

WEST LOS ANGELES VA MEDICAL CENTER

**Local Advisory Panel – Public Meeting
September 22, 2005
Wadsworth Theater**

Start Time: 12:00 PM

➤ **Participants:**

- **LAP Members Present:** Dean Stordahl, Director Loma Linda VAMC and LAP Chair; Alan Robinson, MD, Associate Dean, UCLA School of Medicine; Harry Corre, Ex-POWs, California Department Commander; Roger Brautigam, Under Secretary, California Department of Veterans Affairs; Steve Peck, Medical Social Worker and Site Director, US Vets Village at Cabrillo; Flora Gil Krisiloff, Chairwoman, Brentwood Community Council; Dean Norman, MD, Chief of Staff, West LA VAMC; Cindy Miscikowski, former LA City Councilwoman, 11th District
- **LAP Members Absent:** Barbara Tenzer, President, Tenzer Commercial Brokerage; Stewart Liff, Director, Los Angeles Veteran Benefit Administration Regional Office
- **PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC):** Scott Burns, Adrienne Setters, Brett Burt, Paul Chrencik
- **Perkins + Will:** Russell Triplett, Richard Dachman
- **Other Government Re-Use Contractors (OGC):** Tony Jimenez, MicroTech, LLC; Brian Murphy, CBRE; Eric Shreves, CBRE
- **VA:** Susan Pendergrass, Director, VA OSI; Peter Verdoljak, Capital Asset Manager, VISN 22; Ralph Tillman, Director, Asset Management, VA GLA; David Holt, Network Planner, VA Loma Linda; Beverly Fitzgerald, Public Affairs Officer, VA GLA; and Barbara Fallen, Operations Officer, VISN 22

I. Welcome and Introductions

- Introductions of Panel members
- Pledge of Allegiance: Led by Harry Corre

II. Purpose of Meeting and Review of Agenda

- Review of today's agenda
 - Recap of first meeting
 - Report of Administrative Meeting
 - Presentation of demand data
 - Presentation of Business Plan Options (BPOs)
- Index cards are available in the back of the room for the public to submit any clarifying questions that may arise during the presentations and prior to the public comment period

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Panel will deliberate on the BPOs after public comment period. The public is welcome to attend the LAP deliberations.
- Issues and concerns raised from last LAP meeting:
 - Should lengthen public comment time from two to three hours for the second LAP meeting. That was addressed for today's meeting.
 - Should devote time in the evening to allow those not able to attend during the day to participate. This was addressed in scheduling this evening's public comment period from 4:00 PM and 7:00 PM.
 - Request for clarification on demand data that was presented on the Iraqi combat veterans. This will be accomplished in Dave Holt's demand data presentation.
- The LAP may recommend additional options to go forward to the Secretary.
- Discussed unresolved issues from first public meeting.
- Public Questions – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Will the summary from administrative meeting be made available to the public? Also requests clarification to the previous LAP meeting notes. During that meeting she submitted letter from February 2002 from Secretary Principi that states that no commercial development would occur and promised that the community would have a new 25 year land use master plan process after the CARES process.
 - Dean Stordahl: Understands that this is the initiation of the Congressionally-mandated Master Land Use Plan Process.
- Public Question – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Congress-mandated that there will be an additional Master Plan
 - Dean Stordahl: Will get this issue clarified during the presentations this morning, and, if not, will get clarification on this topic subsequent to the presentation and published on the website.
- Public Question – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Names were not included in the meeting summary from the last LAP meeting. Requests that names are included, since the LAP decided this would be the process in the standard operating procedures.
 - Dean Stordahl: Will get clarification to answer the question.

III. Standard Operating Procedures Review: Dean Stordahl

- Options were developed by Team PwC and OGCs
- Options were posted on VA website and Scott Burns will review during today's meeting
- There will be 10 days after today's meeting to submit additional comments
- Please do not applaud or denounce options during option presentation
- Written testimony can also be submitted and carries equal weight in the CARES process

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- If a point has already been presented, speakers should reiterate their support of that position and not use the entire time allotted to repeat comments
- Public comment period begins at 4:00 PM
- LAP Chair will read off five names at a time to move up towards the microphone
- Decision will be made whether to record names and organizations of speakers
- Question from the Audience: Will you deliberate without seeing all of the public testimony?
 - Answer – Dean Stordahl: The panel will not have had an opportunity to review all testimony, but in the examples that have been read previously, there seems to be commonality in the feelings conveyed by stakeholders with which the LAP can deliberate.

IV. Review of Administrative Meeting

- Review of Standard Operating Procedures from first public meeting
- Discussion about the process for the public testimony portion of the meeting
- No yielding of time or substitutions during public comment period
- Four terminals are available in the theater lobby for comment submission to the CARES website
- Purpose of meeting was to clarify content submitted by Team PwC
- Panel members were asked not to discuss options after the meeting
- Panel will vote on BPOs during today's public meeting from 7:00 PM – 9:00 PM
- Reviewed materials that will be presented during the public meeting
- LAP members asked questions throughout the meeting and were requested to ask those same questions during the public meeting for the benefit of the public
- Standard Operating Procedures were affirmed from the first public meeting

V. Review of Demand Data and Demographics: David Holt, VA Planner

- Presentation titled: *Challenges Facing VA in Meeting Enrolled Veterans Future Health Care Demand*
- Overview of the demand model
- Presented California Market enrollment by priority level
- Review of domiciliary beds and homeless demand
- Review of existing Los Angeles Area non-VA homeless and substance abuse beds (on and off campus)
- Existing Los Angeles Area homeless demand
- Nursing home beds: VA and State Veterans Homes
- Iraqi War veterans, Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) data and data assumptions
- LAP Questions related to Demand Presentation:

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Question – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Why do nursing home and domiciliary beds remain steady on Slide 5?
- Answer – David Holt: 321 domiciliary beds are held constant because the VA only plans to provide this number of beds and will continue to have community partnerships to accommodate additional needs at peak; domiciliary volume is modeled by the VA though nursing home volumes are not a projection, based on decision by the VA.

- Question – Alan Robinson: Happy that Iraqi data was presented, however still uneasy that the need we will have with the returning Iraqi veterans has not been addressed. Concerned that the numbers presented do no account for future demand, and want to prevent the large numbers of homeless Iraqi veterans like that of the Vietnam War. Would like to see more specific demographic data about services that will be needed from the returning veterans in order to have a better idea in order to make better projections
- Answer – David Holt: The model will be adjusted based upon returning veterans in order to accommodate any increase or decrease in demand.

- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: One of the reasons the demand was held static was due to the forecast model. Will the new model continue to absorb the new demand? Will the update numbers show the new demand, and will those numbers be met?
- Comment – Dean Stordahl: Point of clarification. The domiciliary model was run but the nursing home model was not run, and are not a forecast completed for nursing home need in the future.
- Answer – David Holt: The nursing home projections will be completed by the VA at some later stage, and those numbers will be provided once complete.

- Question – Harry Corre: Still concerned about the mixed sex rooms for the current services. Does not see that the figures cover this at all. Is this taken into account?
- Answer – David Holt: Will look into whether or not men and women were separated out during demand projections.

- Question – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Request clarification on what numbers to use during the CARES process.
- Answer – David Holt: Not clear and will find out.
- Comment – Dean Stordahl: Maybe we will have clarification by this afternoon.

- Question – Roger Brautigam: What is the time frame used for the data projections?

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Answer – David Holt: FY03 data was used.
- Question – Roger Brautigan: How is demand measured?
- Answer – David Holt: There are a number of factors involved including Milliman data, migration rates, and Medicare data.

- Question – Roger Brautigan: Are the numbers projected on a nationwide basis?
- Answer – David Holt: No, projections are done at the market level.

- Question – Roger Brautigan: Do you look at waiting lists?
- Answer – David Holt: It is looked at extensively, but not during the CARES process. The Secretary felt that the correct factors were used, but the VA will continue to critique the model.

- Comment – Roger Brautigan: Still not convinced that the demand was captured based on needs or that we have the information quite right.

VI. Current State and Initial Business Plan Options: Scott Burns

- Master Plan. Scope of this effort during Stages I and II will not meet the full Congressionally-mandated request for a 25 year Land Use Master Plan for the West LA VAMC, Team PwC's scope of work will support the capital planning aspects and define parcels deemed excess to the VA for re-use of the Master Plan but future contracts will be defined by the VA subsequent to this scope of work with re-use consultants to fully comply with the Congressionally-mandated plan for West LA.
- Project Overview Timeline
- Overview of Business Planning Option (BPO) development process
- Review of Capital Planning and Re-use/Redevelopment Studies at West LA
- Clarifications since May LAP meeting
 - Clarification of re-use/redevelopment of the campus
 - California State Veteran Home Project
- Purpose of the LAP Meeting
 - Review options
 - Members of the LAP will ask questions about the options
 - The LAP may add options
 - The LAP will recommend to the Secretary which options it believes should be studied further
- West LA public input
 - Categories of stakeholder concerns
 - Key concerns
- Map of West LA VAMC
- West LA site overview
- Option Development: Universe of Considered Options
- Three Capital Planning Options and 15 Re-use Options were considered

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Four BPOs passed through the initial screening for access, quality and cost
- Stakeholder input to BPOs
- Summary of BPOs for West LA
 - Baseline
 - Three capital planning options involve renovating or building a new facility
 - Four re-use options involve redeveloping portions of the Brentwood campus
- West LA campus parcels for BPO re-use discussion
- Re-use/redevelopment: Link to the Capital Planning Options – BPOs 2, 3 and 4
- Description and assessment of each option
 - BPO 1: Baseline, including construction of new CA State Nursing Home
 - BPO 2: Renovate Existing Acute Bed Tower and Ambulatory Care Facilities; Renovate Existing Nursing Home/Mental Health Facilities; New VA Research, VBA, NCA & CA State Nursing Home
 - BPO 3: Construct New Acute Bed Tower and Renovate Ambulatory Care Facilities, Nursing Home, Mental Health Facilities; New VA Research, VBA, NCA & CA State Nursing Home
 - BPO 4: Construct New Acute Bed Tower and Ambulatory Care Facilities; Renovate Nursing Home, Mental Health and VA Research Facilities; New VBA, NCA & CA State Nursing Home
- Summary of Re-Use/Redevelopment Options that support or complement needs of veterans
- Review of potential Re-Use/Redevelopment Options by parcel
- Options not selected for assessment
- Next Steps—LAP will review the BPOs and recommend:
 - Which options should be further studied
 - Additional options
 - Specific concerns to be addressed
- Website: <http://www.va.gov/cares> or <http://vaww.va.gov/cares> (website available at all times, however, input to support Stage I completion requires public to provide input through October 6, 2005)
- Mail stop Address:
 - West LA Study
 - VA CARES Studies
 - P.O. Box 1427
 - Washington Grove, MD 20880-1427
- LAP Members Questions:
 - Question – Alan Robinson: Asks panel to put slide 31 and 32 up for review. First of all, the two functions that most need buildings to be state of the art are the new acute care bed tower and the research tower. Does the proposed Veteran Benefit Administration

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

(VBA) building need the same type of support that a new building needs? The existing hospital (Building 500) has too much space for a research building. On BPO 3, I propose a new acute tower, a new research building, and part of the ambulatory building be utilized for VBA.

- Answer – Russ Triplett: When you consider our standard of care in 20 years, the buildings will be almost 50 years old. The VBA does not need a new building, although a specific floor plate is necessary. What we are presenting today are only options.

- Question – Dean Stordahl: When will the modified presentation be reposted to the website?
- Answer – Scott Burns: Plan is tomorrow. That is handled by the Team PwC Stakeholder Team in coordination with the VA Central Office in Washington, DC.
- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: With the Baseline, there is minimal change. The current lease agreements are mentioned. Can these be recommended or changed for other BPOs?
- Answer – Scott Burns: Yes

- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: Would like maps and agreements posted on the CARES website and other documents posted on web.
- Answer – Scott Burns: OK. Team PwC will post.

- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: What about the area of the campus included under the Cranston Act. For baseline, not impacted, correct?
- Answer – Scott Burns: Correct.

- Question – Dean Stordahl: Given interest shown, can a Cranston Act graphic be on website?
- Answer – Scott Burns: Yes.

- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: For other options, will Cranston Act property be impacted?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: It appeared to the Re-Use contractor that there was an exception to the Cranston Act with the availability of the parking lot supporting the Brentwood Village Shopping Center, across the street.

- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: Some uses may not go along with Cranston Act? I would like this clarified. Will the VA have to go through a re-use plan?

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Answer – Scott Burns: Yes that is correct. The re-use plans are included in each of the BPOs proposed and are to be discussed, as proposed by Team PwC, in the LAP deliberations.
- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: Can there be a statement that proposed BPOs do not preclude a re-use plan?
- Answer – Scott Burns: Yes.
- Question – Flora Gil Krisiloff: In Secretary Principi's letter [of February 2002], the term 'commercial' does not seem to have the same meaning as in the report. I understand that you have received a clarifying view from the VA on 'commercial' and have that included in your slides. Have you received a copy of the Principi letter? Again, I request that we [LAP members] receive a copy of this clarifying letter from the VA.
- Answer – Scott Burns: The request for the clarifying letter on 'commercial' has been forwarded to the VA Central Office for a direct response to the LAP.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: I am concerned that there was a promise concerning no commercial use allowed from Secretary Principi.
- Answer – Brian Murphy: We have interpreted that there is no commercial use, unless it benefits or complements veterans. We only considered commercial use in the form of limited mixed use/residential on Parcel A where there is an existing parking lot supporting the Brentwood Village shopping center. Everything else meets the interpretation.
- Question – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Only commercial use is on Parcel A?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: Only potential use for commercial as interpreted in clarifying note from VA is on Parcel A.
- Comment – Dean Stordahl: What I am hearing is that the term needed to be defined.
- Question – Flora Gil Krisiloff: I am trying to find out if there is a decision that supersedes Secretary Principi's earlier decision.
- Answer – Brian Murphy: VA has not provided any revised definition of commercial to us.
- Comment – Flora Gill Krisiloff: My opinion is we need to honor Secretary Principi's decision unless this has been overturned. I would like to further address consultants. Everyone supports the veterans. I want to make sure there is no private commercial business.

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Question – Harry Corre: What do you consider affordable veteran housing?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: We have not defined specifics of 'affordable veteran housing'. We believe Parcel C is the logical place.

- Comment – Harry Corre: The one that concerns me is the provision for commercial development on Parcel A.
- Answer – Brian Murphy: Only Parcel A is being considered for any type of commercial use.

- Comment – Roger Brautigan: Thanks everyone for previous written input. This is a very frustrating process. It is vital that the information is on the website and is accurate. Once we get the revised documents on the site, then the 10 days should start. Please go to slide 5 to review the 2004 Secretary's Decision. (Makes several statements about the decision.)

- Comment – Roger Brautigan: Need data to filter down data and to ensure that structures meet projected workload.
- Answer – Scott Burns: This will be further addressed as project moves forward.

- Comment – Russ Triplett: Flexibility is built into the capital plans. As we move forward, all of the capital plans will have the flexibility to change the sizing, based on increases or decreases in demand.

- Comment – Dean Stordahl: The feeling seems to be that if you do not take in to consideration wait times, for example, data may be flawed.

- Comment – Russ Triplett: Earliest capital planning would take place in 2009.

- Comment – Roger Brautigan: Need to re-review demand/workload data in the future. When will the projections be available for nursing home projections? Also, would like to review VA policies with regard to decisions/strategic planning for long-term care (nursing home volumes) and the expected date for completion of the VA long-term strategic plans.

- Comment – Roger Brautigan: BPOs 2, 3, 4 offer new construction. The capital plans all align with Secretary's Decision. The re-use options do not comply. Any of these that do not meet the intent of why we are here should be taken off.

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Question – Roger Brautigan: What is ‘mixed use residential’ mean?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: This is the parking lot on Parcel A. Currently this is used for commercial use by a retail entity across the street. It is proposed that parking be provided in this same area along with limited condominiums and retail within the same structure. Parking would be underground.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: The one thing you left out is that veterans run it [the current parking lot serving the Brentwood Village shopping center].
- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Clarification - Veterans had run it. Now it is leased to a non-VA operator.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Maybe it could go back to veterans to run it.

- Question – Roger Brautigan: What is ‘limited new construction’ for Parcel F?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: Leaving options open. This would be more hospitality based, such as the Fisher House concept.

- Question – Dean Stordahl: Are there 4 capital options?
- Answer – Scott Burns: Yes. We have to have BPO 1 which is the baseline. New capital options are described and included in BPOs 2, 3, and 4. The re-use options for each of the identified parcels are separately described but attached with the capital planning options included in BPOs 2, 3 and 4 as revised and presented today.

- Question – Dean Stordahl: Where is the domiciliary in BPOs 3 and 4?
- Answer – Scott Burns: Renovated in both BPOs 3 and 4, and the existing facilities would continue to be used.

- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Our charts say something different for Parcel F than what is shown in the presentation.
- Comment – Brian Murphy: Slide 30 should be changed from ‘residential (limited new construction)’ to ‘limited use hospitality (Fisher House).

- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: There should not be an exception to have commercial for Parcel A. Who is expected to be housed in residential units in Parcel F?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: Not expecting to have residential functions located along Wilshire in Parcel F. Proposed re-use plan leaves green-space along Wilshire and re-uses, if available, the

Comment [In1]: Should we delete this? Was this an incomplete comment?

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

existing Dental Laboratory structure for limited use hospitality (Fisher House).

- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: In Parcels A and F, what do you mean by ‘community education’?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: Our intent is not to put a school there.
- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: We need a definition of ‘community education’.

- Question – Cindy Miscikowski: What about buildings shaded in red [on all site plans supporting discussion of the BPOs]? Not clear what priority it is? Is it re-use?
- Answer – Russ Triplett: Capital Plans only address VA program needs. So facilities (existing and proposed) not needed for VA programs are shaded red to indicate that they are vacated by VA specific programs. Then they become potential re-use opportunities for other non-VA organizations that support or complement veterans.

- Question – Steve Peck: On slide 24, you talk about major infrastructure issues. I assume if someone moves in, would they be responsible for completing/investing in those infrastructure upgrades?
- Answer – Russ Triplett: When we look at capital opportunities in Stage II, level of retail will be fleshed out.

- Question – Steve Peck: If affordable housing would move in, would it be an open issue?
- Answer – Russ Triplett: Yes, we would need to take it into account. We have for capital planning, although it is too early for re-use.

- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: You have current land agreements. You missed some of the agreements in the summary included in the draft Appendix report.
- Answer – Scott Burns: We will add those identified as missing in a final revision of the report upon inclusion of the LAP deliberations.

- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Request certain maps already included in the Appendix to be supplied to the public. All the information the LAP receives, the public should see.

- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Land agreement list and land agreement map list do not agree. Please make sure they tie in making revisions to final deliverables.

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: There has never been an Enhanced Use Lease on the West LA campus. It gives the ability to sell the land.
- Comment – Brian Murphy: Ownership is never going away from VA.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Enhanced Use Leases are a tool for private development.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: There are pieces of legislation – including the Cranston Act – which prohibit certain uses of 109 acres of the West LA campus and the land ever being used for non-VA uses.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: I want to offer up that we do not violate the Cranston Act or violate the legislation that mandates no Enhanced Use Leases. There are existing Sharing Agreements with non-VA users on the campus and these are in compliance with the Cranston Act.

- Question – Dean Norman: For Parcels G1, G2, and K, what were your thoughts for non-VA re-use and redevelopment?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: These could be sites for a commercial medical office building.

- Question – Dean Norman: I get confused on what is 'commercial', and what is 'not commercial'?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: The concept is medical office, pharmacy, and things to benefit veterans. This concept is consistent with the clarifying view provided to the contractors in July 2005 with regard to 'commercial' uses that support or complement veterans.

VII. Public Questions from Cards: Dean Stordahl

- Question – Have there been traffic studies?
- Answer – Brian Murphy: No.

- Question – Milliman Study on VA workload projections does not seem to take in to account potential other wars, beside Iraq and Afghanistan?
- Answer – Dave Holt: Iraq and Afghanistan were not used, but will be used in 2006. Data did not include potential wars but did use a potential of 200,000 separations per year.

- Question – Is the VA National Cemetery Administration columbarium still going to be on Parcel B1?
- Answer – Scott Burns: Since the Secretary's Decision was released; there is an understanding that a full 20 acres may not be needed. This proposed need may be able to be split between the West LA campus and the VA in Sepulveda (San Fernando Valley).

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Question – Where does GSA fit in, as far as building other facilities?
- Answer – Scott Burns: None of these types of GSA structures are planned in this CARES process.

<Break until 4:03 PM>

- Comment – Dean Stordahl: We have made the decision to extend the public comment timeline to October 7th based on the delay in making the LAP presentation available to the public on the website; assuming that it will be uploaded to the website on Friday, September 23, the public will have 10 days to have comments included for consideration in completing Stage I recommendations on the BPOs to the Secretary. Names will be included in the meeting summary, so please identify name clearly, and specify the group you are representing.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Expressed concern that LAP is being asked to deliberate without all of the stakeholder information and makes a motion to delay deliberation to a later date, due to a lack of basic information, lack of adequate time, lack of Secretary's/VA's clarifying memos, documents that are being revised today, and the absence of two LAP members.
- Motion by Flora Gil Krisiloff: Motion to delay deliberations.
- Second by Roger Brautigam, followed by discussion.

- Comment – Dean Stordahl: CARES process is contracted by VA to get public input, and the LAP, according to the contract, is to take the opportunity to obtain that input and deliberate on it. He understands the desire to delay deliberations, but if the LAP does not finish these deliberations as published, then this is not in compliance with the contract and notice in the Federal Register on announced LAP deliberations.

- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Ask that you can re-post the deliberation period in the Federal Register. Very uncomfortable with the tight timeframe in which to obtain information for deliberations. Would like to see written comments from stakeholders on the BPOs, and she is interested in what the 95 people said. Understand that the LAP is to be thinking independently and does not feel there is enough time to get that done.

- Comment – Scott Burns: From contractor's perspective, does not have any more elaboration to what the Chairman stated. The contractor is under a contract to comply with dates agreed upon, as there are 17 other sites along with West LA involved in the same process and tight timelines.

- Comment – Susan Pendergrass: Manages the CARES contract. The LAP may choose not to deliberate. LAP is only one component of the Secretary's request to gather information and is chartered to act under a specific charter. Specific meetings were established and published in the

Federal Register. If the LAP chooses not to deliberate, then the LAP cannot obligate the Secretary or the VA of any additional cost of running the contract. If the LAP requests an additional meeting, the Secretary would entertain this request, and PwC will continue to gather information from Stakeholders and make a decision.

- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Decide upon deliberation after public comment period this evening. Will narrow what the LAP considers and move forward with further meetings if necessary. The LAP should at least deliberate a little bit today on what information can be provided.
- Comment – Dean Stordahl: Ask that the public comment period begin. Ask that this vote be held until the end of the public comment period.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Not suggesting that we do not deliberate, but move that delay deliberation until clarity is given regarding several issues.
- Comment – Dean Stordahl: Will delay this decision until end of public comment period, and can have a vote during the beginning of LAP deliberation period.

VIII. Open Testimony & Deliberations

- **Testimony 1: Bobby Shriver, Santa Monica City Council member**
 - Thanks the LAP members for volunteering and work in important effort.
 - He has been working on this proposal for 10 months to provide homeless veterans with housing on the West LA campus.
 - The cost of war is visible here, as well as on the streets along the west side of Los Angeles.
 - He and many others find it inconceivable for homeless veterans to live on the streets, on the beaches, or next to empty buildings on the campus that could be housing them.
 - Many people feel the same way.
 - Proposal to designate three buildings on the North [Brentwood] campus for homeless veterans.
 - Want the commission and the group to know an alliance has formed around this proposal including New Directions, US Vets, and Volunteers of America.
 - A group of elected officials are also in attendance to support this proposal.
 - The veterans also agree with the program.
 - Spoken with people of different religious faiths who also support this program/proposal.
 - Government should not consider using land for anything other than VA uses.
 - LAP members have a copy of the proposal.

- **Testimony 2: Bill Rosendahl, Los Angeles City Councilman, 11th District**
 - Thanks Krisiloff and Miscikowski in keeping process moving with great attention to potential re-use/redevelopment of the VA campus by non-VA interests.
 - Veteran from the Vietnam Era.
 - Supports the Bobby Shriver proposal to house homeless veterans on West LA campus.
 - As a representative for the 11th District, strongly believes that we need a master plan for everyone to see and respond.
 - Veterans in the room do not tolerate anything that does not serve the veterans.
 - Passing along a message today from the LA Mayor to keep this property for veterans.
 - Supports whatever is done for veterans with the master plan.
 - Introduces the former Mayor of Los Angeles, Richard Riordan, who is also a Korean War veteran.
- **Testimony 3: Richard Riordan, Former Los Angeles Mayor)**
 - Afraid that goodness will have nothing to do with decisions made on the campus
 - He loves the land on the campus and indicates it is “magical”.
 - Should make it into the greatest park in the world for veterans and the community
 - Utilize the land for hiking, recreation, culture that would help everyone
 - Speaking for veterans and homeless
 - Have great urban designers, many based in LA, that could come up with a variety of great master plans for development of the North [Brentwood] campus of the VA site.
 - Do not compromise. Do what is needed to have the best park in the whole world here.
- **Testimony 4: Bill Weldon, Land Manager for Breitburn Energy**
 - Produce oil and gas beneath the site since 1965 [Parcel B2].
 - Lease states that this agreement is to remain in affect until gas and oil can no longer be produced.
 - Any plans must take into account the current land use by Breitburn Energy.
- **LAP Question:** What is the agreement with the VA for proceeds from mineral rights in the lease?
- **Answer:** The underlying lease is with the US and proceeds go to the US Treasury, and the local VA medical center gets a fraction of those funds.
- **Testimony 5: Zev Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles County Supervisor**
 - Represent LA County district comprising this property and the area around it
 - Graduate of UCLA, knows the area and the environment of the West LA campus.

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Resident of the area almost his entire life.
 - Here to lay a marker on this discussion.
 - This is deeded as land for veterans and is not intended for commercial use.
 - Most of the years it has been a good neighbor of Los Angeles.
 - Relationship has been outstanding with the City of Los Angeles.
 - Property not to be exploited and used for other reasons; only for direct needs of the veterans.
 - The US Dept. of Veterans Affairs launched an effort to determine what to use this property for, and they are in no position to evaluate the proposals for this property.
 - Important to identify the uses that are appropriate and not appropriate.
 - Need a master plan to know what will go where as identified in the Congressional mandate.
 - Will hear from the Los Angeles County, Office of County Counsel attorneys on this plan during same public comment period.
 - The consultant feels that this is in City of Los Angeles, yet the site is zoned by LA County; the North [Brentwood] campus is zoned as open space. Incorrect that local jurisdiction is the city, it is not, it is the County and there is not much allowed here.
 - People feel that the wool is being pulled over their eyes.
 - Urge that during recommendations and deliberations that the potential commercial uses be taken off the table. Take leasing properties off the table.
 - Get back to issues important to everyone in the room and among the LAP.
 - To turn the history of the property upside down is an insult and travesty to the veterans and neighbors.
 - Here with a spear in one hand and an olive branch in another. Will file law suits if necessary but hope it does not come to that in upholding the deeded purpose of the site and land for veterans use
 - At the end of the day, the decision will be made in Washington, but hope this message is taken back to Washington.
- **Testimony 6**
- Spoke about Senator Jones gift of the land for the VA as an Old Soldiers' Home.
 - Originally donated 300 acres of land for disabled war veterans.
 - Donated a total of 525 acres; some of it currently occupied by the Federal Building (across I-405 from West LA campus).
 - Widdled away by parking lots, Salvation Army, and the Brentwood school.
 - Veterans have not had a gymnasium since earthquake of 1984.
 - Appalled that options are being recommended that will destroy the integrity of the land.
 - Opposed to the open space being used for redevelopment for any re-use by non-VA functions.
 - National veterans park currently in progress and should proceed.
 - Land must be preserved for veterans.
 - Appeal to sense of patriotic duty.

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Historical significance can not be overlooked.
- This land is the land that American veterans fought for and deserve.
- **Comment:** Dean Stordahl: Asks crowd to show hands if they would like to see the property to be kept for sole purpose of helping veterans. [Clear majority of those in the room raise their hands.]
- **Testimony 7: Lisa Pinto, Representative of Congressman Henry Waxman**
 - House of Representatives is in session, so Mr. Waxman could not be present to provide his own remarks.
 - Thanks to veterans and other members of the community.
 - Thanks to the LAP for volunteering to undertake their role and responsibility.
 - The 387 acres of land have a unique national status as the only remaining Old Soldiers Home in the VA system.
 - Cranston Act prohibits non-VA re-use of the land if determined 'excess to VA use'.
 - The VA needs to develop a long-term master plan, consistent with Congressional mandate.
 - Fortunate to have Secretary's follow-up letter to LA County Supervisor Yaroslavsky to not allow VA property to be utilized for commercial uses.
 - Attached letter from the Secretary was provided to LAP members.
 - Secretary Principi stressed the need to preserve the land for veterans use.
 - The VA and Team PwC will present a number of options.
 - It is important that the VA take into consideration the promises and protections extended to the veterans.
 - A veterans option will be introduced to the LAP.
 - Encourage everyone to stay through the deliberations.
- **Testimony 8**
 - Full-time Brentwood resident for last 42 years.
 - Worked with VA and panel members on earlier master plan (acknowledged with LAP Member Krisiloff).
 - Something to think about is that there is going to be some kind of re-use or redevelopment.
 - Enjoy the VA as a neighbor as the best custodians of this property.
 - Staff has been open with the community to bring in opinions.
 - As the CARES process continues into implementation phase, suggests that since they enjoy the VA as a neighbor, it be brought back locally so the people in community are brought into the decision, not the people in VA Central Office to make a decision.
 - Commercial use is a horrible idea for the West LA campus.
 - People would not be able to come up freely if did not have veterans.
- **Testimony 9: Beverly Kenworthy, Senior Field Member for Los Angeles Councilman Jack Weiss**

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Sends Councilman Weiss' kind regards on his behalf.
 - Weiss represents 5th council district, which is the local area adjacent to the VA West LA campus.
 - Historically, members of the surrounding community are concerned.
 - West LA property deeded to be used for Old Soldiers' Home.
 - Council member extremely concerned that the land would be used for purposes that it was not deeded for, specifically purposes other than for veterans.
 - Little to no transparency during this project's process.
 - Would like to see a master plan for land use.
 - Provided testimony document to the LAP.
- **Testimony 10**
- Outraged at PricewaterhouseCoopers' report calling for 'commercial re-use'.
 - President has ordered a comprehensive review to be prepared for an emergency situation.
 - The VA land would be perfect for an emergency preparedness program.
 - Can see from the recent earthquakes the need for emergency land in major metropolitan areas like Los Angeles.
 - Should be preserved for open space for tent city or emergency land.
 - Idea of the proposal to have commercial use is unacceptable.
 - Report should be junked.
 - Common sense should prevail.
 - Get the material on the CARES process out to stakeholders (via website) on time to consider and make decision.
 - Should not deliberate until have adequate facts.
- **Testimony 11: Carol Gross, Culver City Council Member**
- Representing both Culver City and City of Beverly Hills, as announced.
 - All of us stand together on this issue.
 - Pointed out New Directions (program on West LA campus for rehabilitation of veterans) people who are benefiting from the current land.
 - What are we doing to address the 17,000 veterans on the streets of Los Angeles?
 - People with great needs. 20% of people returning from war are in need of mental health services.
 - Beauty of the proposal is that it serves the community and provides a place for veterans to move into.
 - Proposal is a win all the way around.
 - Consistent with the land use commitments (e.g. Cranston Act).
 - Need 25 year site master plan that will keep programs in place for veterans.
 - Need long-term planning to avoid fighting this battle every few years.
 - Do not turn land over, but keep for veterans only.
- **Testimony 12: Robert Norris, Century Housing Executive Vice President**
- Vietnam veteran

- In a position where his corporation can put together a large financing package to assist the VA; submitted his written remarks to LAP members.
 - He is in a position where he can help fellow veterans.
 - Century Housing has proven that it can put together a successful financing model.
- **Testimony 13: Jay Handal, President of Greater Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce**
- Discussed broken promises and provided evidence related to the West LA campus specifically.
 - In 1999, Congress enacted a law requiring a 25 year master plan yet to be completed.
 - Letter from the former Secretary [Principi] restricted commercial use on the campus.
 - How can you make a decision tonight without seeing public comment?
 - Mandated 25 year plan is not in place.
 - Chamber supports the proposal that councilman Shriver proposed along with the 25 year master plan.
 - Three years ago were told that the veteran population was shrinking, then Iraq happened.
 - Need to be prepared for additional wars.
 - We do not want Enhanced Use Leases (EULs), want enhance services for all veterans.
 - We will be prepared to fight “this war” if we have to.
 - Repeat slogan: “It’s veterans land for veterans use only.”
- **Testimony 14**
- Supports what Ms. Perry said in earlier testimony
 - Submitted a copy of original document that deeded the property as an Old Soldiers’ Home, which is now on the West LA campus.
 - Wording in document came from an act of Congress.
 - Second page in document says that it will be ‘constructed and permanently maintained (for use by veterans)’.
 - Congress should use our tax dollars to maintain this property.
- **Testimony 15**
- Supports Senator Jones interests.
 - Thinks that the government needs to decide to keep the land the way the family intended it, and the gift should be honored.
- **Testimony 16**
- Resident of Brentwood Glenn (adjoining the West LA campus).
 - Served with Flora Gil Krisiloff on 25 year land use project.
 - Shares accolades to Krisiloff on pursuing what is best for veterans.
 - Want to see this land retained for veterans’ use.

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Wants to know whether any hope of getting income from Breitburn Energy to go to West LA campus rather than to the US Treasury Department.
- **Testimony 17**
 - This facility is of importance not only for this portion of Los Angeles County but also different portions of other neighboring counties who also use this facility.
 - The term transparency has been used. Has heard that certain information is on website, but it is not. Just received information at the start of the meeting.
 - Should not have to go to Congressman Waxman's website to receive [draft Appendix only] documents.
 - Data that was presented flies in the face of what the Secretary has said.
 - Refers to this month's issue of AmVets and discussed increased demand due to veterans returning from Iraq/Afghanistan wars.
 - How can the VA say there is no increased demand, when [VA Secretary Nicholson] is going to Congress for more money?
 - What are we going to do and how are we going to do it? Need 25 year master plan.
- **Testimony 18**
 - Supports use of the land solely for veterans
 - Town was misled by the consultants.
 - Summarized factual errors presented by consultant. Cranston Act, page 40 of 129 page report, unable to locate original document. Even though it violates that Cranston Act, why propose development on the land regarding the question of commercialization?
 - From PricewaterhouseCoopers website, the sample report shows owners of real estate how to make money. How can you define the lessee in the case of "verbaside"?
- **Testimony 19**
 - Past Mayor, City of Santa Monica
 - People of Santa Monica have a special place in their hearts for the VA property.
 - Have a wonderful opportunity to fight for the people.
 - Everyone in the room wants the same thing.
 - Please do your best [directed to LAP members and stakeholders].
- **Testimony 20**
 - US Air Force and Vietnam era veteran
 - Thanks to the family who donated this land
 - Listed name of veterans who lived and died here and are in cemetery (National Cemetery across I-405 from West LA campus)
 - The land should only be used for veterans
 - Have questions for PricewaterhouseCoopers:

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- How can you know what the workload numbers should be for Iraqi war veterans [that would need services at West LA through 2023]?
- Why are we being called a market? We are not a market. We are human beings and deserve respect.
- **Testimony 21**
 - Resident in the Naomi House.
 - Atmosphere is not good for the veterans.
 - Takes two to six months before a veteran receives treatment.
 - Women are lacking in services and have different problems than men.
 - Veterans are paying now.
- **Testimony 22: Sylvia Castillo, California State Assemblyperson, District #47**
 - Sends warm greetings to those that are trying to preserve the veteran's site.
 - Karen Bass called upon governor to help preserve the West LA site only for Veterans.
 - Calls upon people to do the right thing.
- **Testimony 23: Bobbie Fiedler, Congresswoman**
 - Former member of Los Angeles School Board.
 - Worked with Vets for some time.
 - People from all over the region depend on this facility to respond to care and needs of veterans.
 - Stick with your plan of action to maintain this facility for veteran use.
 - The community is working on preserving it for veterans all over the country.
- **Testimony 24: Elaine Lemke, Attorney, County of Los Angeles, Office of County Counsel**
 - This process must be more open and inclusive.
 - This property is zoned by the County of Los Angeles, not the City of Los Angeles as stated in the contractor's report.
- **Testimony 25:**
 - Wants to thank many of the people that have been engaged in this CARES process.
 - Here to represent the peace movement.
 - Need to support the veterans and keep the facilities/land preserved for the veterans.
 - A lot of veterans or peace activists are mending bridges.
 - Support Bobby Shriver's proposal for re-use of three structures on Brentwood campus for care of homeless veterans.
 - Consensus is clear that the property has to be kept for veterans.
- **Testimony 26: Paul Koretz, California State Assemblyperson**
 - Lifetime resident of West Los Angeles

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- How can serious consideration be made to put VA West LA campus land on the auction block?
- Land should be reserved only for facilities that benefit veterans.
- Must preserve site for veterans
- **Testimony 27: John Keaveney, Vietnam Vets of America, Culver City**
 - Thanks family that donated land
 - [Has man stand and show charter to the land with another person holding historical picture that shows handing of document preserving the land for veterans.]
 - Within about the last 20 years, approximately one millions dollars has been earned from oil wells on VA property.
 - Served two terms in Vietnam
 - There will never be commercial development on this land.
 - There are 17,000 homeless veterans in the area, and need to bring more to this site and cared for by the VA.
- **Testimony 28**
 - Korean War Veteran
 - Government is threatening to break their promise to the veterans
 - Asks government to keep promise
- **Testimony 29: Carol Magnusen, Westwood Hill Community Association**
 - In support of what has been said here today
 - Property should only be used for Veterans.
 - Parcels G1 and G2: no specificity here on what the re-use plans could be and would like to know what is planned [to be considered in LAP deliberations as proposed in LAP presentation].
- **Testimony 30: Steve Twining, Beverly Hillcrest Community Council**
 - There have been cumulative effects of building in this neighborhood, adding to congestion.
 - Provides a list of building projects that have taken place in recent months.
 - Community is in gridlocked with traffic.
 - We need a subway as the new Los Angeles Mayor has promised.
 - Need rapid transit up I-405 corridor (running along East border of West LA campus).
 - Why are more of the homeless veterans not living on this VA campus?
- **Testimony 31**
 - Korean War veteran
 - Number of veterans committing suicide is not included in projections, and it is significant.
 - Must preserve the campus for use by veterans.
 - Diagnosed with lung cancer recently; color scheme of panel is offensive to my eyes [LAP members are sitting at table with blue tablecloth].

- **Testimony 32**
 - Live in neighboring residential community adjacent to Parcel B1.
 - Concerned that the land should be for veterans only and not developed for commercial uses.
 - Site maps do not show where the VA NCA columbarium will be; columbarium serves veterans in a next life.

- **Testimony 33: Sue Young, Veterans Park Conservancy**
 - Focused on preserving the West LA VA site for use by and for veterans
 - Land has been neglected since the 1950's
 - Understand the contractors are aware of your interest in the site
 - Omission of understanding should be included on CARES website.
 - Only present to support Veterans Memorial Park [sponsored by the Veterans Park Conservancy] and to show support for the green space re-use of Parcel F.
 - Applaud the new acute care bed tower as well as renovating other facilities on the north and south campuses.

- **Testimony 34**
 - Father and uncle served in World War II.
 - Open space is good for the soul.
 - Veterans work hard to keep golf course alive, and it should be maintained.
 - Should be no commercial development on the campus, and it should be preserved for veterans.

- **Testimony 35**
 - Land here revives the spirit of the souls of veterans.
 - Against private interest

- **Testimony 36: Trevor Daily, Representative of California Senator Diane Feinstein**
 - [Reads statement from Diane Feinstein]
 - Property safeguarded for the past 120 years.
 - We must do more for veterans.
 - Community unified in opposition to commercial use.
 - Voices from all communities against commercial use need to be heard.

- **Testimony 37**
 - Concerned that part of campus could be used for non-VA uses.
 - Should not have commercial use on this (West LA campus) land.
 - Thanks to family that donated land in original deed as Old Soldiers' Home.
 - Availability of services for veterans on campus has declined.
 - Only want uses consistent with original donor's deed restrictions (as stated earlier in testimony).
 - Support Veterans Option (proposed re-use option).

- **Testimony 38**
 - Feels that issues need to focus more on women veterans.
 - Need to emphasize more programs for woman veterans.
 - Are they talking about refurbishing the mental health building on campus or rebuilding?

- **Testimony 39: Marsha Hanscom, Wetland Action Network**
 - Father served for 17 years in military and had to leave/retire to receive treatment for PTSD at the West LA VA facility.
 - Would come to visit father at this facility.
 - Eventually he was able to rejoin family due to the tranquility and calmness of the campus.
 - Appalled to learn there is methane gas and other hazards on portions of campus.
 - Keep in mind current military. Please preserve the tranquility of the West LA campus.

- **Testimony 40**
 - Biologist
 - [Does a role play of a person discovering and working on the campus.]
 - Proposes that the VA should work with National Park Service to document the many flowers and plants and to use the campus for educational purposes for veterans as well as the public.

- **Testimony 41: Tony Reinis, Executive Director of the New Directions Program on West LA Campus**
 - See over 800 veterans per year.
 - Just placed a veteran in a \$40,000 a year job; opportunities are available for rehabilitated veterans.
 - New Directions provides culinary training.
 - Veterans find a variety of jobs not only in the community, but on this site where 33 veterans were hired in one month.
 - Cranston Act enabled New Directions to be on this land.
 - Submitting a proposal for a veterans' housing project.

- **Testimony 42: Keith Jeffries, Citizens for Veterans Rights**
 - Introduces an additional Business Plan option.
 - Reads the 'Veteran's Proposal'.

- **Testimony 43**
 - Is anything happening with toxic materials on the campus? What is the status of remediation?
 - [No response from LAP members]
 - Supports keeping the West LA campus only for veterans.
 - Concerned about the CARES process.

- **Testimony 44: Willy Boyd, Veterans Upward Bound Program**
 - Outpatient program in Building 257 on [Brentwood] campus.
 - Vietnam Veteran and had PTSD.
 - Opposed any use other than those for veterans.
- **Testimony 45**
 - Takes care of pools and ponds on Japanese Gardens and wants them to be opened up to the public for education.
 - Endorses keeping the VA open to veterans.
- **Testimony 46: Cephus Danials, AmVets District 1 Commander**
 - Support the Veteran's option.
- **Testimony 47**
 - Protesting the lack of knowledge about the CARES process and having to learn about it from the LA Times articles.
- **Testimony 48**
 - Agree with the consensus that West LA should be preserved for veterans.
 - Did not understand the documents posted on the website because of the many (undefined/unexplained) acronyms and terminology.
- **Testimony 49**
 - Strongly oppose the projects as proposed in the contractor's presentation.
 - Campus needs to be for veteran use only.
 - The spot of green is important to whole community.
 - No other place to have a staging area if there is an emergency.

<Break until 7:40 PM>

VIII. LAP Deliberations

- Dean Stordahl: Motion on the floor, from Ms. Krisiloff earlier.
- Based on what VHA Central Office stated, may lose opportunity to vote.
- Need to make sure the public notices and all information on the website is made available prior to the meeting.
- Concern now that, perhaps instead of delaying, need to re-work the motion.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Still stands firm that have not had adequate time, but need to deliberate. Wishes she had clarification on the issues; wants objection to stand regarding the issue of deliberating at this time. Need to place a

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

condition on re-use options that complies with stipulations in Congressman Waxman's letter.

- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Should start with the fact that the Cranston Act is the fundamental principle here and the deed from the DeBaker family. Also add Secretary's Principi's letter stating no commercial re-use and remove a number of re-use options proposed. For example, the medical office building not owned and operated by the VA should be taken off the table.
- Comment – Dean Stordahl: Need to deliberate as a LAP and comment on each of the proposed BPOs. Also need to comment on each of the re-use options, both on endorsement as a LAP of the type of proposed re-use/redevelopment and on inclusion/exclusion of the identified parcels for possible re-use.
- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Start with the premise to adapt what is stated in the [Secretary Principi] letter. Then we will have a platform to work from.
- Comment – Roger Brautigan: Withdraws second to Krisiloff's motion.
- Motion failed for lack of a second.
- Krisiloff requested that her concerns be noted.
- Question – Roger Brautigan: Why is the color code different for the buildings on the site plans that serve veterans?
- Answer – Russ Triplett: Will have clarifier for graphic that shows red buildings which "vacate" VA uses; not that these structures would be vacant upon implementation of any BPO.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Ask for clarification on BPO 2 maps. Wants presentation of the maps to be taken a step further and to show what non-VA sponsored services are presently utilizing buildings on campus.
- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Would like consistent other uses on the campus now to be shown on the map as continued uses unless otherwise directed, because some of the leases are long-term on certain buildings.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Should send Miscikowski's recommendation to the Secretary.
- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: There are some leases that are not veteran-serving. Leases that are long-term or veteran serving should be maintained.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Current land agreements are included in the contractor's Appendix report pages 20 and 129, two are missing: Barrington Park

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

and Veterans Memorial Park as well as the agreement for City of Los Angeles for playing fields southeast of US Post Office [on Parcel F of site re-use plan].

- Comment – Dean Stordahl: Ask the LAP to discuss each BPO as presented.
- Comment – Dean Norman: BPO 4 reflects the need to take care of all patients. Renovation of the current space will cost more than a new building, so do not recommend renovating the current space for VA research. It is difficult to recruit professionals to the current hospital, so the decision to consolidate patient programs on the campus is the way to go on the South Campus. Acute care facility should be a new building and not a renovated building.
- Question – Alan Robinson: Is there a seismic issue with Building 500?
- Comment – Harry Corre: In order to get what you want for the veterans, BPO 2 would give you what you want.
- Question – Dean Stordahl: Would you be opposed to other options?
- Comment – Cindy Miscikowski: Further detailed analysis should include efficiency of using the old facilities versus building new facilities.
- Question – Dean Stordahl: How many square feet does VBA need? Interested to find this out.
- Answer – Scott Burns: Actually had conversation with Stewart Liff and the VBA. Have some preliminary information for the VBA, but not set in concrete with the needs for new facility on the West LA campus though a proposal has been developed in conjunction with VBA officials in Washington, DC.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Ask that the LAP members take apart capital plan options, and make clear that they are only voting on capital planning options not on re-use options.
- **BPO 1**
 - Will move forward as a given.
- **BPO 2**
 - May have issues with getting a new bed tower, so may make capital planning portion of BPO 2 a more practical option. May not be enough money in construction budget to handle other pieces of the project.

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Comment – Russ Triplett: Financial means [funding] exist to renovate existing hospital to current state of the art but would include major renovation.
- Question – Dean Stordahl: Would your analysis include how this renovation would occur during a time perspective?
- Answer – Russ Triplett: Yes, this would be included.
- Comment – Dean Stordahl: Call for vote on capital part of BPO 2.
- Vote to send forward BPO 2: Unanimous vote to recommend this option to the Secretary for consideration.
- **BPO 3**
 - Members express concern with renovating ambulatory care under BPO 3.
 - Vote to send forward BPO 3: Unanimous vote to recommend this option to the Secretary for consideration.
- **BPO 4**
 - Comment – Allen Robinson: Would like to propose a BPO combination of 3 and 4 (hybrid model). This includes consideration for a new acute care bed tower, a new VA research building and should accommodate renovating current hospital (Building 500) for both VBA and ambulatory care versus putting VBA and ambulatory care in a new building. Propose that each go forward as two options.
 - Comment – Russ Triplett: Needs to be 2 new distinct BPOs. Analysis would be to compare costs. VBA presence is taken into consideration under each option. Team PwC has had discussion with VBA on sizing.
 - Vote to send forward BPO 4: Unanimous vote to recommend this option to the Secretary for consideration.
- **BPO 5**
 - New option similar to the capital planning aspect included in BPO 3, except consider a VBA and ambulatory care center in current Building 500 (hospital).
 - Vote to send forward BPO 5: Unanimous vote to recommend this new option to the Secretary for consideration.

- **BPO 6**

- Would be all new buildings, including new acute care bed tower, ambulatory care, new VBA, and research buildings and renovate other buildings (on Brentwood campus).
- Question – Steve Peck: Doubt about land on the Northwest side. Is this within the Cranston Act?
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Would like to clarify Cranston Act. 109 acres (explicitly included under the acts that comprise the Cranston Act) would not be for sale. The parking lot is being run by a non-VA operator, but the VA receives money from it. Would like to offer up that the leasing of the parking lot brings up miscellaneous leases that are not agreements.
- Question - If we strictly agree to it then what happens to the current agreements?
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Not a problem with the Cranston Act. There are no current exceptions to the Cranston Act (i.e. there are no Enhanced Use Leases (EULs) on the West LA campus that do not comply with provisions in the Cranston Act).
- Comment – Dean Norman: Three scenarios: Department of Defense, YMCA, and research facility that would directly benefit veterans. A fourth scenario: pharmaceutical company. Let us build a building, and we will build you an ambulatory building if a for-profit developer builds housing for veterans.
- Comment – Steve Peck: Do not want to eliminate things that will benefit the veterans. If an opportunity that may be considered commercial benefits the veterans, then possible commercial uses should be considered.
- Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: We have heard testimony that there will be no commercial uses.
- Comment – Steve Peck: Testimony has not limited ability to explore options.
- Answer – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Current Veteran's Option reaffirms what is already on deck.
- Vote to send forward BPO 6: Unanimous vote to recommend this new option to the Secretary for consideration.

- **Motion put forward**

- Guiding principle for all re-use options, as defined in 'BPO 9: The Veterans Option' (as presented in public comment period) would be the guiding principle as they further analyze options.

- **Guiding Principle 1:** The VA will strictly adhere to Section 421 (b)(2) of the Veterans' Benefits and Services Act of 1988 [PL 100-322] and Section 401 of the Veterans' Benefits Programs Improvement Act of 1991 [PL 102-86], commonly referred to as the Cranston Act.
 - Motion put forward and seconded.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to move forward.

- **Guiding Principle 2:** Any use of the land should be for direct benefits of veterans.
 - Motion put forward and seconded.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to move forward.

- **Guiding Principle 3:** Motion to use Secretary's Principi's letter as definition for no commercial use.
 - Motion put forward, seconded - to go in agreement with Secretary's Principi's letter—no commercial use and each element in the future will have to be tested.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to move forward.

- **Guiding Principle 4:** Motion to maintain current land agreements and the lease arrangements including the two that are not listed in the summary.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to move forward.

- **Guiding Principle 5:** Henry Waxman's letter, Page 3/139, describes excess land for non-VA use and, as indicated, that it should be determined that there is no excess land for non-VA use on the West LA campus.
 - Motion to consider CARES commission recommendation that the LAP determined that there is no excess land on the campus.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to move forward.

- **Guiding Principle 6:** Motion to abide by National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Must go through the process and meet the legal requirements of the national historic preservation as it applies to the campus.
 - Comment – Russ Triplett: In the Appendix, all existing buildings that are on the internal VA listing are marked, and two buildings (chapel and trolley station) that are on National Historic Register are also marked.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to move forward.

- **Re-Use Option: Parcel A**
 - Community education/recreation
 - Support open space recreation, potential option for Parcel A, passed and will move forward.
 - Motion to not endorse community education, seconded.

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Unanimous vote to not endorse 'community education' as recommendation to the Secretary for further consideration in Stage II as possible non-VA re-use in Parcel A.
- Mixed used residential: Move to remove mixed use residential. Seconded.
- Vote: 7 for and 1 against recommendation to Secretary to include 'mixed use residential' as possible non-VA re-use in Parcel A.
- **Re-Use Options: Parcels C & E**
 - Affordable/transitional veteran/family/nursing housing
 - Change from 'nursing housing' to 'direct patient care staff and family housing' as possible non-VA re-use of Parcels C and E.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote. All favor endorsing this revised definition for non-VA housing re-use of Parcels C and E.
 - Comment – Flora Gil Krisiloff: Do not want to see non-veteran housing dominate over veterans housing. Give priority to veterans.
 - Motion to change 'Long-term veteran housing' to 'long-term therapeutic supportive housing for veterans'.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote. All favor endorsing this revised definition for non-VA long-term re-use of Parcel C.
 - Residential therapy/treatment programs
 - Vote: Unanimous vote. All favor endorsing this revised consideration for non-VA re-use of Residential Therapy/Treatment Programs in Parcel C and E.
 - Limited use/hospitality (Fisher House)
 - Motion to have Fisher House in Parcel E but eliminate as consideration in Parcel C.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote. All favor endorsing this revised consideration for non-VA re-use of Limited Use Hospitality (Fisher House) in Parcel E and not in Parcel C.
 - Parcel E: Administrative Support/training
 - LAP decides to keep it in for consideration by the Secretary for further exploration in Stage II.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote. All favor of considering non-VA re-use of Parcel E for Administrative Support/Training.
- **Re-Use Options: Parcels G1, G2, and K**
 - Medical Research

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

- Motion to move forward for consideration by the Secretary for further exploration in Stage II.
- Vote: 1 opposed, 7 in favor to recommend to the Secretary Medical Research for benefit to veterans in Parcels G1, G2 and portion of K for further study as non-VA re-use option.

- Medical Office Building/Veteran-Patient Pharmacy
 - Motion to not study further
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to not recommend to Secretary Medical Office Building/Veteran-Patient Pharmacy in Parcels G1, G2 and portion of K for further study as non-VA re-use option.

- Limited Use Hospitality (Fisher House) in Parcel G2 and Portion of K
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to recommend to Secretary Limited Use Hospitality (Fisher House) in Parcel G2 and portion of Parcel K for further study in Stage II as non-VA re-use option.

- **Re-Use Options: Parcel F**
 - Open Space Green Belt
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to recommend to Secretary Open Space/Greenbelt in Parcel F for further study in Stage II as non-VA re-use option.

 - Open Space Recreation
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to recommend to Secretary Open Space/Recreation in Parcel F for further study in Stage II as non-VA re-use option.

 - Residential (limited new construction), specifically the Fischer House as clarified in comment by re-use contractor (Brian Murphy).
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to recommend to Secretary Limited Use Hospitality (Fisher House) in Parcel F for further study in Stage II as non-VA re-use option.

 - Community Education for Veterans
 - Change to: "Consideration for Veterans Training/Vocational Training (Parcels C and E)"
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to recommend to Secretary Veterans Training/Vocational Training on Parcels C and E for further study in Stage II as non-VA re-use option.

 - Endorsement of the configuration of all proposed parcels on map.
 - Motion to adopt map as exhibited in Appendix as Exhibit A.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to endorse proposed parcel configuration of the West LA campus, specifically Parcels A, C, E, G1, G2, portion of K,

10/06/05 LAP CHAIR APPROVED

and F (as provided in the LAP presentation, included in the Appendix report as Exhibit A, and as described above for recommended non-VA types of re-use/ redevelopment).

- Motion to adopt re-use options, as revised and linked with each of the LAP accepted capital plan options. Specifically, those identified in existing BPOs 2, 3 and 4, as well as new BPOs 5 and 6 corresponding with the parcel descriptions provided immediately above as recommendations to the Secretary for further study in Stage II as those Business Plan Options endorsed by the West LA LAP.
 - Vote: Unanimous vote to recommend to Secretary for further study in Stage II those BPOs redefined as BPOs 1, 2, 3, and 4 and those BPOs added as BPOs 5 and 6.

- Chairman Stordahl concluded the LAP deliberations by thanking all those stakeholders who participated, and thanked the LAP members for their involvement, patience, and professionalism in working through the details to achieve a result.

Meeting Adjourned 10:15 PM