

Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)

Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board Federal Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

January 9 – 10, 2019

Committee Members Present:

Lieutenant General (R) John D. Hopper Jr. (Chair)
Anthony Allman
Carolina Winston Barrie
James Battista
Robert Begland
Leticia Colchado
Arthur Delacruz
Raymond Delgado
Donna Deutchman
Howard Hernandez
Kate Hoit
Philip Mangano
Dan Rosenfeld
Sarah Serrano
Jeffrey Scheire
David Tenenbaum

Committee Members Absent:

Sarah Mahin (Non-Voting)
Julian Manalo (Non-Voting)
Daisy Mo
Benjamin Winter

Department of Veterans Affairs Staff Present:

Dr. Lynda Davis, Chief Veterans Experience Officer
Eugene W. Skinner Jr., Designated Federal Officer
Chihung Szeto, Alternate Designated Federal Officer
Betty Moseley Brown, Designated Federal Officer
Toni Bush Neal, Alternate Designated Federal Officer
Emily Andrade
Nikki Baker
Sharon Birman
Ann Brown
Lewis Finocchio
Meghan Serwin Flanz
Frank Gainer
Bruce Garret
Michael Kraycinovich
Paul Macpherson
Heidi Marston
Robert Merchant
Lori Moore
Jeff Moragne
Christina Robinson
Hannah RoggenKamp
Shana Spangler
Brandi Stockstill

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Call to Order Lieutenant General (R) John D. Hopper Jr., Committee Chair Eugene Skinner, Jr., Designated Federal Officer (DFO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lieutenant General (Lt. Gen.) John Hopper called the meeting to order at 8:50 AM PDT and noted that there was not a quorum of the full Federal Advisory Committee (FAC). • Mr. Eugene Skinner noted that those who would like to be compensated for their local travel should submit their travel form to Ms. Tony Bush Neal.
Opening Remarks Lt. Gen. (R) John D. Hopper Jr., Committee Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lt. Gen. Hopper recognized the new members of this FAC. • Lt. Gen. Hopper noted that the 8:30 AM PDT starting time is not doable given the traffic in Los Angeles. The FAC suggested a 10:00 AM PDT starting time. • Lt. Gen. Hopper stated that the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) 101 and the Ethics briefings are the critical guidelines on how the FAC should conduct its business.
Veterans Experience Office (VEO) Update Dr. Lynda Davis, Chief Veterans Experience Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Lynda Davis welcomed the group. She noted that this committee is a very tangible example of how VA is trying to ensure that it has a culture of customer service and that it is committed to having the best possible care benefits and service experience for Veterans, their families, caregivers, and survivors. She stated that the Secretary's number one priority is customer service, the service experience of the Veteran. Dr. Davis stated that the FAC has a chance to really own that, not just daily, but for future generations to come in supporting their work with the Greater Los Angeles (GLA). • She noted that the FAC's chartered mission goes beyond just the campus development. It also involves looking at the quality of life for all Veterans and their families in the greater LA area. It is about getting customer service right. • Dr. Davis thanked those who were present during the Secretary's visit at the hospital. She noted that it gave him a very basic understanding of the complexities and how he needs to be supportive of and ready for the FAC's and the group's recommendations. • Dr. Davis stated that the VEO revised the Welcome Kit. She wants everyone to have the electronic copy of the Welcome Kit. The Welcome Kit, she noted, is being given to every Service Member leaving the military as part of the Transition Assistance Program (TAP) class. They are understandable, clearly written by and for Veterans, and usable. Dr. Davis encouraged the FAC to distribute the Welcome Kit to the Veterans with whom they work and interact every day. She noted that VEO is here to support the FAC in any way it can.
FACA 101 Briefing Jeffrey Moragne, Committee Management Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Jeff Moragne introduced himself to the FAC as the director of VA's Advisory Committee Management office. He asked the FAC to listen carefully to the FAC 101 and Ethics briefings as they cover mandatory information, rules, regulations, and guidelines to help the FAC members do their job quicker, faster, and better. • Mr. Moragne stressed that these two briefings help FAC members stay on the playing field. If folks depart the playing field, then that play is over—whatever advice and recommendations were offered can and will be challenged by the Secretary and all the work behind that set of recommendations and advice will be thrown out. • Mr. Moragne stated that the FAC came into being in 1972. Before then, there was 8000 FAC. With the stroke of a pen from the then-President, in collaboration with Congress and

	<p>other stakeholders around the country, we reduced that FAC portfolio down to 1000 advisory committees! He noted that the FAC Act brought the light of transparency to the inner workings of FAC and how it is managed and how representatives from the Federal Government collaborate with non-Federal Government individuals in order to provide some recommendations to cabinet-level Secretaries or all the way up to the President.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Moragne noted that VA has been an outlier in that it grew by four FACs in 2017, unlike any other Federal Government agency, and this year, in 2019, it will grow by another three. • Dr. Davis emphasized the need to redistribute the list of other FACs again because other committees are working on issues relevant to what is going on in Los Angeles. • Mr. Moragne noted that the committee member handbook is included in the documents the FAC received. The other committees are listed on the last four pages of that handbook, as well as VA's portfolio of advisory committees. He noted that, to reach out to other agencies, committee members should work through their DFO to him. He will then make a warm hand-off to the other government agencies, who will respond in kind to any requests for information. • Mr. Moragne stated that another document in the package is also of extreme importance: The Veteran and Community Oversight Engagement Board Charter. The charter operationalizes the FAC's statute. It contains the committee members' marching orders and the boundaries of their playing field. Mr. Moragne noted that, as committee members gather information and conduct interviews with VA employees and other stakeholders, they are empowered to ask for information, gather information, challenge information, and then reach a conclusion based on consensus. If they cannot come to consensus, then majority rules, and the committee members vote on a recommendation and advice to put before the Secretary. He stressed that a committee member cannot walk through a VA facility and give instructions or even recommendations to VA employees or VA program offices. A committee member's charge, as stated in the charter, is to advise and provide recommendations to the Secretary, not to individual VA employees or individual program offices. • Mr. Moragne asked committee members to use their DFO and chair to open doors to the program offices of other Federal Government agencies, which are a wealth of information. He recommended that members review the charter and the committee members' handbook. • Mr. Moragne reviewed the FAC 101 basics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ By law, committee members have a DFO—Eugene Skinner—or an alternate DFO always present for any committee or subcommittee meetings. A quorum must be present in order for a meeting to be held. ○ Subcommittees are not required to have a quorum. Subcommittees do not have to post a notice of meeting in the federal register. Subcommittees do not have restrictions on meeting times or locations because, when the subcommittee comes up with its conclusions after having done its body of work, it has to present to the parent committee. ○ Subcommittees do not report to Congress, the Secretary, program offices, or VA officials. Subcommittees report to the parent committee. This is very important. • Mr. Moragne stated that individuals of this FAC may be called upon by a local, state or a federal entity to testify. He emphasized that individual members do not represent the thoughts and recommendations of this FAC. However, they can speak as citizens and represent their individual points of view.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Davis added that committee members can also speak as members in reference to recommendations that have been sent to the Secretary and received a response. • Mr. Moragne shared best practices with committee members. He urged them to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Master their calendars: have a good grasp on logistical and operational issues. ○ Develop SMART recommendations: specific, measurable, actionable, realistic, and time-based. ○ Work cross-collaboratively. ○ Make use of the VA library service. If asked, the library can conduct research for committee members. Committee members should work with their DFO, who can introduce them to the director of the VA library service, Nancy Clark. • Mr. Moragne reminded committee members that they are limited to two terms (a term is two years, making the limit a total of four calendar years). He asked members to provide suggested replacement names as they near the end of their terms. This reduces the FAC's workload in terms of searching for replacements. • Mr. Moragne stated that the term limits apply to non-voting members and voting members. The FAC is working with the Chair, DFO, and program office leadership to make sure the group has the right rotation going forward. • Mr. Moragne explained that the DFO is designated by the program office leadership, so Dr. Davis will determine how long the DFO stays. He stated that there are no term limits for the DFO, but there is around 35% turnover in the DFO management sector of the 28 FACs. He is constantly training new DFOs. • Mr. Jeff Scheire suggested that non-voting members be tied to a two or four-year term. • Mr. Moragne pointed out that this was a very good point because non-voting members bring critical information to the table; the FAC could make an exception for them. • Dr. Davis clarified that the Community Veterans Engagement Boards (CVEBs) are not FACs; they are not governed by the same rules. CVEBs are entirely different and are not created by statute. • Dr. Davis stated that the FAC's first recommendation last year was overcome by events and is no longer as relevant. The Secretary has personally read the second one, was aware of it when he came to the LA campus in December and is now going through concurrence. He noted that every single recommendation from any FAC has to go through the process of being reviewed by every other relevant office, particularly General Counsel. • Dr. Davis apologized that the system appears to be as barrier-full as possible to reduce the flow of communication. She noted that when there are personal concerns, committee members can email the Secretary, email her, or call the White House VA Hotline. All of those will get a response and awareness. She stated that there is a tremendous value for having both committee and personal comments on the record. However, her goal is to help the FAC get smart recommendations. Individual citizens always have the opportunity to comment, including to the members of Congress or anybody else.
Ethics Briefing Joan Liguoro, Ethics Attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Joan Liguoro provided the following information to the FAC regarding general ethic rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FAC members are Special Government Employees (SGE). ○ Career employees are subject to the ethics rules, but FACA members are subject to a smaller subset of the ethics rules—in acknowledgement that committee members have other careers and other things going on. ○ A SGE is an advisory committee member appointed to serve not more than 130 days

	<p>during any 365-day period (with or without compensation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ You are not an SGE if you serve on Committee as a representative of an outside organization or another federal agency. ○ You have to be a FACA member. Just being on a committee does not subject you to the government ethics rules. ○ The easiest and most effective way to get ethics advice is to email governmentethics@va.gov. This inbox is checked regularly by four paralegals on our team. Someone will acknowledge your request and assign it to an ethics lawyer who will likely contact you for more information. ○ The ethics rules are from the 70s. Seek the advice. We can help you work through these somewhat older rules that might not fit tidily into our modern civilization. Not only that, if you seek advice from us, you get protection. Ethics rules are derived from two different places: The statute, the United States Code of Statute; and the government federal regulations, the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). As far as the CFR goes, those are enforced by the government against its employees. If you seek advice from me and you have an opinion from me that you have followed and you have fully disclosed all the facts, your agency will not act against you. It is what we call the Safe Harbor Provision. You have disclosed all your facts, you have received an opinion, and you can rely on that opinion whether it is misguided or not. If you seek government ethics advice, you can rely on our response. ○ Get advice in writing; do not rely on memory. ○ Ethics rules apply even if you serve without compensation; they apply even when you are not directly performing government services. <p>About 80% of the ethics rules deal with financial conflicts. Unless exempted by written Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO) determination, you must file a Confidential Financial Disclosure (CFD).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We need the CFDs or Form OGE 450. Coordinate with Eugene to have it submitted. Do not encrypt the form before sending it; governmentethics@va.gov does not accept encrypted emails. The report must be certified before you can participate in any deliberative meeting. ○ Conflicts of Interest: This is what we call the granddaddy of ethics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 18 U.S.C. § 208 is our shorthand for it. It is the financial conflict of interest rule. ▪ It says it is a crime for you to participate personally and substantially as a government officer or employee in a particular matter which will directly and predictably affect your financial interest or a financial interest imputed to you. That is our main statute. ○ Whose Interests are Imputed to You? That means that we treat their interests the same as your interests. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Your spouse. ▪ Any minor children. ▪ A general partner, if you are involved in ownership of a corporation. ▪ An organization in which you serve as officer, director, trustee, general partner, or employee. ▪ A person or organization with which you are negotiating, or have an arrangement concerning prospective employment. ○ Particular Matters: Deliberations, decisions, or actions focused on interests of specific parties (a grant, a contract, a lease, or matters of general applicability focused on a
--	--

	<p>discrete and identifiable class, such as an industry).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is not a broad policy directed at a large and diverse group. ○ Direct and Predictable: There must be a close causal link between the decision or action to be taken and any effect of financial interest on the matter. Not everything is going to be direct and predictable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the link between the financial interest and the effect of matter is attenuated or its effect is contingent upon occurrence of events that are speculative or independent of the matter, then that is not considered direct and predictable. ○ Exception for Particular Matter of General Applicability: This has a lot to do with FACAs, because you are working on matters of recommendation and policy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ You may participate in particular matters of general applicability where the disqualifying financial interest arises from your non-federal employment or prospective employment only where there is no special or distinct effect on you or your non-federal employer, other than as part of a class. ▪ The exception does not cover interests arising from stock ownership. Stock has its own separate exception. For publicly traded stock, I believe the limit is \$15,000, so if you own less than \$15,000 in a publicly traded stock, you have an exception from the conflict rules. There is no corresponding exception for private equity. ▪ Non-federal employment must involve actual employer/employee relationship (not a contractor). ○ Other Exceptions: You can apply and we can grant you a waiver. If it is determined by VA that the need for the services outweighs the potential for conflict, then the waiver is issued. It is issued in consultation with our office and with the Office of Government Ethics. It is not a particularly easy process, but if it is necessary, we will do it. ○ Multi-campus Exception: You can participate in a matter affecting one campus of a multi-campus state institution of higher education where a disqualifying interest arises from employment with a separate campus of the same institution; no multi-campus responsibilities. ○ Appearances Matter: Direct conflicts are most common, but many times, appearances can get you into trouble. Some things just do not look good. And if you think about the history of why this committee exists, appearances matter. Appearances matter to the Secretary and to VA in general. We are here to restore public trust, so appearances matter. ○ Prohibited Compensation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For regular federal employees—No non-federal compensation for performance of official duties, except from the Treasury of State, local, municipal government. 18 U.S.C. § 209. ○ Switching Sides: Leaving a federal position to work for an outside entity that had something to do with your position at VA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An SGE is prohibited from receiving compensation based on their representation of anyone else before any federal agency or court in connection with any specific party matter in which they participated personally and substantially as a government employee. 18 U.S.C. § 203. What you do in this committee is going to determine what you would be prohibited from doing post-committee. ▪ A SGE is prohibited from acting as an agent or attorney, with or without compensation, before any federal agency or court in connection with any specific
--	---

	<p>party matter in which they participated personally and substantially as a federal employee. 18 U.S.C. § 205.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lifetime Ban: Representing back to the government in connection with a particular matter involving specific parties in which the SGE participated personally and substantially. It is not a complete ban. It has to do with making representations back to the government with an intent to influence. ○ Standard of Conduct: These are the regulations, not the criminal statutes, that also have some prohibitions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ You may not serve as an expert witness for a party opposing the government where you participated in the underlying proceedings as a government employee. ▪ An SGE may not serve as an expert for a party opposing their own agency where they serve on a committee established by statute or serve for more than 60 days. ○ Misuse of Position <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No use of non-public information to engage in any financial transaction or to further your own private interest or that of another. ▪ No use of government property for other than authorized purposes. Government property includes telephones, faxes, and emails. ▪ No use/allowing use of your official title, position, or authority to imply that the department officially endorses/sanctions a private product, service, or activity. ○ Teaching, Speaking, and Writing: This prohibition was developed primarily for researchers who also sit on scientific boards or serve dual capacities in universities, but if you are giving lectures or writing articles that represent anything here, please contact us so that we can help you work through whether you can use your title and mention things that deal with the committee. ○ Gifts: You may not accept a gift given because of official position or from a prohibited source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An entity seeking official action by VA. ▪ Seeking to do business with VA. ▪ Or whose interests could be substantially affected by committee decisions. ▪ Or a majority of the members are prohibited sources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exceptions: You may accept meals, lodging, transportation, and other benefits arising from outside employment when benefits not offered due to status as a federal employee. ○ Charitable Fundraising: SGE may engage in fundraising in a personal capacity as long as you do not personally solicit funds or support from a person whose interests may be substantially affected by the performance or non-performance of your official duties. ○ Hatch Act: It restricts certain political activities of government employees. It applies to you only when engaged in government business:
<p>Certification to New Members</p> <p>Dr. Lynda Davis, Chief Veterans Experience Officer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Eugene Skinner introduced the new committee members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ms. Donna Deutchmann: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ President and CEO of Homes4Families, which builds Veteran Enriched Neighborhoods, adds Veteran housing with wrap-around services. ▪ Has a background as a gerontologist and in senior housing. ○ Sarah Serrano: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marine Corps Veteran.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal and grant writer working in project management as an independent contractor. ▪ Served in LA on other non-profits and committees that address concerns for LA Veterans and Veterans nationwide. ○ Robert Begland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Partner at LA law firm Cox, Castle, and Nicholson. ▪ Lives in Sepulveda Pass. Ms. Begland has been a neighbor of the campus for almost 20 years. ▪ Army Veteran and son of an Army officer. ▪ The issues discussed here have been near and dear to him for his entire life. ○ Dan Rosenfeld: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Born on an Air Force base. Father was Air Force, uncle had distinguished service in Vietnam, and grandfather was in the Army. ▪ Lived in the neighborhood for 40 years. ▪ Mr. Rosenfeld has been involved in real estate, land use, investment, and development for four decades. He was the head of real estate for the state of California and for the city of LA, and most recently worked for the county supervisor, Mark Ridley-Thomas, on land use and economic development issues in south Los Angeles. • Dr. Davis presented the certificates to the new members and an updated Committee photo was taken. • Mr. Skinner noted that the photo will be posted on the Advisory Committee Management Office (ACMO) website.
GLA Updates Ann Brown, Medical Center Director of Greater LA Healthcare System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Ann Brown described her experience working for VA for over 25 years, serving our nation's heroes. She noted that the Greater LA Healthcare System (GLA) is unique in VA. It is the most complex hospital and the largest health care system in the country. Ms. Brown emphasized that the GLA is more than just a hospital. No other medical center in the country or VA has a FAC. • Ms. Brown asked the FAC how GLA can help the FAC achieve its mission. • A committee member suggested the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A level of engagement that meets the needs of Veterans in the community. ○ A fast response time as issues come up, particularly regarding service and providing service. ○ GLA being the primary conduit for outreach. • Mr. Arthur Delacruz asked that meeting minutes from regularly cadenced meetings be provided so committee members are informed of what is being said in the Veteran town halls. • Mr. Jeffrey Scheire suggested that people be invited to attend meetings to drive community engagement. • Ms. Brown noted that every medical center, every teaching facility in VA, has an affiliation with a medical school. GLA's affiliation is with UCLA. GLA also has affiliations with University of Southern California (USC) and a hundred other schools. Because of the land and the relationship over the Jackie Robinson Stadium, GLA has a higher level of engagement with UCLA. • Dr. Davis noted that the FAC will provide to the new members background information on UCLA as well as share all the meeting minutes from last year.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Brown stated that a platform can be built for other VAs that do not have all the assets that GLA has. Those types of relationships go beyond the affiliation of training medical students; other hospitals can use that information to strengthen their relationships, which will ultimately serve our nation's heroes. • Mr. Howard Hernandez suggested having more town halls outside of Sepulveda and the local area of LA. He added that CVEBs should consist of members from the geographical area that they cover. This will help with listening to the needs of the Veterans in outlying areas who have the least amount of access to the facilities. • Mr. Philip Mangano suggested that GLA can help with letting the FAC know of any activities planning already underway with regard to the 1200 Veterans coming to live on the campus, not only in terms of services that might not exist on the campus, but maybe even more importantly, the scaling of services that do exist to accommodate the increased level of need of those Veterans who are coming. • Ms. Brown stated that through the CVEB, GLA has had discussions about RAND and the studies they provide. They have reviewed longitudinal studies as they try to find where they can fill a gap in services for Veterans. It is an ongoing discussion. GLA has not explored having RAND study the influx of families onto the campus and what that is going to look like. • Dr. Davis noted that VA has an office of Health Services Research and Development (HSR&D), which is specifically focused on all Veterans Health Administration issues and to whom we can make recommendations through the Secretary. The FAC can pull research that has already been done within VA and HUD. • Mr. David Tenenbaum asked to be part of an outreach and communications engagement subcommittee, to work with GLA's Public Relations (PR). He would like the community and the Board to be more aware. He would like to broadcast the good work that the GLA is doing and, in the process, inform this FAC. • Ms. Brown stated that GLA needs to work on being a better communicator. There is some work to be done maybe at the subcommittee level to keep information flowing. • Dr. Shana Spangler provided updates on the Trauma Recovery Services (TRS) Groups to the FAC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was a big transition in the program in June 2018. There were 21 groups at that time, with 21.5 hours of programming. This is when the program was located on the north side of campus. ○ Around mid-September, the program was moved to the south side of campus. It is now housed with all the other mental health programs. There are 17 groups remaining, with 17.5 hours of programming. ○ Some groups transitioned for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Three groups ended due to low census. Veterans who were in those three groups have been connected to other groups. ▪ One group ended due to provider retirement. ▪ One group transitioned to the Domiciliary. ▪ One new group (anger management) was added to meet Veteran requests. ○ Since September, we have seen a 25% increase in access. ○ Veterans now have access to a range of treatments. Previously, Veterans were required to attend groups. If they could not attend groups, they were denied access to the Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) program ○ 23 Veterans received an Evidence-Based Practice (EBP), i.e., Prolonged Exposure (PE) or
--	--

	<p>Cognitive Processing Therapy (CPT), in October 2018 (one month) compared to 13 Veterans from April 2017 to April 2018 (1 year). Veterans are not required to engage in an EBP, but are now offered as a treatment option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In FY17, only 217 Veterans were attending the PTSD groups at least one time per month (i.e., 13+ group appointments in a year). During the same time (FY17), 6,742 Veterans at West Los Angeles (WLA) had a diagnosis of PTSD. This demonstrates a large unmet need. Our goal now is to be able to increase access and get more Veterans access to treatment. ● Ms. Brown noted that a lot of the conflict was around the Tuesday night group. Out of the 23 Veterans that were engaged in that Tuesday night group, all but five of them are engaged in other services in the medical center. As for the other five, we are here to help when they decide they want to reach out and get help. In one month, we are providing almost twice as much EBP health care than we provided in the entire year before. We are in synch with the 2017 VA/DoD guidelines for treatment of PTSD, access to all Veterans has increased substantially, and we are still hiring mental health providers. ● Dr. Davis stated that, for those who are new, it has gone a long way. We responded first to what we heard directly from Veterans who came in to give public comment two times ago, very strongly, about their concerns regarding the future of the dual diagnosis and peer support programs. That was one source of the concern directly from the Veterans. Second has been from a series of letters. Given the changes that were made, this, she noted, is the tangible, factual response to those concerns. Dr. Davis stated that we will always be open to hearing about our Veterans. ● Ms. Brown answered that mental health is integral to what we do at VA. GLA focuses very, very strongly on mental health. From an administrator's point of view, what we have is a tracking of Veterans' engagement with mental health programs across GLA. We look at and update this regularly to ensure that every Veteran who wants to engage in services is engaging in services. We are tracking these Veterans, every one of them that was impacted, and doing everything possible to engage them in services, whether they need PTSD services or substance abuse services. We created the group at the Culver City Vet Center to continue any groups if they wanted to engage in that manner. ● A committee member asked: What kind of recommendations need to be made, either regarding the service providers' provision of support groups for PTSD and trauma, as well as for grief support? GLA only has so much capacity and so much budget. ● Ms. Brown noted that GLA's support is not going to cover every Veteran. This question can be best answered by the principal developer because they have done this before. What is it VA can provide? What services can we contract out to our partners? How do we marry those things so that we have a myriad of services across the campus, either provided by VA staff, the folks who are doing the Enhanced Use Leases (EUL), the community?
<p>WLA IPT Update/Status</p> <p>Meghan Flanz, Executive Director, VA West LA Campus Master Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ms. Flanz gave her reflection and observation of the first year of this committee. What the committee did, suffered through, and learned from. She noted that she heard the frustration expressed earlier about how slowly formal recommendations make their way from a group like this to the Secretary, such that the solicitation for the Principal Developer Team was already done by the time recommendations to the Secretary to change it had reached the Secretary. ● Ms. Flanz underscored the importance of the Secretary's visit. She stated that a political reality is oftentimes associated with a multi-year project and needs to be considered. ● Ms. Flanz stated that, about the relationship with UCLA, the first large engagement was

with the chancellor and a large group of people at UCLA. The Secretary understands that is a special relationship and that the relationship probably has not yet been leveraged fully for the benefit of Veterans. There was a high-level, but very meaningful, conversation between the Secretary and the chancellor about what else they can and should do together. There was also a meeting with Mayor Garcetti to talk about the absolute need for VA, the city, and the county to partner robustly and effectively to address issues of Veteran homelessness, substance abuse, etc.

- Ms. Flanz noted that this will be a critical year in terms work on the Master Plan:
 - Within the next few days, we will be filing an Environmental Assessment (EA). Regarding the EAs for the first three buildings, the issue is the first obvious touch point at which anybody who wants to challenge the sufficiency of that work can do so through litigation.
 - Once you get something into the hands of the judge, you are at the mercy of somebody who may or may not fully understand all the equities and all the laws. It is the Department of Justice (DOJ) who handles the government's case.
 - At some point this year, somebody is likely going to at least be thinking about, if not in fact, initiating litigation to challenge the work we have done thus far. That type of litigation can result in an injunction.
 - This makes me nervous to think that we could be on the cusp of a judicial process that could slow us down.
 - We are now poised to begin in earnest a lot of construction that will result relatively soon in the delivery of a lot more units of housing, and that is exciting!
 - Because of the nature and extent of some of the Inspector General (IG)'s recommendations, the agreed-upon action plan was to implement those recommendations by the end of September 2019. We are actively working to get all those moving parts both started and aligned with each other. That is going to take a lot of work. I wanted to flag that for this group, both for your awareness and also to reiterate the point that Ann started with, which is that we—I and the IPT members—want to continue to be completely transparent and forthcoming; we are going to find ourselves a little bit strapped in terms of resources and energy this year.
- Ms. Flanz stated that the operational and near-term housing will be delivered through the EUL process in the near horizon.
 - Building 209 opened in June 2017.
 - The next step in development is buildings 205 and 208, which should result in the delivery of about 120 additional units; 207 has about 50 units. If all goes well, those units will all be delivered and available for occupancy by chronically homeless Veterans in fiscal 2021.
- Ms. Flanz discussed her team's programmatic environmental impact study process, where we were, and what happens next.
 - The West LA Leasing Act requires VA to comply with all applicable environmental impact laws. Our statute says follow those laws.
 - The decisions about what process to use happened several years ago.
 - In December 2018, we issued a draft statement that shows all the studies that were done about the potential impact on traffic, noise, the historic elements on the property, etc. It includes things that everyone is required to study in connection with any wholesale redevelopment, and the results have to be made available to the public for comment.

- We published the Draft document in the Federal Register in December. We were asked over the holidays to extend the public comment period. We extended the public comment period into mid-February. We will have some public meetings next week to begin to take in public comment, which can happen either through those meetings or through written submissions.
- We are looking at issuing a final document in late June or early July. The issuance of that record of decision in connection with the Programmatic Environmental Impact Study (PEIS) is another opportunity for those who may seek to challenge our process or our decisions in court. We will keep an eye on that and keep you informed.
- Ms. Flanz gave details on the Safe Parking Program.
 - We have expanded it to another parking lot that is fenced and has greater capacity. The program is partnering with other service providers to provide food, in addition to a safe place to park and hygiene stations.
 - It has been a wonderful success.
- Ms. Flanz noted that the interim bridge housing is a partnership between VA and the city and county.
 - The city is paying to grade the site and place the structures.
 - It will be two different housing structures, one for homeless Veteran men and one for women. There also will be dining and shower and hygiene options.
 - The mayor has made it a priority to have one of these facilities in each of the city council districts, but it is hard to find property that is amenable to it. Fortunately, we have the space and so we are moving forward. We had hoped to open those in February, but we lost a couple of weeks while we figured out what was under the ground. It still will be a great success story and also a lesson in what happens on a campus like this where buildings and underground utilities have been moved, and our records are not really great about what is where.
- Ms. Flanz discussed the process for determining when and under what circumstances third parties can use VA space.
 - There is an online form that people fill out saying what it is they want to do. If it is on this campus, as opposed to the Sepulveda campus or anywhere else in the GLA system, any third-party land use must comply with the mandate in the Draft Master Plan that it be Veteran-centric—focused on meeting the needs of Veterans.
 - If it is under a lease, then under the West LA Leasing Act, the standard is even higher: It must principally benefit Veterans and their families.
 - There are times when the requested use would benefit Veterans, but the impact on hospital operations or on limited resources is so high that we cannot support it.
- Ms. Flanz noted that The West LA Leasing Act is set up such that lease revenues on the campus go into a special account. They can only be used for the renovation and maintenance of the land and facilities. She stated that the EUL is the only mechanism that VA can use to provide housing.
 - We do not have our own authority to provide housing. An EUL allows VA to partner with a developer and private sector funding to renovate an underused building or to build on unused property in order to support housing for homeless Veterans.
 - Revocable licenses are, by their very terms, revocable. They are short-term, although VA has often used them much longer than short-term. They are supposed to be a short-term, non-recordable interest in real property.

- Easements are a legal concept that is generally used when somebody needs to pass over your land on their way to their own or to come onto your land for purposes of doing something under it. For example, in the West LA Leasing Act, there are a few types of easements that are provided, e.g., easement to a mass transportation entity to provide mass transportation onto and around the campus.
- Ms. Flanz remarked that one thing the IG recommended was that VA's Office of Real Property issue clearer policy around when to use what. The policy now, she noted, is grossly unclear, and the practice across the entire system is all over the place.
 - I have seen revocable licenses that are 100 years.
 - We had some on this campus that were 50 years.
 - They were revocable at a moment's notice, but that is an odd use of that authority.
 - As a result of the IG report, VA Policy Office is supposed to issue clarified policy. Then GLA is supposed to make sure that all its agreements comport with the clarified policy.
- Ms. Flanz provided the following details regarding the federal appropriations funds:
 - We operate two years ahead. The VA just submitted the 2021 budget.
 - The Congressional Budget Office identifies the cost to the government of any legislative change and new budget initiative for at least the past six or eight tenures. It is an effort to avoid deepening an ever-escalating federal debt deficit, but it makes life really complicated.
 - If you want to make a recommendation to our Secretary around appropriating funds for the work we are doing, you need to be aware that 2021 is already closed unless there is some surplus that can be found in something that somebody already asked for and cannot spend. You need to be aware of where we are in the planning, for which year's budget, and what the mechanism is, historically, for getting housing built through the EUL program. It does not rely on appropriated funds. However, our Draft Master Plan is far more comprehensive and robust than just a few buildings being rehabbed. There are a lot of the services and activities that are contemplated in the Draft Master Plan. I do not know how we would pay for those through the ordinary EUL program. It is going to need some creativity and appropriated dollars.
- Ms. Flanz stated that GLA is required to show compliance with the IG's recommendations by September 30th of this year. However, the IG's practice is to require quarterly updates. GLA is drafting the first of those quarterly responses.
- Ms. Flanz explained that there was a criminal prosecution of one of their former lessee's contractors who had under-reported revenues and over-reported expenses in connection with his operation of a parking lot business on their campus.
 - Richard Scott was sentenced.
 - The sentencing included an order to provide restitution to VA and also to forfeit some assets such as three homes, boats, cars, and some high-ticket assets.
 - We had asked and received assurances from the DOJ that, unlike the ordinary course of business which has the proceeds of forfeited assets going to a particular forfeited assets fund that is administered by DOJ, in this case, because the restitution order named VA as the victim, the right thing to do was to have the forfeited assets go toward satisfying the restitution order. Our colleague at DOJ agreed. Unfortunately, DOJ has been hit by the shutdown.
 - We also have been in contact with some of our elected officials and their staffs to figure out whether we would need anything to happen to the West LA Leasing Act to expand

	<p>the definition of our lease revenues and the requirement that they stay here for the renovation and maintenance of this campus and include monies from forfeited assets. We are working it hard, we are paying attention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Brown stated that, regarding land use on the campus, what they are allowed to do on their campus is to support Veterans Service Offices (VSOs) as they work with Veterans on their benefits, health care claims, and other advocacy activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recently, we started a program with the Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA), where VBA employees are meeting with individuals in the inpatient units to help them find out what services they have earned, to increase their service connection if required. ○ We work with our VSOs to do the direct patient, Veteran-centric work in the building. However, we are not able to host business meetings for any of our VSOs. ○ If any organization wants to do things on this campus, they can go through our land use approval process. ○ As we look through our records and find out what is happening on this very large campus and this very large organization, I do not have 100% confidence that we know everything that is occurring. More changes may come, but we have the processes in place to ensure that what we are doing on the campus does conform with the CFR and the regulations.
<p>Principal Developer Brief</p> <p>Brian Deandra, Senior Vice President at Century Housing, West Los Angeles Veterans Collaborative LLC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Brian Deandra, the Senior Vice President at Century Housing, provided the following details on the West LA Veterans Collective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are in the midst of a crisis of epic proportions involving homelessness in our region, a crisis that affects our Veterans more acutely than the general population. In LA County alone, more than 3,900 Veterans experience homelessness on any given night. That simply cannot be and needs to change. ○ West LA Veterans Collective represents a very natural and strategic alliance of organizations consisting of Century Housing, U.S. Vets, and Thomas Safran & Associates. ○ Our partnership is a very natural and strategic alliance that has a long and storied history. Century and U.S. Vets goes back to the 1990s when Century financed the U.S. Vets Inglewood facility. In 1997, our two organizations worked together to create the Villages at Cabrillo, which is now home to more than 625 Veterans. The Century/Thomas Safran & Associates connection relates back to more than 17 years, and over that time, Century has financed more than 14 of Transportation Security Administration (TSA)'s developments, helping produce more than 1200 homes here in southern California. Together, our team features three organizations that are led by Veterans driven by mission and deeply experienced in creating community. Each of our organizations is headquartered right here in Los Angeles, well within the WLA VA's geography. We are rooted here locally, we are deeply accountable to our community, and we are very proud to say that this is our backyard. • Mr. Deandra, provided the following details about Century Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are a non-profit. ○ Century both develops and finances affordable housing throughout the state of California. We have financed more than 33,000 affordable homes and invested more than \$1.5 billion of capital. Our housing development operation specializes in the provision of supportive housing, both the development and the management of supportive housing. ○ We have deep experience in Veteran housing, as well as Master Planning. That is rooted

	<p>largely in our 20-year history at the Villages at Cabrillo in West Long Beach, a 27-acre community, a community where we comprehensively brought together partners and are serving the diverse needs of more than 1500 residents on any given night, including 625 Veterans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Century was founded by Judge Harry Pregerson, a World War II Veteran; today, our President/CEO, Ron Griffith, is a decorated Army Vet, having served in Vietnam and then awarded a Purple Heart. ● Mr. Steve Peck, President and CEO of U.S. Vets, shared the following details on U.S. Vets.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ U.S. Vets was founded in 1993. ○ Our initial program started in May 1993. It has been our learning lab over the years. Now that facility holds more than 600 formerly homeless Veterans in a full continuum, going everywhere from bridge housing to permanent housing. ○ We learned there that we have to provide a range of services: Employment assistance, mental health, case management, therapeutic groups, etc. ○ We have since grown to 11 sites across the country. We have 21 different housing buildings, serve more than 3300 Veterans every night. ○ Through the Supportive Services for Veterans program, we serve another 2500. We have experience with the whole manner of Veterans—all shapes and sizes of individual Veterans, families, seniors, women—and want to bring all that experience to bear when we mount our site here. ● Mr. Andrew Gross, President of Thomas Safran & Associates, shared the following details about Thomas Safran & Associates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We were founded over 45 years ago by Thomas Safran. Mr. Safran is one of Brentwood's key stakeholders. We have our office less than ½ mile from here. ○ We are rooted here in Brentwood in this little community. ○ I am on the Board of New Directions, and one of the keys here is our local roots. ○ We have experience in public/private partnership. ○ Our goal is to really enhance the world in which we live to enrich the lives of the people, with emphasis on the people who reside in our buildings. ○ We believe in providing the highest standard of living conditions and enriching lives of those people because you have to. ● Ms. Lise Bornstein shared the following details about KFA Architecture: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are a Santa Monica based firm that has been around over 40 years, right around the time that Thomas Safran's office was coming into play. We have made Los Angeles the focus and center of our firm. ○ We have done over 16,000 residential units, both new and adapted for use; 4000 of those are affordable housing for seniors, for special needs families, formerly homeless, and Veterans. ○ We have done many campuses throughout the area as well, including a live/work campus in Chatsworth, a transit-oriented campus in Culver City, and a campus for homeless. ○ We pride ourselves in listening engaging and delivering projects that incorporate community at the center of every building. ● Mr. Peck noted the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are a Veteran-led organization. We are Veteran-minded. ○ It was not lost on us when we read in the Request for Proposal (RFP) how important it is
--	---

	<p>that everything comes back to Veterans. Every decision we will make on this will come back to 'How do we best serve Veterans?' We see it as a model, not only for LA, but for other VA campuses nationwide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are rooted locally. We see that as a huge asset. ○ We are mission-driven. ○ We understand that doing this project was going to involve close interaction with VA, not only at the local level, but the national level. We have done a lot of that over the years. Most VA Secretaries have been to our sites, HUD Secretaries. We are keenly aware of the challenges around that VA. ○ U.S. Vets has been working with VA for 25 years. This VA Medical Center has employees out-placed at our site and we talk with them on a regular basis. ○ Together, our three organizations represent a highly capitalized partnership with strong balance sheets and healthy liquidity—these are all the necessary ingredients we need to bring together the capital needed to construct housing. ○ We go out, we find the capital—whether it is federal, state, local—we bring together the resources to create the supportive housing, including both public and private resources. Over the past 40 years, our teams have developed more than \$1 billion worth of real estate here in southern California. We are very much long-term owners and managers. We are very proud of the portfolios we have developed and we greatly look forward to expanding our mutual portfolio here on the north campus at West LA. ○ We also have deep experience Master Planning that we will certainly bring to bear here on the north campus, building upon the planning work that has already been done as part of the Drat Master Plan (DMP) and many of the outreach efforts and discussions that have funneled into that. ○ Our goal ultimately is to create a better human experience, a better experience for our Veterans by careful and thoughtful planning work. We are happy to share with you a couple of examples of our planning and development activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our Villages at Cabrillo community in Long Beach: Long Beach used to be a Navy town. By the mid-90s the Federal Government made the difficult decision to shutter those shipyards, and that decision inflicted a great shock on the local economy in Long Beach. The Navy's property was ultimately divided up, and under the Federal McKinney Act, a piece of that property was set aside primarily to benefit the homeless. At the time, a concept was hatched to create a Master Planned comprehensive and therapeutic community on those 27 acres that would be set aside. More than 20 years later and after five distinct phases of development representing more than \$170 million worth of investment and after bringing together a consortium of more than 30 different organizations, both private and public, we are proud of what has been accomplished and we are very grateful to those big thinkers from the early days. ▪ The secret sauce as to what has been created is all those elaborate partners, the more than 30 partners that come together day in and day out to provide the necessary services to our residents and our Veterans. These include organizations that provide health care, mental health, case management, including partnerships with universities that bring occupational therapy and social work students that create groups for our residents, career and educational resources. ▪ All these services have been brought to bear for the direct benefit of our residents. Our partners include U.S. Vets, with whom we started 20 years ago in VA itself. We work very closely with the Long Beach VA. It operates a CBOC, a Community-Based Outpatient Clinic, within the heart of our community. The VA also operates a Recovery Clinic for Veterans. We
--	--

have learned a lot at the Villages over those 20 years. These are lessons and experiences that we will bring to bear here in West LA.

- The stability afforded by our backbone allows partners to focus on what they do best, which is serving the residents and Veterans that they are there to serve. We have also come to appreciate the tension between urgency and patience. There is an absolute urgency to our work. No Veteran should go without a dignified home.
- We know from experience that a long-term view of the world is helpful and even necessary. Communities do not materialize overnight; they are wrought of hard work, persistence, missteps, and learning, but in the end, all these efforts can have tremendous successes. In Long Beach, our residents are increasing their incomes, remaining in their housing, and we are moving the needle in terms of reducing the incidence of Veteran homelessness.
 - Each site that we have started, we started from the ground up.
 - We start with building number one and Veteran number one, and we have done these 11 different times.
 - Inglewood has been our learning lab. For seven years, it was our only site. We started the very first month with Veteran town halls, inviting first the 25 Veterans who were there and then the 100 Veterans who were there to talk to us once a month to see how we were doing, to see what we could be doing better, what their needs were. We always use the Veterans as our source of information.
 - We create a healthy and safe environment where Veterans are free to experiment, to change, to bring themselves out of their old habits into new habits that will make them healthy and independent and hopefully enable them to rejoin the community, rejoin their families, and become productive citizens again.
- Mr. Gross stated the following:
 - We have over 60 housing developments all over southern California.
 - We manage only our own buildings.
 - We developed a large collaboration to provide 25 units of transition age youth housing with Home Health Agency (HHA) funds that are in the city of Los Angeles. This was in partnership with the LGBT Center of Greater Los Angeles.
 - It has 98 units of senior housing and 50,000 square feet of office and community space for the LGBT Center to provide services.
 - Another example is the Veterans Village of Glendale. This community provides 45 units of affordable housing to Veterans.
- Ms. Bornstein shared the vision for the West LA VA:
 - We see a community that serves the spectrum of needs with a priority to advance the health and well-being of our most vulnerable Veterans.
 - We see a community that provides high quality homes with the necessary amenities and services assembled holistically for our Veterans' health and growth.
 - We see a community that honors the legacy of the original land grant and America's collective support of our military Veterans. Embedded within this vision is a broader goal to put together neighborhoods both within and outside of the campus, to form communities and social networks that lead to healthy and vibrant lives.
 - We will get connections within the campus to find ways to allow for a diversity of mobility throughout the site, not only to accommodate cars, but also to include sidewalks and small, intimate streets so people can enjoy sunny afternoon walks with friends and family; a bike network to encourage other means of transit; places where you can catch a bus or even walk to the purple line.

- We look to create open spaces with a variety of landscapes that lead you through and connect the site. Our guiding principles create a road map for our Master Plan work, creating homes for our residents, building neighborhoods, creating support for mental and physical health, creating opportunities around the site, restoring and respecting the historic fabric of the site, and creating a sustainable approach and promoting sustainable ideas.
- Our design strategies dive deeper and allow us to further develop and create a finer grain and texture to the Master Plan site.
- Mr. Deandra noted the following:
 - After our selection in early November, we hit the ground running.
 - We have been working closely with the VA team, both here at GLA and the DC team. We are presently in the midst of the public comment period associated with the Draft PIS.
 - Our team understands that partnerships are challenging, that their success often hinges on both trust and clarity. We understand the importance of outreach and engagement with key stakeholders. As part of our proposal process, we garnered more than 20 support letters from important stakeholder organizations, elected officials, and VSOs. That same spirit of outreach is going to infuse our planning and development activity and operational work here ultimately at the West LA VA.
 - As part of our organized business practices, we incorporate and exceed local participation and hiring requirements. We customarily work with General Contractors (GCs) that have a successful track record of meeting these targets. In our Principal Developer role, we have identified a series of Veteran-focused hiring targets and contracting goals that we plan to achieve, including contracting goals to Veteran-Owned Small Business and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned small business apprenticeship and hiring programs. To hold ourselves accountable, we are bringing in a third-party compliance monitoring firm.
- Mr. Tyler Monroe, Vice President of Development, Thomas Safran & Associates, stated:
 - Our plan for building 207 is to do an adaptive reuse of the existing building with at least 50 units of supportive housing for recovering homeless senior Veterans.
 - The current discussion is a target population of 100% permanent supportive housing for senior Veterans ages 62 and over.
 - We were selected at the end of last year. We are currently gearing up to apply for the first funding applications to give Los Angeles HHH funding.
 - We have an in-house property management company that is critical to who we are and that enables us to maintain and ensure top quality for the communities that we develop. It is not enough to just build a project and turn it over. It is of paramount importance to ensure that once a project is complete and operating, it is maintained at the highest standards so when you see it 20, 30, 40 years down the road, it is of the same standard. That is how you create a community. That is how you ensure that it stays vibrant and an amazing place for our Veterans to live.
- Mr. Deandra noted the following:
 - We want to make sure that Veterans feel safe, that they feel they are in a place where they can take chances and move forward.
 - We want them to reconnect with their families.
 - We do regular events: Veterans Day, July 4th, Thanksgiving, and Christmas to make it a

	<p>home environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We welcome their families. Some of the Veterans that we treat have not seen family in 20 years because of their substance abuse or their homelessness. We really encourage them to make those connections again. This is much more about Veterans than it is about building buildings. We are very intent on creating a place where Veterans will feel safe and at home. ○ We are in the midst of the public comment period associated with the PEIS. We are not actually able to proceed with any development activities. We are very much in assessment mode. We have a civil engineer and a dry utility consultant on board, and both of those groups are beginning their assessment work. We are also beginning our neighborhood planning work to assess the buildings that are on the north campus, identify those that we think are suitable for redevelopment, identify those that may not be, and identify new construction areas. ○ We are eager to hear comments out of the PEIS process. We are undertaking assessment activities right now that will ultimately be informed by the draft PEIS process. By the end of this year, we will have a much better idea what the ultimate needs are. This is subject to change based on financing and the actual environmental process. ○ One basic challenge of the project is the sheer vastness of the real estate. We have 388 acres. Not all 388 acres are north of Wilshire Boulevard, but there is a tremendous opportunity before us in figuring out how to plan sensibly to create a cohesive community and a community that has enough center of gravity to produce the vibrancy that we are looking for. Additionally, there are many voices with lots of ideas and opinions. We are being hit up daily with people and organizations that have ideas on how to proceed. The sheer volume of ideas and organizations, many of which have a vested interest in seeing this be successful, being able to aggregate all that, sort out what makes sense, what may not make sense, and be able to communicate back to stakeholders—that itself is a challenge. ○ In terms of financing, it is a huge challenge for us going forward. Fortunately, on the housing side specifically, that is what we do: we cobble together money and put together communities to make them peaceful. On the housing side, there are funds from the city of LA, the county of LA, the state of California, and the Federal Government. However, these ebb and flow. ○ There is money for services, especially for the homeless population. We will apply for those funds. For infrastructure, our job right now is to put together a proposed Master Plan. We saw the Draft that was done. Now, the question is how are we going to change or amend that, and we will present it to you, but what is it going to look like? This needs to be its own neighborhood. How do we do that? It is going to require infrastructure. How do we fund that? That is to be seen. We have some ideas, but that could be a great place to partner with you all. If there are great ideas, we would love to hear them. ○ In regard to availability of family units, we have a Women With Children program down in Long Beach, but we are keenly aware that there are single men out there with children. Within that family area, there will be space for both single fathers and single mothers, as well as for families or couples. As we go on, this will roll out over a number of years, so this senior project is simply the first of many, and we will continually evaluate what the need is and incorporate those other populations that maybe previously have not been served into the construction. The services are a different
--	---

question. U.S. Vets is continually in Sacramento, in Washington DC, talking about these various populations for which there is no funding. We are continuing to expand. This is a very high-profile project. We have talked to the county a couple of times. They said they are in. We are going to hold them to it. But we know that this is going to be a challenge. This team is really up to this challenge.

- As we develop our plan with more specificity, we want to bring in all those services that are present. We know that there is a whole variety of other services. There is no point in our raising money for services that are already being provided by somebody else.
- As we understand our selection, we have been tasked with serving as the Principal Developer for the entirety of the north campus. That touches buildings that have already been awarded to other EUL holders, including BlueGreen, Step Up on Second, core companies. We are already coordinating with them. For us to build this holistic community we need them at the table and bought into this concept. To the extent the RFP was written in that manner, the Request for Quote (RFQ) was also written in that manner, entrusting us with the responsibility for orchestrating the entire date of the north campus. That has given us the charge of the commission to work collaboratively and productively with those third parties. We are open to your ideas and feedback, so please keep those thoughts circulating to us. We are very much in data gathering mode right now and listing to ideas, and there are no bad ideas at this juncture. We feel confident that among our partners here, with the support of the local VA and VA in DC, we will be able to undertake this important task of creating community, creating a neighborhood, on the north campus.
- We envision this community to be just like any community, having space for recreation, whether it is a playground to the extent we are serving Veteran families; green space; gathering spaces, both the exterior and interior spaces, like a social hall where there can be gatherings and other types of workshops and things of that nature. This community will be replete with amenities. Many buildings on the north campus are underutilized and vacant and have great potential to be repurposed and put back into productive use in service to our Veterans.
- We know the organizations that are already developing here. We have met with them. While we do not have direct authority over them, we are hoping we have, to some degree, some more authority given our experience and track record, to bring them along and show them what can be done to participate in a larger community. We can provide a very compelling proposition to them as to sharing of resources and coordinating services to avoid duplication.
- The intent of the Kemper bridge housing is to provide Veterans, whoever they may be in the cohort, a place to be while they are engaging in VA Services. These are Veterans who have a housing plan but have not yet had permanent supportive housing for them identified.
- We are viewing the temporary bridge housing as it is clearly temporary and a bridge for the individuals going through it, but it is also a temporary reprieve solution for us here on the GLA campus as the permanent housing is being built out. Although I think it makes good sense from a community planning perspective to identify which part of the campus is going to housing for families versus housing for seniors, I do not think it makes as much sense to do that within these temporary bridge housing structures, which are a short-term solution for people on their way to something else.
- We are currently working on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with VA that memorializes our relationship in this interim period.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From the RFQ, we understand the charge to be a minimum of 1200 units. There is presently an environmental document that is out for public comment that contemplates a certain amount of housing and people. We are working within the envelope of what is being studied in connection with the environmental process. ● Ms. Flanz suggested that it will be helpful for the Board to have a full presentation on the map: Explain where the 1200 came from in the DMP, what factors are appropriate to look at as that number is being refined based on the need and demand, and also any additional available housing that is out in the community. ● Mr. Paul Macpherson noted the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We tasked the Principal Developer with informing the PEIS. ○ There has been a lot of information downloaded to the Principal Developer so far, and we continue to download information at an amazing rate. They are taking it all in because we are under a tight timeline to complete that informative process to the PEIS. ○ Right now, they are just dealing with broad concepts and ideas. As we go forward, we are in the biweekly update to the Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board (VCOEB), and we try to give a brief update during those calls as to what the Principal Developer is working on and the kind of themes that they are thinking of. ○ As we get close to the middle of the year and the completion of the PEIS, there will be a lot more clarity as to how north campus might look and what concepts the Principal Developer is following through on. ○ The RFQ did not have specific deliverables, but there was a concept that we asked the developer to do. The first thing is to come forward, to respond, be selected, inform the PEIS, and move forward with building 207. ○ There are two processes that are going on. One is the, 'No kidding, we need 207 done as quickly as we can,' and the developer has set up a team to do exactly that, led by Thomas Safran & Associates. The second deliverable is informing the PEIS, and that is an ongoing process that is not completed at this point. It will become complete toward the middle of the year.
Public Comment Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Matt Millen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commander of Post 118 of the Jewish War Veterans. ○ For the past six years, our Post has been meeting in this building in room 6400 on a Sunday morning for about 3 hours, 4 times a year. In our meetings, we provide information to our Veterans regarding VA benefits and services at the West LA VA campus. Any person or Veteran is welcome to attend. ○ Ms. Brown indicated earlier that there are federal regulations that prohibit VSOs from meeting on a VA campus. I have not seen a copy of the regulations that say VSOs are prohibited, but given the criteria in the Leasing Act as to what activities should be taking place here, why would VA not allow 3,000 Veterans living on this campus not to have a VSO meet on this campus where those Veterans could go and participate in a VSO meeting? ○ I am asking this Board to recommend to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that VSOs meeting on this campus fulfills the requirements of the Act, and part of the provisions of the act talked about what can take place on the campus, which is peer activities, socialization, physical recreation, assistance with legal issues, and federal benefits. ● John Gannon: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Mental Evaluation Team (MET) team.

	<p>MET is a collaboration between the Sheriff's Department and the Department of Mental Health, where we partner a non-uniformed deputy sheriff and a Department of Mental Health clinician to respond to mental health calls in regard to our patrol. We have three primary objectives: We mitigate crisis and de-escalate patients, we assess the patient's mental health condition, and we transport the patient if they meet certain criteria. Then the MET seeks to divert patients away from the criminal justice system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In 2018, the MET responded to over 4400 calls in Los Angeles County; 110 of those calls involved mental health crises involving Veterans, generally suffering from PTSD and often with substance use disorders. ○ Following a series of incidents in Hammil Valley that involved a Veteran with deteriorating mental health over roughly a one-week period in 2018, I sought help from the WLA campus here from VAPD to ask if they would assist us with outreach in the field regarding a Veteran who was deteriorating over a period of time with his mental health condition. We had requested a clinician and a VAPD officer. Our request for VA support here was denied because greater LA VA does not send personnel into the field to provide help during the mitigation of a crisis. Two days later, the Veteran died after he attacked two of our deputies who were patrolling the neighborhood where he lived. ○ Personnel at VA are subject matter experts in military culture and VA services. Their shared experiences and familiarization with protocols at VA are something that very few of our police officers and deputies and even our MET personnel are familiar with. The ideal response for outreach to help mitigate the mental health crises involving a Veteran should always include team representatives from VA. ○ To replicate the core response strategies of the MET, which is also the same as LAPD with MEU, we partnered so a Veteran Mental Evaluation Team (VMET) would be comprised of a VA police department officer and a VA clinician. This has proven effective now for over two decades. In the short amount of time VMET Long Beach has been operational, their program has saved lives. As of just the past three months, they responded to 274 calls, made 122 welfare checks, and they responded to a sheriff's jurisdiction as far up as Lancaster and Lake Los Angeles. ○ The VA could save many lives if the VMET concept is extended to other campuses. The LA MET and LAPD can help with educating other police agencies on the many benefits of working with the VMET. ○ We are urging that VA will reciprocate that and implement the VMET. Until then, VA West LA is not likely to reach those 14 of 20 who have currently lost touch with VA. ○ VMET staff must be permitted to leave the confines of this campus in order to provide those outreach services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Stephanie Cohen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ District Director to Los Angeles County Supervisor, Sheila Kuehl. ○ Supervisor Kuehl represents the areas of Los Angeles from the beaches to Atwater Village and all the San Fernando Valley and mountain communities. While the supervisor's district has one of the lower numbers of Veterans with social services needs across the county, we house the West LA VA campus and the Sepulveda VA. ○ We have a severe need for housing on the west side of Los Angeles. ○ In service planning area 5, where West LA is, we have the lowest number of crisis and bridge housing in the entire country at about 132 beds with a need far exceeding that. ○ We request that you do all you can to expedite the creation of housing and find creative ways to also address the needs of those Veterans who need housing now.
--	--

- As we approach the building of more units, we want to make sure that VA has services in place to truly support these Veterans and those who access the campus and do not live onsite. This includes increased partnerships on mental health services and enhanced transparency with elected offices when programs begin to shift, and needs are no longer able to be met.
- We ask that VA takes additional steps to find reasonable solutions for Veterans experiencing homelessness in the immediate area, including implementing a storage program for personal belongings similar to those that exist in downtown LA. This is a huge need and we believe that additional staff may alleviate some of the systemic issues.
- Jim Zenner:
 - Combat Veteran and a patient at West LA VA.
 - We must remember that it is not just housing we are building. We are building a community, and if we fail at that, those entrusted in our care will not thrive despite all the great data points that we will gather via getting Veterans housed.
 - The Veterans we place on campus need more than housing or just treatment. We need to provide them with opportunity, and my hope is this oversight board and VA locally and nationally is discussing this topic in a meaningful way.
 - There should be a significant outreach and engagement with the community and the providers outside VA locally and nationally to solve this third and equally important aspect of Veteran reintegration: purpose and meaning.
 - I would like to ask the Board to please prioritize exploring possible recommendations to VA that could lead to more community involvement in this area. Public safety and having the appropriate emergency response capability in lieu of 1200 permanent supportive housing units should be a priority.
 - My understanding is that VAPD is currently not able to write holds on this campus. I submit inquires to the Board about VAPD status regarding this topic and prioritize it as a strong recommendation. Failure to make this change while more housing is ruled out will lead to more preventable Veteran suicide. VAPD and mental health service line must be resourced adequately to make this happen. Veteran suicide prevention efforts must be prioritized as implementation of the Master Plan moves forward.
 - Successful implementation of the Master Plan will require simultaneous effort put into four areas: Housing, treatment, supportive services, and public safety.
- Brian Bixler:
 - Officer in charge of the Crisis Response support section for the LAPD.
 - Oversees the training and the department's response to those suffering from a mental health crisis.
 - Here to support and advocate for the implementation of the VMET program here at the WLA VA campus.
 - For the last 25 years, the LAPD has worked in conjunction with the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health and the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department to develop and implement the co-deploy model of the specialized police response to persons suffering from a mental health crisis. This model pairs a specially trained police officer with the clinician from the Department of Mental Health. In the LAPD, this is called the System-wide Mental Assessment Response Team (or a SMART team). In 2018, SMART teams responded to over 8000 calls for service involving persons with a mental health crisis, 146 of which we identified as Veterans in crisis.

- These Veterans are some of the most vulnerable people we deal with, and ensuring they receive proper care is critical. Our experience has taught us that when a SMART team or a MET team engages with persons in crisis, we have better outcomes versus a regular police unit or police response.
- We would like the administration to implement the VMET model on the WLA campus to serve our Servicemen and women who need assistance, especially in light of the 1200 proposed housing units.
- We believe implementation of the VMET will lead to fewer violent encounters with law enforcement and will lead to better outcomes for our Veterans.
- Earl Roth:
 - Acting Senior Vice Commander of Jewish War Veterans Post 603 in the San Fernando Valley and operating out of the Sepulveda VA. We were denied usage of building 22A in the Sepulveda VA. We have been there for 10 years on Sundays. We have programs that directly benefits Veterans regardless of race, religious, or gender background.
 - As a Veteran, I went to the Sepulveda VA, accessed the program, and things are much better in the household, but that is a direct benefit and other people attending our program at the Sepulveda VA are receiving that same benefit. I hope that we continue to use Sepulveda VA building 22.
- Kathleen Flanagan:
 - Lived in the Brentwood neighborhood for 20 years.
 - Board of the Brentwood Homeowners Association.
 - Member of the CVEB for the last two years.
 - I attended my first meeting at VA a little over 3 years ago. As of today, I was asked to sign up on a sheet of paper, expecting that when I had done that, I would be getting communications about the Master Plan. I have signed up since then for probably at least two dozen other meetings and put my name down. Unfortunately, nothing really came my way for the first two years. I had to rely on the Vets Advocacy or a loose network of neighbors to find out what was going on about the Master Plan.
 - There are a lot of communications coming from a lot of different groups.
 - The Master Plan website is also an unreliable source of information.
 - The VA Master Plan is probably one of the most complicated that you could ever incur. Communications to the neighborhood, Veterans, government officials, and others should be a priority. In my experience, it is not. I am here to say that communications have improved over the last six months, but it is still far from clear the when, where, why, and how.
 - I recommend that the board requires an annual written detailed communications plan directly tied to the Master Plan and to make sure there are enough resources put behind it. There needs to be timely and frequent communications to the public using both old and new media, newsletters, email, social media, the whole bailiwick. There needs to be measurement and tracked results of communications, which are then reported back to this Board.
- Jerry Orlemann:
 - 100% disabled Vietnam Veteran and I am here to talk about Barak, which is Hebrew for lightning. I spent several years not going out of my house very often. I went out of the house on one occasion, on August 1, 2006, and I had a bad experience, so I came back home that day and I swallowed a little more than 180 Klonopin. I woke up four days

later in the psych ward upstairs in this building.

- My wife brought home a young dog that had qualifications that made him a good candidate for service dog training. I started going out of the house because Kyle was dragging me out of the house to make 180-mile round trips every week to take the dog for service training with a group of other disabled Veterans who were all training service dogs under the direction of a certified trainer. I wanted to continue staying in the house; that is where I was most comfortable. But the odd thing is with training a service dog, he has to be trained for public access. Suddenly, I was forced to take the dog out—and I had never wanted this dog, but now I had to take the dog outside, I had to leave the house, I had to go into restaurants, I had to go into stores, I went into Costco, big warehouses. I did not like it. People would come up and start asking questions about the service dog. I did not have any choice; I had to answer the questions. The questions started turning into conversations. I started liking the conversations. I started feeling more comfortable being around other people and talking to other people.
- Barak gave me back my life. In August of 2013, Barak and I flew to Jacksonville, Florida. That was the first time I had been on an airplane in over 10 years. I was going to Florida as a delegate to the Vietnam Veterans of America National Convention and I was there with 1000 other people in a huge hall. With Barak with me, I was comfortable. I functioned. I did my job as a delegate. I was whole again.
- In April 2015, one evening Barak, in a matter of a couple hours, totally crashed. We took him to an emergency veterinarian and we were told that he had something called Immune-Mediated Hemolytic Anemia (IMHA). We had luck on our side because we could get him treated. This was not something that we could afford. But we had a wall-to-wall veterinary insurance policy. Under certain specific conditions set by VA, VA will provide a service dog with this wall-to-wall policy. Barak got the treatment and he still died, but if he had not gotten any treatment or I had to have him put down because we did not have money to pay for a veterinarian, I likely would not be here alive, standing before you, and telling you all this.
- Shortly after Barak died, we were told about another dog, a young dog who might also be good with a service dog training. Talon has a limited veterinary policy. He does not have a wall-to-wall policy that comes from VA. The reason for that is that VA has only approved and recognized one service dog trainer organization in the entire United States. Not even all states have trainers that are affiliated with that organization. It creates a bottleneck and creates a hard time for people to get treatment for their service dogs.
- I am able to be where I am today because I have had two service dogs that have saved my life, that have given me the chance to be human again.
- I am asking this body to take a good long hard look at the service dog issue.
- I know that there are a lot of Veterans out there today who are where I was 10, 15 years ago and I would bet that they could use a service dog that would give them their lives back, as Barak and Talon gave my life back.
- Kyle Orlemann:
 - You have heard me for the past few years at all these meetings advocating for putting a service dog training facility on this campus. It is because I know what Barak did, what these dogs have done for my husband, and I know that he would be on the other side of the grass if it had not been for those.

- There are some problems with VA's rules and regulations that are unintended consequences that created a bottleneck. When you get a service dog from an agency, the agency is returning the ownership of those service dogs. We found out about that when a friend of ours was hospitalized upstairs here and the agency that owned her service dog was going to take her dog that she had for seven years and place him elsewhere and give her a new dog. She had to have somebody hide her dog.
- When we started this process, we made sure that we had legal ownership of our dog. Part of the problem is that there were no regulations at that point and really kind of a wild west approach to service dog training.
- In 2012, VA put a policy in place and the final rule was published on September 5, 2012 and became effective on October 5, 2012. In an effort to regulate the service dog providers and the appropriate training, they stipulated that the dogs had to be trained by a member of Assistance Dogs International. The reason that is a problem is that there are only 82 programs for Assistance Dogs International in the entire United States; 12 of those are in California and only one of those is in the Los Angeles area.
- If you get your dog trained by anyone who is not a member of this organization, your dog does not have this coverage and so if your service dog breaks a leg, gets hit by a car, gets cancer, whatever, it is at your own expense and that puts Veterans in the place of if that they cannot come up with the money to do the training, you have a suicide on your hands.
- In 2015, when Barak's card was issued, nationwide he was number 814 in the program. Considering how many Veterans have service dogs, that is a critical issue. My suggestion to you has been with the process that is going on here, you have the opportunity to do a pilot program that could be a cutting-edge program that would be a leader for the rest of the country.
- You have a number of military service dog trainers and handlers who are retired or who have been RIF'd or who live in the area. The training to train a service dog to smell high or low blood sugar for diabetes or an oncoming seizure or whatever is very analogous to the training there is to sniff out a bomb. The people that are service dog training facilities who are authorized by Assistance Dogs International right up here in Malibu, funded by the Sam Simon Foundation, could train former military working dog handlers and trainers to do the training here on the campus. Also, an organization called the American Humane. They also have service dog training programs; they are tremendously well functioning, and well-financed. They have mobile veterinary clinics. In addition, you could put together with these resources a service dog training facility on this campus where you would be able to quantify and qualify the effectiveness of the training.
- Many of the Veterans who are homeless and living under the bridge, their only support is their dog. They are not going to come in to these programs if they cannot bring their dogs. So, you are going to have a bunch of untrained, unvetted, not neutered, not spayed dogs coming onto the campus or you are going to have the Veterans going, 'Forget it. Not going to do it and I am going back under the bridge.'
- These organizations and others that I have been in contact with would be able to put together a network to do the vetting of those dogs as they come in and they would be able to do all the veterinary care for the pets that would be coming in with families who will live here. They would be able to do all the training and necessary veterinary care for the Veterans in the service dog training program. That would also allow some of those Veterans to be trained as groomers or other trainers, which would be another path to

freedom and jobs and back in the community.

- I beg you to give serious consideration to putting a service dog training facility on this campus. I am more than happy to work with you in coordinating with the other entities that can make this financially possible and bring the necessary expertise to the program.
- Terence Lyons:
 - Army Vet and a journalist. News correspondent for the Strawberry publication published by Metabolic Studio.
 - The legislative history of the Leasing Act particularly indicates that this organization, this Board, is to be involved in the preparation of the Master Plan implementation.
 - The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has rendered its report on its review of the VA West LA campus and the various land uses here. I would just like to underscore that the OIG, in rendering its report, particularly criticized VA for not sufficiently involving Veterans in its decision-making. With respect to the current implementation of the Master Plan, the OIG report called for a stronger voice from this group, the VCOEB. They said as follows: "Allowing VCOEB to provide input to Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System (GLAHS) leadership on existing and proposed land use agreements will ensure Veterans have a voice on whether land use agreements benefit Veterans and their families. This would improve transparency between GLAHS leadership and the Veteran community in Los Angeles as VA works to rebuild trust while also revitalizing the campus as a permanent home for Veterans."
 - I would urge this Board to please get involved in the implementation of the Master Plan, look at those site plans, review the proposed Land Use Agreements and please provide your input, not only by way of recommendations to the Secretary, but also by way of your input and expertise in dealing with the GLAHS leadership.
- Tess Banko:
 - Executive Director of UCLA VA Veteran Family Wellness Center.
 - We have enjoyed spending the last year and half implementing the program, ironing out some kinks, creating programming in conjunction with the VA sections and special thanks to our VA partners and the different sections that we have been working with. We have also been creating relationships with philanthropy, the arts, and faith-based communities.
 - We have upcoming Getty Museum and Lyft partnerships. The Lyft partnership will be funded by philanthropy. It will focus on building 220. It is a pilot to see how it would work out to bring Veterans into the campus via something like Lyft.
 - I am getting a lot of interest in the 501c3 that is going to be established for the community needs. We have also been working on building the supportive fabric of community. I put together a guide as to things that I wish that I would have known as we were implementing the program.
 - I created the Veteran Family Service provision groups and subgroups, so this is kind of a taxonomy for the committee to be able to use as you are evaluating programs and who is being served. You can look at the data that is presented in terms of reporting. This is a breakdown of the different main groups, the subgroups, and then we have the resource pillar category; these are the resources that Veterans and their families need in terms of transition. I submit these documents to you.
- Andrew Mahoney:

- Army Veteran.
- Recent employee of The Shakespeare Center of LA (SCLA) of Veterans In Art program.
- My experience working with and being employed by SCLA has been an outstanding highlight of my experience, now six years running, dealing with this VA facility. It was by far the best therapeutic experience of my time in LA and it might very well be of my entire life.
- Every Veteran I worked with remarked positively about how the employment, the tasks of the job, the atmosphere of teamwork, and the physical exertion involved was beneficial to their health, to their quality of life and to their recovery. The people of the SCLA treated each of us with the utmost respect, dignity, and kindness, and they were also very accommodating to the individual needs of every member of our team.
- As this facility moves forward, it is crucial that the people who shape and execute the Draft Master Plan know that there are partnerships here today which work wonders. It is my assertion that every community entity involved, much like every Veteran involved, benefited from this stellar example of what VA can do when it seeks the proper partnerships and then stays the hell out of the way.
- Charles Lennon:
 - About six months ago, I met Chief Weiner down at the LA VA, who is initiating the Veterans METs, and currently I am the program manager for all the countywide programs through LA County Department of Health. It is an EBP supported by the DOJ in Washington. We are a learning site through the LAPD program.
 - I have spent most of my time as a mental health professional speaking against the stigma of mental illness. Thank goodness, we have a partnership with law enforcement in 39 of the 44 police departments in LA County. It is a huge, wonderful thing and I would just like to speak in support of the possible expansion of the VMET here on the West LA campus.
 - I am here often, bringing people to the Psychiatric Emergency Room. There is always a need. It is humbling for me as a non-Vet to see how many people are broken, but how often they come here to be healed.
- Francisco Juarez:
 - Project manager for Veteran Advocate Lobby Organization.
 - Southern Area Commander for AmVets, Post 2 in Culver City.
 - Surviving PTSD Veteran.
 - Member of the United States Marine Corps League Detachment 1347.
 - The last night we had a meeting, I brought to their attention an article that was in the Semper Fi magazine just sent to us, an open letter to the Marine Corps League's membership on suicide prevention. The question it poses is, within the League, we must ask what supports, if any, were available; later, it specifically referenced the Marine officer that killed himself at a VA location.
 - We need to move rapidly on these things, and these government processes drag their feet forever and people are dying every day. You know that; we have told you that before. I want to thank all the speakers who came here today, particularly Mr. Terence Lyons and his remarks. I have been following Mr. Lyons over the years.
 - In that, at the offset, one of my fellow advocates, Sal Gramatico, who could not be here today, asked me to pass on a message to you about breach of ethics and what mechanisms are in place, if any at all.
 - We cite the vision of the one and only Master Plan that was in the 1800s. This is a

	<p>settlement plan you are working on, not a Master Plan because that one was in the 1800s and it included beachfront property that mentions, in a separate deed, the deed for this property, attesting to the fact that it was a Master Plan. The beachfront property never manifested. It was hidden and there is land grab going on all this time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The task of this Board here—we refer to it and one of the things you want to make sure that you do not allow to happen—is manipulation of land use policy, manipulation, or misrepresentations of what certain things mean. ○ We ask that you not separate the beachfront property that has come into light from your task of developing this Master Plan. In fact, it should be brought back, now more than ever because of the increased mental illness problems. ○ These are our honest concerns as grassroots advocates, not just the VSOs, but the many grassroots advocates that are aware of the wrong that has been done, and I have to say that because people are dying every day that could have been helped. Our concerns have all been honest, we are all volunteers, we are not being paid to argue with people that are making nice salaries, but we do it because we have not gotten the right explanation. Hopefully this board will facilitate that. ○ We are asking you not to become a rubber stamp for the government. ○ There should not be a bus station here because that is just giving more of this land away to the public. There should not be any non-Veteran, non-profit, or for-profit big oil entities on this land. We should not continue to dismantle the vision that was set forth in the 1800s. It can look like it looks like on the plan, but you have to take out the non-Veteran element. ○ Pay attention to the person from Brentwood that said you have to take communication seriously. Reach back out to Valor, reach out to the non-profit organizations, let us know what you are recommending to the Secretary. Do not just recommend it and do not just rubber stamp it.
Wrap-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The FAC took a five-minute recess after the public comment session and wrapped up the meeting.

Thursday, January 10, 2019

Call to Order Lieutenant General (R) John D. Hopper Jr., Committee Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lt. Gen. Hopper called the meeting to order at 8:50 AM PDT.• Lt. Gen. Hopper noted that there was a quorum of the FAC, thanks to a couple members who joined the meeting via phone.• Mr. Skinner remarked that if FAC members would like to be reimbursed for their local travel for mileage, they need to fill out the form and send it to Ms. Bush Neal at the end of the meeting.
Opening Remarks Lieutenant General (R) John D. Hopper Jr., Committee Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lt. Gen. Hopper gave administrative announcements. He welcomed new committee member, Mr. James Battista, and noted that a certificate will be presented to him around the lunchtime hour.• Lt. Gen. Hopper noted that the FAC would like to address a couple of questions from the previous day's meeting.• Mr. Mangano stated the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ One concern is that U.S. Vets, who made a sterling presentation, who has done this kind of work for a very long time, and we heard about all the experience they have—there is no guarantee that they will provide the services on this site. It very well could be that VA will provide the services.○ In different places around the country, we have seen contracts awarded with a certain service provider as a part of the effort who then gets traded out for VA staff. We have long-term community-based providers who are very experienced in being moved out for reasons often unbeknownst to the developer or to the community and freshly minted VA staff put in their place.○ There is a confidence with U.S. Vets, but that can be undone at any time.• Ms. Flanz stated that, regarding U.S. Vets being the guaranteed provider, it is a conversation that needs VA voices that were not in the room—most importantly, Ms. Heidi Marston's voice.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ In many cases, VA reserves the right to determine which supportive housing services will be provided by VA staff, which will be contacted for, and with whom those services will be contracted. Ms. Flanz suggested that this ought to be its own agenda item with all the right people in the room to address it.• Ms. Deutchmann remarked that the FAC's charge is to give recommendations to the Secretary and stay out of the weeds. She noted that the importance of the services is primarily twofold:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ One is the breadth of the services: Our ability to provide services for all the Veterans being housed at the project. We were told that is not going to be the case with the current VA caseload—nor should it be, because they are not there yet. The recommendation should for an additional provider with considerable supplemental services to meet VA. The other question to address is whether any services are missing (for example, pets and animal support).○ The second point revolves around outcome measures: What are they? Is the Secretary requiring ongoing measurement and is there recourse if that measurement fails? Ms. Deutchmann stated that it is the FAC's job to make requests of the Secretary in those regards, so that there is a constant measurement factor and response to ensure our Veterans are cared for properly.

- Ms. Flanz noted that the Draft Master Plan called for the establishment of a unique structure in the VA system: A 3-senior executive leadership team at this facility.
 - Ms. Ann Brown is the overall medical center director. She has Mr. Robert McKendrick (Mack) as the senior executive over the outpatient services.
 - Ms. Flanz is the senior executive as the leader over the Master Plan, which will ultimately be for the management and operation of the non-health care activities north of Wilshire.
- Dr. Davis noted that Ms. Deutchmann points were valid and added:
 - The FAC committee could benefit from some additional briefs in a larger context. Part of what is done here at this facility, and even will be done on the campus, is not guided strongly by policy and practice and procedures, etc., that have been determined—especially whether it is under health care strictly, or social services, or the homeless program—to be the best and informed practices that will produce good results. That information needs to be in play here. This FAC needs to know what the guidance is, including what housings are evaluated and the metrics used.
- Mr. Hernandez seconded Ms. Flanz’s idea to have a general discussion around the table regarding services on the campus:
 - We have a services committee that is looking up what services are not here and what services need to be ramped up. It would be worthwhile to have those personnel, including Ms. Marston, who will be making determinations about the services on this campus. I would recommend including that at our next meeting.
 - What we heard yesterday was a very stable and professional presentation of three partners who went into an RFP, but one-third of them could be removed without a lot of interaction by outside people. Let’s look at that to ensure that we have the appropriate level of services for the 1200+ Veterans who will be living on the campus.
- Mr. Hernandez suggested the following:
 - Let’s start getting more representatives on the CVEB that geographically represent the affected Veterans. We have to have those services from the Los Angeles region represented throughout the region, and we have to extend those services throughout the region, not solely here because this is the primary concern of the property.
 - If any of the potential contract awardees have a concern, then I am of the impression that those members should also be present to make sure that there is no conflict of interest. To me, that is right on the cusp of a conflict of interest because you are basically feathering your own bed. My concern is Veterans; my concern is not business. My concern is conducting the business of treating our Veterans to the best of our ability and utilizing the resources we have to alleviate those concerns.
- Ms. Leticia Colchado stated that the campus is charged with serving a vast area of the county and areas outside of LA County. Strategies need to be put in place to ensure that connections to Veterans are not dependent on Veterans coming to the campus. There should be extensive outreach outside of the campus, co-location of Veteran VA staff from the campus, other mainstream systems, and other community locations outside of the county, across the county, across the entire service region.
- Lt. Gen. Hopper noted:
 - VEO will ensure representation across the board.
 - The FAC will ask Ms. Flanz and Marston to reengage when they brief the entire committee.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The FAC will have to plow through some of what is in the RFP to get to the bottom of what this means for service providers. ○ The Creating Options for Veterans Expediting Recovery (COVER) Commission FAC is working in the PTSD area. Going forward, this FAC should collaborate with the COVER Commission FAC.
CHIP IN Act Brief Office of Real Property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Michael Kraycinovich introduced himself as being part of the Office of General Counsel. He also introduced one of his office staff attorneys, Mr. Francis Gainer, the lead attorney for all things on WLA campus. ● Mr. Kraycinovich noted the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ By the way of general background, VA has had—and continues to have—donation authority to receive funds, gifts, equipment, and facilities. ○ We have special authority for donations with respect to our National Cemeteries, but a special need was required for Omaha. ○ Donations can be stocks, bonds, or mutual funds. The key determination before we accept a gift or a donation is, does VA have a need for it? ○ For any construction of a facility, we need two things: Appropriation and authorization. ○ What we had with respect to Omaha was an appropriation. We had money to spend on design, and at the same time, we had a donating entity that wanted to contribute private funds. What VA lacked was the ability to use both of those at the same time without seeking authorization to construct the facility. That is what gave rise to CHIP IN: the ability to raise funds for a specific project and to apply private funds to it. ○ The CHIP IN Act is not a donation of funds. ○ Under the CHIP IN Act, we receive a facility/structure or land or both. ○ We turn over the project that has already been determined to be a bona fide need of the department—that is, through our Strategic Capital Investment Priorities (SCIP) process—and then we turn it over to that developer and they deliver a facility. The process is hands-off; however, the facility is built to our standards. ○ SCIP is a relatively new structured process at VA. It is a list that spells out all our requirements. The process works by identifying a philanthropist, somebody with the means to donate to this facility, who would come with a contractor or developer and then pick from the list of requirements and deliver that to us. ○ The purpose of CHIP IN was really to reduce the SCIP backlog because what you have in any appropriation process is a fight for the most important things, and there are a lot of important things on that list. However, some are less important. The hope was that we would have a philanthropist come in and say we are going to build out exactly what you need and remove it from the list. ○ The Act authorizes two types of donations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The first is having a specific project appropriated for a facility. ▪ The second one is where VA gives no money. We have a need but not an appropriated project; it is a turnkey-type project where the developer comes in and delivers the facility. ○ You will note in the Office of the Inspector General (OPIG) audit report, which is required by the Act and was published by the General Accountability Office in December 2018, that VA is making progress with respect to the process of receiving delivery of these facilities. We are authorized by pilot projects. We have one in Omaha. There are some initial discussions underway with respect to the second pilot.

But the general process is that we receive some overture from the developer or philanthropist and we determine whether we have a need for it (i.e., is it on the SCIP list). Then, we get together and develop the requirements. Getting to the application is a process. VA works with the developer and the philanthropist to shape that. The application is then received and evaluated, resulting in a formal agreement. Then we make a public announcement and provide courtesy notice to Congress. Then the developer will engage in designing the structure, if a design needs to be done.

- Mr. Brandilyne Stockstill stated that Omaha is the only example they have.
 - A lot of pre-work was done to develop the donor group for the Omaha pilot.
 - They called the Board of Directors concurrently with that initiative coming together. When they pulled together the board and went through the design process, it took about 9 or 10 months and was just completed.
 - The Omaha World-Herald submitted an article about the design of it—Leo A. Daly is the architect with whom the board had contracted. Because it is outside of VA, we anticipate a reduced timeline compared to what we typically see in the VA construction and design process.
- Mr. Kracynovich stated that what comes first depends on what the philanthropist is proposing to do. We hope it is picking off of our menu where everything is pretty much done, but that may not be the case.
- Ms. Flanz asked about the specifics of what the group anticipates doing on the campus:
 - On this campus, we have a series of projects which we are calling our major construction projects to replace this hospital and the other health care facilities on the south campus.
 - On the north campus, we anticipate using our EUL authority to build supportive housing for homeless Veterans. We also have other services that are not housing or health care—a town center, innovation, or entrepreneurial space. Can you speak to which, if any, of those things on this campus the CHIP IN Act would and would not be suitable for, why and why not?
- Mr. Kracynovich stated that you cannot use EUL and CHIP IN together. The only authority that VA has for supportive housing is EUL—not the CHIP IN Act. Under the EUL authority, the developer is generating profit. Under the CHIP IN Act, we do not and cannot compensate the developer, as required by law. For example, the chapel on campus: what is the best authority to renovate that? We would propose using the WLA Leasing Act, specifically awarding a lease for its renovation, along with equally important supportive services. CHIP IN is good for facilities and structures; it does not necessarily have to be a medical facility. It can be a power station to support a medical facility, but it cannot be housing.
- Ms. Flanz stated that, in addition to a replacement hospital, they have plans for other buildings on the south side of campus to include outpatient clinics and research facilities. Those projects may be a good fit for CHIP IN if they can find a donor group or entity to assist with those.
- Mr. Dan Rosenfeld asked that the issue of the historic buildings be addressed.
 - As a citizen with 40 years in this community, I think of VA's presence and the hospital, the cemetery, and those beautiful buildings along Wilshire and the state of those buildings as a symbol of the treatment of Veterans' issues; I think it is deplorable today.

- Just like the U.S. Capitol or the Vietnam Memorial, the symbolism of those buildings is very important to the stature with which we hold the activities that take place here. I believe there would be popular support for privately financing the restoration of those buildings.
- I was involved with Los Angeles City Hall, where the Federal Government provided \$140 million for the structural work but was unwilling to pay for the architectural improvements. A non-profit was established called Project Restore, which has raised millions of dollars privately; all that work has been done with private money. The building is beautiful today. If we could fundraise in the broader community, those of us who drive by that chapel almost every day would love to contribute to making it beautiful again.
- Mr. Allman asked if a potential CHIP IN project needs to be on the SCIP chart. Is it required?
- Mr. Kraycinovich said yes: If the FAC is interested in utilizing the CHIP IN Act on this campus, then that project needs to be identified in the SCIP chart. In VA, this is done through the alternative path, by adding it to the SCIP list. He noted that the SCIP list also has major as well as minor construction projects.
- Mr. Stockstill stated that the way a project gets added to the SCIP list is by someone at the medical center or by leadership identifying it as a need. That is the first phase, which is called our action plan. It shows all our gaps: that we have space, we have parking, we have energy, security, a bunch of different issues that can be resolved by a project's identified needs. If you want the project to be funded in the first year and want it to be part of the CHIP IN process, it proceeds into the business case phase, which is the second phase. During the business case, a more detailed application is created for the project. Once it gets submitted to our central office, it gets prioritized on a national basis. Assuming it does not over-exceed gaps and it answers all the questions in the business case, it gets added to our approved business case list from a SCIP priority. Then it gets included in the budget. That cycle starts around January. We are about ready to start January 2019 for the FY 2021 cycle. The action plan phase goes from January to March, and then the business case goes from March until May. Projects get prioritized in the June timeframe.
- Someone at VA WLA is responsible for the SCIP process. Several projects are included on the SCIP list.
- There are multiple legally permissible ways to address the question raised about historic structures. One of them is CHIP IN, one of them is the Leasing Authority under the WLA Leasing Act.
- The fundamental question is which is going to be easiest and most cost-effective? If you choose a path that requires Congress to authorize a project, you are adding layers of complexity and lots of time. If you choose a path that allows private donations to be used outside of the government appropriation and authorization project, you have removed layers of red tape that add time and cost.
- There are multiple ways the CHIP IN Act could work. An argument could be made that the chapel is part of the overall health care facility and could be put in the SCIP, but once you do that, the various layers of oversight and authority that Congress attached to the CHIP IN Act apply in ways they would not if 1887 Fund or some other lessee raised the money privately, and under the terms of their lease, funded and did the work themselves.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SCIP is tied to a specific project, not to any monetary value. If it is the chapel, that is one project. • Ms. Deutchman noted that the cemetery has a non-profit foundation behind it that raises money separately. There are two different foundations—one is historical, and one is cemetery—that are raising money for related entities. She stated that there was something brought up in a past meeting about the possibility of putting VSO offices in one of the historic buildings that is not suitable for housing. • Ms. Flanz clarified the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are looking into ways we could reuse the building that the American Red Cross built on the south campus, which has some administrative office space. That was the context, not the historic buildings. ○ Our conversations around the historic buildings have focused on which types of services are permissible as a lease under the WLA Leading Act and the appropriate use of each building. Our working theory was that the best way to facilitate the renovation of those buildings using private funds was under a lease of the WLA Leasing Act. • Mr. Hernandez noted that this project would be right for a donation or even financial support from various industries to develop the property because it is being utilized by Veterans, and Veterans are an integral part of our community. By the same token, if the Community Reinvestment Act finances can assist in the development, we can go ahead and identify those public utilities, banking institutions, and insurance companies to make sure that we get some funding here and decide if it is necessary to go to the CHIP IN Act. He emphasized that the money is there. If nobody taps into it, it is often because they do not know the process of getting into the Community Reinvestment Act facility or the procedures to get the funding. • Mr. Kraycinovich stated that, in terms of what to do first, his view would be to proceed with the Principal Developer, receive the Master Plan, and concurrently work the CHIP IN donation. The CHIP IN donation and its application is in its infancy, and Mr. Kraycinovich does not think the priority should be to proceed with the Principal Developer, receive that money, and move forward. The CHIP IN has a sunset of 2021. The FAC will have to have all the other four pilots all worked out and ready to go, as Omaha was a year in the making, at least. The sunset clause is provided for in the statute. There is a possibility the Government Accountability Office (GAO) is required to do an audit. The CHIP IN Act is the exclusive authority for VA. However, we could receive, as a regular donation under our general donation authority, a structure. But it would go through the SCIP process of determining whether we really had the need for that structure. • Lt. Gen. Hopper asked the following question: Do EUL projects go into the SCIP, and if not, why not? • Mr. Kraycinovich stated that EUL projects do go into the SCIP. However, EUL projects are a disposal process. That is one of the opportunities for disposing of unneeded land and buildings. We have a lot of land and buildings. That is part of the space gap issue. • Based on the robust conversation that the FAC has around the CHIP IN Act, Lt. Gen. Hopper asked the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This has been complex and confusing. Do we need to have more clarity on how we dig into this a little bit more? Do we need a specific discussion of what is on the SCIP and what needs to be on the SCIP? Do we need to have the Principal Developer come in and give us some thoughts on how to anticipate using the CHIP IN Act and/or the SCIP
--	--

	<p>process to fulfill the WLA Leasing Act requirement?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Deutchman recommended the following: Rather than asking the developer for specifics regarding use of the CHIP IN, ask them for a proforma that explains their sources and uses. Then you can see where they are getting their funds, what sources they attempting to use, and any tax credits they are using. That would be one major source for the affordable housing component; what are some other uses and what is their budget? We are not looking into the shares of their profit, simply where they are planning to get their funds. Then we decide whether we think it is feasible and whether they are on strong foundational territory. • Lt. Gen. Hopper noted: We have successfully flipped this over to the Master Plan subcommittee to add some order to the way they are thinking about this. There are going to be some requirements for additional information. By giving it to the subcommittee, we have the opportunity to speed up that process and not necessarily kick this all the way to our next meeting. Perhaps some information papers or something similar, as well as more information from Meghan, the IPT, and the attendees here, would help us make a good recommendation that also acknowledges the budget cycle and the sunset clause. This must fit into the budget cycle, and the sunset clause has an impact, even if we note that it will be extended/moved whatever.
<p>Purple Line/Metro Brief</p> <p>Kasey Shuda, Manager, Construction Relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Kasey Shuda introduced herself as the Manager at Construction Relations for the Metro Purple Line sections 1, 2, and 3. • Ms. Marleen Walker introduced herself as the Assistant Manager at Construction Relations for the Purple Line extension. She stated that she has specific emphasis for the section 3, although she has some oversight for the other sections as well. • Ms. Shuda gave an overview of the metro Purple Line project and schedule. She noted that some advanced utility relocation will be starting in March. Currently, the metro Purple Line ends in Koreatown on Wilshire at Western. It is going to be extended almost 9 miles. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 1 of the Purple Line will add new stations at Wilshire La Brea, Wilshire Fairfax, and Wilshire La Cienega. That construction has been underway since 2014. There will be a celebration for the halfway in May. ○ Section 2 of the Purple Line: New stations at Wilshire and Rodeo in Beverly Hills and Century City at Constellation. Construction started about two years ago. Things are progressing well. ○ Section 3 of the Purple Line: Two new stations at Westwood UCLA and Westwood in the VA Hospital. ○ The Purple Line was broken up into three projects, mainly for funding purposes. It was easier to get smaller chunks of billions of dollars from the Federal Government. ○ Section 1 is scheduled to open all three stations at the same time in 2023. ○ Section 2: the two stations will open together in 2025. ○ Section 3 is scheduled to open at the end of 2026. ○ We anticipate starting here on VA if all goes well in June of this year. That will start with true relocation; Q3 2019 is our goal. We will take construction all the way out and finish up with system testing starting in 2026. We do about a year of system testing, opening at the end of 2026. ○ We are going to upgrade the Southern California Edison (SCE) substation around the VA campus. We will bring additional power to the Sawtelle station to run the subway. We are not going to be taking any existing power. We will be adding our own power.

- We will extend lines down Ohio, up Federal, over to Wilshire and onto the VA campus. That will help power the subways. We anticipate this starting in March. It will take one year.
- We work on Ohio and Federal during the daytime hours and on Wilshire at night. We will maintain one lane of traffic in each direction at all times, so only temporary parking restrictions and usually only 1 to 2 blocks at a time. The red line will not be under construction all at once. We will take it two blocks at a time, most likely Ohio and Federal to Wilshire.
- We currently have advanced utility relocations going on on Wilshire Boulevard by the UCLA station at Westwood. We have been working there since April. Utility relocation at Westwood will take two years because of all the lines we need to get out of the way of the future subway.
- The VA Hospital station: our proposed station areas will have our station entrance and exit on the south side of Wilshire, to the east of Bonsall. In the purple area is where we will be having the station and the drop-off area.
- We will upgrade bus service on Wilshire Boulevard, which is at an elevation, and on Bonsall on the north side of campus. There are proposals to add new traffic lights at Wilshire and Bonsall and ramps to help facilitate that traffic flow.
- A steel and glass facility would be at the underground entrance and exit. There would be stairs and escalators in this facility, and elevators as well; two of each.
- In addition to the station, we will create a drop-off area for the station. It is what we call now a kiss-and-ride, not really a park-and-ride. We do not want anyone parking there for long periods of time, but there will be an entrance to a loop-around area and some short-term parking while you wait for your passengers to come or get out of the car. This will also be coordinated at some point with the Uber and Lyft situation. This is south of Wilshire.
- On the north side of Wilshire, we will create a set of escalators, stairs, and elevators to get people on the north side of Bonsall up to Wilshire.
- Between now and 2026, we are going to get into some construction, plans, and renderings. The purple area is the area that Metro is going to use for construction purposes, to build the underground subway tunnels and the station. The underground station is 100 feet below ground and 1000 feet wide. That needs to be dug out slowly, excavated, and then built back up. On campus, this is the area where we will be performing our construction.
- Off Dowlen, the purple area is next to the GLA property. We will create an access road that we will share with VA until late 2025, mainly the entire length of the construction project. We anticipate starting construction in this area in the spring of 2019. Right now, we believe that to be June. We will start work in this area in the spring of 2019 and will last here on this piece of property all the way through the opening in 2026.
- As we move over toward Bonsall and the parking area, we anticipate starting in that area in the summer of 2019, and then in the parking lot in summer 2020.
- We will not be closing Bonsall. We believe that we will be able to keep it open at all times. We will slightly shift the alignment of the road. During stage 1 of our construction when we are working on the east side of Bonsall, we will be maintaining one lane in each direction on the west side of the street with a sidewalk open. When we switch to working on the west side of the street, we will have Bonsall open with one lane in each direction with a sidewalk on the east side of the street.
- Our truck trip plan: all our tunnel-boring dirt will come starting in late summer on the

	<p>left side of campus and exiting directly onto Wilshire, heading down Wilshire and getting on the 405.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Our truck drifts will occur in various stages. If we look at when we are starting in the summer, we are averaging about 50 trucks a day according to our environmental document. Then when we move into major tunneling, we will be up to 130 trucks a day. ○ The staging areas will be surrounded by staging yards. We build 20-foot sound walls that have sound blankets on the interior of the yard. We also do noise mitigation at the source. ○ Metro has a very extensive environmental document that lists all our mitigations for the project, including noise control. ○ We have noise mitigation levels that are directed by the county and that we have worked with VA on. Usually, 5 dB over ambient is our regulation. ○ We also have vibration monitoring. ○ Dust is a huge issue. We use all-covered loads; every truck will have a cover, and nothing will be exposed. We hand-sweep the work area. We will have people on shift to keep the outside of our staging yard clean. ○ Metro has a green policy that holds us to higher standards than are normally required from the city and county of Los Angeles. We are doing more than required from our agencies based on Metro's policy. ○ We have to be in compliance with the air quality per the South Coast Air Quality Management District. They follow us closely. We had them stop by our other projects unannounced to make sure everything was in regulation. ○ We use all Tier 4 equipment—that is the highest level of equipment that is needed. We have inspectors and monitors who will be watching this project on a daily basis and are required to give reports. ○ There is a mural on a part of the Bonsall ramp, west Wilshire, west bound, going down to Bonsall. We need to remove that mural in order to build the escalator stairs. We know it has significance on campus so we have created an art program to help memorialize it. We are going to ask Veterans to help create a mosaic of that image. We would like that to be complete before we even demolish the wall. It is a long process through bureaucracy. We have to go to the county Department of Public Works, Arts Commission, the board of supervisors, Department of Military, and Veterans Affairs to make sure everyone is on board. We will keep you apprised of that process. We hope to get started in about a year. ○ Metro has services for Veterans in our gateway headquarters, and we would like to start engaging with you more now that we are going to be on campus. We will have a field office on the campus, probably in Westwood, starting in the next year or so. We want to help translate Metro's services directly to the residents of campus and people who will be using services here. That includes discounted tap cards, helping leverage military experience to civilian jobs and other programs that Metro has listed. ○ Metro has a lot of small business requirements for the contracts. We have awarded one contract so far. However, we did not get a notice to proceed. We expect to work directly with the campus to help ensure that those programs are being utilized. ● Mr. Hernandez stated that the Metropolitan Transit Authority has an MOU with the Veterans Alliance, which is a disabled Veterans business alliance. They provide an extensive number of hiring opportunities, and they also utilize a substantial number of
--	--

disabled Veteran business enterprises in the majority, if not all, of their projects. They do have at least 5%, if not more. I believe that anywhere between 5% and 50% of their projects are utilizing disabled Veteran business enterprises. They allocate those positions for the Veterans.

- Ms. Shuda stated that they have been holding quarterly community meetings, mainly in the Westwood area because all their work has been in the Westwood area.
 - Our next meeting is Thursday, March 21, but as we get ready to start construction on campus, we hope to be having on-campus meetings to help facilitate and educate people who live on campus, work on campus, and deal with campus impacts.
 - Most of the comments we hear are: Can we get a parking lot and restrooms? What will ridership look like? How long will it take me to get downtown?
 - We anticipate working with VA to define the exact area, number, and look of the replacement parking spaces. However, Metro will have to replace the parking spaces that we are taking from the lot just south of Wilshire.
 - We are getting ready to finalize a lot of the final environmental documents that we need. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has been heavily involved and we are on the same page. We anticipate wrapping everything up by this spring, around March/April. There might be a slight delay because of the government shutdown.
- Ms. Flanz remarked that VA and LA Metro have had two conversations.
- One is on the environmental documentation that LA Metro has to have completed to move to the next phase of its funding. The second is the negotiation of a temporary and permanent easement; it is a real estate transaction. They are related, but not the same. Both are proceeding on pace. We are not quite done with the real estate transaction. We are closer to being done on the environmental side.
 - The final approval authority regarding the project is a delegated authority to the Office of Real Property. It has authority from the Secretary to grant easements. The WLA Leasing Act authorizes the Secretary to grant easements and leases. Those authorities within the VA system have been delegated to the Office of Real Property, which is in the Office of Construction and Facilities Management in DC.
 - There has been a lot of GLA involvement because the impact of both the environmental piece and the real estate transaction is local.
 - When the Secretary was here on campus, he asked a lot of very specific questions about the Purple Line. Depending on which part of LA you live in, you either completely bought into the LA Metro or maybe you have not. The Secretary asked a lot of questions and was of the firm opinion that we cannot properly serve Veterans living and working on this campus if they do not access to good, strong public transportation to get them from the campus to jobs, other activities, and the surrounding community.
- Ms. Shuda noted that Metro has authorized a contract to do first-last mile resource planning, to look at the first-last mile gap. We will be working here on campus with staff to facilitate programs and means of transportation that help get people to and from the subway within a mile of the subway. That program will likely start this month, coming to campus and looking at ways to help facilitate those connections.
- Ms. Shuda added that slide 15 of her presentation showcases the shared access road. This is where the majority of their construction staging and truck traffic will take place. The majority of their trucks will be coming off the shared access road over here on the left side of campus, away from Bonsall.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Shuda stated that her team is willing to give presentations to smaller groups as necessary. If the FAC has a smaller group that is interested in learning about the project or different pieces of it, they would be happy to come present anywhere, anytime to give updates on the Purple Line.
Certification to New Member Lieutenant General (R) John D. Hopper Jr., Committee Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lt. Gen. Hopper welcomed Mr. James Battista, the newest FAC member. He presented him with his certificate. Lt. Gen. Hopper asked Mr. Battista to introduce himself to the group. Mr. Battista stated the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am very happy to be here. Thank you for having me. I grew up in Florida. Naval Academy, 2003. I had the opportunity to attend SEAL training and became a SEAL to SEAL team 8. I deployed several times to Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, and Mexico. Spent 10 years on SEAL teams. I got married, started a family, decided on another career path, and ended up getting out and going back to school at Rice University and earned my MBA. My focus was energy, oil and gas. I ended up working in oil and gas for a couple years in Houston and had an opportunity to come out here to LA. I currently work at a multi-family office investment advisement firm here in Beverly Hills. A lot of what I do is around real estate. Most of my clients have large allocations in real estate, among other things. I hope to bring some business experience to the group. I come here for my health care as well, so I have an investment from that perspective.
Breitburn/DAV Agreements Brief Richard Valdez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Richard Valdez introduced himself as the legislative director for Disabled American Veterans Department in California. He shared the following details about the Breitburn Agreements with the FAC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EUL is the model part of the West LA Leasing Act of 2016. Myself as well as a number of the VSOs here and Vet Advocacy were involved with Master Plan development in early 2015. The Leasing Act was to provide inclusion of all these things for our Veterans here on campus and also within the WLA service area. The key component of that, which involves us at DAV, is the transportation. I provided you with all the documents regarding the agreement with VA relative to the donation we are receiving from Breitburn. The amendments to the agreement are spelled out in the agreement. We received approximately \$260, 000 since the inception, which was in September 2017. With that initial sum of money, we have already purchased two vans for the transportation network here onsite, and those vans arrived over the weekend. They are now in VA's possession. I listed two key points in the agreement: #6, which means we shall provide transportation services to Veterans and their families to and from VA; and #9 specifically states that we will ensure that we follow all laws and regulations relative to the service, as well as transportation on campus, a shuttle service. We have to take into consideration public law 11562. We have guidelines and procedures. A key element that VA provides for us is the processing of volunteer driver applicants. The processing consists of background checks, a physical, and also whether the individual has their own insurance—not so much that the insurance is required as coverage on the vehicles themselves, but to

	<p>show that the Veteran is insurable and does have insurance in the event the driver has an accident that is totally his fault due to his negligence. That is something VA will not cover through their overall policy. The driver needs to have the insurance for those sorts of instances, which we have not encountered yet, but you never know.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With regard to our Veteran Transportation Network (VTN), we are providing the transportation service based on Veterans who call our coordinator for a ride to the facility for an appointment. The driver is covered under part B as an eligibility requirement. Spouses on Champ VA are also eligible for transportation. The problem we have when we go back to looking at the laws and regulations is that, to transport those individuals, children, and spouses that are not covered under Champ VA, we find ourselves in a quandary. ○ We find our major problem is with children, because the rules stipulate that our vehicles must be equipped with safety devices, harnesses, and accommodations to transport children. None of our current vehicles have that capability. That is something we are continuing to explore. ○ We are looking at establishing a campus shuttle service through the purchase of additional golf carts to provide that service here onsite within the first quarter of this year. ○ We are also looking into a volunteer driver recruitment strategy. We have 11 drivers right now and that fluctuates. ○ Regarding the Principal Developers and what they ultimately end up doing over time, I have seen some schedules over the next 6-10 years. The incremental development and the number of the Veterans that will reside onsite will get up to about 1200. Whether or not that occurs is something that we need to know for acquisition planning and asset assessment: the number of drivers we need, the acquisition of additional vehicles, and replacement of vehicles based on mileage and the length of time they have to stay in the shop for repairs. ○ We also need to know how many Veterans and possibly family members will utilize the UCLA VA Wellness Center. That is key with regard to expanding our current transportation network beyond what we are currently providing. Having those numbers will allow us to know what additional purchases we need, what additional training and drivers we need, and what other options we have to look into (for example, Lyft or some outside contracting). ○ With any of the efforts that we put forth here, ultimately the final decision resides with the director. We are gathering data which will allow us to provide much more definitive information to the CVEB and the director. We are also working with the community and the CVEB. ○ How are we going to get the information out that the services are available? We are looking at working and teaming with VA's Public Affairs office as we develop a strategy for getting that information out. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lt. Gen. Hopper asked who negotiated the \$260,000 and who determined it was 2.5%? ● Mr. Valdez stated that the relationship was worked out by VA. He noted that he provided the agreement to Mr. Chi Szeto. Mr. Szeto will send it to the FAC for review. Also included are the amendments that are addressed in the agreement, but they are not spelled out. The 2.5% determination was settled between VA and Breitburn. ● Dr. Davis remarked the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When we look at customer service in the context of access to medical care, that
--	---

	<p>access is critical. I know that you provide access to the VA Medical Centers across the country from assisted living facilities, CLCs, and rehab facilities that are used and contracted with VA. Reliability is key: Reliability to meet appointments, whether a patient is on campus or coming to the campus from someplace else. It is almost impossible to reliably move physically around the LA area. I would encourage you to set clear expectations for Veterans and providers. Start low, rather than over-promise and fail to meet expectations. Having a missed appointment has a tremendous impact. It affects the trust scores for the hospital care and everything else that we have. If there are barriers at the national level that we can help get out of the way, we should do so, because I have used the services that you provide and I know it can be challenging.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Communication has come up time and time again. We will be working to better support the facility, as well as the local VSOs and non-profits, to make sure the communications are out there. ○ I have executive oversight of the Veteran, Family, Caregiver and Survivor FAC, and I would like to talk to you further in headquarters to address the question you raised about accommodating family members and children. There may be some things that the other FAC can address. If you need to have a van that has seat belts and safety for children who are perhaps going to be living on campus with a single parent, we need to address that and eliminate barriers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Valdez responded that his team is exploring all the available options for facilitating that. He noted that Veterans getting to their appointments on time is paramount for his team when coordinating appointments. ● JH: Thank you. Here is the order: Mr. Battista, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Scheire, Mr. Allman, Leticia. ● Mr. Battista strongly urged the committee to review the agreements. ● Ms. Flanz provided an important clarification: Mineral rights are administered across the Federal Government. Any right to extract minerals from federal land is administered by the Department of the Interior. The underlying lease is administered by the Bureau of Land of Management. This is why it was so difficult for VA to extract anything from Breitburn; their lease is with a different federal agency. ● Mr. Battista asked the following: Do we receive any audited financials to make sure that what you are receiving is exactly what you are supposed to be receiving? ● Mr. Valdez noted that in the in-fact contract, part of the agreement specifies that, after the first year, these will be requirements. We are providing those as we speak. We are talking with the VA concourse team on the proposal we submitted. We provided them some of the data in terms of overall monies received and expended through the end of November. We will be providing additional data in future reports that covers all aspects of the monies received, copies of the payment method and our deposit statements, and ultimately how we are utilizing those funds. ● Lt. Gen. Hopper asked Mr. Valdez the following: How do we clarify that 2.5% of their profit is in fact what you got? ● Mr. Valdez clarified that the agreement was discussed between VA and Breitburn. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We were merely the recipients of the agreement. We had not questioned the basis of the agreement. I had asked for at least a ballpark figure in terms of what VA receives so that we can at least have an estimate of what we might potentially receive, and on average, I would say we are getting about \$15,000 each time they render payment to
--	--

us or a donation.

- Lt. Gen. Hopper stated that he was asked to notify Ms. Flanz that Breitburn financials go to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).
- Mr. Battista asked the following: Do the funds flow from Breitburn directly to DAV or do they flow from Breitburn to VA and then to you?
- Mr. Valdez stated that he will provide that documentation. He added that when they receive payments, it is listed as being from Breitburn. It does not say VA or BLM. He will provide a sample to Mr. Szeto to distribute to the FAC.
- Mr. Valdez noted that the agreement between DAV and Breitburn relative to the donation is the first item that the FAC may have a copy of. That is the agreement VA signed. It is dated September 2017. The first donation DAV received from Breitburn was July 21, 2017 in the amount of \$12,618.98. Prior to that time, DAV was not receiving any royalties from Breitburn.
- HH: My concern is how do you develop all these statistics, the driving back and forth or providing transportation, specifically from LA to the facility here?
- Mr. Valdez informed Mr. Hernandez that he will get back to him about the noted disruption in transportation services. As far as he knows, they have not had any problems other than what was brought to his attention last week. That had to do with gas cards for the vehicles that were not operable because they were getting close to running out of gas, which would interrupt service, but it was taken care of before that occurred.
- Mr. Scheire stated the following:
 - It seems like DAV provides a certain subset of the transportation on campus. I would love to see what Veterans Transportation Service (VTS) provides, what DAV provides, what we are estimating the service to jump to, and how we are going to pay for that and ramp those up in the future.
 - I am really happy to hear that you are working with VA on communications, and it further reinforces the fact that we need to have an integrated, strategic communications plan.
 - The system to approve contractors across VA is broken at best. I have experienced it here on the campus and it is worse than a DMV. If we could make a recommendation to fix that across VA, I think it will reduce costs for the entire VA and improve the level of service for all contractors, and ideally remove a bottleneck that we will continue to experience as you onboard more and more contractors to do a lot of this work here at West LA.
- Mr. Allman asked: It looks like Breitburn went through bankruptcy in April of 2018. They are still paying you?
- Mr. Valdez responded yes.
- Mr. Allman asked: VA just unilaterally decided to give DAV almost \$13,000 a month?
- Mr. Valdez stated that he was not privy to any of those discussions.
 - Early on, the Secretary asked if I would pull together a group of Veteran Service Leaders in southern California. In the first conversation I had with Vince, he brought up that ultimately there is going to be a transportation issue, and I agreed that this was a high probability and that we would try to our best to accommodate it with our transportation network. That was the extent of it. That was in early 2015. What discussions transpired over the end of the year when the Master Plan was being developed, and ultimately to the point where we are now with regards to the

	<p>legislation that made it public law, I have no idea, nor does DAV, regarding the content of those discussions between VA and Breitburn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Allman asked Mr. Valdez if he could talk about what they have done with the revenue so far. • Mr. Valdez stated that they purchased two vehicles. He added that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part of the Veteran transportation service that is provided at all VAs is done by VA. Other facilities have special arrangements, but when the VTS was put into place, it was for VA to pick up disabled Veterans, blind Veterans, and wheelchair bound Veterans. ○ We entered into an agreement early on to supplement that by picking up all other Veterans and transporting them to and from their appointments. • Ms. Flanz interjected and provided context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have a subsurface drilling lease administered by another federal agency. The original lease is older than I am. ○ The DMP and the WLA Leasing Act provide specific legal requirements that this property be used for the principal benefit of Veterans and their families. The folks who were then in charge had to figure out how to negotiate a deal with a lessee and another federal agency. The lessee was really only accountable to that other federal agency to provide something that allowed us to make Veteran-centric use of an oil well that has been on this property since a long time ago. That led to the negotiations, which led to an agreement by Breitburn to provide 2.5% of its royalties to go into a fund to be used to meet a need. ○ The need that was identified at the time was a need that was not being met and probably is not being met well now either: transportation for Veterans onto and around the campus. At the time, DAV was the obvious partner for VA because DAV nationally provides transportation services. I am told by the individual from the Office of Real Property who did those negotiations that it was something far more violent than pulling teeth to get 2.5% out of an entity who could rightly say, "VA, we do not even have an agreement with you. We just stand on your property to put a drill under your property to tap into subsurface mineral deposits that are administered by the Bureau of Land Management." ○ That is how we got where we are, and We have been working ever since then to ensure that the monies are as well-spent as possible to meet as fully as possible the very specific and complex transportation needs of Veterans and their families. ○ The arrangement that VA has nationally with DAV does not require competition. I think it was handled that way because it was a preexisting relationship that did not require competitive contracting, which can be time-consuming. • Mr. Valdez explained why drivers need proof of insurance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show they are insurable; under VA liability coverage, they are all self-insured. ○ If anything were to occur that is not the driver's fault, it is covered by VA. VA is not held liable for any negligence on the driver's part. ○ If a driver or anybody else operating on behalf of the Federal Government is a volunteer, they cannot be reprimanded. The VA's ability to control their behavior and ensure that they behave safely is far less than with a paid employee for whom the consequences of negligence are obvious. We have to manage a program that involves volunteer drivers differently. The fundamental question is, should the very different
--	---

	<p>nature of transportation needs for Veterans and their families residing on this campus result in a different approach, such as having a corps of VA employees who can be properly managed to provide this transportation service?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Colchado stated that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is a huge liability issue, even for VA. If I am a Veteran who is being picked up by one of the volunteer drivers advertised on a flyer I obtained at a VA campus—a driver that you guys are endorsing as a way of transportation—and the driver’s insurance liability limits do not cover any of my potential damages and injuries, how can I feel confident about getting in the van? ○ If that is the process and policy, we need to look at making recommendations that all these drivers be VA insured employees, or that the contract includes some kind of provision to make sure the volunteer driver is protected. Otherwise, I know I would not volunteer to be a driver if I knew the liability that I could be facing.
Way Ahead/Next Steps/Future Actions and date of Next Meeting DFO/Chair/FAC Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lt. Gen. Hopper discussed administrative matters, relating to the FAC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We only have the money for two more meetings this year, not including this one. ○ The dates in semi-concrete are 10 and 11 April and 10 and 11 July. If we discover during those two meetings that we have some things that we need to get to before the end of the calendar year, I will talk with Dr. Davis to get more money for another meeting. ○ The FAC cannot reach out to local or national organizations for donations or grants. It does not preclude individuals representing themselves (not the committee) from doing that. ○ Briefers should provide a read-ahead two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting. ○ The follow-the-money portion of the Master Planning subcommittee comes over to use the expertise of our money guy. We will work with that arrangement going forward. The emphasis is on collaboration between groups and individuals. • Mr. Scheire recommended that the committee create a document repository that is open to members. For ease of reference, the repository will have all the collected briefings that have happened to date, including all minutes post-meeting. • Dr. Davis noted that VA staff will work with Ms. Brown and Ms. Flanz to address the important communications concerns and recommendations that have been brought up. Dr. Davis stated that she will find out what is feasible in terms of the repository. Her intent is to have an easily accessible, forward-facing, publicly-accessible repository for everything related to this FAC so that the public or anyone else can access it. • Lt. Gen. Hopper stated that the FAC reached a consensus to begin subsequent meetings at 10:00 AM PDT. FAC will be tentatively shifted to 10:00-6:00 PDT. They will check with GLA to make sure that the meeting is administratively supported. • Lt. Gen. Hopper asked the FAC to break into their subcommittees. • Lt. Gen. Hopper thanked Dr. Davis for her time and expertise.
Recommendation Discussion/Vote DFO/Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lt. Gen. Hopper acknowledged Mr. Begland and Mr. Delgado, who joined the discussion via telephone. • Mr. Allman called up draft recommendation #8 for consideration. He stated that this recommendation is a time-sensitive issue, as discovered through the CHIP IN Act briefing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendation #8: In light of the scale and unique opportunity at VA West Los Angeles, VCOEB recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs direct the Veterans Health Administration to identify and include real property projects specific

<p>Anthony Allman, Master Plan Subcommittee</p>	<p>to the Draft Master Plan in VA's Strategic Capital Investment Plan by March 2019, permitting use of CHIP IN Act strategic partnerships.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommended suspense date: Q2 FY19 • Mr. Allman stated that they broke up the initial draft recommendation into three separate recommendations: #8, #9, and #10. That way, in case VA or the reviewers have a problem with the solicitation for the expertise, it does not hold up resourcing VA WLA or identifying any of the projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendation #9: VCOEB recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs properly resource VA West Los Angeles, and other VA offices associated with campus development, to carry out donations under the CHIP IN Act. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommended suspense date: Q2 FY19 ○ Recommendation #10: VCOEB recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs expedite the announcement of a solicitation to acquire expertise in promoting the CHIP IN Act to potential donors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommended suspense date: Q2 FY19 • Lt. Gen. Hopper suggested that recommendations #8, #9, and #10 go forward as a package under one cover letter that stresses the need for speed. The FAC, he remarked, needs to mention in the cover letter the sunset clause and budget deadlines. This should be done by May. • Lt. Gen. Hopper temporarily tabled recommendations #8, #9 and #10. He asked the FAC to approve these recommendations in principle and then table the final form for recommendation #8 until after they have gone through all the recommendations. • Lt. Gen. Hopper called on a motion to vote on recommendation #8. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Hernandez seconded the motion. ○ Lt. Gen. Hopper roll called and noted that the measure passed by a vote of 10 yeses and two abstentions. • Lt. Gen. Hopper called on a motion to vote on recommendation #9. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Hernandez seconded the motion. ○ Lt. Gen. Hopper roll called and noted that the measure passed by a vote of 10 yeses and two abstentions. • Lt. Gen. Hopper called on a motion to vote on recommendation #10. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Deutchmann moved to approve the motion. ○ The FAC held a discussion around recommendation #10. ○ Lt. Gen. Hopper roll called and noted that the measure passed by a vote of 10 yeses and two abstentions. • Mr. Allman called up the draft recommendation #6. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendation #6: VCOEB recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and Office of Real Property approve mutually agreeable plans for development and operations of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Purple Line extension station at VA West Los Angeles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommended suspense date: Q3 FY19 • Lt. Gen. Hopper called on a motion to vote on recommendation #6. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mr. Mangano moved to approve the motion. ○ Mr. Battista seconded the motion.
--	--

- The FAC held a discussion around recommendation #6.
- Lt. Gen. Hopper roll called and noted that the measure passed by a vote of nine yeses, two abstentions, and two nos.
- Ms. Serrano asked if there was a preferred format that the FAC was using to develop the recommendations for the Secretary.
- Mr. Scheire noted the following:
 - We are setting a dangerous precedent of getting a briefing just a couple of hours ago and putting a recommendation in front of the whole board when our subcommittee has not had the opportunity to look at it. I understand that we only meet quarterly, so we are always time constrained.
 - If it is not an emergency recommendation, I do not see what the rush is, especially given that the timelines are pretty broad and long. I feel uncomfortable being forced to make a decision today without having time to address what we heard.
- Mr. Mangano noted that any intel the FAC has regarding what makes a recommendation more palatable to the Secretary is important information. He added that, if there is any way to know from other advisory committees what has worked and what has not worked, what has and has not been approved, the format and wording, that would be helpful.
- Mr. Allman called up draft recommendation #3 for consideration.
 - He noted that this recommendation was drafted in response to OIG and their advice to get VCOEB and the Veteran community more involved in the land use agreements.
 - Recommendation #3: VCOEB recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs direct the VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System Medical Director to submit a comprehensive report of land use proposals—including short-term permits, revocable licenses, and interagency agreements—to the FAC for public review. VCOEB requests that a “Land Use Quarterly Report” be distributed to the FAC and posted on the VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System Master Plan website at least 15 days prior to the next scheduled FAC meeting. The Land Use Quarterly Report shall include a table summary of all active, under review, and expired land use agreements at VA West Los Angeles, to include active agreements and applications under review in the appendix.
 - Recommended suspense date: Q3 FY19
- Mr. Tenenbaum recommended that the FAC breaks for 15 to 30 minutes to allow members to review the email that Mr. Allman sent, the day prior, regarding the 10 recommendations.
 - Lt. Gen. Hopper moved to approve the motion.
 - Mr. Allman seconded the motion.
 - Lt. Gen. Hopper roll called and noted that the motion to recess passed.
- Lt. Gen. Hopper stated that the group will reconvene at 04.15 PM PDT.
- The FAC reconvened at 04.15 PM PDT.
- Lt. Gen. Hopper roll called to confirm that Mr. Begland and Mr. Delacruz were on the line.
- Mr. Allman made a motion to discuss recommendation #3.
- The FAC held a discussion around recommendation #3.
- Lt. Gen. Hopper tabled recommendations #3, #4 and #5 because some FAC members did not feel comfortable voting on them. He stated the following:
 - The yeses are in conflicts, coupled with some concerns about whether this is at the proper level for the Secretary, and how it fits in with some of our follow-on recommendations on communications.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The subcommittees are tasked to collaborate and come up with the proper wording that reflects the proper Secretarial oversight for recommendations #3, #4 and #5. At the point at which the subcommittees feel like they are ready to go, I am amenable to having a virtual meeting for the purpose of considering recommendations #3, #4 and #5. ● Mr. Allman read recommendation #11. He noted that this recommendation is becoming increasingly important because of the public feedback the FAC received regarding the need for communications. People do not know how to get communications clearly. The current system of writing your name and email address on a spreadsheet is not working. This recommendation makes a point that VA already uses a system-wide notification system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendation #11: VCOEB recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs direct the VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System Medical Director to publish all Draft Master Plan public notices and events under topic category “VISN 22-VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System – News & Announcements” in Granicus’ GovDelivery Communications Cloud, generating an automated notification to all subscribers. This recommendation ensures that all self-identified, interested parties enrolled in VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System’s electronic notification system are aware of significant actions related to the Draft Master Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommended suspense date: Q2 FY19 ● Lt. Gen. Hopper stated that the FAC does not direct the Secretary; it makes recommendations. ● Mr. Hernandez made on a motion to vote on recommendation #11. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lt. Gen. Hopper moved to approve the motion. ○ Mr. Mangano seconded the motion. ○ The FAC held a discussion around recommendation #11. ● Mr. Hernandez withdrew the motion to approve recommendation #11. ● Lt. Gen. Hopper acknowledged that the motion is withdrawn. ● Lt. Gen. Hopper stated that the way forward, as proposed by Mr. Mangano, was a collaborative effort between the Outreach and Communications and the Master Planning Services subcommittees. Both committees have 10 days to collaborate and present the FAC with a recommendation. Lt. Gen. Hopper asked that the two subcommittees prioritize this recommendation over the land use, because it comes up directly from the FAC’s interactions with the community. He asked that the subcommittees include the supporting information that can be included in the cover letter. In the meantime, the FAC will get more information about the communications process controlled locally in conjunction with the higher headquarters. ● Ms. Flanz requested that one or both subcommittees get on a quick call with the GLA communications staff to help them understand what is controllable and what is not. ● Lt. Gen. Hopper thanked all participants for their patience. He stated the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have four recommendations. We will make sure we have them in the SMART format and start composing the cover letter to get them moving forward into the process. ○ What we know about the process right now: We have heard a couple of reasons that the Secretary likes to see unvetted recommendations—unvetted does not mean that it has not gone to at least a preliminary staff look to go to the Secretary—and then
--	---

	<p>the Secretary presumably concurs and sends it back, and then it goes through a more complete staff look for implementation. Speed will always be determinable. It will probably always be subject to how quickly the staff works. However, nothing happens if we do not get a good, tight recommendation with a strong cover letter up to the Secretary and get the process started.</p>
Adjourn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Hernandez made a motion to adjourn the meeting. • Mr. Allman seconded the motion. • Mr. Hernandez adjourned the meeting at 04:47 PM PDT.

/s/ John D. Hopper, Jr.

John D. Hopper Jr.
Chair,
Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board
Federal Advisory Committee