bolden Green (virtual)
Eugene Skinner (DFO)	Fiona Hwang (virtual)
Lauren Bolanos (virtual)	Kristin Groteclass (virtual)
Cynthia Cordova (virtual)	Tony DeFrancesco (virtual)
Sally Hammitt	Elizabeth Brett
Janet Elder	Soma Arens (virtual)
Cyndee Costello (Contractor)	Joseph Friddie
Maggie Walsh (Contractor)	Andrew Strain
Shilpa Desai (Contractor)	Chelsea Black
Alfred Flores (virtual Contractor)	Robert Merchant
Kathlea Piche	Estello Ana
Nicole Flores	Brett Simms (virtual)
Darryl Joseph	Roberto Marshall (virtual)

**Public Attendees**

Jenerette Christian	Marty Bovlo
Thomas Payne	Jen Escobosa
Kyle Olemann	Brian Jones
John Vierra	Diana Skidmore
Jerry Olemann	Tory M. June
Janet Turner	Larry Van Buran
Tom Shea	Stephanie Stone

**Virtual Attendees**

Ally Cimino	Rob Reynolds
Robert Davenport	Kevin Herrera
Lori Moore	McCabe
John Alford	Wallace Bonner
Billie Pacheco	Tess Banko
Abe Bradshaw	Decaral Smith
John Oppenheim	Stephen Peck
Andrew Strain	Thomas Payne
Shira Hoffman	

Call to Order,	<p><b>Lt GEN (Ret) John D. Hopper Jr., Chair; Mr. Eugene Skinner Jr. Designated Federal Officer (DFO); alternate DFO is Chihung Szeto.</b></p> <p>DFO welcomed members reviewed the Rules of Engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To the greatest extent possible please hold all questions until the presentations are complete.</li> <li>• The Chair will ask for questions and/or comments throughout the meeting.</li> <li>• Turn your name care on its end to signify to the Chair your desire to provide comment or ask a question.</li> <li>• Allow DFO/VCOEB Chair to yield the floor to you prior to speaking.</li> <li>• Please help our minute takers and identify yourself prior to speaking.</li> <li>• Allow the DFO support team to provide a microphone to you prior to speaking (This meeting is being broadcast via WebEx).</li> <li>• Note: This meeting is being recorded.</li> </ul> <p>DFO turned the meeting over to Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper.</p>
Opening Remarks Committee Chair Pledge of Allegiance	<p><b>Lt GEN (Ret) Hopper</b></p> <p>Welcomed members.</p> <p>Lt GEN (Ret.) Hopper leads the Pledge of Allegiance.</p> <p>Comments on the Bob Hope Patriotic Hall building and history.</p>

	<p>Thanked Mr. Zenner and L.A. County for allowing the use of this building.</p> <p>Discussed the agenda and updates from stakeholders. The board is short one person for a quorum but will not be voting on anything until tomorrow. For the record this Board as having the most recommendations accepted by the Secretary.</p> <p>Introduced Mr. Boerstler</p>
Opening Remarks Executive Sponsor	<p><b>Mr. John Boerstler, Chief Veterans Experience Officer</b></p> <p>Thanked Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper.</p> <p>Chief Bradsher was unable to participate in today's meeting and sends her regrets. She has been nominated to serve as Deputy Secretary for the United States Veterans Affairs and will the first women to be nominated to that role.</p> <p>Congratulations to Rob Merchant joining as the interim Medical Center Director for the VA Greater Los Angeles (GLA) Healthcare System.</p> <p>Important to relay important dates that are coming up that are not necessarily aligned with the VCOEB but are important to the PACT Act In particular.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Veterans who have bee exposed to toxins in their service ranging from Vietnam to the Gulf War, Cold War era and post 911 era.</li> <li>• The deadline to file claims is August 9<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>• August 10, 2020, the bill was signed into law and if you filed your claim before then you'll be backdated to that date.</li> <li>• But if a claim is filed after the August 9, 2023, deadline they will not be able to be retroactively applied.</li> <li>• This is important as many Veterans are now eligible for VA care under the 23 conditions and this is pivotal to what we do to increase access and improve outcomes for the Veterans.</li> </ul> <p>They conducted their first in-person convening for the Vet Resources Community Network, which is essentially committees like the Federal Advisory Committees, Community Veteran Engagement Boards, State Department's of Veterans Affairs county Veteran Service Organizations (VSO), anyone wo acts as a listing or observation post for customer experience at VA. They are hosting and convening in Nashville in late July, and he encouraged and invited the members of the Board to participate in that meeting either in-person or online.</p> <p>If they have set the record on the number of recommendations accepted by the Secretary, he proposed that they formally recognize that at their</p>

	<p>next meeting in Washington, D.C. and be able to speak and celebrate with Secretary McDonough and hopefully, the newly confirmed Deputy Secretary at the time and be able to celebrate the success of this committee, especially with the progress that has been made in the past 2 years.</p> <p>He thanked the committee for all their efforts.</p>
Opening Remarks GLA Leadership Lawsuits Status Update	<p><b>Mr. Robert Merchant, Medical Center Director, VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System</b></p> <p>Currently serving as the interim Medical Center Director for GLA, was the Chief of Planning at GLA before moving into the position as Executive Director for Ambulatory Care. He is also the executive with responsibility for Veteran experience and outreach. Navy OIF/OEF Veteran he did some extensive service in Baghdad supporting the Navy's Civil Affairs Unit and the Department of State for about five years.</p> <p>Mr. Michael Fisher retired as the Network Director on April 30<sup>th</sup> and Dr. Braverman is now serving as the interim Network Director. Dr. Braverman is traveling and sends his regrets because he is unable to be at today's meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May 2, 2023, they cut the ribbon on 120 new units of permanent supportive housing.</li> <li>• Together with the opening of building 207 they now have 233 units of permanent supportive housing on the West Los Angeles campus.</li> <li>• More than 500 units currently under construction this will be marked with a groundbreaking ceremony on the 27<sup>th</sup> Dr. Braverman will be there to speak in addition to other members of the community.</li> </ul> <p>During these two-day the committee will hear the progress on their goal of ending Veteran homelessness.</p> <p>Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PACT Act outreach very important they are out in the community deliberately targeting areas where there are densities of Veterans that may be underserved and underrepresented.</li> <li>• Objective of meeting Veterans where they are rather than just where we are.</li> <li>• Events at Bakersfield College trying to reach Veteran students who may not be ready to fully engage with VA for healthcare, but they know it is important to get those Veterans connected to healthcare now.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COVID, they have removed restrictions on campus except for the most high-risk procedural areas such as their fusion center and dialysis for example. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Masks are no longer required</li> <li>○ Both employees and Veterans are self-regulating, and they have not seen a spike in employee or Veteran COVID positivity.</li> <li>○ There may have been one or two Veterans in the hospital that were found to have COVID once they were admitted rather than them being admitted for COVID.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hiring fair they brought onboard 422 new staff members selected across 52 different occupations, (mental health professionals, primary care providers, nurses, clerks, etc.), 75 of those hired completed their onboarding the same day.</li> <li>• Quality ratings with the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) will be coming out later this summer. They anticipate the VA care will do well.</li> <li>• Veteran Health Administration (VHA) senior executives across the country and all their program officers in Washington, D.C. met in Phoenix last week to focus on and understand both the Under Secretary for Health, Dr. Shereef Elnahal, and Secretary McDonough's priorities. The Secretary's three priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Creating access to timely, quality, evidence-based care</li> <li>○ Focusing on our core healthcare mission, looking for new and innovative care strategies</li> <li>○ Retaining staff</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Opening Remarks Special Advisor Area Median Income (AMI) efforts update	<p><b>Dr. Keith Harris, Senior Executive Homelessness Agent (Greater Los Angeles), Office of Secretary</b></p> <p>Discussed the issue with income eligibility for housing and the role disability payments play in determining eligibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To fill project-based housing around the L.A. area many had an income threshold of 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). There were not many Veterans that meet that income level to fill these housing units.</li> <li>• In order to solve a problem, there needs to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Data</li> <li>○ Policy – relevant statutes, regulations, from the agency, federal and state governments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction regarding housing eligibility.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homelessness has a myriad of causes, but a primary factor is a lack of affordable housing.</li> <li>• Funding designed to incentivize the development of affordable housing is crucial to our efforts to end homelessness.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such funding typically requires tenants to meet strict income eligibility for housing.</li> <li>• For Veterans, disability income is not taxable, yet it is counted as income in determining eligibility for housing. Considering that Veterans incurred their disability in service to their country, and for whom such service was compulsory, in some cases, it seems unfair to disqualify such Veterans for housing based on their disability payments.</li> <li>• In many communities, this is not an issue with HUD-VASH tenant-based vouchers (TBVs), which allow income up to 80% of the AMI. But in lower-income areas, even this 80% threshold can disqualify severely disabled Veterans from housing.</li> <li>• The more common and pressing issue arises with project-based vouchers (PBVs) that are often used in developments financed with tax credits, bonds, and other funding with restrictive income eligibility criteria.</li> <li>• Within HUD-VASH, TBVs are used in independent apartment units in the community, without onsite services. However, PBVs are most often used in buildings with a cohort of other Veterans, accompanied by onsite supportive and clinical services.</li> <li>• PBVs with onsite services are often the best fit for severely disabled Veterans, but the disability benefits these Veterans receive can disqualify them for the very housing they would most often benefit from.</li> <li>• It's estimated this issue affects approximately 25% of homeless Veterans. While 25% is a relatively small percentage, it still represents hundreds of homeless Veterans in L.A., and thousands nationally. And more importantly is who it affects: severely disabled Veterans who most need the housing they are disqualified from. Thus, this issue is as much about fairness and service needs as it is simple raw numbers.</li> </ul> <p>So why do they place income eligibility caps on housing? It's done because there is a lack of affordable housing and is a primary cause of homelessness. Therefore, we need to incentivize it, to build more of it and once it is built you must require that it serves the people that you wanted it to. There is a reason for these caps, one of the problems is for disabled Veterans their disability payments while not taxable are counting against their income eligibility, you can make multiple cases for degree of unfairness about that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disability payments come from an injury occurred while on active duty.</li> <li>• Evidence that many of these Veterans are economically disadvantaged.</li> </ul> <p>However, HUD-VASH tenant-based vouchers can go up to 80% AMI, (approximately \$70,000/year), there are nine Veterans on the waiting list that go over that.</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue is not with tenant-based vouchers but project-based vouchers.</li> <li>• Project-based vouchers are tied to a unit with many of them in a building, as seen on our campus.</li> <li>• Many have been coming through mechanisms intended to incentivize affordable housing comes with lower eligibility caps (60%, 50%, 30%).</li> <li>• Of the 37 active project-based buildings in L.A, 30 of them were either all 30% AMI or some units were 30% AMI. The 30% AMI comes into play with project-based vouchers not the tenant-based vouchers.</li> <li>• Severely disabled Veterans who are considered unemployable by the VA, the type of housing they need is the project-based housing that has services co-located in it or very close to it. They are eligible for HUD-VASH vouchers to go out into the community by themselves, however, that is not the type of housing they need.</li> <li>• The issue is of fit and fairness of service needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Veterans with Service-Connected Disability and/or Social Security.</b></p> <p>Granular level of what the picture looks like for homeless Veterans in Los Angeles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using the By-Name-List (BNL), an active list of every known homeless Veteran in L.A. managed by LAHSA and co-managed with the VA. The list from December: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Approximately 2000 Veterans at that time</li> <li>○ Evaluated the BNL list with VBA data for discharge status, service connection levels, actual payments, and social security.</li> <li>○ There were 250 Veterans that VBA could not find. That's either because they were not Veterans or that the information was incomplete.</li> <li>○ The data set was approximately 1750 Veterans.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• General income data on the 1,749 Veterans on the BNL: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Average annual income: \$17,556</li> <li>○ Median annual income: \$12,671</li> <li>○ Maximum annual income: \$96,544</li> <li>○ Minimum annual income: \$0</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 50% receive VA disability (compensation or pension)</li> <li>• 30% receive Social Security</li> <li>• There may be outliers as this data did not include other sources of income, but it is known that these are the two primary sources of income for homeless Veterans in L.A.</li> </ul> <p><b>Number of Veterans by Service Connection Percentage.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the 873 service-connected Veterans on the BNL:</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The largest group is 100% SC: 258 (30%)</li> <li>○ Next largest receives Pension: 111 (13%)</li> <li>○ 100 (12%) are 70% SC</li> <li>○ 96 (11%) are 10% SC</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Veterans at 70% SC or above can have an annual income that exceeds 30% AMI.</li> <li>● When paired with Social Security, any Veteran can have an annual income that exceeds 30% AMI.</li> </ul> <p><b>Veterans with Service-Connected Disability, Social Security, Both or Neither.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 34% of Veterans receive VA disability only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Avg income: \$27,188</li> </ul> </li> <li>● 15% of Veterans receive Social Security only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Avg income: \$14,140</li> </ul> </li> <li>● 16% of Veterans receive both VA and SS disability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Avg income: \$39,257</li> </ul> </li> <li>● 35% of Veterans receive neither VA nor SS disability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Avg income: \$0</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: The difference between the Point In Time (PIT) list and the BNL is stark, help me to understand what is missing and is this a true representation of homeless Veterans?</p> <p>Dr. Harris' response: They don't know the answer as far as which list is closer to the actual number of homeless Veterans. They are likely to see some Veterans missing from this particular BNL, there ongoing work on this. One of the checks was to compare the BNL with the VA Census and there were Veterans in the VA Census that were not on the BNL. The PIT count is not an outright tally either, and could be an over count of the Veterans. The best way to answer is that the amount is probably somewhere in the middle. The percentages are likely more applicable, whatever the total number is.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: What evidence do you have of that? Have you done any sampling?</p> <p>Dr. Harris' response: They have not done random sampling but have looked at the VA Homes data set and the percentages are relatively similar, and they have done significant testing, but they are close enough to suggest nothing is completely "out-of-whack."</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: The face validity of the PIT count leads some questions that it can suggest a greater percentage of unsheltered Veterans than the general population. Veterans have access to on-demand shelter whereas the general population does not, so therefore, the PIT count for unsheltered Veterans should be a lower percentage.</p>
--	--



Dr. Harris continued. The number and percentage of Veterans at various AMI levels breaks down the numbers and percentages of Veteran AMI levels.

**Number and Percentage of Veterans at Various AMI Levels.**

- Number of Veterans at various AMI levels:
  - <30% = 1,291 (74%)
  - 31%-50% = 228 (13%)
  - 51%-60% = 123 (7%)
  - >60% = 107 (6%)

Three-quarters of the Veterans on this list were under 30% AMI, when you take into account VA disability and social security 74% are under that vital threshold. Service providers have noted the challenge of finding Veterans to fill these 30% units. Part of the problem is once you start layering additional criteria after the 30% then it gets difficult. The 13% of Veterans having an AMI between 31-50% is important because many of the housing units that will break ground next week have an AMI eligibility threshold of 50%.

The AMI levels and service-connected disability income based on the standard published disability the payments to 100% service-connected Veterans pushes the income over the threshold.

Mr. Perley question/comment: Confused. One graph shows that a great majority of these Veterans receiving disability puts them over the 30% but the other graph shows that a great majority are under 30%. Asked for clarification?

Dr. Harris' response: Clarified that the majority of Veterans he was referring to is of Veterans who are service connected, however the majority of them on that graph are not.

Mr. Boerstler question/comment: Will AMI adjust with the cost of living?

Dr. Harris' response: The AMI does not increase with the cost-of-living increase, it's going to move as the community is literally based on median incomes in the community. So, if something radical changes in the community that AMI will fluctuate up or down in different ways from the cost-of-living. We adjust our rates in January, but HUD adjusts their rates in June.

**Veterans over 30% AMI by Service Connection Percentage.**

- SC only Veterans over 30% AMI by SC percentage – for Veterans who are only receiving service-connected disability, the only way they are over 30% is when they're at 70% service connected or above none of the others exceed the 30% AMI.
  - 183 Veterans at 100%

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 44 Veterans at 90%</li> <li>○ 15 Veterans at 80%</li> <li>○ 26 Veterans at 70%</li> <li>● Veterans with both SC and SS over 30% AMI by SC Percentage – Once SS is included you get Veterans at every SC level, it shows you the bump that SS creates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 76 Veterans at 100%</li> <li>○ 12 Veterans at 90%</li> <li>○ 18 Veterans at 80%</li> <li>○ 25 Veterans at 70%</li> <li>○ 8 Veterans at 60%</li> <li>○ 4 Veterans at 50%</li> <li>○ 4 Veterans at 40%</li> <li>○ 3 Veterans at 30%</li> <li>○ 4 Veterans at 20%</li> <li>○ 1 Veteran at 10%</li> <li>○ 18 Veterans on Pensions</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Analysis of B207 Eligibility Criteria using GLA Current Homeless Census.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This looks at VA Homes data where they can find things like serious mental illness, chronic homelessness, etc.</li> <li>● In this sample 67% of Veterans were under AMI</li> <li>● Some of the units in B207 require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 30% AMI,</li> <li>○ age 62 or older,</li> <li>○ a subset requires a diagnosis of serious mental illness,</li> <li>○ and chronic homelessness.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● In the base sample: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 67% &lt;30% AMI</li> <li>○ 34% were 62+</li> <li>○ 21% suffered from Serious Mental Illness (SMI)</li> <li>○ 50% were chronically homeless – this is twice the national average. Chronically homeless is defined as continuously homeless for a year or 40 episodes of homelessness over three years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The above is the base rate of those four categories (62+, &lt;30% AMI, SMI, chronically homeless).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Veterans in B207 Eligibility Categories. When the four categories are layered together the base sample decreases significantly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 24% were 62+, AMI &lt;30%, a loss of three-quarters of the original base sample of Veterans claiming those two things together.</li> <li>○ 5% were 62+, AMI &lt;30%, Serious Mental Illness (SMI), by layering on SMI you’ve lost another 20% of your population from the original base sample.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3% were 62+, AMI &lt;30%, SMI and chronic homelessness, by layering chronic homelessness to the other three categories your down to only 3% of your population.</li> </ul> <p>The fact that they were able to fill the 50+ units in that building was a miracle given the small sliver of Veterans that met the criteria. This is also a cautionary tale about creating eligibility criteria like that.</p> <p>Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper question/comment: Was the criteria tied to the developer getting funding?</p> <p>Dr. Harris' response: Some of that was their choice, some of it was when they applied for funding, (Shangri-La and Step Up), the rules changed from year to year, some of it was required some of it was by choice.</p> <p>Mr. Boylan question/comment: What is the path looking forward?</p> <p>Dr. Harris: Conclusions to draw from this and the path forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise AMI eligibility thresholds where possible and appropriate (e.g., B207 increase of half its units to 50% AMI).</li> <li>• Build in provisional increase to AMI eligibility thresholds (e.g., if a unit can't be filled at 30% AMI after a predetermined time, the eligibility threshold increases to 50% or 60% AMI). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This concept is being considered at the state level (AB 1386) and in service plans for future buildings on the WLA VAMC campus (e.g., MacArthur Field Phase 2).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Exclude VA disability benefits from income calculations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can Treasury change how it determines income for the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program and use its own income definition excluding VA disability benefits rather than HUD's Section 8 definition (24 CFR 5.609)?</li> <li>○ Can HUD "specify alternative requirements" as provided by the HUD-VASH Operating Requirements (86 FR 53207), and exclude VA disability benefits from its income definition at 24 CFR 5.609?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Path Forward: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ VA has submitted these proposed solutions to Treasury and HUD and continues to meet with both agencies to seek a solution that will exclude VA disability benefits from Federal income definitions, which will have a significant downstream impact on state, county, and city funding eligibility thresholds.</li> <li>○ If neither Treasury nor HUD believes they can implement these changes without legislative changes, Congress is poised to draft a legislation solution.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Mr. Boyland question/comment: One of the concerns was when a developer looks at the opportunity to get more money based on who they</p>
--	--

	<p>say they will serve, some may make a lot of promises. However, once they get the building built and start leasing the units, they may have some challenges filling those units and ask to change the criteria for filling those units but then forget why they got the money, the tax breaks and everything else in the first place. The other concern is the coordinated entry system and how effective it is in finding Veterans that are not on the BNL in the community. What is the city or county funding as part of the equation?</p> <p>Dr. Harris' response: Part of the finance management should have all the credit rating services and they have that, the trouble is they don't get into the verification until later down the line in terms of housing applications.</p> <p>Mr. Boyland question/comment: There really needs to be a push that if they absolutely cannot fill a unit at 0-30% AMI and they are able to fill it with a Veteran at 50% AMI, then once the unit is vacated that it reverts back to 0-30% AMI.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: They don't know the number of Veterans, the PIT count and BNL are not accurate. One of the things we can do with this committee is to encourage the Secretary to invest the money in a more accurate count of homeless Veterans. Any ideas on that?</p> <p>Dr. Harris: LAHSA works with the team USC they do verification on the spot and there is a team that does several months of in-depth surveys with a smaller number of people and the portion of Veterans in that survey is applied to the total tabulation. There are ways to potentially improve this process.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: One of the reasons why the AMI issues exist is due to the system that HUD has in place to try and serve those with the highest need, so HUD has to ration services because they do not have enough resources to serve every homeless person. The VA has not gotten to the point where they must ration services. So, there can be a recommendation acknowledging that Veterans are different, we have a different resource level, and they don't need to ration services and these things are creating barriers.</p> <p>Dr. Harris: We will hear later about the One Team and its close ties to the coordinated entry system. It is a bedrock need to have a solid number and a BNL we believe is valid.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: Why is HUD balking at your recommendations?</p> <p>Dr. Harris' response: They did not provide a direct response to the proposal. HUD-VASH within its own regulations, gives the HUD Secretary authority to do what's call specifying alternative requirements to any</p>
--	---

	<p>statute or regulation that is tied to the operating property program. We suggest that the Secretary could make a separate alternative income definition for Veterans that would exclude any disability benefits. They introduced a separate idea which is that in units that receive both low-income housing tax credit funding, and the VASH voucher that the HUD-VASH income threshold would supersede. This is a big deal because the HUD-VASH housing program could go up to 80%. Treasury had doubts whether existing statutes would allow for a definition to change as the HUD definition is used downstream. The bigger fix would be changing the definition itself, however, there is a potential impact on the budget, and there are two different income definitions; annual income is used to determine eligibility, adjusted income is used to determine portion of rent.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: If the definition is changed the budgetary impact would be reduced because people with more money would be getting vouchers so their contribution to rent would be greater and the federal contribution for that voucher would be less.</p> <p>Dr. Harris: The other concern was opening this same issue to other populations, for example, new demands to do this for social security outside of Veterans.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: Possibly political issues driving this. If HUD Secretary makes this change and Treasury accepts that the problem is solved. We need to encourage the HUD Secretary to make this change.</p> <p>Dr. Harris: There is support on the congressional side.</p> <p>Mr. Begland question/comment: Where other than in L.A. is this a challenge in VA? Or is this specific to L.A.?</p> <p>Dr. Harris: It is most notable here in L.A. In some ways it's a bigger problem in lower income communities There are 1700 communities and there could be 100% service-connected Veterans that can be over 80% AMI so they can be priced out of the HUD-VASH, so it is a problem elsewhere. To its credit, L.A. does more project-based housing to create housing for Veterans and trying to get disability payments excluded from AMI.</p> <p>Mr. Begland question/comment: Suggesting more of a "deep dive" into the data to present to HUD so they recognize this is a bigger issue. Should we ask HUD for a presentation when we go to D.C? We as a board can carry the message that disability should not be included in income AMI calculations.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: Why has the Secretary supported HR 34-38?</p>
--	---

	<p>Dr. Harris: Our written testimony provided the basis.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: A huge concern for the committee. This was a piece of legislation that was presented by a freshman senator from Oregon that supports the idea that Brentwood School should stay. Brentwood School circumvented the VCOEB. The Secretary asked Ms. Diaz to testify in support of this, is ridiculous when we have fought this, and we need some accountability.</p> <p>Dr. Harris: The agency cannot do some of the conferring talked about when preparing for the hearing, this is a rare case where they are bound in terms of the type of discussions they can have, and they did not have the opportunity to discuss with the Board. Brentwood school is not mentioned in this legislation, the legislation mentioned applies to all the uses on campus. They are in a bind with the way the West L.A. Leasing Act reads and the findings of the OIG, there are real world hinderances which they are looking for ways to resolve.</p> <p>Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper question/comment: The VA will have a chance to tell us the rational as far as which direction they will go. This issue will come up in this meeting or tomorrow when we have discussions with our subcommittees. He thanked Dr. Harris for the briefing it was informative, he acknowledged it is difficult to respond to public testimony at this point. He thanked Dr. Harris for his briefing and applauded the direction they are going in and look forward to further discussion on how the Board might shape their comments or recommendations to support his efforts.</p> <p>Mr. Perley question/comment: Someone with a 100% VA disability can only qualify for 50% or below and if they have social security, they qualify for 60%. It looks grim, is that accurate?</p> <p>Dr. Harris: You need to look at actual payments first, there is no bottom line. Everyone that is service connected is over 30% that's the only guarantee but they can be over 50% when you look at actual average annual payments.</p>
VA Leadership Remarks/Q&A	<p><b>Ms. Tanya Bradsher, VA Chief of Staff</b></p> <p>Unavailable</p>
ULI Technical Assistance Panel: Town Center Concept at West LA Campus	<p><b>Urban Land Institute (ULI) – Marty Borker, Executive Director of the Los Angeles ULI</b></p> <p>Mr. Borker: Introduced panel: Brian Jones, Chair of the panel; Diana Skidmore, traffic circulation consultant; Tony June, finance. The focus of the technical assistance panel was the Town Center. ULI is a global non-profit corporation, focused on the real estate industry and its mission to shape the future of the built environment for transformative impact for us worldwide. Their L.A. District Council they have about 2000 members across the spectrum of the real estate community. Developers, Land Use</p>

	<p>Attorneys, design professionals and other non-profits that make up their membership. Their Technical Assistance Panels is an opportunity for the ULI members to get back to the community to help tackle tough problems and provide perspective from our point of view on how to solve some of these tough issues. They developed a Scope of Work (SOW) for what the town might be.</p> <p>He reviewed the <b>ULI-LA Technical Assistance Panels (TAP) process</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor Engagement – development of the SOW.</li> <li>• Pre-Tap – the SOW is determined and the problem they are trying to resolve is identified.</li> <li>• TAP Assembly – the TAP members are ULI that volunteer their time.</li> <li>• TAP Date – coordination with the panel, panel leadership and the VA.</li> <li>• Briefing book – provide the data and salient background of the project, (leasing documents, master plans, etc.).</li> <li>• Venue &amp; Logistics – important to be TAP to be on-site during this work.</li> <li>• Convening the TAP – this was a two-and-a-half-day process which included stakeholder interviews, touring the existing conditions and new housing being built, understanding the different development areas the buildings that are on-site.</li> <li>• Post TAP – report out to the Board, walk through where they are in the process and document their work and recommendations.</li> <li>• Report Draft</li> <li>• Final Report</li> </ul> <p>Discussed the TAP make up the panel (slide) professionals in finance, development, design professionals, sustainability, legal, policy, adaptive reuse for historic buildings on campus, market analysis. Addressing legal and policy issues as we think about implementation. Cultural anthropologist to help think about what it means to be a community of Veterans and who makes that up.</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews they worked closely with the VA, invitations to approximately 100 people to have interviews with the TAP members either in-person or virtually. They worked to get a representative sample of stakeholders across the board (Veterans, Principal Developers, VCOEB Board members, etc.). They completed the panel and are looking forward to continuing the conversation with the VCOEB.</p> <p>Mr. Perley question/comment: Retail for homeless Vets is a whole different issue. Do you have anyone on your panel that has that experience?</p> <p>Mr. Borker: They have members on the panel that understand marketing and what could be and what should be retail for Veterans.</p>
--	--

	<p>Mr. Perely question/comment: Nobody on the panel has experience doing retail for homeless Veterans, correct?</p> <p>Mr. Borker: Not developed retail for homeless Vets.</p> <p>Mr. Perely question/comment: Where do you go to get retail information on what works for homeless Vets?</p> <p>Mr. Borker: They have panel members with experience on military basis and at the VA and they also look at market data on what kind of retail would work.</p> <p>Mr. Perely question/comment: This is a learning curve. No one on the committee with experience in developing retail for homeless Vets, this concerns him. Are they talking to anyone?</p> <p>Mr. Borker: They have the experiences of the principal developer regarding retail development, they've spoken to other Veterans and if they need to target others they will.</p> <p>Mr. Perely question/comment: He expressed his concerns about the report missing the specific niche. The Villages at Cabrio is a good example.</p> <p>Mr. Begland question/comment: He hoped they would make an effort to look at daytime users of the hospital and look at Veterans broadly. He does not believe the retail aspect has to solely be for homeless Veterans.</p> <p>Mr. Borker: They spent a lot of time trying to understand what the community of Veterans looks like and integrating services with retail and what other opportunities there might be as they define a larger market such as hospital workers that come from offices, or artists and things that would bring other people to the market and to the campus that then grows to opportunities. They believe the most important part for unhoused Veterans is assisted services, so the services part takes up some of the square footage as well retail, food, beverages, and they have talked to the Veterans Canteen Service for additional input.</p> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: The town center is much broader than retail, all retail is a potential opportunity for homeless Veteran employment. People work so they can afford to live, training or retraining, chronically homeless Veterans through employment is something that needs to be taken seriously to address homelessness in the future. They should talk with the Social Security Administration and learn about what they are doing for individuals who are on SSDI.</p>
--	--



	<p>Mr. Perley question/comment: Expressed his concern that developing retail that the resident population may not be able to afford would be a failure. His bias is listening to somebody who's done this before.</p> <p>Mr. Borker: The hope is that work that they have done would become foundational elements as the master plan is updated. Their program is a broader set of program elements (amenities, services, retail).</p> <p>Dr. Wellisch question/comment: The VA is part of the community and there is much that goes on within the community that is impacted by the VA it does not seem to be integrated as the Brentwood Community Council was not mentioned as part of the stakeholders.</p> <p>Mr. Borker: The VA is a resource for a larger community, they thought of other things that would bring the larger community to the campus and how to build on that. More work to be done to integrate whatever those needs are but they have tried to have that recognition.</p>
Homeless Veteran's Reintegration Program (HVRP)/Employment Programs	<p><b>James D. Rodriguez, Assistant Secretary U.S. Department of Labor for Veteran's Employment and Training Services (VETS)</b></p> <p>Mr. Boerstler introduced provided background on Mr. Rodriguez' background. He explained that this due to the large homeless Veteran population in L.A., this committee is very focused on ensuring that L.A. not only becomes a model for the country but also thinks about more innovative ways to create more ways to create pathways into employment and training.</p> <p>Mr. Rodriguez: Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Program for all Veterans who are at risk of being homeless, who are homeless, or falls into any category of the homeless phase. The want to ensure they partner with the VA, at the state level, VSO level and MSO level to ensure collaboration as to the best solution to support Veterans.</p> <p><b>What is DOL's Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Program (HVRP)?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An employment-focused competitive grant program.</li> <li>• Federal grant to focus on competitive employment for Veterans experiencing or at-risk of homelessness.</li> <li>• Programs are locally designed and tailored to the service area, helping Veterans experiencing homelessness the ability to reach their full employment potential and obtain high-quality career outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>The focus is on post military service, but they want to ensure that they are in careers that provide longevity, that they have careers, not just jobs that are low paying and do not allow them the requirements of sustainability.</p> <p><b>HVRP Goals</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The goal of HVRP is to help Veterans experiencing or at-risk of homelessness reintegrate into the labor force.</li> <li>• The program is part of the larger service delivery system that addresses the complex problems associated with homelessness. There may be gaps in service and how to mitigate risks.</li> <li>• HVRP provides employment which plays a critical role in creating and maintaining housing stability. They do provide clinical resources that are institutionally important because they know the value of employment to long term healthcare and long-term success.</li> </ul> <p><b>Who can apply for HVRP Funds?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-profit organizations with or without 501(c)(3) status with the IRS,</li> <li>• For-profit organizations,</li> <li>• Faith-Based organizations,</li> <li>• Federally recognized Native American tribal governments. Native American tribal organizations other than those federally recognized, and Native American Tribally Designated Organizations,</li> <li>• State, county, city, township, or special district governments, including U.S. Territories or Possessions,</li> <li>• State and Local Workforce Development Boards established by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA),</li> <li>• Public housing authorities/Indian housing authorities,</li> <li>• Other State and Local Government Agencies,</li> <li>• Public, Private and State controlled institutions of higher education.</li> </ul> <p>Organizations apply for funds if they believe they can make an impact on the future and are investigating ways to expand resources to help support Veterans that may be homeless.</p> <p><b>HVRP Program Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three types of HVRP grant types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All population categories of Veterans experiencing homelessness (HVRP).</li> <li>○ Homeless Women Veterans and Homeless Veterans with Children (HWVHWC).</li> <li>○ Incarcerated Veterans Transition Program (IVTP) for Veterans recently released from incarceration who are at risk of homelessness.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Grants are awarded via a Grants.gov Funding Opportunity Announcement which is January through February, with awards announced in June.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p><b>HVRP Program Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HVRP authorization for FY 2023 was \$65.5 million.</li> <li>• Grants may be for up to \$500,000 per year for each of the 3 years of the grant’s performance period.</li> <li>• Program Performance Period July 1 – June 30 (Program Year or PY).</li> <li>• In 2022, DOL-VETS funded 166 grants, 56 of whom were new grant recipients and 110 of whom were continuing their grant for the second or third year.</li> </ul> <p><b>HVRP Eligibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Veteran <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One day active duty including basic training.</li> <li>○ Discharge other than dishonorable.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>And</b></p> <li>• Homeless (includes recently housed in last 60 days).</li> </li></ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participating in Partner Service (HUD-VASH, SSVF, GPD, etc.).</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At-Risk of Homelessness in the next 60 days.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transitioning from incarceration.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would benefit from HVRP employment services.</li> </ul> <p><b>HVRP Participant Profile</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typical participant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 48 years old, (the average age of Veterans is 64 years old, so this will need to be considered when discussing employment).</li> <li>○ male of color,</li> <li>○ varied education levels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Participant categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Female (11%)</li> <li>○ Homeless with children (10%)</li> <li>○ At risk of homelessness (10%)</li> <li>○ Justice involved (10%)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 76% discharged more than 9 years ago,</li> <li>• 41% have a service disability or special disability,</li> <li>• 28% are episodically homeless.</li> </ul>
--	---

**HVRP Program Year (PY) 2021 (July 21-June 22) National Targets & Outcomes – Measures, Targets and Outcomes**

Measure	Target	Outcome
Total Participants Served	19, 500	16,923
Total # of Exiters*	N/A	12,896
Total # of Participants Co-Enrolled at American Job Centers (AJCs)	N/A	12,117
Average Hourly Wage at Placement	\$15.00	\$17.47
Placement Rate (exit-based)	66%	61.3%
Placement Rate – Episodically Homeless (exit-based)	N/A	61.2%
Employment Rate 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter After Exit	54%	45.4%
Employment Rate 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter After Exit	N/A	33.9%
Median Earnings 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter After Exit	\$7,000	\$8,216

\*Exit occurs when a participant has not received services from the program in which they are enrolled for at least 90 days, and not future services are planned.

They are seeing positive outcomes, even with their new grantees, they want to continue to build up finding that longevity within careers and sustainability once participants are housed and receiving mental health and healthcare.

Mr. Perely: To qualify they had to be either homeless, or less than 60-days in a home, if you believe in housing first wouldn't it be better to house these people first and give them some time to qualify?

Mr. Rodriguez: They understand that and are constantly looking at ways for individuals to get the support they need.

Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper: If all the funds are not expended, do they carry over to the next year?

Mr. Rodrigues: Yes, they do carry over to the next year.

Mr. Boyland: The HVRP program has been around awhile, and it is liberal when it comes to the definition of Veteran and homelessness so it catches a lot of Veterans that the prior VA programs may not have captured. Another consideration is the AML issue and perhaps looking at how to tackle this moving forward.

Mr. Zenner: Non-profits that have HUD VASH contracts tend to integrate a little better.

Mr. Boerstler: We see a lot of the non-profits that VA work within the field use a combination of HVRP, HUD-VASH, and some are going further to prevent homelessness by getting reimbursed to provide food assistance, utility assistance to help keep their homes so they don't fall into that cycle of homelessness.

Mr. Begland: Very informative presentation but thought there may be some things left out. Average earnings of Veterans that have gone through this program is \$8,000. There is a huge opportunity on this

	<p>campus for Veterans to find work. We should look upon the campus as a meaningful chance for Veterans to work.</p> <p>Mr. Perely: Project based section 8 housing if someone makes more money they can stay, they must pay 30% of their income into the system but they don't need to move out. The original project Section 8 housing the resident can't stay in the unit if they make more money.</p> <p>Dr. Harris: There is not simple answer, there is a point where the income rises so much that the 30% share matches or exceeds the rent itself and the voucher pays the company that is technically coming out of the program. So, when the voucher portion gets to zero, they are no longer eligible for the program.</p> <p>Mr. Perley: We have that, but they can stay in the unit they are in, they pay the market rent for the voucher and do not get a subsidy, but they do not have to leave.</p> <p>Dr. Harris: His understanding is at that point they are no longer on that HUD-VASH voucher. Different Property Managers may handle this differently.</p> <p>Mr. Perely: We cannot evict them; we must keep them.</p> <p>Dr. Harris: There is a survey being developed for property managers that will assist with them understanding several things about their bill.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: (1) Make and increase in HRP and SSVF as well, different programs are heavily weighted towards the lowest income. So, there will be varying people coming into the program with zero income and folks coming into the program with a higher income. The impact is greatest for those who are most severely challenged. (2) For folks that are working a better option might be a shallow subsidy offered through SSVF, it will pay 50% of the rent for two years. This was developed to incentivize income growth; the two-year window is to help a Veteran develop their income so they can be more independent.</p> <p>Ms. Barrie: She was made aware of an issue with one of the residents that is thriving but now is making too much money to stay in B209. How should this be handled?</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: He should not be thrown out but offered an opportunity to move to another apartment. He encouraged Ms. Barrie to send this resident to him so he could discuss options.</p>
Announcement	Mr. Skinner: Announcement regarding Public Comments and next meeting in September.

Public Comment Session	<p>DFO discussed the rules of engagement for Public Comments.</p> <p><b>Francisco Juarez</b> - Absent</p> <p><b>Thomas Patrick O'Shaughnessy</b> - Absent</p> <p><b>Larry Van Kuran</b> – “Good Afternoon. I am the spokesperson for the American Legion for both the Department of California state and national. I want to speak to you about HR 38-48. A letter that was written by the Department of California that went to the House of Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Opportunities that was last Wednesday, a week ago today. We take exception to the points in HR 38-48. The first was Grant and Per Diem Rate; they want to raise the rate and proposing to raise the rate by \$10, from \$64 per day and change to \$74. It's a 15% increase. We feel, especially in California, that's not taking into account the costs in the L.A. County area and the catchment area of the West L.A. VA. Because it goes all the way up to Santa Barbera, San Luis Obispo, and the costs there are just not \$74 a day, it needs to be more. We tend to agree with a sister bill that was discussed, HR 491, that talks about \$150, \$130 a day rate. So, we disagree with the degree of the rate not the rate increase itself. The second two items deal with West L.A. specifically, and the two laws, Public Law 114-226 which was the West L.A. Leasing Agreement and the other is the public law that modified 226, HR 117-263. There are two items we strongly disagree with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The topic of limiting our Office of Inspector General to inspect the leases for propriety, particularly in the case stipulates principally for Veterans and their families. Given the history of land abuse at West L.A. VA, we feel strongly that the OIG should remain intact in their capacity to inspect and report.</li> <li>2) The In Kind instead of cash payment or lease payments for lease holders, we feel the In Kind would negatively impact West Los Angeles. West Los Angeles, under Public Law 117-263, is the only VA that is allowed to keep these payments on the property to be used for the benefit of Veterans. The only VA that is allowed to do that. If we go In Kind that will significantly impact the amount of funds the VA has at their disposal at West L.A. to assist Veterans, particularly homeless Veterans.</li> </ol> <p>And that's the comments I want to deliver on both behalf of the American Legion National that represents the state of California. And I might add that's really other Veteran organizations agree with us.”</p> <p><b>Jerry Orleman</b> – “Good afternoon, my name is Jerry Orleman. I am the vice president; Vietnam Veterans of America California State Council and I</p>

<p>(Experienced some technical difficulties during this presentation that were eventually resolved)</p>	<p>would also like to address HR 38-48. VBA has been involved with West L.A. VA since the “get go” on the idea of putting in housing and returning the property to being a national home. VBA was a part of the, or one of the litigants, on the 2011 lawsuit and VBA, after the lawsuit settlement was a member of the VSO coalition that helped put together the master plan. I was not part of that when we were doing all that, that was somebody else. However, after the master plan, I became the representative for VBA California State Council to the West L.A VA and I have been personally involved with the Leasing Act of 2016 and particularly the amendment to that campus Improvement Act of 2022 and my biggest fear is that HR 38-48 will gut the purpose of those two acts and open the door for what could be disastrous to one of the great progress of this moment at the West L.A. VA. I don’t need to go into any real detail on this because Mr. VanBuren covered it excellently and all I would be doing is repeating his words and I don’t think you need to hear that over-and-over again. We just want you to know where we stand, and we stand together. Thank you.”</p> <p><b>Abe Bradshaw</b> – “Hello my name is Abe Bradshaw I’m a Navy Veteran, and a patient at the West L.A. VA since I moved to Los Angeles in 2008. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to make a comment and thank you again for all the work you’re doing to help Veterans. About three or four meetings ago I made my first comment about how I wanted to volunteer to help clean up the areas around the Brentwood and Wadsworth Theaters and I also enlisted the help of Captain Randy Zimmerman and the L.A. County fire department. Since I made that public comment, I am happy to say that I had several meetings with the VA including Jane Andrew and so many others who were all very helpful and supportive about my ideas. Over the course of our talks, we realized the areas that I was concerned about would actually be addressed and cleaned through other projects and teams and so I didn’t even have to worry about it. So then on Earth Day I got some volunteers from Bethany Entertainment, and we helped with the cleanup project on the VA campus for that day and we cleaned the Japanese Gardens, which was great. So, even though I felt a sense of accomplishment that day, I’m asking again, to offer my services if I can help in anyway with renovation efforts they have planned for Wadsworth and Brentwood. And I would also like to thank you for allowing me to be a part of the ULI team and the interview they did because I thought they were very helpful. I was also happy to see the two people that interviewed me were also Veterans and I appreciate being able to offer my feedback and I think it’s important to get any feedback you can from Veterans who care as many times as possible whether it’s for the theaters or town center, or for the metro stop, the more Veterans you can talk with, the better because we all care about each other and want things to improve. Thank you very much. Sorry for my audio.”</p> <p><b>John Oppenheim</b> – “My name is John Oppenheim. I’m an Airforce Veteran and advocate for seniors Veterans and I appreciate the opportunity to</p>
---	---

speak today. The last time I spoke up there, it was basically an alarm regarding care for Veterans in my area. And those who know me will be a little bit surprised, today, I want to do a “shout out” to the VA for their efforts to reach out to the community and keep us in their plans. Last week, Abe and I were on the call together along with 14 other Veterans, I was privileged to participate in a feedback session regarding the town center concept for the Greater L.A. campus and also the local community. And what’s really exciting is this is a collaboration effort by the Greater Los Angeles VA and ULI the Urban Land Institute. As an advocate for Veterans in the Long Beach area for many, many years, I have felt the community engagement and involvement on the part of the VA are essential. While the VA is not necessarily, well they’re not, against the concept, I was really frustrated it seemed like it was not going to happen because there was no vehicle to “get the ball rolling” at Greater Los Angeles. And again, I started back in February to understand a little more about that since I go to Long Beach. The concept of engaging with local Veterans that has been ongoing with this group I’m speaking with today, as I discovered when I was able to express my long-standing concerns that I have for senior Veterans. The exercise last week was a great example of what I observe as a big change on the part of the VA. In my opinion, community engagement is the best vehicle we can have for moving in the right direction for that. I applaud you for listening to us, giving Veterans and the broader community the opportunity to participate in the changes. Let’s keep it going. Thank you.”

**Rob Reynolds** – “First thing I wanted to bring up was HR 38-48, I was really disappointed to see the amendment for the West Los Angeles Leasing Act that essentially takes some of the power away from the OIG and allows the VA to enter into lease agreements with entities that don’t principally benefit Veterans or their families. This has been an ongoing issue for decades. There’s been two lawsuits, and it seems that history is repeating itself. At some point UCLA, Jackie Robinson Baseball Stadium was declared in the legal lease until their lease got written into law, thanks to Congressman Ted Lieu and now we have Brentwood School lobbying to change the law so they can stay on the property and at the same time there is a lawsuit in litigation right now and I think it is absolutely outrageous that Brentwood School is trying to circumvent a lawsuit and also change the law so they can stay on the property. That’s just not acceptable at all. So, I really hope the VCOEB can take a position against that amendment. Additionally, I just wanted to bring up the housing on the property, I’m thankful that we have building 205 and 208 that have just recently opened. However, the opening ceremony took place almost two months ago, on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, and the housing authority or HACLA is taking a very long-time processing paperwork and getting Veterans into those buildings. So, I don’t know if there’s anything the VA could do, or this board can do to try to help push that because some buildings are still, remain like 80% empty going on two months since the opening ceremony and I’d like to see a lot of those Veterans get moved



into those apartments. And as far as the outreach that's been happening about the town center, or town square, I think it was ULI, I think that the VA, these entities need to go around and get input from the Veterans that are living on that property at CTRS, at the domiciliary, at New Directions, all the new housing. I think the most important thing that can be done is to make sure that everyone is getting input from everybody, all the Veterans that live on that property the more input they can get the better. That's all I have."

**Kyle Orleman** – "Good afternoon, ladies, and gentlemen. Thank you again for the opportunity to address you. I have a couple of issues that came up as a result of comments that were made this morning that I wanted to address. Jim Perely brought up a really good question about "What happens to the Veterans if they get a job, and their income happens to go up and are they kicked out of their units or not?" And yet, another area where somebody's income could go up potentially substantially and wanted to know if it's being addressed in terms of what would happen if a Veteran comes in and as a result of the PACT Act? For example, goes from 10% serviced connected disability rating, to 100% disability rating, which would see their AMI or eligibility for AMI substantially change. So, what happens in those circumstances to those Veterans who get a higher disability rating and therefore higher payments lose their ability to be in the housing that they're in? One of the questions that I have, I haven't heard any information at all about the Veterans who are living on campus at this point or those that are going to be coming on. How many of those Veterans have spouses or other family members living with them? They're particularly interested in that in terms of building 208 where the members are age 62 and older. The reason I'm brining it up is because what happens if a Veteran is already in housing, and they have their spouse and their family member with them and then something happens to the Veteran either ends up with an illness or hospitalized or if, "God forbid", the Veteran passes away or if there's another issue and it results in the incarceration of a particular Veteran. What happens to a family member if that Veteran is not in the housing at that particular point? Is it, "your spouse is in the hospital, and you have three days to vacate?" Do they stay there? When it's a widow situation or a widower situation, how is that going to be addressed? And I think that's going to happen sooner or later and better to have the plans in place before then. And then, the last couple of things that I want to cover, and I know this is gonna be a great shock to all of you who have heard me speak many times before, pertains to dogs. And there's a couple of issues on that. Also, they've got covered personally this morning. The training programs and the grants that are available are a piece of the answer to what I've been trying to address. You're going to have a number of Veterans who are living on that campus who have various levels of being able to engage with the public, being functional, being able to get into a job training, getting their life together to be able to become, hopefully, independent members of our society again. And one of the things that needs to be covered in this gets

to the town center area as well. You're going to have a lot of dogs and cats living on the property because it's not just a question of service dogs. You're also going to have people who have emotional support animals, they may be cats, they may be rabbits, they may be dogs, they may be guinea pigs, I don't know. But again, what happens in a situation when the Veteran who is in housing and has an animal of some sort and that Veteran has to go into building 500 for a procedure who will be gone for several days. What happens to the animal? That needs to be covered. The other part of it is, or the town center part of it, you're going to have people who have animals who are going to need to purchase supplies, they're going to need pet food, they're going to need litter boxes, they're going to need pee pads, you know, all of the "nitty gritty" stuff and that needs to be planned for with the town center as well. That is a place where I think there would be a significant number of people making purchases. I know when I go to building 500, I go into the canteen, a lot of times, I end up buying dog supplies there, that's where our pet medicine comes from, we've had dog toys that have come from there, we've got all kinds of equipment that come from there as well. And that needs to be planned for on campus. Another area where some of those grants might come into place and tie in with getting Veterans to be able to have professional positions. There would be the opportunity to train some of the Veterans on how to do pet grooming, there will also be the opportunity for people to be dog walkers. Good money in that. The same thing with boarding issues, if a Veteran needs to go on vacation for a week or go to the hospital for surgery. Who boards the dog? That needs to be addressed. One of the things that ties into this, it used to be that if you had a service dog and you're a disabled Veteran, and it went through a particular program, you could get one of these cards for the dog, and this is a Companion Insurance Policy. The VA supplies these "wall to wall" 100% everything paid anywhere, any when, preexisting conditions, doesn't matter if you have a service dog and they are ill or need some kind of treatment this card paid 100% of it, the VAP premiums on these insurance policies. A few years ago, there was a change in the way that these policies are issued, and it created, unfortunately, and unintended consequence was a bottleneck. So, now instead of any service dog who is properly trained having access to these insurance cards, now, the only people who can get these cards are Veterans whose dogs have been trained by an organization called Assistance Dog International. What ends up happening with that is there's only 9-90 ADI trainers in all of North America. So, if you have a dog that needs to be trained for diabetes alert in Maine and your mobility alert in Mexico, and for PTSD in Canada, obviously that's not going to work. So, the Veterans don't know that there's that bottleneck and most of them don't know about this card. The reason it's important that we deal with it here, now, is because my husband and I have been working with service dogs for a long time. Most of you have seen my previous dog, who died a year and a half ago, this is the successor, she is not trained by one of those members, so she's not covered on this. Jerry's dog just died on Memorial Day, we're gonna have

	<p>to get a successor dog that won't be covered either. The bills on his dog before his death can in over \$100,000 and since we did not have a full expense card, only 90% of that was covered, the remaining \$10,000 just came out of his disability pay. So, these cards are critical. If we had a training facility for service dogs on the campus, we can use the military working dog trainers and handlers that we would have access to, get them trained under the SAM Simon Foundation, which is one of the approved members of the Assistance Dog International. The dogs trained on the campus would have access to these cards because they were being trained by ADI certified handlers, and that way if a service persons dog gets sick on campus, they are not faced with the possibility of "I don't have the money to pay for that broken leg" so they put the dog down and they have to start all over again. These insurance cards are critical, and they have to be addressed. Thank you for your time."</p>
Parcel Release Plan	<p><b>Brett Simms, Executive Director, Office of Asset Enterprise Management</b></p> <p>Discussing the EUL Program Placemat for West L.A. used to show a snapshot of the EUL on the West L.A. campus. The placemat is a planning document and is updated on a regular basis and includes all the parcels that are under the EUL on site.</p> <p><b>WLA Campus EUL Program Placemat Overview:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To provide key internal &amp; external stakeholders with a snapshot of the EUL Program on VA's WLA Campus.</li> <li>○ The Placemat serves as the sole source document for accurate &amp; current information related to the development of housing, via EULs, on the WLA Campus.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Placemat is a planning document and is subject to change.</li> <li>○ Timelines and schedules shown are estimates and dependent upon factors such as availability of funding, developer acquisition of financing, completion of lease negotiations, preparation of parcels for release, and fulfillment of all EUL statutory &amp; program obligations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Moving Forward: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OAEM is committed to transparency and will maintain &amp; release the WLA Campus EUL Program Placemat Quarterly – January, April, July, &amp; October – with notable changes highlighted for ease of review.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recent Timeline Adjustments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In Spring 2023, OAEM, VAGLAHS, and the PD Team collaborated to adjust the EUL Project Phasing Timeline, to ensure no adverse impacts to the access and delivery</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>of care provided by VAGLAHS on the WLA Campus. All current timelines were reviewed as well as traffic &amp; parking impacts, move/space availability, and continuity of operations, leading to seven adjustments.</p> <p>There are many dependencies when they are talking about future parcels, (successful competing for funding, completion of lease negotiations, verification requirements, etc.).</p> <p><b>Key information in the WLA EUL Program Placemat:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Last updated] – ‘current as of date’</li> <li>• [Building #] – Project Building #</li> <li>• [Developer] – Lead Developer</li> <li>• [Status] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Preliminary Planning Activities Underway</li> <li>○ EUL/Sublease Activities Ongoing</li> <li>○ Construction Started: Activities Ongoing</li> <li>○ Construction Completed: Lease-Up Underway</li> <li>○ Open &amp; Operational</li> </ul> </li> <li>• [Proposed Parcel Release Date] – Forecasted timing for turnover of parcel to Developer.</li> <li>• [Construction Start] – Projected or actual construction start date.</li> <li>• [Construction Finish] – Projected or actual construction end date.</li> <li>• [Official Opening] – Date when lease-up commences.</li> <li>• [Veteran Units (per Project)] - # of units of Veteran housing for a specific Project.</li> <li>• [Veteran Units (cumulative)] – Running total # of units of Veteran housing for Projects.</li> </ul> <p><b>WLA Campus EUL Program Placemat (slide)</b> – he reviewed the content of the slide with actual data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building 209 is open,</li> <li>• Buildings 207, 205 &amp; 208 Lease-up in progress,</li> </ul> <p>Between what is open (building 209) and those in the lease-up process, there is a cumulative total of 233 units of available housing at this time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MacArthur Field Phase I, buildings 404, 402, 156 &amp; 157 are under construction.</li> <li>• Buildings 156 and 157, while they are two separate buildings, they are being done as a single development.</li> </ul> <p>When the units under construction are completed, (est. May 2025), the cumulative available units will be 600.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MacArthur Field Phase II, building 158, negotiating lease expecting to be executing these leases late this fall with construction starting in November.</li> <li>• Building 210, 408 (Lot 20), building 300, preliminary planning (financing applications, designs) estimated parcel release dates in mid to late 2024.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>Once all units are completed, (est. June 2026), there will be 879 cumulative Veteran housing units available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He discussed some of the outyear units with proposed parcel release dates from April 2025 through June 3032 and construction completion dates from June 2027 through August 2034. Once all units are completed there will be a cumulative total of 1641 Veteran housing units.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: What is the process for the parcel handoff to the developer?</p> <p>Mr. Simms's response: There are two key dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Principal Developer (PD) team submits a request to the VA asking to release the parcel and they have financing in place to develop that parcel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The VA has the obligation of saying they believe they can release that parcel within that 24-month period to meet the PD's financing timeline. This allows the PD to move forward with proposing their design, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As they get closer to the actual lease date, the PD will submit the second request asking the VA to acknowledge the actual parcel release. That second acknowledgment is when VA formally says, "you now have control of the parcel from both a development and an operational state."</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: There is no obligation on behalf of the VA to transfer the parcel, correct?</p> <p>Mr. Simms's response: That is correct, there is no obligation to do so.</p> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: In 2016 the goal for the draft master plan was 1200 units based on the greater L.A. COC homeless information. In 2022, the goal was 1200 but included the broader catchment area for five counties. According to the placemat the parcels are 1641, so some of the parcels will not be developed under the current plan.</p> <p>Mr. Simms's response: The goal is 1200 the way the PD EUL is set up is such that we are requiring the PD team to develop 900 units which in addition to the other developers would meet the 1200-unit target. The 1600 units is essentially an option if there were a need, and it was agreed upon.</p> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: Currently the VA plan is 1200 units, looking at this placemat is 1600 units with a minimum commitment to the PD of 900 units. But the current plan is the 1200 units, correct?</p>
--	---

	<p>Mr. Simms's response: Yes, with a caveat. The 1641 units came from the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), it was assessed at a higher number to make sure that there was the capacity to meet whatever was needed.</p> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: The Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) does not set VA policy regarding what the target is, it provides for capacity. So, the PEIS and the EIS can get the campus up to roughly 1800 units. There are different thresholds, right?</p> <p>Dr. Harris' response: The language has been consistent in the master plan that it is a minimum of 1200 units.</p> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: It's a great document, it will provide us real time information on a quarterly basis in terms of expectations.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner question/comment: Building 300 is being pushed out nine months, this is our service center, so he expressed his concern with all the housing being built without a place for services for a while.</p> <p>Mr. Begland question/comment: The 1200 unit vs. 1700 history, this committee 2 years ago resisted the PD's desire to move the target to 1700 units. This was done for a few reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PD was behind on delivering housing,</li> <li>• L.A. historically had a low use of HUD-VASH vouchers,</li> <li>• The Secretary settled on the 1200 units.</li> </ul> <p>He felt the personal planning offices should be on 1200 units and there should not be hypothetical planning on 1700 units.</p> <p>Building 13 has been identified as a potential turn-over to the PD, the committee was not confident that PD had demonstrated expertise in mixed-use or commercial development. If the VA wants to go with another developer, they are allowed to do that. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr. Simms's response: That is correct, with the caveat, that it is planned for mixed use development now, but understanding that there is an open question looking at the community aspect and how that is done which could change this. The planning document can change depending on the decisions made moving forward. The PD does have experience in mixed use, while that is an option, that is not the plan at this time.</p> <p>Mr. Begland question/comment: He visited the Villages at Cabrio which is what's being reported as the PD's experience in mixed use development. In his view they did not demonstrate any excellence at all. The PD's portfolio shows outstanding housing development, he did not think they had experience in mixed use development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning parameters should be 1200 units.</li> <li>• The status of building 13 and anything around the town center should have an Asterix awaiting ULI study.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Mr. Perley question/comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are 4000 homeless Veterans in L.A.,</li> <li>• 30% of homeless Vets are in California,</li> <li>• there is a long lead time for tax credits,</li> <li>• makes sense to plan for additional units now because of the long lead time,</li> <li>• the master plan should be used as a guidance,</li> <li>• the committees' goal should be to get as many units as fast looking toward the future.</li> <li>• The homeless population might not require retail (mixed use) and the PD experience should not be based on retail but housing.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Zenner question/comment: Not comfortable with that number of 4000, the BNL is around 1800, the Point In Time count is largely criticized, and it is only a once-a-year count. Working with the One Team approach he anticipates a more accurate number in the future.</p> <p>Mr. Perely question/comment: We're not committing to it; we are planning for it and if we don't plan for it then it will be delayed. No downside to planning for it.</p> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: From the services perspective the number of homeless Veterans will always be debated. But the master plan will be updated in 2025 and they need to balance the number of units the VA is building with what the city and county of L.A. are building for homeless Veterans.</p> <p>Mr. Begland question/comment: Concern 1200 vs. 1694 practicality in building a community. Urban design works by creating a certain amount of density of housing, social activities, etc. They should be planning the density with 1200 units.</p> <p>Mr. Perley question/comment: Much of this is unknown, they will not know until the units come online and there does not seem to be any downside to planning for more units.</p> <p>Mr. Boyland question/comment: In the L.A. area there are 26 projects that were approved through the VHHP program, a handful are on campus. What is the purpose of the master plan? Is it to solve homeless the homeless problem in the L.A. region? Is it to deal with the catchment area facilities in that part of the region? He would be able to get the numbers in terms of how many other units can be produced by VHHP throughout the L.A. area to have a better idea of where they are with the 1200 units from the master plan. He asked for some clarity.</p>
--	---

	<p>Mr. Allman question/comment: The campus was never looked at as the “silver bullet” that this would end Veteran homelessness not all Veterans wanted to live in West L.A, they have housing choice. With the original plan it was always known this was a “moving target” that is why the original plan had a readjustment date of every three years to look at what had happened in the broader community. A mistake with master plan 2022 is it did not address the \$1.2 billion bond program for housing. Suggested that when they update the master plan for 2025 that they work with the city and state to have these conversations as to what is happening regarding Veterans homelessness projects.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner question/comment: Even if you build the best program in West L.A. some Veterans do not want to move and they stay in temporary housing because this is the area they want to be. Understanding and respecting the developers experience is one thing, but we also need to respect the Veterans that have been homeless and understand the stigmas and establishing health social connections.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn question/comment: Addressed some issues being talked about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of units being developed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Currently 1400 project-based units outside of the West L.A. campus,</li> <li>○ need to incentivize private landlords,</li> <li>○ cautious of the PIT count can distort the numbers,</li> <li>○ building plans can not be tied to a single PIT count,</li> <li>○ on the West L.A. campus what is the community going to look like,</li> <li>○ mixed-use development in addition to housing to bring a balanced community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Dr. Harris question/comment: This requires an analysis of need and supply; affirm they need to take into consideration of assessing the numbers.</p>
<p>Coordinated Entry System</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How will Veterans be identified within the CES?</li> <li>2. Will there be a process of assessing medical and psychiatric conditions during the CRE process and how is that</li> </ol>	<p><b>Ms. Sally Hammitt, Chief Community Engagement and Reintegration Service (CERS), VA Greater Los Angeles Health Care System</b>  <b>Jen Escobosa, LAHSA’s Veteran Coordinator</b>  <b>Estelle Ana, Deputy Program Manager, GLA HUD-VASH</b></p> <p>Introduced: Jen Escabosa from LAHSA, Veteran Coordinator</p> <p>Ms. Hammitt: Started the discussion about the One Team concept and that is a lot like coordinated entry.</p> <p><b>Mission Statement:</b> <i>“To end Veteran homelessness in L.A. by creating a coordinated, efficient and effective system that moves Veterans from homelessness to housing.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values:</li> </ul>



<p>incorporated into recommendation for type of PSH?</p> <p>3. How will individual choice balance with targeted recommendation for type and location of PSH?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Veteran Centered – Recognizing their experiences, needs and desires.</li> <li>○ Ease of use-processes should be easy to navigate.</li> <li>○ Rapid provision of services – Minimal barriers, few delays to housing.</li> <li>○ Housing focused – Housing ends homelessness.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Principles to lead our work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Create a high functioning homeless crisis response system.</li> <li>○ Embed racial equity into all aspects of the system.</li> <li>○ Increase utilization of VASH and maximize all Veteran housing resources, including the array of SSVF options.</li> <li>○ Effective communication and data-transparent and used for decisions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>One Team was started in July of 2022 with help from the homeless program office and technical assistance team.</p> <p><b>One Team’s Goals</b> – this is not just the VA but community partners acting as One Team.</p> <p><u>Overall Goal:</u> Act as One Team to identify all Veterans experiencing homelessness; triage them quickly to a housing resource; and use case conferencing, navigation, and intention bridges to rapidly place Veterans into permanent housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish a strong team structure that is streamlined and action oriented.</li> <li>2. Identify all Veterans experiencing homelessness using a quality By Name List.</li> <li>3. Ensure all Veterans are triaged to a housing pathway and can come inside immediately if unsheltered.</li> <li>4. After triage, ensure referrals across programs are clear, transparent, and accountable.</li> <li>5. Formalize intentional bridges between SSVF and HUD-VASH to accelerate placements into permanent housing.</li> </ol> <p>She discussed the Veteran’s Journey to Permanent Housing (slide). A VA coordinated approach to ensuring access to emergency housing services and rapid linkages to permanent housing opportunities.</p> <p>Jim Zenner will be her co-training for One Team, and they are working on another co-chair hoping to have an SSVF grantee as they develop the leadership team.</p> <p><b>One Team Structure</b></p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Veterans Leadership Team – Oversees system-level goals to end Veteran homelessness. Initial priorities include the tasking for the One Team committees. Weekly meetings to start.</li> <li>• One Team Committees – ensure that these committees will impart policies and procedures for different Service Planning Area (SPA) level case conferencing groups. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Access &amp; Triage – need to know the entry points.</li> <li>○ By Name List refinement</li> <li>○ SSVF &amp; HUD-VASH collaboration</li> <li>○ Data &amp; Performance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• One Team Case Conferencing Groups – By SPA or geography; case conference Veterans to integrate care and end their homelessness crisis.</li> <li>• One Team Committees’ Role – Committees build the infrastructure needed for an integrated system, or the roads we need to drive on; they do not coordinate direct services for individual Veterans. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Processes</li> <li>○ Policies &amp; Procedures</li> <li>○ Workflows</li> <li>○ Performance improvement approaches</li> <li>○ Training</li> </ul> </li> <li>• One Team Case Conferencing Groups’ Role – Case conference groups coordinate care on a Veterans or client level to ensure every Veteran has a pathway out of homeless and integrated care coordination by using a housing focused case conferencing process and an updated and complete By Name List.</li> </ul> <p><b>One Team Roadmap</b></p> <p><u>Goal:</u> Act as One Team to identify all Veterans experiencing homelessness; triage them quickly to a housing resource; and use case conferencing, navigation, and intentional bridges to rapidly place Veterans into permanent housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kick Off Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working groups will meet to complete their deliverables by June 23<sup>rd</sup>.</li> <li>• Technical assistance team will work with chairs to provide templates, tools, agendas to move deliverables forward. Provide more transparency into various groups databases.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. One Team Launch Meeting – June 28<sup>th</sup>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-person meeting with One Team Leadership Team, Working Groups, and SPA-Level case conferencing members to launch our One Team. The SPA groups will have different barriers and challenges.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
--	---

- Working groups will present their deliverables for SPA-level case conference groups to learn and provide input for implementation.

3. Implementation

- Working groups and leads for each SPA will work together to implement the deliverables from the working groups.

Ms. Escabosa: Discussed the By Name List (BNL) process flow.

**Veteran BNL Process Flow**

Goal: Everyone that encounters a Veteran has access to enter that Veteran into HMIS which is where the BNL pulls information from. To date they have 100 HUD-VASH staff that have access to the BNL.

- Entering Veteran into CES – (everyone can enter the Veteran into CES).
  - LAHSA Outreach
  - SSVF
  - VPAN
  - HUD-VASH
  - GPD, HCHV, ABH
  - VA Outreach
  - Community Providers
- \*Validating Veteran status prior to adding to BNL. They were able to streamline this to one day.
- \*Prioritized for case conferencing. The HMIS numbers are pulled and forwarded to all providers beforehand and they will let her know whether that Veteran is connected to services, whether they need any other wraparound services and support from the community.
- \*Eligibility and needs assessment.
  - Temporary/transitional housing matches
  - Screen for SSVF & VASH
  - Match to permanent housing opportunities

*Veteran status validated through SQUARES & coordination w/VA	*Newly added Veterans highlighted for case conferencing	*Action driven case conferencing leading to housing plan.
---	---	---

It is estimated that 25-30% of Veterans experiencing homelessness in L.A. County are not accounted for in the BNL. They have been working on “cleaning up” the BNL, removing duplicates and the BNL number is approximately 1790, but they are still working on this as they are not convinced, they are capturing all the Veterans.

- Ramping up Outreach – capturing Veterans who were not eligible prior to eligibility expansions.
- VASH in HMIS – Onboarding 100+ VASH social workers into HMIS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engaging non-HMIS users – Engaging programs which have historically underutilized HMIS.</li> </ul> <p>Working with LAHSA counterparts to build feedback loops to make sure that they are capturing Veterans that may be in other systems (i.e., domestic violence, family system, etc.).</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: You are not using any questionnaire to prioritize housing?</p> <p>Ms. Escabosa’s response: They are not using the questionnaire.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: Some of the housing that uses the questionnaire only those that score a certain percent on the questionnaire get housing. That is not what is happening in L.A., Veterans get housed if they go through a system. There is enough housing, more or less, for everybody. Getting through the bottleneck is not necessarily finding more vouchers or finding more housing it’s getting people through the system and matching them with housing. That’s different. Is that how you see it at this time?</p> <p>Ms. Escabosa’s response: It is understood that any Veteran meeting the eligibility for available housing sites if they want to move into that unit, they will immediately start the process of whatever steps they would need to take to help them get into that unit.</p> <p>Mr. Khun: Their biggest problem is engagement, making sure that Veterans know about us and believe they have reason to come to us. They need to reduce the bureaucratic hurdles and engage Veterans, so they are not bewildered by the different organizations and see one organization working together to meet their needs.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: Why do we let the barriers get in the way of housing Veterans? Why not house them today and then figure out the rest later?</p> <p>Ms. Hammitt’s response: The answer is complex, however, we do know that we create our own barriers. The hope is that through this One Team community they will come together and breakdown these barriers and streamline the process.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner: We’re not One Team yet.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: When they project based vouchers available, they are at about 81% occupancy, tenant-based housing is at 61%, and the emergency housing vouchers at about 63%. The emergency housing vouchers are more attractive than the HUD-VASH vouchers because they come with an incentive, they work with SSVF, and there is no service involved. So, there</p>
--	---

	<p>is no requirement or caseload, etc. The challenge with tenant-based vouchers is to track those private landlords who are not interested either because they are concerned about the clientele or who don't want to keep an apartment open, they don't want to wait for the inspection and the administrative burden of having to deal with this.</p> <p>Ms. Escabosa: The One Team concept is bringing together all the components from VA, LASHA, housing authority and the county to streamline the processes.</p> <p>Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper question/comment: What are the goals of reducing the housing? What is the goal of One Team?</p> <p>Ms. Hammitt's response: Streamlining that system, getting a housing plan in place as quickly as possible, within the first 30-days. They need housing stock through a coordinated effort they can help prevent homeless encampments from popping up.</p> <p>Mr. Boyland question/comment: The state should be part of One Team. The coordinated entry system is a funnel which has been a challenge with a small passageway to get people in. The VA is holding the funds that are the final part of the funnel with a partnership with LAHSA. When you council the Veterans through the intake process do you have the income information on the BNL?</p> <p>Ms. Escabosa's response: They do have the capacity to collect the income information. The biggest issue was that the systems were not talking to each other. The information you see on the BNL is only as accurate as the data in the access base. Much effort has been made to bring in all this information from the VA, the county, LASHA, etc. they should be able to back up the information with data and bring this all together.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: They do have some data they know that nationally 70% of the Veterans they place are below 30% AMI. They want to attract as many Veterans, without restrictions, as possible and make sure they get assigned. The coordinated entry system described is used by HUD not the system that the VA is developing, HUD must ration the VA does not have to ration so they can develop a coordinated entry system to include as many Veterans as possible without restrictions on AMI.</p> <p>Mr. Boylan question/comment: We are in a situation in L.A. where there are empty buildings and cannot find people to live in these buildings. When they see that 75% of the BNL, of the 1800 people are eligible for almost all the units available in L.A. Why can't all these people get housed?</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn's response: They do not want to restrict Veterans with the highest disability from obtaining housing, so they are asking for those AMI</p>
--	---

	<p>restrictions to be removed so they can expand the eligibility. Significant barriers still exist. Property managers have their own processes and must screen, and this takes time and Veterans have a choice and some don't want to live in these areas.</p> <p>Mr. Underwood question/comment: What is the data on the recidivism rate? What are the criteria for someone to be taken off the BNL?</p> <p>Ms. Escabosa's response: Recidivism first origin data will be capturing their placements and fall outs. Veterans are not removed from the BNL, they are shifted from active to inactive.</p> <p>Mr. Underwood question/comment: What is the estimated percentage of Veterans waiting for housing because they did not want to live in a particular housing unit?</p> <p>Ms. Escabosa's response: They can put that information together for them.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner question/comment: Provided information on what the One Team is working on from a community perspective. Working with VPAN, legal outreach and National Guard places where they are able to get into and find Veterans who may be temporarily housing insecure, there is the benefit screening partnership, L.A. Housing Authority is partnering with One Team to ensure Veterans are not falling out of housing, DHS CCM program, they are reaching out to Veterans for healthcare enrollment, homeless rights, consumer affairs and continued talk about a real solution from the county perspective.</p> <p>Mr. Allman question/comment: One Team partners it is important to keep in mind that a representative of landlords should be part of One Team. Previously this was a missed opportunity and to talk about real solutions the earlier landlords are brought into the conversation may help. How does LAHSA and the VA recognize landlords?</p> <p>Ms. Escabosa's response: She will get back to him regarding LAHSA recognizing/incentivizing landlords.</p> <p>Ms. Hammitt's response: VA looks to incentivize landlords through monetary means. Utilize the landlords to ensure the Veterans are safe once they are housed, encourage landlords to be more vocal about what they are providing Veterans. A Triage tool is being developed, not live in the field, the intention is to use this to provide a guided conversation.</p> <p><b>Using the Triage Tool</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used with all Veterans contacting the Homeless Response System.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tool provides a guided conversation to determine Veteran options for services and housing.</li> <li>• It is housing focused, even if initial referrals are to short term housing options.</li> <li>• Focuses on identifying Veterans strengths and determines their desired path to permanent housing.</li> <li>• Utilizes a Housing Problem solving philosophy that offers SSVF Rapid Resolution services to make housing opportunities successful.</li> </ul> <p>Not all those Veterans are unsheltered some are in transitional housing, Grant &amp; Per Diem, etc.</p> <p><b>Ensuring Success</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building rapport, trust, and therapeutic relationship is critical,</li> <li>• Mutual investment and Veteran choice,</li> <li>• Coordinated Care,</li> <li>• Flexibility,</li> <li>• Collaborative partnerships.</li> </ul> <p>Understanding that homelessness causes a lot of trauma and that these are individuals, and we need to build that relationship, and while we can simultaneously ensure that they get housed quickly, that plan may look a little different depending on the individual and the engagement process.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: Complete reasonable observations from the past and coming up something for the future. Make sure we see trends on average, number of homeless on the BNL, recidivism, healthcare costs, steps to housing comparing past and present, see the diversity of the housing stock in the future presentations.</p> <p>Ms. Ana: Discussed the HUD-VASH/Geriatrics and Extended Care Collaboration Pilot. They were instructed by National to find a way to use the vouchers to help subsidize assisted living expenses. In large cities the cost of assisted living is very high and the subsidies with the costs of the assisted living was not working.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are reviewing the HUD Directive to determine what category these facilities fall into.</li> <li>• LACDA inspectors had gone out to several facilities to determine what housing would they fall into and then that would determine what voucher rate they could use.</li> <li>• Determining what the lease would look like. It would include care services; this is something the Housing Authority does not pay for.</li> <li>• They chose some of the facilities they had been working with that wanted to pilot this project, helped create a lease agreement that would separate the room and board cost from the care fees.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This new lease created had gone through the LACDA legal counsels, after several attempts, last week the LACDA legal counsel signed off on the lease agreements.</li> <li>• They settled on a voucher rate to be used with the new lease agreements and are moving forward with implementation and anticipate piloting this within the next couple of months.</li> <li>• The Veteran would need to be HUD-VASH eligible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Currently in HUD-VASH that can no longer reside safely in their unit alone. They would work with the PHA to request to move the Veteran into assisted living.</li> <li>○ Homeless Veteran that initially may not have been HUD-VASH eligible because they could live independently but now, they are HUD-VASH eligible because they need an assisted living facility.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• This allows them to reach a population that they previously would not have been able to reach because if they were not able to live independently, they would not have been HUD-VASH eligible.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Cohen question/comment: Where are those housing units located? What is the AMI level is of each unit? If there are open units why haven't Veterans been placed in them? Can you provide a list of the programmatic partnerships that are involved with One Team? She would like to have a better understanding of what the ecosystem is in serving homeless Veterans in L.A. County.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner question/comment: Working with Long Beach and GLA medical centers on the Veteran Home Care Program. He asked if it was too early to ask how this program would tie into the HUD-VASH/Geriatrics and Extended Care Program?</p> <p>Ms. Ana's response: She thought it was to early. The idea is for families to be able to work with Veterans to choose those services, whether it is assistance with ADLs, help with grocery shopping, etc. Leveraging family support and Veterans choice is what this is about.</p> <p>Ms. Stanley question/comment: How many women Veterans and those with children are coming into the system and getting support? Would like to have a conversation regarding this.</p> <p>Bamberger question/comment: Where is the problem with Geriatric Veterans pilot? Is it finding the funding for services?</p> <p>Ms. Ana's response: No, they just got the clearance last week so they can start moving forward.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger question/comment: Getting the rent paid for in assisted living is usually the thing we can accomplish, to have the voucher pay for</p>
--	--



	<p>rent is huge. If there is a gap in the ability to pay for services, this should be able to be filled by the assisted living waiver through Medi-CAL.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn question/comment: He wanted to thank Ms. Ana for all the work she has done on this.</p>
Trend Analysis of current data collected via Dashboard with projections based on analysis	<p><b>Ms. Sally Hammitt, Chief Community Engagement and Reintegration Service (CERS), VA Greater Los Angeles Health Care System, Darrell Joseph, Deputy Chief of Service CERS</b></p> <p>Mr. Joseph: They were tasked by the VCOEB to put together a dashboard and identify trends. The Secretary added two goals to last year's goal, they do have the updated goal of Permanent Housing Placements on the dashboard for this year and they want to include the two additional goals from the Secretary and wanted to see if the VCOEB thought this would be beneficial since this is a collaborative effort as well as incorporating some of the data the VCOEB would like to see as mentioned in today's meeting. The home for the dashboard is on the master plan dashboard under CERS, updated monthly, some bi-monthly and some information is dependent on our community partners.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 16-01 from the March VCOEB Meeting</b></p> <p>Create a web-based dashboard available to the public that reports on progress in providing permanent housing for Veterans experiencing homelessness in the Greater L.A. area to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly report of available HUD-VASH vouchers and utilization for both tenant-based and project-based housing and,</li> <li>• Quarterly reporting on progress towards filling vacant HUD-VASH staff positions and,</li> <li>• Monthly reporting on By Name List (BNL) that is in coordination with the L.A. Homeless Services Agency that maintains industry standards for BNL fidelity and,</li> <li>• Monthly progress on available housing at the West L.A. VA campus and,</li> <li>• Quarterly reporting on progress towards placement of Veterans in Residential Care Facilities, Board and Care and/or Assisted Living level of care and,</li> <li>• Monthly reporting on the number of Veterans exiting permanent housing.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Hammitt: Discussed the CY 2023 Homeless Goals. One of the challenges is ensuring the data is up to date through multiple sources.</p> <p><b>CY 2023 Homeless Goals</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• House <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ permanently house at least 38,000 Veterans experiencing homelessness (1,500 for GLA). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Update: currently they are at 694 unique Veterans housed and are on track to meet the goal of 1,500 unique Veterans housed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Prevention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No more than 5% returns to homelessness</li> <li>○ Of those who return to homelessness, no less than 90% re-housed or on a pathway to re-housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Update: of those 694 unique Veterans housed, as of June 2023, there were 22, (3.2%), returns to homelessness and 20, (90.9%), re-housed or placed on a pathway to re-housing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Engage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Engage with 28,000 unsheltered Veterans (1,888 for GLA). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Update: unsheltered Veteran engagement there were 831 HOMES Assessments and 324 SSVF RRH Entries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unique unsheltered Veteran engagement = 1,074,</li> <li>• Remaining unsheltered Veterans needed = 814,</li> <li>• Unsheltered Veterans needed per month to reach goal = 116,</li> <li>• Goal Unique Veterans = 1,888</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Ms. Jhaveri: Discussed the two Veterans that returned to homelessness. She was able to reach out to one of two Veterans primary care provider. That Veteran was at a community hospital and was discharged to a nursing home, where he is still recovering his primary care provider does have a plan once he is discharged from the nursing home. The other Veteran that was on that list has been in and out of transitional housing. He did receive a referral from our walk-in welcome center; however, he was a no show. They did reach out to HUD-VASH where he did have an inquiry for possible placement as well as the transitional housing social worker and the CRC social worker to see if they can make contact with the Veteran.</p> <p>Ms. Hammitt: Angira has been doing a lot of work around suicide prevention and develop reports for their clinicians so they can do targeted outreach so they can recognize who the most high-risk individuals are and who may need to be seen urgently.</p> <p>Ms. Jhaveri: Briefed the committee on the suicide prevention efforts. They had noticed that only about 24% of the suicide risk assessments were being completed. Anyone can complete the initial suicide risk screening; they were able to identify those Veterans that were going to be seen in clinic and alert the healthcare team that the Veteran may need a</p>
--	--

	<p>suicide risk assessment. Through this effort they were able to increase the completed assessments to approximately 48% compliance.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner question/comment: The housing numbers does not say the level of services being provided. He would like to see in addition to the number of engagements some kind of measure of the services the Veteran is getting. Quality of life events, some of our Veterans that get housed don't have furniture, so it won't feel like a home, or they won't feel connected to their communities, etc.</p>
<p>Recap of Housing Navigation Contracts</p> <p>Contract Performance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Qualitative Assessment</li> <li>2. Quantitative Assessment</li> </ol>	<p><b>Ms. Sally Hammitt, Chief Community Engagement and Reintegration Service (CERS), VA Greater Los Angeles Health Care System</b>  <b>Elizabeth Bret, HUD-VASH Contract Coordinator and COR for the Housing Specialist Contract</b>  <b>Nicole Flores, Program Manager, Madison Avenue Support Services</b></p> <p>Ms. Bret: The original contract was awarded in 2022, there are four vendors that were awarded this contract; Madison Avenue Support Services, Volunteers of America, American for Contracts and the The Partimage Group.</p> <p>Three main components of the Housing Navigation Contracts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unit Acquisition <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. finding apartments,</li> <li>b. developing a relationship with landlords and property managers, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. informing them of the HUD-VASH program,</li> <li>ii. benefits of working with the program and housing Veterans.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Property Management and Engagement <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. developing relationships with individuals within the PHAs, landlords and property managers, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. to ensure the housing Navigator a Veteran is working with has a list of landlords and property managers they can call and access housing.</li> </ol> </li> <li>b. housing stock - apartment and units available,</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Housing Search and Placement <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. housing contractor is working specifically with the Veteran, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. conducting and intake,</li> <li>ii. obtaining Veteran choice/preferences,</li> <li>iii. some challenges the Veteran may have encountered getting housing,</li> <li>iv. some needs the Veterans may have.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>This is all in place so when they're working with the Veteran and trying to secure housing, they know where the Veteran wants to be housed and what needs the Veteran may have.</p>

	<p><b>Performance data</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referrals received = 313</li> <li>• Veterans served = 299 have been referred to VASH housing contractors.</li> <li>• Veterans Housed = 85</li> </ul> <p><b>Data by Contractor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mass received 174 referrals and housed 53 Veterans,</li> <li>• AGX received 71 referrals and housed 21 Veterans,</li> <li>• VOA received 37 referrals and housed 8 Veterans,</li> <li>• TPG received 17 referrals and housed 3 Veterans.</li> </ul> <p>Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper question/comment: Have these contractors performed better than this in the past?</p> <p>Ms. Bret's response: When some of the housing navigators were hired a couple of the agencies were on the East Coast and did not have the awareness of the homeless services and resources in GLA. Some of the Housing Navigators did not have the experience when serving in these roles.</p> <p>Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper question/comment: Were you surprised by that?</p> <p>Ms. Bret's response: She did not know what to expect. They did expect some challenges working with contractors who were not in the area.</p> <p>Some Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application fees and security deposits and being able to access these funds in a timely manner for the Veteran. These funds are available through SSVF but sometimes there are delays and when they finally receive the funds the unit is gone.</li> <li>• Eviction on record and poor credit history related to non-payment of utilities. Some property managers will not work with these Veterans.</li> <li>• Communication – The HUD-VASH teams and contractors are getting to know each other. Communicating with the PHAs and the Veterans, some of the Veterans lose their phones or phone numbers change and this causes a breakdown in communication and delays the process.</li> <li>• Staffing there has been a lot of turnovers among the four contracts.</li> <li>• Housing market and the cost of living in L.A.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>Some Successes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barrier Buster Group a collaboration with Dr. Savaris who was the first Housing First model, facilitated the group for housing navigators to include SSVF, PHAs, etc.</li> <li>• Landlord Incentives the 4207 funds very helpful, incentives through SSVF have moved the mark for landlords who may have been reluctant to rent to Veterans with a poor credit history.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Boyland question/comment: You follow Housing First policies, the second part of California State Law is that advocates are not rejected based on poor credit, financial history of eviction, poor or lack of rental history, criminal convictions, unrelenting tendency or behaviors that indicates a lack of housing. Many people that are sent over for housing later go back on the BNL because the contract managers for these facilities and those facilities being built are not following the Housing First policies. By law, it is illegal to reject people under the Housing First policy for reasons mentioned, so the numbers on the performance slide should not be a surprise if they are rejecting Veterans based on the challenges cited. People don't truly understand what "Housing First" means this is a huge point of concern we need to start looking at the way it is pushed out to the community.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner question/comment: The application fee is that not able to be handled by SSVF?</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn's response: It can be paid by SSVF it may take time and we want to make housing navigation easier. They are a few things they are trying to do; a new contract where the application fee would be paid directly and eliminating one step, also trying to make home navigation easier through massive leasing this would be a great way to secure housing and address some of these challenges we face. Massive leasing would take the landlords out of the decision-making process and let the partners they are working with be responsible for leasing those apartments and take any discrimination out of the equation.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner question/comment: Follow-up with what events impacts the recidivism rate and making sure that the data drives what the reasons are so we can address specifics. Do you have the authority to enter into contracts in the future that mandate they be on the West Coast?</p> <p>Ms. Bret's response: Once the solicitation closes, they look for the strongest candidates and now to make sure they are local, however, they need local agencies to bid on the contract and that has been an issue.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner questions/comments: They would like to partner with them to get the word out to community channels about getting local providers for this contract.</p>
--	--

	<p>Dr. Bamberger questions/comments: The fidelity of the Housing Navigator was clear, they needed to pay \$10,000 a door and they 're paying about \$1,000 and they needed to have the lease with the agents and not the individual. They did not follow fidelity his recommendation is to scrap it.</p> <p>Mr. Underwood questions/comments: What are the mechanics of getting the application fees?</p> <p>Ms. Bret's response: Many of the Veterans served in the HUD-VASH program have no income or very low income and the \$50 or \$75 application fee is a lot. There are services and resources through the PHA and SSVF getting the resources, the issue is getting them in a timely manner. The housing market is very competitive here and if it takes 5-days to get access to the services most likely the landlord has moved on.</p> <p>Mr. Underwood questions/comments: Why are homeless Veterans going to fall under the umbrella of looking for a place if they are not already set-up and prepped to execute?</p> <p>Ms. Bret's response: If the contractors had the funding to pay the application fees, they could secure the apartments and the numbers would look differently. Once a Veteran finds a place, they will reach out to SSVF for the Veteran to secure funding, but there is a process to get that funding.</p> <p>Mr. Underwood questions/comments: So, someone fills out a form to go to the government point of contact, and if that person is out, it could be delayed, etc. and then the apartment is gone.</p> <p>Ms. Brett's response: Yes, that all that does lead to those delays. If the contractors had the funding for the application fees, they could pay this upfront.</p> <p>Mr. Underwood question/comment: So, it could be set up like a petty cash fund of \$1,000.</p> <p>Ms. Brett's response: These are the things they are looking at as to what they can do to address these concerns because they do want to see better outcomes for this program.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: Several items they are addressing in the solicitation; to include application fees and adjusting the reimbursement rate.</p> <p>Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper questions/comments: Who is the source selectin authority? Who makes that decision?</p>
--	---

	<p>Mr. Kuhn's response: They have a team from West L.A. that will review the solicitations and selects the vendors. It will be based on their new work statement which is currently with OGC.</p> <p>Mr. Allman: How are the housing navigators doing their housing search?</p> <p>Ms. Brett's response: The currently have one contractor now on the table and that is Madison Avenue Support Services, Nicole will speak to this.</p> <p>Ms. Flores: The process is no one size fits all, they work with individual Veterans and their VASH case managers to start the intake process to determine where to start. Searching online but also out in the field conducting outreach. As program manager her plan is to build more relationships with community partners, researching and utilizing other resources that could help with application fees.</p> <p>Mr. Allman questions/comments: He has gone through the PHA list and landlord list to spot check availability of units. His concern is that if we are data mining the same PHA which has not updated in years, are they just spinning their wheels with the Housing Navigators? Are they developing a new list?</p> <p>Ms. Flores' response: The PHA list is not where they start, they research a variety of websites as well as doing their own searches by speaking to property managers, etc. and are building their own list.</p> <p>Ms. Brett: Success stories, they have a Veterans who was in the HUD-VASH program and is currently going through the onboarding process with the VA to become a Housing Specialist.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner: When you see Veterans making it and working alongside the other Housing Navigators drives home the purpose of why they do this.</p> <p>Mr. Allman: You don't want to bother landlords because they talk with other landlords so when the VA goes in that the ask is comprehensive and reasonable. There is a natural suspicion regarding the government inspection the landlords may enter this relationship in good faith and then have a bad experience. It may take many conversations, but it is doable.</p> <p>Ms. Hammitt: Cultivating relationships is important across the system.</p>
<p>CTRS Projected plans for CTRS (modular for Veterans w/families, etc.)</p>	<p><b>Ms. Sally Hammitt, Chief Community engagement and Reintegration Service (CERS), VA Greater Los Angeles Health Care System</b></p> <p>Ms. Hammitt: Some updates for CTRS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about pulling in bikes and charging stations in the tiny shelters, there are now bike racks and charging stations and security service that can help ensure bikes stay a safe distance from the tiny shelters.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• June 1<sup>st</sup> the food service contract rolled out and Veterans seem to be very happy with this. The contractor takes into consideration dietary needs (breakfast, lunch, and dinner).</li> <li>• Showers and laundry trailers brought on site.</li> <li>• There are some more administrative trailers to be brought on site, so they are collocated in CTRS compound.</li> </ul> <p>Ensuring the success <b>CTRS</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hope The Mission</b> - monitoring contract provides 24 hrs. support to include safety and wellness checks on each unit several times per day. Previously this was done by security staff.</li> <li>• <b>VA Staffing</b> - Social workers approved a special salary rate, support staff and a 10% retention bonus. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 12 filled positions in CTRS,</li> <li>○ six current vacancies of which positions are being filled.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Capacity has increased to 125</b> - they have drop in shelters and want to make sure they get to total capacity whether that is traditional housing or contract, they are working with their partners.</li> <li>• <b>Informed consent and SOP</b> – this is with the OGC being reviewed.</li> <li>• <b>Veteran Engagement Committee (VEC)</b> - once per week the Veterans come together in CTRS and they have an engagement committee a peer leads that and they discuss issues/concerns, etc. And the staff hears from them as to what is important to them and what is going well and what may need to be improved.</li> <li>• <b>Security Cameras</b> - to be installed for additional safety.</li> <li>• <b>Outdoor kitchen</b> - to provide opportunities for engagement.</li> <li>• <b>Fencing</b> - developing privacy fencing around the perimeter of CTRS and some beautification processes the intention is to make sure people feel safe.</li> </ul> <p>Currently, families are not able to be service in the emergency shelters or CTRS, so they are exploring this.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: They have some advanced planning on creating modular housing on campus to provide housing for families. Twenty percent of SSVF enrollees are dependent children, if they had the service they would come, currently the campus does not have the service. Trying to use the existing authority under CTRS and extension of this to accommodate different populations. They need to have different kinds of housing options for different groups of people in addition to families such as those with disabilities, etc.</p> <p>Mr. Allman questions/comments: The CTRS housing they could not use the lease revenue fund because they cited issues, so they had to rely on donors to donate these tiny shelters. Is it different for modular housing?</p>
--	--



	<p>Dr. Harris' response: They were able to change the revenue authority about six months ago so they are trying to see if the modular housing would fit under that authority which requires services to be provided.</p> <p>Mr. Allman questions/comments: CTRS would no longer require donors?</p> <p>Dr. Harris' response: Yes, there may be gray areas. There are ways the VA could purchase those.</p> <p>Mr. Allman questions/comments: So, the plan is that VA is anticipating being able to purchase these modular houses for Veterans with additional needs?</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn's response: They are waiting for OGC to provide guidance. They are hoping they can do this under existing authorities and expand that concept to serve the special needs populations.</p> <p>Mr. Allman questions/comments: Have they discussed the sites where to put these modular houses on campus?</p> <p>Dr. Harris' response: They have some thoughts on sites but awaiting OGC opinion before they invest the time and effort to determine the sites for the modular homes on campus.</p> <p>Mr. Allman questions/comments: Could provide some idea as to where these sites for the modular houses would be?</p> <p>Mr. Zenner questions/comments: The engagement with CTRS is great. Are they looking to expand CTRS?</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn's response: They are looking to increase capacity for service, they currently have tiny home capacity, currently at 125 they can go to 140 when they have staff. There are grant opportunities exclusively for CTRS so that could add a substantial level of service consistent with the One Team approach.</p> <p>Ms. Hammitt: They had been taking in two Veterans per day due to staffing, but with an increase in staffing they can take more than that per day.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: It is important to them that CTRS is not the only option, they had many open units around their catchment area that were offered by Grant and Per diem, and they need to make them accessible and make sure they are providing prompt responses to requests for housing.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner questions/comments: Would like to get an update on that in the future regarding the progress of this.</p>
--	---

	Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper: Thanked Ms. Hammitt and thanked Mr. Kuhn and the VA for the much-needed pay raise for Social Workers working with the homeless project.
Review/wrap-up/Adjourn	<b>VCOEB Chair/DFO/FAC Staff</b>  Adjourned the meeting.

**DATE: 22/06/2023**

**VCOEB Board Members Present**

Lt GEN (Ret) John Hopper Jr. (Chair)  
 Anthony Allman (virtual)  
 Dr. Joshua Bamberger  
 Christine Barrie  
 Robert Begland  
 Keith Boylan  
 Jim Perley  
 Joseph Sapien  
 Kristine Stanley  
 Dennis Tucker  
 Hamilton Underwood  
 Dr. Mark Wellisch  
 Jim Zenner

**VCOEB Board Members Absent**

Philip Mangano (Vice Chair)  
 Aimee Bravo  
 Stephanie Cohen  
 Jennifer Marshall  
 Heidi Marston  
 Shawn VanDiver  
 Larry Vasquez

**VA Employees and Staff Present**

John Boerstler	Tony DeFrancesco (virtual)
Darryl Darden (virtual)	Sally Hammitt
Dr. Keith Harris	Elizabeth Brett
John Kuhn	Janet Elder
Rika Brown (virtual)	Soma Arens (virtual)
Alan Trinh	Cyndee Costello (Contractor)
Angell Bolden Green (virtual)	Joseph Friddie
Eugene Skinner (DFO)	Maggie Walsh (Contractor)
Chihung Szeto	Andrew Strain
Fiona Hwang (virtual)	Shilpa Desai (Contractor)
Kristin Groteclass (virtual)	Chelsea Black
Cynthia Cordova (virtual)	Alfred Flores (virtual Contractor)

Robert Merchant  
John Tennor  
Brett Simms (virtual)

Darryl Joseph  
Roberto Marshall (virtual)

**Public Attendees**

Brian D 'Andrea  
Swati Anna  
Thomas Payne  
Tess Banko  
Cyrus Jahanian  
Ren Ross  
Kyle Olemann  
Jerry Olemann

**Virtual Attendees**

Ally Cimino  
Ari Majer  
Tyler Monroe  
Nicole Jean  
Decaral Smith  
Stephen Peck  
Lori Moore  
John Alford  
Billie Pacheco  
Abe Bradshaw  
Janet Turner

Call to Order	<b>Lt GEN (Ret.) Hopper, Chair; Mr. Eugene Skinner Jr. Designated Federal Officer (DFO); alternate DFO is Chihung Szeto.</b> Lt Gen (Ret.) Hopper welcome members back <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>DFO Mr. Eugene Skinner went over the rules of engagement for Federal Advisory Committee</li></ul>
Opening Remarks Committee Chair	<b>Lt GEN (Ret.) Hopper</b>  Lt. GEN (Ret.) welcomed members and thanked them for their discussion yesterday. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>He gave the floor to VEO Chief John Boerstler</li></ul>
Opening Remarks Executive Sponsor	<b>Mr. John Boerstler, Chief Veterans Experience Officer</b>  Mr. Boerstler said he brief the Secretary on the discussion from previous day and he was impressed with the feedback during Public Comments section.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentioned he was leaving early, need to attend Congressional meetings for the STRONG Act but looking forward to meeting in DC in September</li> <li>• Honored departing Board members for their work.</li> <li>• Thanked the Board for the progress made so far.</li> </ul>
Opening Remarks Special Advisor	<p><b>Dr. Keith Harris, Senior Executive Homelessness Agent (Greater Los Angeles), Office of Secretary</b></p> <p>Dr. Harris wanted to clarify that Vets under the 30% AMI is not necessarily a numbers problem but project-based housing with collocated services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they cannot serve in the housing they need.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>HR 38-48 discussion</p>
Opening Remarks GLA Leadership	<p>Mr. Robert Merchant, Medical Center Director, VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System</p> <p>Mr. Merchant clarified he was not allowed to comment on pending lawsuits at this time. He also thanked Sally Hammitt for being here to brief the Board and her efforts at accelerating community efforts across the healthcare system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentioned the mission is too big and too great to accomplish without VA partnerships</li> </ul>
<p>Update of the construction progress since the last meeting to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction milestones and Progress</li> <li>2. Lease up/move in plan.</li> <li>3. Details of services plan</li> <li>4. Funding Commitment Levels</li> </ol>	<p>OAEM/Veterans Collective: Tyler Monroe, Senior Vice President; Thomas Safran &amp; Associates; Teresa Banko, Project Director, U.S. Vets; Brian D’Andrea, Vice President, Housing Development at Century Housing</p> <p>Ms. Banko gave update on Building 210 being in pre-development (see Slide for more details)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building is for homeless women Veterans.</li> <li>• Serve Veteran children as well.</li> <li>• Services include case management, substance abuse.</li> <li>• Child-care and family program staff members.</li> <li>• Hiring a director of behavior health.</li> <li>• Veteran service coordinator is already working in building</li> </ul> <p>Brian D’Andrea:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building 158 is third of the cluster.</li> <li>• Received an award of credits and bonds.</li> <li>• Refurbished old convalescence units (1.5 case managers, services for intensive case management, substance abuse services)</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Wellisch: When is Building 210 done?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Banko answered in 2026.</li> </ul>

	<p>Mr. D 'Andrea said Building 404, containing 73 units, are expected to be complete by next year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building will have 2 full-time case managers, occupational therapists, and other services.</li> <li>• Buildings 156 and 157 will contain 112 supportive homes and the construction financing was just closed with the goal of completion in 2025 with two full-time case managers, intensive case management, mental health, and other supportive services.</li> </ul> <p>Tyler Monroe added that Building 402 is under construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 118 rooms for Veterans</li> <li>• Modular new construction completed late 2024 and 2025.</li> <li>• Service staffing being supported by U.S. Vets.</li> </ul> <p>Building 207 had a recent ribbon cutting and project is fully occupied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building 207 was executed by the VASH contract, VASH staff on ground serving members.</li> <li>• Working to provide a plan for wraparound services, housing resources.</li> <li>• Currently one female Veteran living in Building 207 and services are provided by Women Vets on Point.</li> <li>• Working on building community with other Veterans and functioning as a community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "Coffee and Conversation" where Veterans can get coffee and chat with each other.</li> <li>○ Monthly Veteran community meeting (Town Hall).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Listening to the needs of Veterans and want to better aid Veterans in transportation, nutrition, mental health needs, etc.</li> <li>• Created a partnership with CTRS to provide Narcan training to Vets and staff, Technology 101 training.</li> <li>• Building activities for residents like planting different herbs, Veterans excited to tend their gardens.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Zenner asked if the staff was interacting with the Veterans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Banko responded that the position is not intended to be a desk job and is meant to talk and engage the Veterans.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Zenner recommended setting aside 50% of their time for clinical work.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner: what is the purpose of outreach for Building 210?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Banko said the target was women Veterans, trying to grow the services as the community grows.</li> <li>• Mr. Zenner said there needs to be a flexible timeframe for intake and to make sure whoever is running the building to not put barriers in place.</li> <li>• Ms. Banko agreed.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Mr. Zenner: Believes there are some issues with HCLA and asked how they are addressing that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. D’Andrea said LACDA have the vouchers and Building 207 is a LACDA project.</li> <li>• Mr. Zenner said there was confusion about which buildings were HCLA or LACDA and Veterans have to go through unnecessary hoops to qualify.</li> <li>• Mr. Monroe said he wanted that feedback to be include in the after-action report.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Monroe said he was aware of the tenant relocation and learned about the charges last week.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TSA does not have control over the votes and do not control what they do.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger: Are you pushing for more robust medical services on site for people who are struggling with mental illness, chronically homeless, etc.?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Banko said they are working with VASH regarding each individual Veterans’ needs.</li> <li>• VASH Team members can give meds if needed and they are working with medical staff in the hospitals to provide resources and identify higher levels of care.</li> <li>• There are medical staff visiting the buildings and they also have an arrangement with US Vets.</li> <li>• Checking in with primary insurance or private care Veterans who get care outside of the VA.</li> <li>• A comprehensive approach to health care and making sure Veterans receive a higher level of care.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger said he did not agree with the concept of higher level of care, there is no higher level of care, and his recommendation is not to use the term “higher level of care.” That does not mean home care service can’t be provided by HVAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Banko said in this instance, she is seeing directly that care is being delivered in the building.</li> <li>• U.S. Vets implement support services to aging Veterans.</li> <li>• Identified 11 Veterans most in need for aging services.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Bamberger said like the Housing Navigator functions, where they did their best in the community to provide best practices to the VA on what could be done in permanent supportive housing, those services did not follow the recommendations of the board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants to make sure that as they move forward and the best practices for medical services are not ignored.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. D’Andrea said when visiting the sites in San Francisco, one of the takeaways was the benefit of having the onsite services and the nursing station for offices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small offices that could be staffed by nurses.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once they have those resources, they are hoping that those type of services will be in place.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger asked about IHHS and how they can be challenging for Veterans. It's an equivalent of Medicare and does not get used to pay the person to help. Many Veterans in San Francisco need homemaker services and he asked if they were providing that service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Banko said they haven't had any Veterans requiring that service yet, but she would like to talk more about that service.</li> <li>Mr. Bamberger suspected that people who have already moved in are not that medically compromised.</li> <li>Ms. Banko said there a few with more extraordinary needs like memory care.</li> <li>A lot of support has come from them and knowing everyone's situation and being able to help care for them. They are observing needs over time.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Bamberger said that in San Francisco he has seen VA staff not being given the green light to be able to administer Naloxone or carry it with them in case they came across a Veteran who has overdosed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Banko said she wanted to see the training that was done by VA staff and CTRS, but Naloxone is not always available.</li> <li>Mr. Bamberger said they converted an old cigarette machine into a dispenser for Naloxone that distributes this, and VA staff can put their ID in and get it, but it is not allowed for social workers or other staff to administer.</li> </ul> <p>Sally Hammitt said that the national office is aware of social works not getting Naloxone and there working federally on this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state of California has not given a response.</li> <li>Right now, what the VA requires is that the state give some type of licensing or written authorization so social workers can administer Naloxone.</li> <li>Advocating for federal supremacy on this issue.</li> </ul> <p>Lt Gen (Ret.) Hopper asked for clarification on what Naloxone is and Dr. Bamberger said it is an opiate antagonist that reverses an opioid overdose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State of California has many overdoses, so it is crucial that everyone carry it with them.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland congratulated the team on the progress of 156, 157, and 158. He also asked how they were able to accomplish and receive the funds for the building so quickly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. D'Andrea said there were able to sign the pre-development license in June and applied for multiple sources of financing including the savings in capital.</li> <li>Leverage LA County office resources.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Made credit and bond application last year.</li> <li>• Goal is 1,200 homes and already have 600 homes completed.</li> <li>• Between Field B and Building 158, they will be at 741 homes by the end of the year (62% of the goal)</li> <li>• All of the board will receive an invite to the joint groundbreaking celebration next week.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland asked how much funding was completed for Building 158.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. D’Andrea said they were closing in November, and they just received the credit bond application and that is the last financing source.</li> <li>• Will start construction immediately after in November.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland asked how they were able to receive funding with the recognition that the 30% threshold would be a challenge for a lot of disabled Veterans and wanted to know what their experience has been and whether it has been easy to depart from the general preference for 30% AMI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. D’Andrea said that some of the funding they received may have to be revisited like they did on Building 207.</li> <li>• Now a precedent for that with the county and state, so that is good news.</li> <li>• Many applications had been submitted anticipating that there is a sizable population of metrics out there below 50% AMI.</li> <li>• Monitoring 205 and 208 because those buildings are not restricted.</li> <li>• Will correct as needed, have some time to revisit.</li> <li>• Mr. D’Andrea explained the upcoming Phase 2 developments as well, making progress on the north campus around 205/208 courtyard.</li> <li>• Release dates, VA is done a good job of preparing parcels for release.</li> <li>• Phase 2 a priority for the team.</li> <li>• PACT Act resources helping with the building.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Monroe, who attended virtually, said wanted to answer the AMI question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not officially reported out the AMI.</li> <li>• Half of Building 207 is at 50% or 60%.</li> <li>• 100% service-connected Veterans to live in 207, working with LA County.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Harris said income averaging is one of the few tools they must assess income under the current statute. He asked if the team was taking these into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. D’Andrea answered yes for Phase 2</li> <li>• There is an amendment to allow for higher AMI.</li> </ul>
--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many of these projects were allocated as special needs and must be averaged at 40% AMI.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Harris asked about VSSR (Veteran Support for Self-Reliance), and that VA may not know about the grant and asked Ms. Banko to explain what that is.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Banko said it is a grant to provide increased services to Veterans regardless of age including mental health care, physical needs specific to aging Veterans.</li> <li>Already identified 11 Veterans that could benefit from the program grant.</li> <li>Mr. Harris said this would be important to connect with the GLA HUD VASH team.</li> <li>Ms. Banko thanked Ms. Sally Hammitt for her leadership.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Perley: if AMI was higher than 30% or 40%, they would have to leave their unit. For example, if a Veteran does get a job, will they have to move since they no longer qualify?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. D 'Andrea said he was not an expert on Section 8, but he believes there is a point where income can exceed the requirements.</li> <li>Best for property management experts to address this issue.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Boyland stated that the VSSR program is a pilot program to provide additional support for senior Veterans and higher needs Veterans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Money that they receive can hire nurses or whatever positions the grantee needs to hire.</li> <li>Fund can support the staff.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger said there is a CLC (community living center) on campus and very rarely do systems of care go through nursing homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Placed there when they were sick but after they healed, may not have permanent housing after they're discharged.</li> <li>Nurses through the grant could review these CLC points.</li> </ul> <p>Robert Merchant said there is another CLC on Sepulveda Blvd.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many could be living independently.</li> <li>Build 212 is being redeveloped as a sub-acute mental health facility.</li> <li>Working to secure the funding.</li> <li>Want to keep Veterans in the least restrictive living situations.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger asked if those in the CLC qualify as homeless.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Boylan said that West LA rarely has vacancy.</li> <li>Building a new nursing facility (some opportunities for reimbursement for care).</li> <li>Some do qualify as homeless, qualification challenges.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. D 'Andrea went over the financing commitments.</p>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To date, more than \$832 million financing commitments have been leveraged.</li> <li>• CALVET home and higher level of care financing (creating space for Veterans who do need more care).</li> <li>• Localized continuum of care on campus.</li> <li>• PACT Act resources to be sorted out with the state and county.</li> <li>• Will follow up with team once the funds are secure/</li> </ul> <p>Lt. Gen (Ret.) Hopper noted that the funding for building 207 went very well with lots of momentum.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn thanked the developers for engaging the community partners.</p> <p>Mr. Boylan: Veterans may need to step down to a unit or step up to a unit—all a part of the continuum of care.</p>
<p>Update of the construction progress since the last meeting to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction milestones and Progress</li> <li>2. Lease up/move in plan</li> <li>3. Details of services plan</li> <li>4. Funding Commitment Levels</li> </ol>	<p><b>OAEM/Shangri-La: Joe Cowan, Project Manager, Shangri-La construction and Ari Majer, Friendship for Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>Mr. Cowan stated their joint mission is to be at the forefront of change to deliver safe housing solutions coupled with compassionate support to help the most at-risk recover, stabilize, and integrate into their communities.</p> <p>Mr. Majer went through the milestones of the West LA Campus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grand opening of early may for building 205 and 208.</li> <li>• Able to pass all inspections for Building 205 and 208.</li> <li>• HAC LA contracts finalized.</li> <li>• Lease up by 6/23 for Building 208 (31 leases) and Building 205 (5 leases).</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Garcia said they were able to determine eligibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For referrals, they contact the Veteran and social work to determine AMI.</li> <li>• Once they are eligible, they have occupancy withing 60 days.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Nicole Gene presented general information about the Step-Up program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides housing and mental health services to those that need it.</li> <li>• VASH team works with the Veterans and referrals come from homeless Veterans on the streets.</li> <li>• Step-up provides outreach and help with Veteran enrollment.</li> <li>• Once Veterans are housed in Building 205 and 208, Step-Up VASH program still provides mental and physical health services including life skills program.</li> <li>• All Veterans assigned a HUD VASH case manager to support them.</li> <li>• 1:25 HUD VASH case worker to Veteran ratio.</li> <li>• Services provided on-site from 8am-5pm Monday through Friday.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-call services for afterhours.</li> <li>• Case manager treatment plan to address the Veterans' specific needs.</li> <li>• Goal is to help the Veterans obtain and maintain housing (Housing First principle) and high quality of life.</li> <li>• Services HUD VASH provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Transportation for Veterans</li> <li>○ Aiding with paperwork</li> <li>○ Referrals</li> <li>○ Job placement</li> <li>○ Life skills</li> <li>○ Therapeutic techniques</li> </ul> </li> <li>• HUD VASH will coordinate with VA providers to ensure the Vets are getting the services they need. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide services to enhance community living (art classes, computer classes)</li> <li>○ Food pantry access</li> <li>○ Job placement and supporting improved outcomes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ms. Garcia discussed the funding commitment levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bond financing</li> <li>○ City of Los Angeles HHH Loan</li> <li>○ LIHTC Investment (40% funded per investment document schedules).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Mr. Zenner asked how Step Up is working with HCLA to streamline the process for vulnerable Veteran populations. It's difficult to build trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Garcia answered saying both property management and Step-Up services work closely to help the Veteran obtain those documents.</li> <li>• Work closely with Nicole and team as well as social workers.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Zenner acknowledged they have a hard job. What he is hearing from the community is Veterans are getting the runaround, getting unnecessary screenings, etc., waste of county money. The process is cumbersome and there seems to be a disconnect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Garcia said there are several different programs at play such as the tax credit program (documents are only valid for 120 days).</li> <li>• If people are not moved in within that timeframe, they must restart the process.</li> <li>• Clients that are moving in have to go through a couple sets of programs to be approved.</li> <li>• Mr. Zenner said it should be on us as government service providers.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Mr. Bamberger said they were doing wonderful work, but it does not have to be this difficult</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinated entry system that identifies individuals and moves them in that night, that is how it should be done.</li> <li>• Why not do a one-day clearing house where everything is done at once?</li> <li>• Ms. Garcia said her response goes back to funding, hoping they can do something on the legislative side.</li> <li>• Mr. Bamberger said he would like to see a reduced number of days where homeless Veterans can be in housing.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Bamberger asked how the homeless Veterans are selected and if they are all coming from CTRS? How do we know the right people are selected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Kuhn said they started with homeless Veterans in the vicinity</li> <li>• First group that was set for screening are folks in CTRS.</li> <li>• Work through other programs where Veterans are engaging in services trying to get them into housing.</li> <li>• Open to external folks after.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Hammitt invited them to the One Team launch next week and recognized the efforts to get Veterans into CTRS program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also recognized there may be referral halts do to number of referrals received.</li> <li>• She asked if there were plans to reengage in the regular effort coordination with CTRS.</li> <li>• Must be intentional about events to bring partners together.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Bamberger said in response to Mr. Kuhn's comment there may be other strategies to finding people, don't want people to think if they don't get a EUL, there isn't any permanent housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Kuhn said he wants to get to a point where they have throughput service but there are other options that just the campus.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Zenner added its helpful to move homeless Veterans to CTRS first and to set them up for success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He thanked Ms. Hammitt and her efforts for One Team</li> <li>• Helpful to move homeless Veterans to CTRS first and help them set up for success.</li> <li>• Don't last in the unit because their Veteran friends are somewhere else.</li> <li>• An agenda resolution on the county side to fix this issue.</li> </ul>
<p>Update of the construction progress since the last meeting to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction milestones and Progress</li> </ol>	<p><b>OAEM/Core Companies and Build Group: Cyrus Jahanian, Development Manager, Core Companies; Daniel Franco, Project Manager, The Build Group; Ren Ross, Associate Director of Project Management, New Directions for Veterans</b></p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Lease up/move in plan</li> <li>3. Details of services plan</li> <li>4. Funding Commitment Levels</li> </ol>	<p><b>Mr. Jahanian introduced the group.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core companies is based in San Jose, CA.</li> <li>• Responsible for developing the private Field Campus in the northwest corner.</li> <li>• Split up between two phases, each Phase has 75 units, and all units are one-bedroom apartments.</li> <li>• All have HUD VASH vouchers attached to them.</li> <li>• Began construction on Phase I in January, now framing second floor.</li> <li>• August 2024 will be the start of moving folks in units.</li> <li>• Begin leasing 4 months prior.</li> <li>• Fully occupied by the end of year 2024.</li> <li>• Close financing in December.</li> <li>• Project cost \$45 million, so \$600,000 per unit</li> <li>• Unit is mixed use catered to Veterans experiencing chronic homelessness as well as disabilities.</li> <li>• One of the challenges is disability designation, so who is entitled to this compensation (not an expert on this)</li> <li>• Support Assembly Bill 1386 that allows for flexible AMIs.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Ross introduced himself as a Veteran.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goes after financing including supportive services.</li> <li>• New Directions provides all those services along with the VA including mental health care.</li> <li>• Challenges with lease ups</li> <li>• On VA campus as transitional housing, work to get Veterans into VA doors.</li> <li>• Help get Veterans who don't qualify for VA services get dishonorable discharged changed.</li> <li>• Veterans have many choices, having housing on campus will help a lot.</li> <li>• Challenges include lease up process, get frustrated when they're screened for VASH but must apply again for a specific-based units.</li> <li>• Screen all and help with housing authority packet, one screening where property managers are on site.</li> <li>• To speed up the process, go into the streets to help Veterans get into the VASH units, a working effort, 60% AMI issue is something New Directions is addressing.</li> <li>• Try to have more affordable units with a Veteran preference.</li> <li>• ALTA Med to help Veterans that do not qualify for VA healthcare.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Jahanian said they will have two and a half fulltime staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three fulltime employees from VA.</li> </ul> <p>New Directions will be coordinating with dental services.</p> <p>Mr. Ross said they cannot work in silos, must implement VA's treatment plan.</p>
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to have wrap around services during the life of the project including community partners.</li> <li>• Property management is important, third party in place.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger said he wanted a commitment today for a mass rent-up event, one day to have Veterans come into a rent up where people can look up Veterans' incomes right away and get them into the proper housing fast.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In an electronic world, it should not take five months to house Veterans.</li> <li>• Bring 25 Veterans in for a one-day clearinghouse.</li> <li>• Dr. Kuhn said they can work to organize some type of event like that.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Perley asked if they had the same problems off-campus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Ross said they have more problems with other VASH sites and if they do not fill those vouchers, they could lose funding.</li> <li>• Mr. Perley said his next question was if they do not fill the VASH certificates, they can lose their loans, including the ones on campus.</li> <li>• Mr. Jahanian said there is a date deadline (this year it is June 30) so if 100 of those units are not leased up, they're not qualified for a tax credit by the fiscal year.</li> <li>• Mr. Jahaian raise tax credits assuming 100%, two million dollars of tax credits.</li> <li>• Mr. Perley assumed if tax creditors have had a bad experience, they are less likely to participate.</li> <li>• Mr. Jahanian said they closed on financing in December of last year, six months later they got tax credit for last year, over six months they had major banks fail.</li> <li>• May be a risk to lose funding and investors.</li> <li>• Mr. Ross said some vouchers require a 30% AMI preference but if those cannot be filled, they should be opened to the general homeless Veteran population with 50% AMI.</li> <li>• Need to adjust how many days it takes to fill a unit once they get referral.</li> </ul>
Status of FY 2023 EUL Infrastructure Projects Master Plan 2025 Projections	<p>Chelsea Black, <b>Acting Chief, Office of Strategic, Facility &amp; Master Planning, VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System</b></p> <p>Addressing two issues: Update on infrastructure projects for FY 23 and Master Plan 2025 Projections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FY22 had seven projects complete.</li> <li>• In 2023, slated to complete nine projects.</li> <li>• Turnover two parcels, working with OAEM to get parcels ready.</li> <li>• FY23, first two are matched by developer, remaining eight, working with contracting group, VISNs.</li> <li>• Were able to tap into PACT funding for the EUL projects.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award 4 projects, other 4 are in procurement now (projects on time)</li> <li>• Shared projects for FY24/25/26/27/30.</li> </ul> <p>They then went back to EUL Security Support which will fund 35 callboxes to north and south campus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bumped that project to FY23 to get it done faster.</li> <li>• Project build on one another, for example, the Sepulveda utilities studies is an assessment and what comes out of the study can help develop additional projects to support the campus and provide additional housing.</li> </ul> <p>FY24, Ms. Black anticipates additional projects, and the office takes on additional projects as necessary.</p> <p>FY25 is an important year, 2/3 of the housing will be developed with hundreds of Veterans on campus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redo Master Plan in FY25, want to make sure we are in a position to do the redevelopment.</li> <li>• Projects that are already awarded, the previous slides were estimates (two projects).</li> <li>• Execute projects to keep momentum going.</li> <li>• Master Plan 2025 –when are we going to start? Already started (shared slide).</li> <li>• Looking for recommendations, feedback from Veterans, the board, VISNs, etc.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Black then explained the process that the Master Plan goes through with a task timeline (startup, initial concepts, preferred concept, documentations, Federal Register Process)</p> <p>Mr. Zenner asked if there would be any engagement with outside groups like ELI to help with that. The PD team has a vested interest in influencing finances, would be nice to see an outside organization.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Black said they do plan on engagement with outside partners, that could be a recommendation as well.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger said that the campus is at an important inflection point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With new Master Plan 2025, he asked how the board can assist in the process and where does the board see us? What are the benchmarks along the way to make these kinds of decisions?</li> <li>• Ms. Black said they will look for recommendations from board, look to Veterans for the kind of community they want, look at who was at the table in the past FYs.</li> <li>• Look at existing EUL to create the more diverse community Dr. Bamberger was talking about.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Dr. Bamberger: is this something the Secretary should recommend? It may be legislative but could be regulatory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Kuhn answered it was regulatory.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland: Since 2016 1,200 was the target number for permanent supportive housing, number before LA County committed the target of 1,200 without knowing whether we could use the HUD-VASH vouchers. He would love some detailed projections and analysis whether that number should be reset for 1,200.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He applauded VA's openness on what ULI did with the town center, would be great to do that with things like student housing (give UCLA a better connection as a partner. He believes it would be a great contribution to the life of the campus.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Trinh said the engagement and recommendation feedback would be built in with the board playing a major role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master Plan 2025 since 2022 has been taking recommendations.</li> <li>• More stakeholder engagement for Master Plan 2025.</li> </ul>
Subcommittee/Recommendation Brief 20-01	<p><b>Dr. Joshua Bamberger, Subcommittee Chair, Outreach and Community Engagement with Services and Outcomes</b></p> <p>Dr. Bamberger explained this recommendation was about nursing and supportive housing. Mr. Bamberger read Recommendation 20-01 (<b>Please see Appendix A below</b>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Zenner approved the motion and Kristine Stanley seconded the motion.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Zenner said the principle of "housing first" while having permanent nurses onsite is so staff can know which Veteran is struggling since they interact with the Veteran daily.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board voted unanimously for this recommendation to pass.</li> </ul>
Subcommittee/Recommendation Brief Recommendation 20-02	<p><b>Rob Begland, Subcommittee Chair, Master Plan with Services and Outcomes</b></p> <p>Mr. Begland asked Mr. Allman to read Recommendation 20-02 (<b>Please see Appendix B below</b>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Begland voted to adopt the motion and Dr. Wellisch seconded the motion.</li> <li>• Mr. Allman said for many members of the FAC, they are coming up on the six-year mark and over the past six years, this board has done a lot of research, investigating, recommendation.</li> <li>• All the board's work should be available online, anyone can look at the board's history to see what has been done over the last six years.</li> </ul>



	<p>Mr.Begland said this would be helpful as recruiting tool for new board members in assembling all of the board’s past work to get people interested and inform, 10 more years and becomes important to institutionalize the knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open to different ways on how to do it but must be put online so there is a past record of the board’s work.</li> <li>• The recommendation unanimously passed.</li> <li>• Mr. Allman commented that this sets a foundation for how VA should treat all FACs, most FAC information is not easily accessible.</li> <li>• The board dismissed for lunch</li> </ul>
<p>Bridgeland Resources, LLC Sawtelle Development Plans and Status Update</p>	<p><b>Ernest Guadiana, Bridgeland Resources</b> <b>Arash Memarzadeh, Subservice Engineering Manager</b></p> <p>Met with board in February and the board had a lot of questions, so this presentation is a response to those direct questions.</p> <p>The first question was, “What are the dates and duration of the various revocable licenses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two federal licenses, one is as large lease with initial lessor between Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Dowling (8 wells under that lease)</li> <li>• Those have been amendment for license agreement which the VA is included.</li> <li>• Amended, Revival and Extension of the Revocable License for Non-Federal Use of Real Property Agreement (the “Revocable License”) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Allows for override to be given to the DA/VA for 2.5%.</li> <li>○ Allows operator to drill offsite of the federal lease.</li> <li>○ Wells drilled on that site are federal wells, royalties to Bureau of Land Management (BLM)</li> <li>○ Lessee wanted to provide some type of benefit to the VA (funding for transportation) and they entered an agreement to drill offsite while giving a 2.5% royalty on each well.</li> <li>○ 2016 amendment is the Partial Surrender of Surface Rights and Ratification of Protective Oil and Gas Lease (the “Lease Amendment”) which provides a 2.5% royalty on any wells that are drilled under that lease.</li> <li>○ Two wells that are somewhat drilled outside of that federal lease, drilled on campus.</li> <li>○ 60% is given to BLM and other 39% is given to private property owners.</li> <li>○ DA/VA receives 2.5% that is given to the owners.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>List of Sawtelle drill sites, DF-12 and DF-13 are bottom holed in the northwest on private property, federal government still receives more than 10% in royalties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On every single well except DF-14, the DA/VA receives a 2.5% royalty, and the federal government receives 12.5%</li> <li>Sawtelle 2 is the one well that the federal government receives no royalty from which is located southeast of VA's campus.</li> </ul> <p>Lt Gen (Ret.) Hopper asked to describe what "bottom-holed" means and then explain to the board that 2.5% is from what?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bottom-holed means where the actual production is coming from.</li> <li>Even though on the service, the wells are next to each other, bottom holed means where the actual oil is entering the well.</li> <li>Bottom holes can be offsite.</li> </ul> <p>The 2.5% is 2.5% of every single barrel of oil sold (so if a barrel is sold for 100 dollars, DA/VA would get \$2.50).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is gross revenue since price of oil varies, no deductions.</li> </ul> <p>Lt Gen (Ret.) Hopper asked which wells were bottom holed under VA property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The team answered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DF-2, DF-4, DF 5,</li> <li>DF-14 and DF-15 is drilled under the VA property.</li> <li>DF-6, DF-7 and Df-10 are drilled under VA property.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>"Separate and apart from the revocable licenses, are there any outstanding leases from VA?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No outstanding leases, Bridgeland leases the federally owned mineral rights underlying the VA property from BLM.</li> </ul> <p>"Of the total amount of oil produced, how much comes from VA land versus adjacent non-federal land?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most productive well is the Sawtelle 2, 50% of all oil comes from that but VA has 45% oil production.</li> <li>Five wells producing on VA property.</li> <li>Daily production of all Sawtelle wells was 236 barrels of oil per day.</li> </ul> <p>Lt Gen (Ret.) Hopper asked how they predict the price based on the average day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The numbers reflect the number of barrels produced each day, not the actual profits.</li> <li>No deductions from the royalties</li> <li>Royalties were earmarked for transportation services.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notice of intention to drill more wells (have not been approved yet)</li> </ul> <p>“How was the DAV picked to receive monies from the license?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revocable license pre-dates Bridgeland’s ownership of the leases and we have no notes on the negotiation.</li> </ul> <p>“How was the amount of 2.5% determined?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Revocable License pre-dates Bridgeland’s ownership of the leases</li> <li>• An overriding royalty interest of 2.5% is generous compared to customary overriding royalty rates which are typically 1%</li> </ul> <p>“Do you have any short-term capital expenditures contemplated? And, if so, have those now been cancelled because of the City and County ordinances shutting down production and further capital investments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whatever money Bridgeland spends does not affect the royalty other than Bridgeland spends money to increase production (so more barrels of oil= more royalties)</li> <li>• Notices of intention to drill more wells but they have not been approved by the California Geological Energy Management Division, which is the regulator in California.</li> <li>• City of Los Angeles case, negotiations with City to allow those wells.</li> <li>• County lawsuit could prevent Bridgeland from drilling anymore wells, had a meeting with County’s attorney yesterday.</li> <li>• Deciding if ordinance applied with the California Environmental Quality Act (many oil sites have been sued for not doing a certain environmental review)</li> <li>• Action currently pending in LA County Superior Court</li> </ul> <p>“What is the forecasted time to recoup current capital investments?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All capital investments for the Sawtelle wells to date, except for DF-14, have been recouped.</li> <li>• DF-14 will be recouped in the next 3 months.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Memarzadeh presented the Sawtelle Production</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Want to see oil production rise, going up.</li> <li>○ Water going down is good news.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent Successes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ DF-01 Injector Repair and Stimulation (maintains the pressure of the downhole reserve)</li> <li>○ DF-04 COROD job was a success with consistent production.</li> <li>○ DF-12, project paid off, getting fluid level down.</li> <li>○ DF-08 idle injector was repaired, helps keep production up.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recent Challenges</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ DF-14 Unit failure, not a good well</li> <li>○ Highest producing well Sawtelle 2 is losing efficiency.</li> <li>○ DF-05 and DF-02 that failed at the end of 2022.</li> <li>● Upcoming Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ DF-02, tentative approval to repair well in July 2023.</li> <li>○ Generator Restoration, help produce electricity onsite with the gas production of the wells.</li> <li>○ DF-07 Idle Well Test, keeps compliant with regulatory agencies.</li> <li>○ DF-09 Casing Repair, help with pressure support.</li> <li>○ DF-06 Add pay and new drill wells, get some more production, longer term.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Upcoming Projects: DF-04 Rotaflex Install <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ COROD conversation was successful.</li> <li>○ Performing better than thought.</li> <li>○ DF-06 Restoration permitted (all rainwater flooded into well during a storm, rock swelled).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>“Has the operator explored any technologies that will address the health efforts that have been the basis for regulatory action? If so, what is their cost and feasibility?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bridgeland follows all health and safety regulations applicable to its Sawtelle operations.</li> <li>● Do not believe site is considered a health hazard.</li> <li>● Opened for questions.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland: Congress says that everything that happens on the campus must principally benefit Veterans so that was the purpose of answering some of the questions. If the BLM lease has a VA revocable license, how long is that allowed to last? The lease reads that it is indefinite duration so if the lease is producing and paying, correct?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes, generally how oil and gas lease work</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland then assumed since there was 55% production coming off the BLM lease, that is a financially productive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The team answered, yes, that it was profitable.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland follow up asking since the lease is continuing but the VA license expires in 2027, does the performance of the BLM lease require use of VA property?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes, BLM lease (first section) does allow use of the surface to perform oil and gas production.</li> <li>● If the DA/VA wants to revoke the license of the lease, may have to get federal government involved.</li> <li>● Sawtelle 2 may revoke lease because not getting royalties.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Mr. Begland asked about the lawsuit with the City of LA and County ordinances—is the lawsuit with the County going to be a long process?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It's not going to be short.</li> <li>○ Gave brief explanation of the lawsuit, included that the county violated the California Environmental Quality Act and improperly performed its environmental review.</li> <li>○ County must keep record of how they performed the review.</li> <li>○ Expect the administrative record to be certified October 2023</li> <li>○ In a year, will probably have resolution on one claim.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Begland's related question was about submitting a supremacy clause to the federal government for revocable license?</li> <li>• Mr. Memarzadeh said they are the only company who has done that because they are the only company with federal resources in this claim.</li> <li>• Heard during Phase 2 (state and federal issues)</li> <li>• California's laws trump the County's laws (federal lease, County not allowed to interfere with federal leases)</li> <li>• City of LA did not want to fight argument, willing to settle the claim.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland said in a year, the board would be interested in getting an update on the case.</p> <p>Mr. Bamberger said no health system should be promoting the production of fossil fuel in the wake of climate change, pollution, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong legal basis to show the connection between fossil fuels and worsening health. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mr. Memarzadeh said he didn't disagree, there are studies that show fossil fuels are harmful.</li> <li>○ Only producing about 500,000 barrels a day, state of California produces 1.8 million.</li> <li>○ Most claims from U.S. citizens (President wants to phase off oil demand, not supply)</li> <li>○ Push in government funding to define alternative fuels in California to define alternative fuels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• With no more questions, Lt. Gen (Ret.) Hopper asked the presenters to send the 2022 profits to the DFO. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mr. Memarzadeh said he would send later that week.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Subcommittee/Recommendation Brief	<b>Rob Begland, Subcommittee Chair, Master Plan with Services and Outcomes</b>

Recommendation 20-03	<p>Mr. Begland said this recommendation was regarding 38-48 and it established a process for dealing with a non-compliant lease.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• End of recommendation talks about positions that have been taken in Congress regarding the “benefiting Veterans.”</li> <li>• Mr. Begland reminded the board that in October 2022, they brought a recommendation to the Secretary that he should renegotiate the Brentwood Lease. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Secretary responded basically that he did not want to disturb the status-quo.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Mr. Bamberger: Brentwood is funding the development of this legislation, paying for lobbyists and a junior Congressman to support the bill, we are supporting a hegemony of wealthy billionaires that want to manipulate legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• paying for upkeep of land does not qualify as rent.</li> </ul> <p>Begland: The Secretary supports the legislation; Section 3 could be de-coupled because Section 2 and 4 are urgent for the Department.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Zenner said that he just learned of this through other channels rather than the board and requested that leadership be more communitive about information.</li> </ul> <p>Lt. Gen (Ret.) Hopper said those were individual discussions, not anything that would keep the board from voting on the recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lt Gen (Ret) Hopper said he would make sure information gets to the board, but some issues cannot be commented on from a legal matter (politician may be involved with developer)</li> <li>• No investigative ability and it’s difficult to get that information out.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Perley asked if the new information came out after the drafted recommendation and if it could change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, circulated it a few weeks before the Congressional hearing and then revised it and recirculated the draft after the health hearing.</li> <li>• Only change made was the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) have made statements for the record.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger asked what the rules were for talking about this legislation and if they can say anything about the Brentwood school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lt Gen (Ret.) Hopper said the recommendation has not been put on the floor, recommendation is open for discussion.</li> </ul>
----------------------	---

	<p>Dr. Harris said the support for this is based on the entirety of the picture, not just Brentwood School (other leases are not in compliance either).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There seems to be no pathway to resolution as of now.</li> <li>• Brentwood School was asked to renegotiate lease to benefit Veterans (like permanent or transitional housing that had financial significance) but could not extend the lease.</li> <li>• OIG said the lease was non-compliant, but if the school was removed, VA is stuck with the maintenance.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Begland read VCOEB Recommendation 20-03 (<b>Please see Appendix C below</b>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Wellisch motioned to move the discussion.</li> <li>• Dr. Bamberger seconded the motion.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Kuhn said he could not comment on the pending legislation.</p> <p>Dr. Bamberger: it seems that the VA could successfully comply with the West LA Leasing Act and review the lease.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VA needs to be held accountable.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Jim Zenner said the recommendation was well-written, but it was offensive that Brentwood School would go behind the board's back.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-Kind donation not high enough.</li> <li>• Needs to bring to bring this recommendation to the services committee beforehand.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Boyland: we need to note the sensitivity of this issue as the oversight board and VA may need to go another direction after the Secretary's response.</p> <p>Mr. Begland believes the agency is on the wrong side of this issue and the faster it moves to correct it, the better it will be for Veterans and future of the campus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lease does not meet the test. OIG's case is good, and the agency's response is weak.</li> <li>• Thinks Secretary made a mistake in his response.</li> <li>• The Brentwood presentation last year was tone-deaf, and they must meet the same tasks as any other land user on the campus.</li> <li>○ The board even anticipated the idea of the lawsuit and made recommendation before the lawsuit.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Bamberger said he thinks there is room for Brentwood School on the campus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue is they need to be in compliance with the lease.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Mr. Zenner said that he thinks there is no place for Brentwood School especially now after the legislation and going behind the Board's back.</p> <p>Dr. Wellisch said Brentwood's in-kind wasn't enough. They don't want to pay a dollar even though they are an elite and wealthy school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In lieu of money, they could come up with education compensation, but their response was that Veteran children couldn't go to the school.</li> <li>• This is disrespectful to Veterans.</li> <li>• While Mr. Harris made the point that the land would go fallow, he mentioned he worked at the VA in the 1970s and watched the whole campus go fallow over the last 50 years.</li> <li>• The Board needs to let the Secretary know what our feelings are.</li> <li>• As a group, the board must support Veterans and they cannot if that part of the law passes.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Boylan said there were different viewpoints on the role the school has but can agree that there is something that the school is not getting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making a statement is fine, opportunity to take another avenue and approaches as well.</li> </ul> <p>Lt. Gen (Ret.) Hopper said it is very clear for him and clear in the charter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This land is for the Veterans, and we understand Veterans agree with the OIG.</li> <li>• We've provided Recommendation 18-01.</li> <li>• Understand the position of the Secretary, but as a Board, we are on the right side of this.</li> <li>• Likes the recommendation and doing due diligence to Veterans and colleagues.</li> </ul> <p>Vote: The Board voted unanimously.</p> <p>Lt. Gen (Ret.) Hopper opened discussion for the Board if there was anything they would like to go on the record.</p> <p>Mr. Perley asked Mr. Kuhn about the occupancy on offsite Veteran developments. In the previous meeting, the cost of tax credits was explained as to why there may be occupancy issues and wanted an update.</p>
--	--



	<p>Mr. Kuhn said he could pull those numbers up. While he was doing pulling up the numbers, Lt Gen (Ret.) Hopper thanked Mr. Zenner for providing the venue of Bob Hope Patriotic Hall. He thanked the building staff as well as the Sherriff's Department.</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn: There are 262 current projects-based vacancies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the 262 number, 48 of them cannot be used because the condition of the units are not suitable for application.</li> <li>• Of those remaining vacancies, there are 181 active referrals, so most vacancies are accounted for/</li> <li>• Occupancy rate of 81-83%.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Perley said there is a severe penalty if those tax credits aren't 100% fulfilled right away. If filled right away and have the vacancies later, it is different. Is there information on that?</p> <p>Mr. Kuhn said that is up to the property manager to process the referrals. This can lead to losing Veterans since the referrals can sit and take months to process or be admitted to a program.</p> <p>Mr. Zenner: That is why he brought up with Shangri-La and other developers that Veterans have to jump through unnecessary hoops to get housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That is why Dr. Bamberger suggested getting everyone all together and do a Veteran clearing house.</li> <li>• Important for Veterans to see the units before they apply.</li> <li>• Being asked to commit to housing they haven't seen.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Bamberger thanked the chairman and all the other board members who have served their term including Mr. Mangano and Mr. Allman.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many at the DC meeting won't be attending and wanted to thank in advance for their extraordinary work.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Zenner wanted to add quickly that there are 600 Veterans that are not on the by-name list, and he would like to see them added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Hammitt said she would add them.</li> </ul>
<p>Review/Wrap Up/September Full Committee Meeting/Pictures/Adjourn</p>	<p><b>VCOEB Chair/DFO/FAC Staff</b></p> <p>Lt Gen (Ret.) Hopper thanked GLA food services for the snacks, contract staff taking notes, DFO staff, and public attendees.</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned.</p>

/s/ John D. Hopper, Jr.

---

Approved

LTG (Ret.) John D. Hopper Jr. (Chair)

EUGENE SKINNER  SKINNER  
Date: 2023.09.06 21:36:03 -0400

---

Approved

Eugene Skinner Jr., DFO

## Appendices

### Appendix A

#### VCOEB RECOMMENDATION 20-01

WHEREAS, Permanent supportive housing is the best solution to end veterans homelessness;

WHEREAS, Veterans experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles are growing older with the average of now exceeding 50 years old;

WHEREAS, As people age, their medical needs increase and their ability to adhere to medication and benefit from medical recommendations decreases resulting in increased preventable hospitalizations and medical cost;

WHEREAS, On-site nursing care integrated into project based permanent supportive housing has been shown to reduce preventable hospitalizations and improve health outcomes for the subset of people experiencing homeless with chronic medical conditions;

WHEREAS, In one representative sampling of people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco, 10% of the total homeless population were assessed to need on-site nursing services to prevent rapid deterioration of their medical condition;

WHEREAS, the development on the VA campus in West LA is expected to have at least 1200 units of permanent supportive housing.

NOW THEREFORE LET IT BE:

RECOMMENDED, The Secretary of the VA instruct the leadership of the VA of Greater Los Angeles to provide funding and staffing to place at least two fulltime registered nurses in at least two of the proposed project-based facilities on the West LA Campus to serve at least 120 unduplicated veterans with chronic medical conditions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board adopts this recommendation as of June 22, 2023.

## **Appendix B**

### **VCOEB Recommendation 20-02**

**WHEREAS**, the Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board (“VCOEB”) is a federal advisory committee established by the U.S. Congress in the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016; **WHEREAS**, Congress stated that the VCOEB should be formed for the following purposes: “(A) identify the goals of the community and veteran partnership; (B) provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary to improve services and outcomes for veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and the families of such veterans and members; and (C) provide advice and recommendations on the implementation of the draft master plan approved by the Secretary on January 28, 2016, and on the creation and implementation of any successor master plans throughout the course of its work”; **WHEREAS**, Congress stated that the VCOEB’s work would involve public outreach and participation by the Board (“the Board shall (A) provide the community opportunities to collaborate and communicate with the Board, including by conducting public forums on the Campus; and (B) focus on local issues regarding the Department that are identified by the community, including with respect to health care, implementation of the draft master plan and any subsequent plans, benefits, and memorial services at the Campus.”). **WHEREAS**, the VA Advisory Committee Management Office currently maintains VCOEB’s website, which includes a board photo, a mission statement, the Charter, and *some* Minutes and Response Packets from Office of the Secretary to the VCOEB’s recommendations; **WHEREAS**, currently, the website does not provide the public a full or adequate accounting of VCOEB’s research and activity to date and as a result it is not possible for interested members of the public or for committee members to access the full record of the federal advisory committee’s work;<sup>1</sup> **WHEREAS**, it is the opinion of VCOEB that the full breadth of the advisory committee’s work should be available online for public inspection. In doing so, it will provide the public with a full accounting of VCOEB’s efforts to fulfill its Congressional charter while promoting transparency and opportunities for collaboration with the community. **NOW THEREFORE LET IT BE RECOMMENDED ON JUNE 22, 2023: RECOMMENDATION 20-02-A:** the Secretary of Veterans Affairs task the VA Advisory Committee Management Office to post all agendas from past meetings. **RECOMMENDATION 20-02-B:** the Secretary of Veterans Affairs task the VA Advisory Committee Management Office to post all briefing materials from past meetings. **RECOMMENDATION 20-02-C:** the Secretary of Veterans Affairs task the VA Advisory Committee Management Office to post all minutes from past meetings, to include video recordings if available.

**VCOEB Recommendation 20-02 RECOMMENDATION 20-02-D:** the Secretary of Veterans Affairs task the VA Advisory Committee Management Office to post all recommendations, as adopted, by the board from past meetings. **RECOMMENDATION 20-02-E:** the Secretary of Veterans Affairs task the VA Advisory Committee Management Office to post all Office of the Secretary response packets from past meetings. **RECOMMENDATION 20-02-F:** the Secretary of Veterans Affairs task the VA Advisory Committee Management Office to organize all aforementioned material by VCOEB Meeting (in reverse chronological order) to facilitate a streamlined organizational structure for archival information.

## **Appendix C**

### **VCOEB RECOMMENDATION 20-03**

**WHEREAS**, the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 (P.L. 114-226) (“WLA”) charged, in subsection (j)(3), that the Inspector General (the “IG”) of the Department of Veterans Affairs (the “Department”) shall submit a report to the Veterans Affairs Committees and Appropriations Committees of the U.S. Congress “on all leases carried out at the Campus and the management by the Department of the use of the land at the Campus...”

**WHEREAS**, the IG has issued two audit reports on land use practices<sup>1</sup> and both times determined VA’s lease of land to the private Brentwood School for athletic facilities does not comply with federal law because: (1) the lease does not “principally benefit veterans” and (2) the lease’s use of maintenance expenses towards “rent” does not qualify under federal law<sup>2</sup> and therefore does not provide adequate monetary consideration.

**WHEREAS**, VA’s lease of land to the private Brentwood School for athletic facilities was entered after the WLA legislation was passed; so Brentwood School understood the requirement for its lease to comply with federal law in all respects, to include “principally benefiting veterans.”

**WHEREAS**, in October 2022 the VCOEB adopted Recommendation 18-01, which recommended that the Department immediately begin negotiations with the Brentwood School to bring the lease into compliance with federal law.

**WHEREAS**, in November 2022 a group of veterans sued the Department on several grounds, including that it was continuing to engage in illegal land use agreements (naming the lease to Brentwood School, among others).

**WHEREAS**, in May 2023 the Secretary stated he did not concur with VCOEB’s Recommendation 18-01 and justified his non-concurrence as follows: “While VA is limited in its ability to respond to this recommendation due to ongoing litigation, we may revisit this recommendation and update our response upon adjudication of this issue. At this time VA cannot take action to alter or amend the terms of any land use agreements subject to the litigation as it may impact the Government’s litigation posture.”

**WHEREAS**, VA’s current lease of land to the Brentwood School was executed on November 4, 2016 and will lease will expire in 2026, if not renewed.

**WHEREAS**, under the WLA legislation, for the lease to be renewed the Secretary needs to certify to Congress that he has implemented the recommendations of the OIG report, which include coming up with a plan for bringing non-compliant land use agreements, such as Brentwood School, into compliance with federal law:

“If the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs determines, as part of an audit report or evaluation conducted by the Inspector General, that the Department is not in compliance with all Federal laws relating to leases and land use at the Campus, or that significant mismanagement has occurred with respect to leases or land use at the Campus, ***the Secretary may not enter into any lease or land-sharing agreement at the Campus, or renew any such lease or land-sharing agreement that is not in compliance with such laws, until the Secretary certifies*** to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, and each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives who represents

the area in which the Campus is located that all recommendations included in the audit report or evaluation have been implemented.”

WHEREAS, House Resolution 3848 was introduced on June 6, 2023 by Representative Lori Chavez-DeRemer of Oregon’s 5th District. Section 3 of H.R. 3848 attempts to amend the WLA Leasing Act of 2016 in two key areas. Notably, it attempts to remove the current provision that in order for a lease that OIG has deemed non-compliant to be renewed, the Secretary must certify to Congress that he has adopted the recommendation of the IG’s audit. Additionally, the legislation proposes to modify 40 U.S.C. §1302 such that “consideration other than money” (*e.g.* in-kind services) be acceptable forms of rental payment under the WLA Leasing Act.

WHEREAS, on June 14, 2023, the House Committee on Veterans Affairs Economic Opportunity Subcommittee conducted a bill hearing which included H.R. 3848:

☐ The American Legion provided written testimony opposed to Section 3 of H.R. 3848: “The WLA Leasing Act, as currently written, creates a mechanism that prevents the VA from entering into agreements that are not in the best interest of veterans. This mechanism is still necessary to hold the VA accountable for its decisions involving the WLA Campus on behalf of veterans.”) (pages 5-6)

<https://docs.house.gov/meetings/VR/VR10/20230614/116100/HHRG-118-VR10-Wstate-GomezR-20230614.pdf>.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars provided written testimony opposed to Section 3

<https://docs.house.gov/meetings/VR/VR10/20230614/116100/HHRG-118-VR10-Wstate-MurrayP-20230614.pdf>

Disabled American Veterans Department of California submitted a Statement for the Record opposed to the Section 3 amendment: “During our review of the Substitute bill to H.R. 3484 we took into consideration the long history of controversy, misuse, and fraud related to the WLA campus land use. It was the purpose of H.R. 5936 to give the Inspector General oversight and accountability authority to ensure that leases on the WLA property principally benefit veterans. And H.R. 3848 will dismantle that authority for private interests. This authority is critical to give the Federal government a mechanism through which to exit leases on the WLA campus that do not principally benefit veterans, as required by current law.” <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/VR/VR10/20230614/116100/HHRG-118-VR10-20230614-SD004.pdf>

The American Legion Department of California submitted a Statement for the Record opposed to the Section 3 amendment: “The WLA VA campus has had a history of fraud, controversy and misuse of its land. The OIG's authority regarding the WLA VA campus was established in H.R. 5936 (Mr. Marin, FL), becoming Public Law 114-226., the Los Angeles Homeless Veterans Leasing Act of 2016. H.R. 5936 gave the OIG oversight and accountability authority to ensure that leases on the WLA property principally benefit veterans. After our review, it is TAL Department of California's opinion that changes proposed in H.R. 3848 will eliminate that OIG authority to the benefit of private interests.”

<https://docs.house.gov/meetings/VR/VR10/20230614/116100/HHRG-118-VR10-20230614-SD002.pdf>

**WHEREAS**, it is apparent that Section 3 of H.R. 3848 is being sought for the benefit of Brentwood School, as Brentwood School is the only lease holder on campus that faces these twin problems.

**WHEREAS**, other prior land use agreements that served private interests have been terminated when they did not “principally benefit veterans,” such as the revocable license to the Red Cross.

**WHEREAS**, VA provided written testimony in support of amending the West LA Leasing Act per Section 3 of H.R. 3848, but suggesting that it could be decoupled because it was not an urgent need. (“though VA

supports this section, VA would support de-coupling this section from the other sections in this package to expedite progress on this bill”).

**WHEREAS**, during the VCOEB meeting of June 21, 2023 members of the public and veterans who appeared before the Committee voiced their opposition to the attempt to circumvent the West LA Leasing Act, proposed by the amendment.

**WHEREAS**, it is the opinion of VCOEB that this proposed amendment is an improper attempt by a powerful special interest (Brentwood School) to surreptitiously circumvent the clear intent and purpose of the original West LA Leasing Act and, in particular, its requirement that all leases on the West LA campus principally benefit veterans and their families.

**NOW THEREFORE LET IT BE RECOMMENDED:**

**RECOMMENDATION 20-03:** the Secretary of Veterans Affairs instruct the Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs to inform House and Senate VA committee staff that the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs no longer supports Section 3 of H.R. 3848 having heard strong opposition from veterans groups such as The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board.