

Communication from Public

Name: Lori C.

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 05:37 PM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly disagree with the City Attorney's desire to increase the contract with Gibson Dunn and Crutcher from \$900,000 to almost \$6M for its three year term to oppose U.S. Federal Judge Carter's ruling requiring an oversight committee for LAHSA to ensure spending accountability and track effectiveness. This is the hamster wheel going round and round with NOTHING being resolved or to show for such spending. The city could use the \$6M much more constructively like (a) hiring monitors to ensure people in the shelters are receiving the food and care they are supposed to be obtaining; and (b) hiring a professional data firm to build a system to track actuarial performance. Spending money on lawyers who take it all and just pad their billing hours for the money is outrageous and MUST end. \$900,000 is enough money to do the job they were originally hired to do, so tell Gibson Dunn & Crutcher to DO THEIR JOB and the City Attorney to stop giving the people's money away.

Communication from Public

Name: Jodi C.

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 05:38 PM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly disagree with the City Attorney's desire to increase the contract with Gibson Dunn and Crutcher from \$900,000 to almost \$6M for its three year term to oppose U.S. Federal Judge Carter's ruling requiring an oversight committee for LAHSA to ensure spending accountability and track effectiveness. This is the hamster wheel going round and round with NOTHING being resolved or to show for such spending. The city could use the \$6M much more constructively like (a) hiring monitors to ensure people in the shelters are receiving the food and care they are supposed to be obtaining; and (b) hiring a professional data firm to build a system to track actuarial performance. Spending money on lawyers who take it all and just pad their billing hours for the money is outrageous and MUST end. \$900,000 is enough money to do the job they were originally hired to do, so tell Gibson Dunn & Crutcher to DO THEIR JOB and the city attorney to stop giving the people's money away.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 10:55 AM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: This has to be a joke. The entire city is watching what you're doing and everyone knows that this is now a scam. STOP THE SPENDING AND STOP TAXING US FOR WHAT WE KNOW IS A SCAM!!! A BUSINESS.

Communication from Public

Name: Rene Ruston

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 11:22 AM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: VOTE NO on council file 20-0263-S3. Requesting \$6 million to pay an exorbitantly expensive law firm to fight Judge O'Carters order is a slap in the face of every taxpayer in the city of Los Angeles. STOP USING OUR MONEY TO AVOID ACCOUNTABILITY FOR WASTING OUR MONEY. Instead of spending millions of dollars of our money on defending the indefensible, why not contract with a professional data firm to build a system that tracks actuarial performance? It could hire a monitor to ensure people in shelters receive three meals instead of two. It could do a lot of useful and effective things. I instead, it chooses to spend nearly \$6 million to defend: Shelter providers who serve two meals while charging for three. Unverified but clearly insufficient staffing levels in shelters. A system that the city admitted (in 2022 through the Alliance settlement) that has produced nowhere near enough shelter beds. A system that pays LAHSA for unverified services. And that's just for starters. WE ARE AWARE, the substantive findings from A&M's report were never directly refuted during Judge Carter's hearings in May. ENOUGH. TAKE ACCOUNTABILITY and stop wasting our money. VOTE NO. VOTE NO. VOTE NO.

Communication from Public

Name: Eric

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 08:53 AM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Did Katy Yaroslavsky's husband work there? I will seek a link to share this question. Are links to public comments available? Or is this just a receptacle for council to see? If it's obvious to you, send me the link at my email. And if I want to submit a general comment? What case file is that? Where can they be found and linked? Eric Preven

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Collins

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 10:10 AM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: There are few things more disgraceful than eliminating jobs, city services AND homeless housing and services due to lack of funding, while asking for \$6 MILLION to fight Judge Carter's decision that LAHSA receive greater oversight due to it's ineffective and unaccountable spending. The city's attorneys have not disputed the findings of the audit that resulted in Judge Carter's decision - you're fighting the remedy which simply provides greater oversight to ensure funds intended for the homeless are accounted for and being used effectively. The audit that Judge Carter based his decision on showed that over the last 2 years, the City of Los Angeles has spent \$2.3 BILLION with on homeless housing programs but most of the \$2.3 billion is unaccounted for. If the city approves the request to provide millions of dollars to prevent oversight of an agency that has consistantly proven to be ineffective and incapable of providing accurate data, then there is no hope for the residents of this city. The request for these funds is shameful and shows a contempt for the people you're sworn to serve. Please VOTE NO on council file 20-0263-S3 Thank you, Susan Collins

Communication from Public

Name: Rusty

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 01:41 PM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Does the City really have an extra \$6,000,000 dollars!! Isn't it more important to feed kids, and implement true management. Statistics already show how poorly the unhoused programs are being managed without accountability and/or performance verifications. Homicide at the Riverside Drive bridge shelter is just one example of this extraordinarily poor system. Please spend our money wisely rather than wasting it on the unnecessary.

Communication from Public

Name: christy lynn adair

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 07:56 PM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Please VOTE NO on council file 20-0263-S3 The City Attorney's request for these funds is shameful. The current contract with attorney's Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher was approved for up to \$900K to last over 3 years. However, 2-weeks into the contract, their team of \$1300/hour attorneys have already blown past the \$900K and have billed the City for \$1.8M. The are now asking the City Attorney to increase their contract to \$6M. The additional \$5M could be used to keep families in safe spaces versus what is happening this week – informing families that the program providing their housing has lost its funding. The kicker, the steep attorney fees are being used to oppose a ruling by the U.S. Federal Judge Carter that requires an oversight committee for LAHSA to ensure spending accountability and track effectiveness. Why is that worth \$900K or even \$6M to overturn? Hey, I would like some accountability at LAHSA. A recent audit found the city spent \$2.3B over a 2 year period. Okay. But show how it was spent – anyone? That's the problem – they can't. The money is just gone. Why does the City Attorney choose to throw more money at this problem? The contract with Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher should be dissolved, not increased. They've already overspent their contract very early and it should not be renewed. Further, the City should remove this firm from the preferred vendor list because of this rather incredible breach. Their contract was supposed to be for up to \$900K for work to be done over a 3-year period. Even if the work was necessary and beneficial to the City's constituents, the lead negotiator apparently does not know how to manage the cost of multi-year contract terms. Shameful indeed. Please VOTE NO on council file 20-0263-S3
With respect, Christy Adair Sherman Oaks, CA

August 26, 2025

Please VOTE NO on council file 20-0263-S3

The City Attorney's request for these funds is shameful.

The current contract with attorney's Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher was approved for up to \$900K to last over 3 years. However, 2-weeks into the contract, their team of \$1300/hour attorneys have already blown past the \$900K and have billed the City for \$1.8M. They are now asking the City Attorney to increase their contract to \$6M.

The additional \$5M could be used to keep families in safe spaces versus what is happening this week – informing families that the program providing their housing has lost its funding.

The kicker, the steep attorney fees are being used to oppose a ruling by the U.S. Federal Judge Carter that requires an oversight committee for LAHSA to ensure spending accountability and track effectiveness.

Why is that worth \$900K or even \$6M to overturn? Hey, I would like some accountability at LAHSA. A recent audit found the city spent \$2.3B over a 2 year period. Okay. But show how it was spent – anyone? That's the problem – they can't. The money is just gone. Why does the City Attorney choose to throw more money at this problem?

The contract with Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher should be dissolved, not increased. They've already overspent their contract very early and it should not be renewed. Further, the City should remove this firm from the preferred vendor list because of this rather incredible breach. Their contract was supposed to be for up to \$900K for work to be done over a 3-year period. Even if the work was necessary and beneficial to the City's constituents, the lead negotiator apparently does not know how to manage the cost of multi-year contract terms. Shameful indeed.

Please VOTE NO on council file 20-0263-S3

With respect,

Christy Adair
Sherman Oaks, CA

Communication from Public

Name: Joaquin Blount

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 09:13 PM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly stand in opposition to Agenda Item 41. We should not be fighting an accountability team for these funds to work solutions to homelessness. We have seen what happens when cronies of the current city government have control of these funds. As the city is already in debt, I disagree with spending more millions that we don't have to fight what you have shown an inability to fix. There needs to be oversight outside of the business as usual crowd of incompetence that has shown that they can't be trusted to govern our city. Please oppose Council File 20-0263-S3, we can't afford the rates being charged for the continuation of your incompetence.

Communication from Public

Name: Tim Campbell

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 01:49 PM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: This is the firm that has already spent double its original contract for \$900,000 for work defending the City in its settlement case with the L.A. Alliance for Human Rights. The original contract was supposed to cover three years of work, but Gibson Dunn charged twice that amount in two weeks. Now the City Attorney wants to increase the contract with Gibson Dunn and Crutcher by nearly six times, to \$5.9 million. A no-bid contract for \$900,000 that was supposed to cover three years is now a contract for almost \$6 million. The \$6 million will not be spent on homelessness programs. The money isn't being spent to improve anything or protect vital services. Not a single additional person will be sheltered, not one more meal will be served, and no one else will receive medical services they need to stay alive. It is being spent purely so the city can deny its responsibility for the disastrous way its run homelessness programs for years. All it will do is perpetuate a system that leaves thousands on the streets, where seven of them die each night. One can only imagine what nearly \$6 million could do for homelessness in LA. The city could contract with a professional data firm to build a system that tracks actual performance. It could hire a monitor to ensure people in shelters receive the services they need. It could do a lot of useful and effective things. Instead, it chooses to spend nearly \$6 million to defend: Shelter providers who serve two meals while charging for three. Unverified but clearly insufficient staffing levels in shelters. A system that the city admitted (in 2022 through the Alliance settlement) has produced nowhere near enough shelter beds. A system that pays LAHSA for unverified services. A structure that increased large nonprofits' revenues by \$266 million between 2019 and 2023, even as homelessness increased by more than 27 percent. The city has already paid nearly \$2 million to Gibson Dunn to try to defend itself from a damning assessment from the audit firm Alvarez & Marsal (A&M). As LAist reported, "L.A. city officials have made it impossible to accurately track homelessness spending, in large part by outsourcing to an agency that has failed to collect accurate data on its vendors and hold them accountable...". In mounting its defense, Gibson Dunn did not directly refute A&M's findings. Rather, the firm's lawyers tried to invalidate A&M's report by questioning its team's expertise. But A&M's report wasn't issued in a vacuum. The

Times has also reported that Gibson Dunn has already spent \$3 million of the \$5.9 million with no oversight from the Council. AM&M's report was just the latest in a long string of audits and reports, including one from the L.A. County Auditor that found LAHSA's financial management system is such disarray it doesn't even know who it is contracting with. Since the City depends on LAHSA for services and program statistics, any failure of LAHSA's is also the City's. A&M found that City program managers rarely questioned LAHSA's billings. The A&M and County reports were just two of many, as described in federal Judge David O. Carter's June 24 order to appoint a monitor to oversee the City program performance reporting. Its is this order the City is paying Gibson Dunn almost \$6 million to oppose. Any responsible public official should oppose this contract.

Communication from Public

Name: Melissa Bryson

Date Submitted: 08/26/2025 10:58 PM

Council File No: 20-0263-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Please VOTE NO! Enough is enough. Not another dime should be spent on politicians who steal, mismanage and misuse our funds, and certainly not to defend their indefensible actions! It is time to lock people up and throw away the key for greedy, unethical and utterly arrogant conduct with tax payer money. VOTE NO!!!