LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OPEN SESSION

Saturday, June 12, 1999 1:00 p.m.

The Westin - Tabor Center 1672 Lawrence Street Denver, Colorado 80202

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Douglas S. Eakeley, Chairman Hulett H. Askew John T. Broderick, Jr. John N. Erlenborn Edna Fairbanks-Williams Maria Luisa Mercado Nancy H. Rogers Ernestine P. Watlington

STAFF PRESENT:

John McKay, President
Danilo Cardona, Acting Vice President, Programs
Victor Fortuno, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary
James Hogan, Vice President for Administration
Edouard Quatrevaux, Inspector General
David Richardson, Treasurer and Controller

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc. 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 1250 WAS-HINGTON, D.C. 20005 (202) 296-2929

C-09108

C O N T E N T S	PAGE
Approval of Agenda.	4
Public Speakers:	
Hon. Gregory J. Hobbes Bennett S. Aisenberg	6 25
Approval of minutes of the Board's meeting of February 22, 1999.	41
Approval of minutes of the executive session of the Board's meeting of February 22, 1999.	42
Approval of minutes of the Board's meeting of April 17, 1999.	42
Approval of minutes of the executive session of the Board's meeting of April 17, 1999.	43
Approval of minutes of the Board's teleconference meeting of May 27, 1999.	44
Chairman's Report.	44
Members' Report.	47
President's Report.	51
Consider and act on proposed resolution ratifying the adoption of the new corporate logo for LSC's 25th Anniversary.	61
Inspector General's Report.	87
Consider and act on the Board's meeting schedule, including designation of locations, for year 2000.	95
Consider and act on the report of the Board's Operations and Regulations Committee.	
Consider and act on the Committee's recommendation regarding proposed final rule, 45 CFR Part 1641, Debarment,	
Suspension and Removal of Recipient Auditors.	104

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

1025 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 1250 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 (202) 296-2929

C-09109

C O N T E N T S (Continued)

PAGE

Consider and act on the Committee's recommendation regarding proposed amendment(s) to the Corporation's 403(b) Thrift Plan that are intended to increase the Corporation's employer contribution level to match the Civil Service Retirement System.

110

Consider and act on the report of the Board's Committee on Provision for the Delivery of Legal Services.

116

Consider and act on the report of the Finance Committee.

117

Report on the status of the work of the special panel established to study and report to the board on issues relating to LSC grantees' representation of legal alien workers and the requirement that they be "present in the United States."

122

Appointment of Acting Vice President of Programs.

132

Consider and act on other business.

135

MOTIONS: 4, 5, 41, 42, 43, 43, 44, 81, 103, 107, 115, 119, 134, 135, 142

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc. 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 1250 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 (202) 296-2929

C-09110

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Let me call the meeting to order. We have an agenda that was circulated. And in its circulation, we inadvertently dropped one item. And that is to receive and act on the report of the Finance Committee. It has obviously been our practice since we first came together almost six years ago to have committee reports and meetings in advance of the Board so that the Board could consider and act on those committee reports.

And Maria Luisa, forgive us for somehow magically dropping from the agenda the provision. And therefore, I would like to amend the agenda to include the item as consider and act on the report of the Finance Committee. And I will need a -- Victor tells me I need a vote on that.

MOTION

MR. ERLENBORN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Is there a second?

MS. WATLINGTON: Second.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor of

22 | amending the agenda?

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	(Chorus of ayes.)
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those opposed?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Now I need a vote on
5	approving the agenda as amended.
6	MOTION
7	MR. ERLENBORN: So moved.
8	MS. WATLINGTON: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor?
10	(Chorus of ayes.)
11	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
12	(No response.)
13	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. The
14	agenda is approved. And the first item of real
15	business is public speakers. And we are delighted to
16	have with us today two very distinguished members of
17	the Colorado legal community. Justice Gregory Hobbes,
18	Jr., of the Colorado Supreme Court and Bennett
19	Aisenberg, president of The Colorado Bar Association,
20	who I think some of you have already met.
21	First, let me call to the witness stands, if I
22	could put it that way, Justice Hobbes, who was

appointed to the Colorado Supreme Court in April of 1996. Prior to that time, he practiced law for 25 years concentrating on water, environmental land use, and transportation issues. He is currently an adjunct professor of environmental law at the University of Denver. And I should also note with great interest, he previously served as first assistant attorney general of the State of Colorado.

2.2

Justice Hobbes, thank you for joining us. It is a pleasure to have you with us. I said this last night at this reception too. We are the ones coming in from the outside and there is a slight awkwardness and irony to my saying welcome to people who are established members of the committee that we are visiting. But that is sort of the way that the agenda gets written around here. We were in Washington and then transported here.

JUSTICE HOBBES: Well, welcome home. I appreciate you being here. I bring you greetings from my colleagues on the bench of the Colorado Judiciary. Chief Justice Markey is at a Chief Justice's meeting somewhere out of the state and asked me to make this

appearance and to welcome you to Colorado.

And we have a very famous -- we like to think
he was famous -- poet laureate Thomas Hornsby Farrell.

Some of you may know some of his poems, maybe you
don't. He has been forgotten for some time, at least
in other parts of the country, and I would just like to
read three stanzas of his poem, Time of Mountains,
because I think it is kind of relevant to what you do,
and especially to the place you are today.

"When you have walked a long time on the floor of a river and up the steps and into the different rooms, you know where the hills are going. You can fill them. The far blue hills dissolving in luminous water, the solvent mountains going home to the oceans. Even when the river is low and clear and the waters are going to sleep in the upper swells, you can feel the particles of the shining mountains mopping against your ankles towards the sea.

"I push uphill behind the vertebrae fish that scurry uphill ages ahead of me. I stop to rest, but the order still keeps moving. I mark how long it takes an aspen leaf to float in sight past me and go

downstream. I watch a willow dipping and springing back like something that must be a water clock measuring mind against the end of mountains.

"So long ago my father led me to the dark and pounded orders of this canyon. I have confused these rocks and waters with my life, but not unclearly, for I know what will be here when I am here no more."

And of course you have in your work the great privilege of climbing the mountains and getting whacked sometimes. I know that. But as every step you take, you feel the geography and it is the uphill climb that most reminds you that the goal is still in sight. And hopefully on the downhill run when we are measuring our clock against these mountains, we will have made our contribution and feel good about it.

And of course my colleagues and I on the Court feel strongly about your role and your mission and those who help you with your work here in Colorado.

And we recognize how important that work is. I guess we are very keenly aware that almost 40 percent of the appearances made in our county in district courts now are pro se appearances. And that trend is growing.

And it is probably the greatest challenge that the community and the judiciary faces.

We are trying several approaches to try to aid you in your work. We know that the funding is short and that access to justice is one of the most important goals of the rule of law that we are all dedicated to.

Self-help centers. We have done an outreach this past year. Each of the seven of us have been assigned three of the judicial districts each in Colorado. And we have gone out to visit the courts. And one of our primary agenda is are we serving the public. And if not, why not and what can we do better.

We are trying to set up self-help centers with preprinted forms that would be approved through the State Court Administrator's Office with the help of the profession and those who are interested in various subject matter areas.

We have, for instance, one in Jefferson

County, one of our largest growing jurisdictions, and

it is a room right down the hall from the division

clerks of the district courts. And it is staffed

throughout the day five days a week. And that is where

a person can go and get preprinted forms and get some assistance and help getting them filled out.

Now as you know, a lot of these matters are family related matters, but there are a lot of other matters involved too. And we are looking at as many different forms and forms of assistance that we could provide right there on the courthouse steps as is possible. And we want to put those forms in our law library. And we are also posting them on the Internet. We do have a web page.

You know how daunting it is to face the legal system and be told by a clerk that they can't help you because they can't get legal advice. Well, we want some kind of legal advice available, but we know that there are certain ethical and legal standards against the practice of law.

And sometimes cur community goals and our ethical responsibilities and our licensing duties and, may I say, the monopoly of our profession collide. And we need to find ways to accommodate as much legal information to those who cannot afford attorneys and make that a legal practice without violating the canons

of practicing law without a license.

So when I tell the law librarians that they should assist the public and they say, "Well, the public is constantly asking us for legal advice," I say, "Well, you know, you are not supposed to give legal advice, but you sure can show them where the information is. I guess you ought to know where the information is yourself." And hopefully we will have some self-help centers with computers, but we are going to start with these racks with these preprinted forms.

Another thing that we became aware of as the year before last, the federal district court got very upset at the notion that there might be attorneys ghost writing pleadings. And these attorneys were not appearing in court. And we know that those who have good hearts and those who also are willing to represent people for a discounted fee, compared to others in the profession, and don't have the client who can pay them throughout the litigation have been helping folks prepare pleadings.

Now you could take a point of view that that is illegal and in violation of Rule 11 in the federal

courts and Rule 11 in the state court. Our reaction to that has been to propose a limited representation rule that would authorize non-litigation appearance ghost writing on a basis, however, that the attorney's help on the pleading would have to be disclosed.

1.5

2.2

But then that person would not be considered to have made an entry of appearance. But the court would know and the attorney on the other side would know that in fact there has been some assistance rendered in the pleading.

Now I guess figuring out whether to authorize this or not we came to believe that it is better to have some help by an attorney rather than none because as you know, the pressure on trial courts is tremendous. The trial courts have to be fair and impartial, yet a citizen who does not have legal advice is going to throw everything in there in hopes that something sticks.

So the role of an attorney in limited representation would be to help, perhaps, for a small reduced fee. Now we are talking about fee services there. Those who just donate their time without fee at

all on the front end, I don't think -- and don't substantially draft a pleading, we are not trying to make that disclosed.

How to write the final language of this rule has been very difficult because what we want is disclosure by those who have written a substantial part of a pleading of that attorney's name so that there is some accountability to the court, but understanding that that is not a full representation and there has to be some disclosure of the risks and benefits of that kind of relationship with the client.

But it is going to be a professional relationship. It is going to be required to have ethical standards attached to it, it is going to have some accountability. Hopefully, it will be a lot less fees. We expect it will be on crucial items. You know, complaints, answers, motions for summary judgment. But the attorney that is doing this will not come in and argue unless he or she is then going to go ahead and do that. And then that is a full appearance.

We have had great help from the Legal Services community in the State of Colorado to comment and help

us on the drafting of this rule. And I hope that it will be in place by July 1. We certainly don't want to have these workshops that the Legal Services attorneys put on to be considered to be this kind of limited representation where their names don't have to be disclosed.

We are thinking more about trying to get members of the private bar involved in offering this kind of service at a reduced rate and having an ethical responsibility as well. So I don't know whether other states have done that. That has been our reaction.

Rather to ban this ghost writing, we are going to try to legalize it in some fashion. We will report back to you about how successful that is.

Now talking about climbing the mountains, we have had a very interesting, and I don't know whether it was reported this morning -- and may I take a couple of more minutes, please?

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Absolutely.

JUSTICE HOBBES: A committee of the Judicial Advisory Councils studied the issue of mandatory probono. And before it even got reported to the full

Judicial Advisory Council to the Supreme Court, a movement got afoot in the legislature and in the profession to stop it cold.

Now I had 25 years of practice. And I know that legislators, although they are very astute, sometimes don't come up with ideas on their own. And when you don't like an idea and you want to kill it, you go straight for the juggler and kill it. It never got to us where we could vote as a court whether it was the thing to do under our licensing authority because the legislature passed a bill outlawing mandatory probono not only in the legal profession, but in other professions in Colorado as well.

I think that ought to tell us all something.

I guess one thing it tells us is that professionals

want to choose what they do and when they do it and how
they do it. And they don't want to be told by courts

of law or legislature that they have to devote their

time.

We heard some very interesting arguments about confiscatory, slavery, lack of due process, stealing by the suggestion that we might require 25 hours of pro

bono a year. On the other hand, we heard a lot of attorneys say that they were doing it anyway. So that we don't have to require it. We don't even have to think about requiring it because most attorneys do it.

Well, that may be so, although it is hard to tell what the nature and the extent of it is and whether it is throughout the profession or not. The bar association did run some surveys, I think tried to get some initial information, but the survey that was most telling was the survey about "How would you react to mandatory pro bono that may be considered sometime in the future by the Supreme Court?"

And it was overwhelming from the profession nine out of ten opposing it. Well, so, you know, I don't know whether there is any separation of powers involved in this. The Supreme Court does license attorneys. We do set the rules of court. Sometimes the legislature wants to tell us what those rules are. At the present time, we have a law that forbids us from adopting a mandatory pro bono requirement.

Well, the Judicial Advisory Committee when they did meet decide to report out a mandatory

reporting idea now that the mandatory pro bono was dead. There was an interesting dialogue in the Colorado Lawyer pro and con against that. And I will have to tell you, of course the legal profession is split on these.

2.2

The great thing about the profession is to hear the advocates on both sides of these debates. For it was a subcommittee of citizens and citizen lawyers who suggested the mandatory pro bono in the first place.

Well, the Judicial Advisory Council suggested mandatory reporting of pro bono like Florida has. Six of my colleagues were reluctant; in fact, refused to adopt it at the present time because of the outfall of the legislation. And their feeling that we have to try the volunteer side of it first.

So I believe what we have in front of us is perhaps the adoption of an aspirational goal of 25 or 50 hours a year for each member licensed attorney in Colorado. I hope we will get the bar association's support for this. I expect we will.

I would hope the bar association will step up

and self-monitor and survey about whether this aspirational goal is followed if we adopt it. And it was suggested out of some these debates in front of the Colorado Bar Association Board of Governors. So that is yet to be acted on. One step at a time when you are climbing a mountain.

2.1

2.2

We are trying also to have a simplified discovery procedure in cases that are valued less than a hundred thousand dollars. We are painfully aware that the discovery can eat up any amount of the award that can be returned. So we are seriously looking at a severe limitation on discovery and a simplified procedure in the district court. We will see how that goes over.

Those are a few things we are doing. Again, I want to thank you for being here to our great mountains. And we do have a divide that splits this state and sometimes there are citizens on one side and sometimes on the other, but when we meet on the top of the mountain, we all feel good about it. Thanks for your invitation.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Well, thank you very much.

JUSTICE HOBBES: Can I answer any questions?

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I would be interested in

learning more about your self-help centers and how they

are staffed and what the resources are that are being

made or to be made available to pro se litigants

appearing in court.

JUSTICE HOBBES: Well, I will tell you what, I will work with Jon Asher. We will report to you how many we have and how they are going. This is really just a pilot program. Ben Aisenberg may be able to help you a little bit about that.

We certainly hope that members of the local bar associations are going to help out in creating those self-help centers, that we will get them funded if not through the judicial budget, with some help from the community. But I think basically our goal is to have one in every courthouse and in the Supreme Court Law Library.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Maria Luisa?

MS. MERCADO: Yes. I was just wondering, as far as the pro bono documentation and reporting, if you will, that you were talking about, do you currently

have some kind of a statewide program for pro bono that is reported that has worked with some of the legal aides?

2.2

JUSTICE HOBBES: Well, we have a lot of folks active in that. You know, Jon would probably have to tell you how it is reported or Ben. I don't think there is any systematic reporting now. And that was part of the concern of the Committee of the Judicial Advisory Council is that we think a lot is being done, but nobody has a handle on what the extent of it is.

Now, you know, some of the greatest opposition to mandatory pro bono service and mandatory reporting came from members of small firms or solo practitioners and those in rural areas. And it was a combination of they really don't have the luxury that some bigger firms may have to accomplish this. And also that in a rural community, they often don't get paid or only get partially paid and feel they are doing pro bono anyway.

I would hope the bar would think about how to more systematically gather this information because that was really one of the reasons that my six colleagues decided that right now we weren't going to

go to mandatory reporting in the hopes that the bar -in fact, this was mentioned around our table -- will
institute something rather than our annual
registration, which was the recommendation where you
would file for your annual renewal of your license,
your report of how many hours, that hopefully will have
some kind of substitute periodically.

2.0

2.2

We will see. These things are -- now the other thing that happened ironically in our legislature, and you may have heard about this this morning, is that in the midst of the legislature banning pro bono forbidding the Supreme Court from even considering it, they also, for the first time, passed a bill giving an appropriation of 250,000 for assistance to those in need who have suffered family violence, domestic violence.

We have tried, together with the bar association, for several years running to get that and we got not a penny. So sometimes, you know, you think you are losing the fight. On the other hand, you get some other folks in an unlikely alliance that moves the ball forward.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: John Erlenborn.

MR. ERLENBORN: I don't have a question, but I have an observation. You said something about the non-attorneys preparing the pleadings would have a tendency to throw everything in there hoping something would stick. My observation has been that many attorneys do the same thing.

JUSTICE HOBBES: Well, except that, you know, if it is frivolous, they can get nailed with attorneys fees. It doesn't happen often, but at least the threat is there.

MR. ERLENBORN: I was away from the practice of the law for 20 years and when I returned, there was something that had crept into the practice, I guess across the board, pretty much, called Notice Pleading that I was totally unfamiliar with. And it bothered me, it bothered me very much.

I was -- always had a great deal of pleasure in filing motions to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action. That is practically impossible to do now. And I used to be successful. It was one of the things I could do and do well.

1 (Laughter.) JUSTICE HOBBES: You may not have the proof, 2 3 but you gave the notice. CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: If I can interrupt for one 4 second. And it is interesting that John Erlenborn 5 describes his 20 years in the Congress as a departure 6 7 from the practice of law. MR. ERLENBORN: A hiatus is what I call it. 8 9 read an article about Notice Pleading and I recall the 10 description that the author had of Notice Pleading. 11 said, "Notice Pleading seems to be designed to cause 12 the greatest consternation and impart the least information." 13 14 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I don't want us to fill Ben 15 Aisenberg's --16 JUSTICE HOBBES: Yes. 17 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: But our impressions have 18 been in talking with both the exemplary legal services 19 providers in Colorado, but also members of the private 20 bar, that the legal services program enjoys widespread

support of the private bar both in terms of the Legal

Aid Foundation and the fundraising efforts, but also

21

22

1 the pro bono volunteer contributions have been very 2 marked and very significant. 3 And I think we can always do much more and 4 especially need to do much more given the unmet legal needs out there. But I think Colorado is really 5 providing some wonderful leadership in many different 7 directions. JUSTICE HOBBES: Well, thank you, I am glad to 8 9 hear it. CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And we thank you for your 10 11 poetry as well. 12 JUSTICE HOBBES: I invite you to read some 13 more Farrell. 14 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Yes, we will. JUSTICE HOBBES: Appreciate it. 15 16 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Thanks again. 17 Now let me invite Bennett Aisenberg up. 18 currently practices in the law office of Bennett 19 Aisenberg here in Denver and was formerly a partner in 20 the firm of Gorsuch, Kirgis, Campbell, Walker and 21 Grover. He has served in various positions for the 22 Colorado Bar Association and also for the Denver Bar

Association for the past two decades.

1

2.

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

And we were talking very briefly before the meeting. He has transitioned successfully, I think, from full-time trial lawyer to a very nice mix of arbitration and mediation type of work.

Ben, it is nice to have you with us and we look forward to your remarks.

MR. AISENBERG: Justice Hobbes, I too like poetry. You are a very tough act to follow.

But let me welcome all of you to Denver for this conference. I am sorry I did not meet most of you last evening, but the first person I met was John Broderick and we spent quite a bit of time talking to each other. We found that basically we had a lot of things in common.

We are both dedicated to legal services, we are both democrats, we both were somewhat ambivalent about President Clinton and his private versus his public persona, we both come from New England, he went to Holy Cross, I grew up -- my home town is Worcester, and one of his former partners was a classmate of mine at law school.

If all of you are as dedicated as John

Broderick is, I am very impressed, but I have to

confess something to you. All the time that I was

talking -- I have been out here for 40 years. All the

time that I was talking to John Broderick, I kept

thinking to myself, "Gosh, am I glad after 40 years I

have finally lost my New England accent."

(Laughter.)

MR. AISENBERG: Let me tell you about the Colorado experience, and I am going to repeat some of the things that Justice Hobbes said and maybe go into a little more depth and then answer any questions, if I can.

We, up until this year, had been before the legislature on four or five occasions, could not obtain any funding for legal services. It kept going to the House Appropriations Committee, which kept killing it before it ever got out of session -- out of committee. As a result, the Judicial Advisory Committee that Justice Hobbes referred to appointed a subcommittee at the Bar's request, a predecessor of mine, to determine what is the appropriate way to provide legal services

for the poor.

That subcommittee met on a number of occasions and finally decided that mandatory pro bono was the best solution. Basically, we met with the full Judicial Advisory Council June of last year and said, "Wait. Before you make this recommendation to the Supreme Court, let's get input from the members as to how they will react to it."

And they agreed to defer any recommendation until such time as we could send out surveys. I in my visitations to the local bars could determine what their position is. We got resolutions from a number of the bars opposing mandatory pro bono. We held seminars throughout the state with speakers on both sides discussing mandatory pro bono.

We had a Board of Governor's meeting. And I -- we are a voluntary bar. We have 140 members on our Board of Governors. We have what I would call an awkward democracy. They voted, at the request of the members, by something like 90 to 9 against mandatory pro bono. In doing so, we made it clear that we are in favor of, overwhelmingly in favor of support for legal

services. The objection was in terms of the mandatory nature of it.

And I put an article that I had in the Colorado Lawyer on the back table -- that way maybe you can get CLE credits for this, or something like that if I give you written materials -- explaining the whole process.

But basically attorneys did not want to be regulated any further, they did not have to want to do mandatorily what they wanted to do voluntarily. And there are so many attorneys in Colorado who spend just countless hours doing pro bono. Obviously, it is not sufficient in light of the funding cut.

As a result, we met with the Judiciary

Advisory Council, I did about three months ago.

Originally, the Judiciary Advisory Council was in favor
by approximately a two to one vote to recommend

mandatory pro bono to the Supreme Court. Because of
the Bar's input, it rejected mandatory pro bono,

although it unanimously recommended mandatory
reporting.

In addition, at the Board of Governor's

meeting in January, they authorized me to appoint a task force to determine and to look into the area further to see if there were other things we could do. That task force has been meeting.

And the proposal at this point is to have a pledge which will go to all of the members of the Board of Governors and other attorneys who are known around the state and ask them to sign this pledge to do whether it be 25 or 50 hours of pro bono work. And then report at the end of the year whether or not they have complied with the pledge. And this will be published in the Colorado Lawyer.

In doing that, we hope to, by the end of the second year, whatever it may be, to have this pledge go to every lawyer in the state requesting that lawyer sign the pledge then do report the hours that that attorney has spent or at least report whether they have complied with the hours that they have pledged.

That is basically where we are, and it is still in formation. The Supreme Court just last week -- well, first of all, the Judicial Advisory Council in April rejected mandatory pro bono,

recommended the pro bono reporting, but the Supreme

Court just last week, as Justice Hobbes has already

told you, by a six to one vote, rejected mandatory

reporting feeling, I believe, at least from what I read

of the Chief Justice, that that was a step along the

road to mandatory pro bono, which basically the

Judicial Advisory Council and the Bar had rejected.

But we did get something we didn't expect, and Justice Hobbes has touched on this. After years of going before the legislature and getting beaten back in the House Appropriations Committee, one of our attorney members of the legislature on a domestic violence bill found a way to tack on \$250,000 for domestic violence victims. And next year, it still has to be approved in the budget, it is now the thirty-fifth state in the nation to have adopted funding for victims of domestic violence. We were before one of 16 states that didn't have it.

Obviously, we have to work harder, but at least the foot is in the door. And this one passed the House Appropriations Committee, didn't even get to it, and in fact, both the Senate and the House of

Representatives on the floor voted unanimously. There was no no vote.

And strangely enough, I guess something good comes out of everything that is bad. We think that the Columbine experience may have played an effect on having the legislature vote unanimously in favor of funding for victims of domestic violence. It is a sad situation, but basically, some good may have come from it.

John wanted me to fill you in on the fact that the three Colorado legal services programs have combined, they have merged. And hopefully out of this, the following five things will be gained. There will be meaningful access, there will be legal services, there will be justice, it will be able to serve as many people as possible, and it will take place throughout Colorado.

At the risk of overstaying my welcome in welcoming you, let me go into one other thing that happened yesterday morning that I was really very impressed with. We were at a meeting of the Judicial Advisory Council. And the only thing left of the

mandatory -- of the pro bono thing was whether or not we should amend Rule 6.1 of the Rules of Professional Conduct, the aspirational rule on mandatory pro bono -- on pro bono. And if so, what form it should take.

And the recommendation was it be 50 hours.

And unlike the ABA rule, it should be individual rather than collective. So that in a law firm, each attorney aspirationally should do 50 hours of pro bono work. In my naivete, I said, "You know, if our goal is to get legal services for the poor, we can far better accomplish this as long as it is aspirational by having it collective in a law firm."

Because the senior partner in his late sixties or early seventies is not going to perform pro bono work. He will probably say, "Look, I am too old for this," or, "I haven't practiced law, I haven't been in court in 20 years," whatever that may be. And therefore, they will just ignore it.

Whereas, if he sees a way, he or she sees a way to comply with this by assigning it to an associate, it is more likely it would get done. And I said, "Hey, we can serve our purpose better if we adopt

the ABA rule and make it collective."

And I was told by a number of the members that although we do want legal services for the poor, it is equally if not more important that each attorney recognize his legal and moral obligation to perform legal services for the poor and to allow a senior partner to shift it off on some associate is missing the boat.

And I was very proud of the Judicial Advisory Council for feeling that in spite of the fact we may not get the total amount of legal services we might get with a collective rule, that it is important to impress on attorneys in the State of Colorado that we do have an ethical obligation to perform pro bono legal services.

Basically, we are glad to have you here.

Welcome to our city. And I will be happy to answer any
questions you would like me to answer.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: It will be interesting to see, with all of this renewed attention to mandatory pro bono, mandatory reporting, ratcheting up of the aspirational goals, the extent to which you succeed in

having an increase in the pro bono participation among private attorneys.

Я

I think the legal services providers also have to make it easier for lawyers engaged in civil practice and very busy along the way to find the means to get engaged. But once they do, I think that the lesson time and time again has been they will come back for more not because of the ethical obligation in itself, but rather because of the reward that comes from participating in legal services and providing legal services for those in need. So we wish you well on that.

MR. AISENBERG: That was one of the reasons that I felt yesterday that look, if we have an associate do 75 or 100 hours of pro bono work because a senior partner assigns it to him, they will become invested with the process. We hope that we can get all attorneys to become invested in the process.

In the past, we have received commitments from the larger firms in Colorado to do pro bono work, but these commitments have not been met. And that is why we hope that an individual pledge, and basically the

1	reporting requirement behind it that you have lived up
2	to the pledge or that you missed by five hours, will
3	serve a purpose that basically just getting that
4	voluntary commitment before just basically didn't get
5	it.
6	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Will you keep the report
7	card as well for the Colorado Law Journal?
8	MR. AISENBERG: Yes. And again, it is going
9	to be
10	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: That will be interesting, I
11	think, in and of itself.
12	MR. AISENBERG: It is going to be reported in
13	the Colorado Lawyer as to those attorneys who lived up
14	to their commitment and possibly those attorneys who
15	didn't.
16	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: John Erlenborn?
17	MR. ERLENBORN: Let me just suggest that there
18	could be a symbiotic relationship between the grantees
19	of the Legal Services Corporation and other legal aid
20	societies maybe funded in other ways with this pro
21	bono. I have heard many comments from attorneys who do
22	pro bono work for those who have been screened in the

intake process of the legal services local grantee.

And their comments are often go "I am an attorney in this large firm on the 42nd floor of the downtown building. How are the poor people ever going to find their way to me? And when they get there and I am an attorney who specializes in acquisitions or antitrust," or whatever it is, "how can I serve them?"

So what I am suggesting, for whatever it is worth, is that attorneys can, I think, have this intake process taken care of for them to find the people who are really qualified for this kind of service, pro bono service. They won't have to bother with screening all of the -- those who might want to look for services from them.

Or on the other hand, there may be an opportunity for them to do something that they never could do because the clients wouldn't find their way to the 42nd floor. So I just make that as a suggestion as to how this aspirational pro bono may work better if you work with those existing agencies.

MR. AISENBERG: Excellent suggestion.

MR. BRODERICK: Mr. Chairman?

1 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Yes, Justice Broderick. 2 MR. BRODERICK: If I could, if Mr. Aisenberg could go back for a moment and just reread that part 3 about my dedication to legal services because actually 4 when I wrote out those remarks, I expected you would 5 6 pause at that point. (Laughter.) 8 MR. BRODERICK: The other thing I wanted to 9 suggest, Mr. Aisenberg, actually it is very timely mentioned my accent because Edna Fairbanks-Williams and 10 11 I -- she is from Vermont and I am from New Hampshire --12 we were just saying to each other last night we are the 13 only people on the Board without an accent. 14 MR. AISENBERG: John, everybody is out of step, but you. 15 16 MR. BRODERICK: Nice to have you hear. 17 you for coming. 18 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: One other quick question 19 out of curiosity, on the pro bono front again, to what

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: One other quick question out of curiosity, on the pro bono front again, to what extent are corporate legal departments going to be held to this aspirational goal or to the accountability or the tracking or being invited to take a pledge?

20

21

22

MR. AISENBERG: I don't know. Obviously, government attorneys have said to us, "Look, if we perform pro bono services, basically we are getting paid at the taxpayers' expense and we should be exempt from it."

I don't know -- on corporate attorneys, I would think that there should be -- the aspirational requirement should apply to them. I am not quite sure about the government attorneys. We haven't figured that out yet. We also haven't figured out in the rule as to what qualifies for pro bono services. In other words, the bar association meetings, which help serve the public interest, do those qualify as part of your 50 hours, and things of this sort.

How about reduced fee matters where your normal fee is \$200 an hour and you do something for \$50 an hour. All of these things have to be worked out. And we will be making a -- the Judicial Advisory Council will be making a recommendation to the Supreme Court. I am sure the Supreme Court will hold hearings on it and hopefully adopt an aspirational rule which goes beyond what we have now. We do have an

aspirational rule at the time being, but it really isn't spelled out in enough detail.

2.2

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Maria Luisa.

MS. MERCADO: Yes. You mentioned something about the senior partners that might not have had a lot of litigation experience. But in some of the programs or some of the states that have done some of the probono work, big corporate law firms do some massive extensive type of legal work, a lot of it might be transactional, in developing a whole neighborhood of housing, affordable housing for someone or doing economic development issues that big firms do a lot of the real estate transactions and commercial transactions can help them do.

It doesn't necessarily mean that they have to go to court to litigate. And they can still provide some of that pro bono. And it seems like in some of the states that we have looked at, the bulk of the pro bono work is being done by solo practitioners or small firms, the pro bono work. Those are the volunteers that are doing the bulk of the work on pro bono. That may not be true in some of the other bigger cities, but

in the other areas. And I understand the problems with rural areas.

If you have a legal services program in the bar or some other combination thereof that can do the screening, the intake, as John Erlenborn has stated, that would cut of lot of work from the pro bono attorneys where they are actually only doing the service, the legal service, and not necessarily the processing.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Any other questions or comments for Mr. Aisenberg?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Well, we thank you very much for joining us. And it has been a wonderful experience for us to be out here. We goofed yesterday, my fault. We ran out of time and were unable, as a consequence, to visit one or two sites to see some of the wonderful work that is being done out here.

But we learned a lot. And I think the extra staff work that is required when the Board takes its show on the road has been well worth it, and we very much enjoyed meeting you and Justice Hobbes and

appreciate your taking a Saturday afternoon to join us.
MR. AISENBERG: Well, we hope you all come
back out here.
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: We may well do that. Thank
you.
(Applause.)
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. We have an
ambitious agenda ahead of us as modified. Next on the
agenda is approval of minutes of the Board's meeting of
February 22, 1999, which were circulated in advance of
the meeting. Are there any changes or corrections to
be made?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Hearing none, is there a
motion to approve minutes as circulated?
MOTION
MS. MERCADO: So moved.
MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Second.
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Second. All those in
favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

1	(No response.)
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. The
3	minutes are approved. Also circulated were the minutes
4	of the executive session of the Board's meeting of
5	February 22, 1999. Any changes or corrections to be
6	made to those minutes?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Hearing none, is there a
9	motion to approve them?
10	MOTION
11	MS. WATLINGTON: So moved.
12	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Second from Edna. All
14	those in favor?
15	(Chorus of ayes.)
16	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
17	(No response.)
18	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. Also
19	circulated were minutes of the Board's meeting of
20	April 17, 1999. Again, any changes or corrections to
21	be made?
22	(No response.)

1	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Hearing none, is there a
2	motion to approve them?
3	MOTION
4	MR. ERLENBORN: So moved.
5	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. The
11	minutes are approved. This is about the longest run of
12	minutes we have had to approve in six years I can see
13	that. Next we have an executive session on April 17,
14	1999, the minutes of which were circulated. Any
15	changes or corrections?
16	MOTION
17	MR. ERLENBORN: Motion to approve.
18	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Motion and second. All
20	those in favor?
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
	Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

1	(No response.)
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. The
3	minutes are approved. Finally, approval of minutes of
4	the Board's teleconference meeting of May 27, 1999.
5	Any changes to those?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Hearing none, is there a
8	motion to approve?
9	MOTION
10	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: So moved.
11	MR. ERLENBORN: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor?
13	(Chorus of ayes.)
14	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. The
17	minutes are approved. We are done with that run.
18	Chairman's report. I don't have much to
19	report. I have got actually three things that I would
20	like to mention. First, I got a call, a very nice call
21	from Doreen Dodson last week to apologize for her
22	inability to attend on behalf of SCLAID today. She

didn't need to make the call, it was just a very nice gesture from someone who has been a friend and colleague, but I appreciated it and I want to just register and share my appreciation with you.

Secondly, we -- I got a call from the White House, I guess Thursday afternoon of this week, saying that President and Mrs. Clinton have said that they would like to host an event on July 27, 1999, in Washington to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Legal Services Corporation Act. Details to follow.

But mark the date, July 27. I think what we discussed yesterday about the possibility of working in a working session devoted to strategic planning maybe working up an agenda for others, depending upon who is coming and when, we might be able to get some of the business of the Board out of the way so that when we get to Seattle, we will be able to devote our time to substantive issues and do a site visit and the things that we discussed yesterday afternoon.

Thirdly, everyone here is invited. Everyone here is invited, I am not sure we can all fit into my

rooms this afternoon at 5:30, but we are going to have a cocktail reception at that time, Room 1502 everyone, audience included. The main purpose of which is to celebrate the second anniversary of John McKay's presidency of the Legal Services Corporation, which passed about several weeks ago, more or less unnoticed, but not really unnoticed.

I was just thinking of that as we heard the presentations this morning on state planning and thinking back to the discussion yesterday about strategic planning, how much of an impact John has had in these past two years and how profoundly grateful I am, certainly, to John and the wonderful staff that he has assembled or found and has worked with over these past two years.

But it is just a moment to pause and say thank you very much for a job very well done. We are in midstream, but we are with you to see this through. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And that is my report.

Next, we have members reports. Ernestine.

MS. WATLINGTON: None.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Edna.

MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: None.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Didn't you attend a conference at which you were eloquently outspoken recently?

MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Oh, yes. I did do one of my famous maps for the Indian conference. All of the spots in Vermont that helped with pro se, we trained the Office on Aging and the CAP people, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and everybody else that we can shanghai into start out cases, and so on, and send us the worst and pass out the Handbook and so on so people can do their own.

So I had my map and I had all of Vermont pretty well covered. It has taken numbers of years to train some of these people and, of course, we get new workers all the time into different agencies. But the old legal aid was very good about allowing anybody that wanted to come, regardless of whether it was an older lawyer, a younger lawyer, or a layperson, to go to any of the trainings.

1	I particularly am proud of my daughter-in-law
2	because she took the training for the Veteran's
3	Administration to help some of the veterans because my
4	son was a veteran. And she has helped two or three
5	people get their pensions. So training pro se people
6	does work.
7	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Thank you.
8	John Broderick.
9	MR. BRODERICK: Mr. Chairman, just to pass
10	along some greetings, I was at a seminar for three days
11	with Howard Dana and some others and he was inquiring
12	as to how things were going here at the Legal Services
13	Corporation and wanted me to pass along his best wishes
14	and his continued support for the mission of the
15	Corporation. So I have now fulfilled that promise.
16	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: John Erlenborn.
17	MR. ERLENBORN: I haven't been up to anything.
18	I pass.
19	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Maria Luisa.
20	MS. MERCADO: I pass.
21	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Bucky Askew.
22	MR. ASKEW: I would like to make one brief

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc. 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 1250 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 (202) 296-2929

C-09155

report. 1999 is the 75th anniversary of the Atlanta
Legal Aid Society. Tuesday night of this week they
held a banquet in Atlanta, 450 attendees. They asked
the judges to stand. My guess is there were probably
40 or 50 judges there along with lawyers, clients, and
politicians.

The First Lady taped, videotaped -- she had been invited to speak. She videotaped a greeting mainly because they were honoring a man named Randolph Thrower, who formerly was very active in the ABA.

Randolph has given 60 years of service to the Atlanta Legal Aid Society. He handled his first case for the Legal Aid Society in 1939. He is handling cases now for AIDS patients in Atlanta.

In the meantime, he was commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service is one of the things that he did. He is a remarkable man. But the main thing I wanted to mention is the governor of our state, our new governor spoke, and made the most remarkable speech I have heard in a long time about legal aid.

If you remember, when the Board met in Atlanta, maybe it was '94, we heard a report from the

Atlanta Legal Aid Society about the Home Defense Project and representing poor people whose homes were being taken from them by finance companies, in particular, a company named Fleet Finance, and that they had successfully litigated both the Legal Aid Society, the attorney general and private attorneys.

Our governor was one of the private attorneys who litigated one of those cases. And because of that and a lot of other work, is a huge fan of the Atlanta Legal Aid Society. And he gave a most remarkable speech about a lawyer's obligation to society and the importance of legal services and even said, "I am going to bore you about public defense." And went on and talked about that.

And I am going to attempt to get a copy of it because there was people there saying, "This is the governor of a southern state saying things that everybody should hear." But it was a remarkable event. I brought the little brochure to give to Jon Asher because next year is the 75th anniversary of the Denver program. And it may not exist in its current form by then, but they are going to do something next year to

1	celebrate their 75th anniversary.
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Great.
3	Nancy Rogers.
4	MS. ROGERS: No report. Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: How was graduation?
6	MS. ROGERS: Wonderful.
7	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Great.
8	Next we have the President's report. John
9	McKay?
10	MR. MCKAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank
11	you for your earlier remarks. I have to say that I am
12	shocked at the reports or lack of reports from members
13	of the Board because that is not the way your staff has
14	been viewing some of the activities of Board members.
15	And so I have to begin with a little bit of a report by
16	Board members.
17	Ernestine has been very active in the state
18	planning efforts in Pennsylvania. I don't hear about
19	them often directly, but I hear about them indirectly.
20	And I want to thank her for her work. I want to thank
21	Nancy Rogers who has been very helpful in Ohio. She
22	will tell you she is not doing much, but it is not

true. Without Nancy's help, we wouldn't have had the very first meeting in many, many years of project directors in Ohio.

John Broderick, as the Board knows, is going to work very closely with us and already has made a significant contribution on the follow-up to the conference in Miami and to strategic planning.

Maria Luisa was soon to be en route to Canada in Yellow Knife and her trial schedule has interrupted that.

John Erlenborn is chairing a very important commission, which he declined to comment on at this point, but I know there will be some additional report to the Board on the extensive work of his commission on H2A representation. Very important to all of our programs around the country and to our mission. And once again, John has been tremendously helpful on our representation in the Congress.

We will continue to call on individuals like LaVeeda. Bill McCalpin is working on the logo on the 25th anniversary project. Bucky and Bill together on the development of a new logo that you will be hearing

about.

So I had to say to those assembled and for our record that the chorus of no reports is really not indicative of the extensive involvement of our Board members and their work. And I want to thank you all.

And I haven't even mentioned the activities of the Chair who continues to assist us in many ways directly, indirectly. And I want to thank him for his extraordinary time commitment as well.

And Tom Smegal has made several trips back to the Corporation helping us on our building. Maria Luisa also, as chair of finance, is going to help in that way. And I know I have left out a number of other activities. I know it is not quite my place to correct the reports of my bosses on the Board, but really the work has been substantial.

So thank you for that moment, Mr. Chairman, but you have a very active board and I wanted to acknowledge that publicly.

We, since we last met, learned that Karen Sarjeant would be departing and in fact has now departed the Corporation as a vice president and

president for programs. We already miss Karen and her leadership.

.12

2.2

Danilo Cardona has agreed to step in, and I know that is a matter before the Board at this meeting to formally appoint him as the acting vice president for programs. Danilo has already done a tremendous job and will be continuing, at his own request, to lead in the compliance and enforcement area of the Corporation. But I think Danilo would be the first to tell you that he has an excellent team supporting him.

I have also appointed, in consultation with the Chairman of the Board, a search committee to find a permanent replacement for Karen. And I wanted to announce those individuals are Jim Hogan, who will be chairing and coordinating the search along with Joan Kennedy. Karen Sarjeant will serve on the committee as sort of an ex officio member, but full participant. From the Board, Bucky and Maria will serve on the search committee. Don Saunders, Jon Asher, Linda Recksor, Lillian Moy, and Don Isaacs.

We will focus on searching out the kind of leadership that Karen and John Tull provided in that

job. We are very interested in making sure that we have substantial field representation and field capability. Very dedicated to making sure that we consider the necessary diversity in our staff. And I am very concerned about that.

And I hope that the members of our committee, each of whom I have discussed that issue with, will help me as we search for a candidate to submit to the Board. And I appreciate those who have agreed to serve.

The Board was briefed earlier on the situation regarding our case statistic reporting. And I just think for the record I should indicate that we continue to pay careful attention to the information that we gather and submit to the public and to the United States Congress. We do take this very, very seriously. It is clear that we have work to do.

As the Board was briefed earlier, there are ongoing audits in the Inspector General's office, by our own compliance and enforcement division, and by the GAO. Our programs are, therefore, subject to a number of potential visitors who will be looking at their

data.

And I think more importantly, engaging now in a dialogue with us as we redesign -- and this is, I think, what I want to emphasize to the Board and to the public, as we redesign cur statistical data so that we can gather accurate information about the services we provide, not just the cases that we handle in court.

Because today's legal world, let alone the world of poverty law, actually involves a much broader range of services than we have ever reported in the history of the Legal Services Corporation. So we actually welcome the opportunity to describe more fully the services that we do provide.

Native American representation in Indian country. It was a very -- it was more fully reported to Provisions. And as Edna pointed out, she attended. We think this was very good. We want to continue this process next year with a conference on migrant representation, and we will be looking for assistance from some Board members as we prepare for that event.

On the administration side, I wanted to let

the Board know that we are continuing as we move forward with our study of compensation at the Corporation. We appreciate your patience in this.

We have another consultant, Faustino Pino, who is doing that work in cooperation with Joan Kennedy and Jim Hogan and Joan's staff. David Richardson working very closely also as we take a look at our compensation. And we will be reporting to the Board at the next meeting regarding the findings that we will have for you.

The entire Corporation, with some exceptions, which will be corrected, have all participated in a sexual harassment training organized by Joan Kennedy and her staff. I thought it was excellent, necessary, and we will continue to engage in those activities.

We have a number of new employees. And I would just direct your attention to a communication, which if you have not received, it will be in your mail on your return. I am very excited about the wonderful new talent that we are bringing into the Corporation. And Joan's office has released, I think, a very good summary of their backgrounds.

You have met several who have come in participation with this meeting, and they have already made an excellent contribution. And I know that you will welcome the others as they appear before you from time to time.

2.2

I am not going to report fully on the situation regarding our desire to obtain a building, a permanent home for the Corporation in Washington. That continues apace. Jim Hogan is leading that effort internally. Joan Kennedy, Dave Richardson are also assisting. We will provide you with some additional detail as we do move forward on that. But Jim continues to work that issue pretty carefully.

From the Board, Tom Smegal is working directly with us on this. And we have pledged to keep Maria Luisa informed and involved so that we don't have any surprises in terms of financial cost. But once again, we continue to find that a permanent home for the Corporation is clearly in the financial interest of the Corporation and obviously the people that we serve.

The Board was given an opportunity to receive a report on strategic planning. And I just want to

emphasize here, in the public portion of our meeting, that there is truly nothing more important that your staff is engaged in than in strategic planning. This is not a buzz word, it is not a hoop we need to jump through because of legislation, it really is going to go fundamentally to the work that we do and the guidance that we receive from the Corporation. And that means the head of the Agency, this Board.

And so we are working hard to make that relevant, make it something that does guide our work.

And we look forward to the involvement of every Board member in this process. And you will be hearing much more about that as we continue with that effort.

I have made a number of visits out to the field since we last met. I won't mention all of them to you and save that, but I did want to mention, with Nancy on the phone, that I had a very good trip to Cleveland, Ohio where I spoke at the 74th annual meeting of the Cleveland Legal Aid Society.

And I had the opportunity also to spend some time with local media in and around Cleveland. And I was very impressed by what was happening in Ohio as it

played out in the Cleveland Legal Aid Society, which I think all of our members know is one of the most famous legal service programs in the United States and the way in which they have embraced the Ohio version of state planning.

Very exciting. As Lionel Jones stood up and said, it was the last meeting of the Cleveland Legal Aid Society as everyone in that room knew it. And the room was filled with judges and attorneys and clients and staff people. And once they got over the shock, he explained that the new Cleveland Legal Aid Society, although significantly larger, was going to serve clients in a much better way and endorse the process that Ohio has been through. I want to, at this point, with the --

MS. ROGERS: I just wanted to say that I had called and I did report how you did that and people were quite impressed with you.

MR. MCKAY: Thank you, Nancy. I will send you the check after the meeting, but thank you for that.

Mr. Chairman, with your concurrence, I would like to advance item number 17, which is the report on

the Corporation's logo and the 25th anniversary and ask our director of government relations and public affairs, Mauricio Vivero, to come up and lead us through the next portion.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Actually, you are doing it at my request. So you have my concurrence as well.

MR. VIVERO: Thank you.

MR. MCKAY: It is very neatly arranged then, isn't it?

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Yes.

MR. VIVERO: It is nice to have both of you consenting to my presentation. I would like to briefly share with you our planned activities and events concerning the 25th anniversary and then give you a short presentation on the new logo.

Apart from the event at the White House that Doug mentioned, we are planning and setting up a whole range of very, I believe, interesting and exciting activities to help us celebrate the anniversary. The anniversary represents for us a wonderful opportunity to educate the public about legal services, to form new and stronger relationships with community leaders and

other national organizations to support our work. And we will try to make the most of it.

We are planning a second event also in July in Washington on Capitol Hill, hopefully with the Attorney General's participation, to honor members of Congress from both parties who have supported our work and hopefully will support it for the next 25 years.

We have commissioned a national poll, which will -- is taking place actually this week. We will have the results in a week. We hope it will, once again, prove that an overwhelming percentage of Americans support the concept of federal funding for legal services. We hope to make use of this poll to generate positive news during the month of July as we celebrate the anniversary.

We have begun to completely overhaul our web site. And in the next couple of months, we will be bringing to you a report and the presentation on a new web site, which will be, we think, much improved, have much faster, stronger links to our grantees, provide the kind of information, which is persuasive and raises public awareness and helpful to our friends in

Congress, other organizations, and our grantees.

A lot of what we plan to do starts in July, but our goal is to have activities and events throughout the entire anniversary year. We plan to have a special event at every Board meeting throughout the year when we are out of Washington. And that will include, of course, Seattle, Austin, and Minneapolis.

Our goal is to, at every juncture, use the anniversary in order to raise public awareness and at the local level in those cities, form new alliances, which will help us both in terms of funding but also in terms of overall public support.

As part of our activities that will extend beyond July, we have -- we are working with some consultants to establish radio public service announcements, which we hope to have air in the major markets in the U.S. throughout the year.

There will be two separate announcements that we are working on. One will be one that hopefully, in a very crisp and short way, explain what legal services does, why it is of value, and provide a service to our grantees by providing the local phone number of the

place where the public can call. So it will be a public education and advertising campaign, if you will, for our grantees to raise the level of awareness and name recognition for local entities.

The second public service announcement we hope will -- will be designed to encourage pro bono. We want to have an active voice in reminding lawyers that they should participate in conjunction with our programs and dedicate time. We think that both of these announcements will be concluded -- will be finished soon and hopefully will have -- they will be well received and aired in the major markets throughout the entire year.

All of our activities will be coordinated to maximize support within Congress and to raise public awareness. One of the most important activities around our anniversary year is development of the logo, which I would like to share with you now and give you a brief overview on. I would like to invite our President to make a few remarks while we set up the appropriate technology here to get started.

MR. MCKAY: Well, Mr. Chairman and members of

the Board, you will recall that we had struggled a little bit with the issue of creating an identity for the Corporation that will acknowledge the service of many dedicated volunteers and staff people over the past 25 years while giving us an opportunity to build some new identification around the Legal Services Corporation and the service we provide.

In consultation with the Chairman of the Board and individual Board members, we were asked to work with Mr. Askew and Mr. McCalpin as we went through this process. And I want to just give a little caution out here, which is we, in discussing this, determined that it was a little bit like purchasing art work. Some were going to like it, some were not going to like it.

But we wanted to come up with something that both honored the past symbols of the Corporation and yet gave us something new to build support around. And that is indeed a daunting challenge. I think that we have done that. What we need to understand is that part of the meaning that will be attached to the new symbol has yet to come.

So as you see where the small group that has

worked on this came to, you will understand that we will have some work to do. We are excited about this. It does come together at the right time, I think, 25th anniversary of the Corporation. The advent of more technologies, which will allow visual depictions of what the Corporation does.

So we are asking you to peer a little bit into the future, take a little bit of a risk, and see the possibilities of building the kind of recognition of the contribution of past Legal Aid lawyers and those that will come in the future. Or not just the lawyers, but staff and others who are engaged in this partnership for the legal right support people.

So Mauricio.

MR. VIVERO: Thank you.

Let me start with a brief introduction to what we were trying to accomplish. Obviously, the anniversary provides for us a great opportunity. In order to really seize that opportunity and to maximize all of the possibilities associated with the anniversary year, the Corporation needs to have a strong, positive national identity. And that was one

of our principal goals of redesigning the logo.

Our vision is that this new logo will reposition the organization with target audiences, will send a message of permanence, will continue to reinforce LSC as a non-partisan organization with strong bipartisan support.

The specific gcals in developing the icon or symbol that you will see are varied and sometimes don't all work together, but they are, we believe, equally important. The first is LSC really deserves the kind of national recognition that other entities have achieved. And we feel that part of that can only be reached through a new, strong, unique identity.

The United Way and the Peace Corps obviously have stronger recognition nationally, have symbols that come to mind. Those are symbols that they have worked on years in developing. But our goal is to again develop a symbol that we can aggressively market to build public awareness, communicate with our programs, for the first time create a link to our clients.

There is a massive disconnect between the clients -- the services received by clients and any

association with the Legal Services Corporation. We want a symbol that over time will bridge that gap and, at the local level, Legal Services Corporation will be directly associated with the work done through our grantees.

2.0

LSC has a very important history. And really our inspiration for a new logo comes from this tradition. This logo, which you see here, has been adopted by hundreds of grantees as their own, has a long history within the Corporation, and this was really our starting point.

We worked with lots of artists to think about what a symbol for the Corporation needed to represent and how we got there. After a lot of work and different drawings, different concepts being floated around, lots of debate with consultants and the wise counsel of Bill and Bucky, we decided to, in effect, return to the past.

And our logo, we decided, must be centered and focused on equality. We will build on the equal sign as the fundamental symbol of our logo. What it represents cannot be replaced by a different symbol.

The notions of fairness, justice, equality, are central to our mission. And that is why we are starting development of this logo.

Now we are going to take a symbol that has some history and is well known and try to build on it to create something that is unique. And that is the challenge. We decided to duplicate the symbol, form the letter L, obviously reinforce the word "legal."

Then we are going to double it, rotate it, and create a symbol that has some balance, some strength and integrity. It is a symbol which appears to have some movement with it. It is balanced in terms of strength of the organization.

We are going to use color to do a couple of things. First, in terms of the equal signs, we are going to go with red to reinforce some symbolism around the flag -- justice, patriotism -- and focus those colors on the equal sign.

We are going to use blue to reinforce. Blue is a traditional color of the government, a color the President uses. We want to create a symbol that captures all those ideas and when taken together,

provides us with an identity that both captures government work and the type of symbolism associated with justice and fairness that we are reaching for.

1.5

We have decided that we are known as LSC.

Legal Services Corporation is, at best, a confusing

title. We think that the best approach is to maximize

on the shorthand and be referred to as LSC. In a

second, you will see that we are going to add a tag

line, which clarifies what LSC means, but we think it

is best to build on the recognition that we already

have in terms of LSC.

We have developed, through many, many hours of work with lots of partners both inside and outside the Corporation, a tag line, which we think accurately and in a very strong positive way captures what the Corporation stands for. And the tag line is, "America's Partner For Equal Justice."

We want to reinforce the basic mission of the organization. We want to capitalize on the awareness and recognition we have now, which is LSC. But we want to be able to explain it in a way that is shorthand and truly captures the essence of the organization.

For the anniversary, we propose a tag line which will say, "For 25 Years, America's Partner For Equal Justice." We want to both reflect the history and the permanence of the organization and have developed this tag line to go with the anniversary events and be part of all the materials for that year.

The plan is to aggressively market this logo. We do not want our grantees to adopt it as their own. We want them to, through a partnership with us, use it in the -- voluntarily use it in their materials, identify themselves as partners of LSC, grantees of LSC, members of the LSC family.

The logo we have selected works in black and white as well as color. That is an important consideration because we will not -- we don't want to burden people with having to print in color or change materials. We want them -- we want our materials when xeroxed and used not in color to also work. And as you can see, the distinction in the -- with the light gray and black also works.

In conclusion, we think that it is time that LSC had a strong symbol to promote and raise, which

1 should be very good national recognition. We have suffered in part because we are not well known. 2 there is some confusion about what the organization 3 4 does. We think that selecting a unique symbol and 5 marketing it aggressively will over time help establish 6 7 the identity that we want, and that identity will have a direct positive impact, not only in raising public 8 awareness, but in our activities on the Hill and in our 9 10 collaborations with national and local partners. there it is. 11 12 We are going to pass out for you some sample 13 letterhead and t-shirts with the anniversary logo on 14 it. And I am sure John and I will be glad to take any 15 questions you have. 16 MR. MCKAY: I would like you to direct all 17 questions to Mr. Askew. 18 MR. ASKEW: Let me say something first, maybe. 19 MR. VIVERO: Let him defend himself before we 20 move any further.

> Diversified Reporting Services, Inc. 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 1250 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 (202) 296-2929

involved in this process. We thought we were selected

Mr. McCalpin and I were actively

MR. ASKEW:

21

22

because we had been involved in legal services for so long. In fact, they told us we obviously were the two most artistic members of the Board.

We were a little out of our league in dealing with the artists, I will say. Mr. McCalpin would like the record to reflect that if you like it, it was all his idea, if you don't like it, he wasn't here today. So there is no responsibility. We came to Washington twice. The first time, remind me Mauricio, was in March?

MR. VIVERO: Mm-hmm.

MR. ASKEW: In March, where we spent about a half a day with the group of artists and designers who worked with us on this. Where it was interesting because we didn't talk in the beginning so much about logos and art, we talked about the history of legal services and what legal services means to the country and what the mission and goal of the program is.

We talked about -- gave them a historical perspective on the program that they very much wanted to have before they started this process so that they would understand what it was they were trying to

represent here.

1.1

And then we viewed a lot of varieties of different logos that were potentially available for us to use, some of which we rejected, some of which we liked and said needed further work. And we talked about tag lines and various other things. So that was several hours worth of work.

And then they went back to work with Mauricio and the staff and then Bill and I came back to Washington again about two weeks ago last Friday to view this presentation. It was a different tag line, but everything else was essentially the same.

And after a lot of discussion, I think both of us came to the agreement that we very much like this and very much support it and for a number of reasons, which Mauricio touched on in his presentation. It does continue the tradition we have started of using the equal sign, and the equal sign is emphasized in this, which does link us to the past and to -- not only the past logo, but to the whole history of the program.

It is different and marks a departure from what we have been doing, which we came to believe is

important. We are setting off on something new here.

And therefore, it needs to be a new departure. Using the scales of justice, if you look in the yellow pages, about half the people who advertise in the yellow pages use the scales of justice. I mean, that is not something that we can rely upon to indicate anything that is different from just the delivery of legal services per se.

2.2

So we wanted to get something new with this.

We also liked the idea of using LSC and trying to

identify LSC for our future work as we establish this

identity moving into the future. Ironically, as I was

watching the strategic planning discussion and

listening to it yesterday, I was thinking about this

logo and how this fits in very nicely to all of that.

I mean, the things he was telling us yesterday about what we should be trying to do here, were reminiscent of the discussions we were having at the Corporation when we are talking about developing this logo. How do we distinguish ourselves? What is our mission that is different than other organizations? What is it we want people to know about this program?

What do we want our staff and our grantees to feel about the program?

It accomplished a lot of those things. We liked the use of the word "America" in the tag line, that this should be known as America's program. It is a national program funded by the Congress. And that we are partners in the effort.

So anyway, after a lot of discussion and viewing lots of alternatives, we all, I think, reached a unanimous agreement that this is the one that we felt most met the goals that we had for this project when we started. So we are reporting to you that the two of us very much like it.

Now what Mauricio said earlier, looking at particularly the symbol is also like looking at a piece of art. When you view any piece of art, 75 percent of the people, hopefully, will like it, but there are always going to be 25 percent or so who don't get it or don't like it. And so you can't focus too much on that. But I think the package of all three elements work very well together and have accomplished what we set out to do here.

And I think Mauricio and his staff deserve a lot of credit because this was certainly not easy. If you saw what we were looking at the beginning of this and all the different options that were available and what the designers and the artists were presenting, it was quite an overwhelming job. And I think they have done a good job getting us to where we are.

MR. VIVERO: I would like to state for the record that my official job is government relations. This is only a sideline business.

MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Well, it is a good thing that you made that sentence that you didn't expect all the grantees to adopt it because if you had have, I would have probably said I would refuse to accept it.

I will have to tell you a little story about being in New York State. I was standing in line at Port Authority and I still had on my legal aid badge with my name that said Vermont. And this guy walked up to me and passed me an envelope and said, "Vermont" in a very foreign type of voice. And I said, "Yes?" And he tapped my badge and he said, "Tomorrow." And he

passed me an envelope with \$3.

Well, it was a thick envelope and I said, "You want me to mail that tomorrow." And he said, "Yes."

Thanked me and walked away. Well, I put it in my pocketbook not thinking anything about it, went through Albany and so on and so forth never thinking that it was a thick envelope and that it might have money or checks or anything like this in it.

Well, I dragged it out the next morning when I was going to go into Rutland and it was addressed to a local bank in Rutland. And I said, "Well, he had my name from my tag, but I didn't have his name." I said, "I am going to take this to the bank and make them give me a receipt for it and then I will be safe."

So I took it to the bank and I told them that I had received it when I was standing in line at Port Authority and that I had my legal aid badge on, that he had tapped my badge. And that I didn't know who it was and I wanted a receipt for it.

Well, they opened it up and there was \$1,600 in cash besides some checks that were signed. The checks were signed so badly that the girl couldn't

1	figure out what the name was. Well, I said, "It must
2	be a payment. Call the loan department." So she
3	refused. I said, "This money has to be here today, he
4	asked me to bring it here today. And I want a receipt
5	for it, and it has got to be a payment."
6	So she finally called the loan department.
7	Well, the loan department lady was trying to talk to
8	her. She said, "Well, we have got 37 notes," she says,
9	"that are due today." Me being smart, you know, I
10	said, "Tell her a drunken angle room crawled across the
11	check." She said, "I know who it is, I will be right
12	down." It was an Armenian guy and he trusted the legal
13	aid badge because he walked right up to me and passed
14	me that money to put into the bank.
15	MR. ERLENBORN: Congratulations on your out of
16	state contacts.
17	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: No. I just wanted to
18	make the point that he trusted the legal aid the
19	scales and the legal aid.
20	MR. BRODERICK: What Edna didn't tell you is
21	she kept \$500.
22	(Laughter.)

MR. VIVERO: Well, you are right, Edna. We don't want them to adopt this as their own like has happened in the past. We want this to be our symbol.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I want to go back to the anniversary planning in a minute, but let's finish and if there are any other questions or comments about the logo, what we are being asked to do is ratify the selection that has already been made and obviously, in which we have already invested. And it just so happens that I have a resolution here ratifying the adoption of the new corporate logo. And if I could read it to you.

"Whereas, the Legal Services Corporation is celebrating the 25th anniversary of its creation next month; and whereas, the President of the Corporation has approved the adoption of the attached corporate logo to coincide with the Corporation's 25th anniversary; and whereas, the staff of the Corporation has made a presentation of the new Corporate logo to the Board; and whereas, the President of the Corporation has requested Board ratification of the adoption of the new logo; now therefore be it resolved that the Board hereby ratifies the adoption of the new

1	logo for LSC; and be it further resolved, that this new
2	logo shall be the official logo of the Corporation and
3	shall be the one used by all components of the
4	Corporation."
5	That is the resolution. First, could I have a
6	motion proposing it.
7	MOTION
8	MR. ERLENBORN: So moved.
9	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Is there a second?
10	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Second.
11	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Is there any further
12	discussion or questions about it?
13	MS. MERCADO: I just had a question on the
14	the actual symbol itself. Did you all check on the
15	trademark for it? That symbol seems real familiar to
16	me and I can't
17	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Yes, it does to me
18	too, but I haven't figured out what it is yet.
19	MR. VIVERO: Yes, we are checking and
20	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: We are going to register
21	this.
22	MR. VIVERO: Yes, we will register the

1 trademark. If there -- you know, there may be someone 2 that has it, but it is -- but there is no one in our field with these colors that is using it. And so we 3 are pretty certain that that will not yield any 5 conflicts, but we are checking that. And we made some preliminary inquiries before. MR. MCKAY: I would just say that is an 8 important caveat. 9 MR. VIVERO: Yes. 10 MR. MCKAY: We will do -- and Victor's office 11 has already commenced the process to make sure that we haven't adopted something that is taken by someone 12 The law is a little bit more complex than that, 13 else. 14 as I understand it. It would have to be someone 15 essentially doing the same type of thing that we are 16 doing. But we will get that part ironed out. If we run into difficulties, we will let you know 17 immediately. 18 19 MR. VIVERO: And our plan is to register it, 20 you know. 21 MS. MERCADO: Just as a further comment, I

really like the byline, "America's Partner For Equal

22

Justice." I like that. I have a problem, though, just again, it is art, right? I have a problem with the symbol as far as just automatically a layperson in the street identifying it as a legal symbol. It is not something that automatically comes to mind when they think of legal.

So that would be my only question. I think that as long we are not mandating that everybody use it -- but I would think that the purpose, though, of mandating -- of having a logo as United Way does, it doesn't matter what United Way it is, whether Podunc or Seattle or New York, everybody recognizes that symbol as United Way.

And I would assume that the symbol that we would make for the Legal Services programs nationwide would be a symbol that we would hope everyone locally would use and would automatically identify when they saw that symbol as the equal justice partner.

MR. VIVERO: That will take time and that is our goal. And we want -- we will very strongly encourage programs to partner up with us and use this on their materials and identify themselves as part of

1	our family, if you will.
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: John Erlenborn.
3	MR. ERLENBORN: On the issue of the LSC not
4	necessarily being recognized, I think that is probably
5	true, but if you look to the business section, some
6	very large corporations have gone from long names to
7	just a few letters.
8	For instance, United States Steel Corporation
9	for years was that was the name of it. Now it is
10	USX. And that is now well recognized. And it seems to
11	be the trend in the business sector to move toward
12	initials or some short sort of identification for a
13	logo.
14	MR. VIVERO: Yes. Thank you for mentioning
15	that, John. That very much that trend very much
16	guided our thinking in terms of going with the letters.
17	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Any further comments or
18	questions?
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Hearing none, all those in
21	favor of the resolution ratifying the adoption of the
22	logo?

1	(Chorus of ayes.)
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
3	MS. MERCADO: Nay.
4	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: One nay. The ayes have it.
5	MR. VIVERO: And let me apologize to Nancy who
6	could not appreciate the visuals here. We have a color
7	packet, which is on its way to you, with a complete set
8	of the presentation.
9	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And t-shirt, I hope.
10	MR. VIVERO: And t-shirt. Yes.
11	MR. ERLENBORN: What size do you want?
12	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Please, stay
13	there for a minute because I want to go back to the
14	anniversary planning part. Are we doing anything to
15	reach out to or coordinate with our involve
16	stakeholders and interested support sources, such as
17	State Judiciary National Association of Attorneys
18	General and the like?
19	MD VIVEDO Von Von
	MR. VIVERO: Yes. Yes, we are going to work
20	with we have already made efforts to work with all
20	•

non-traditional partners, much broader business community support, and possible activities with them.

2.0

So we are covering the bases. Our press kit, which will be distributed on our anniversary, will have an extensive list of entities, persons, and organizations that support our work and will be making a public statement on our behalf. It includes the groups that you mentioned. And if there is a specific group you would like us to involve in a particular event throughout the year, we can certainly work with that.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: My sense is that there will be or there should be more opportunities to get more groups involved. We had a discussion with Attorney General Salazar last night about the desirability of getting NAG, in particular, engaged this year, state bar associations. We talked in January about the law school deans and also about state judiciary or Association of Chief Justices that Justice Broderick had mentioned.

MR. VIVERO: Right. Well, John has already given us some good ideas about that and we are going to

1	look at that.
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Right. I think that these
3	are areas where the Board can help and also I think in
4	which the Board would like to be engaged.
5	MR. VIVERO: Okay. Will do.
6	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: So I think we will just
7	work on that some more too. All right. Well, thank
8	you very much.
9	MR. VIVERO: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: That is a lot of work, a
11	lot of good work and good results. And good luck to
12	the new logo.
13	John, are you we are still are we done
14	with your report?
15	MR. MCKAY: We are done. Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Are there any
17	other questions of John McKay on his report?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Hearing none, then we will
20	invite Ed Quatrevaux for the Inspector General's
21	report.
22	MR. QUATREVAUX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to open by reporting on the status of our audit service reviews. You will recall that the purpose of these reviews is to confirm that the compliance checks by grantee independent public accountants were adequate. Our target for fiscal year '99 is 50. We are ahead of schedule. We have issued 20 reports to date. Of those, only one of the audits was found to be inadequate due to insufficient testing by the IPA. That has been corrected.

Our plan on these reports is to send only adverse reports to the Board. The reason for that is they are all kind of boilerplate, but if you would like to receive the positive reports as well as the adverse ones, if there is more than one, please let us know and we will be happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I think the tally is significant. I think it is significant that if you go in and find satisfactory audits, then it is good to balance the bad news with the good news or a sense -- get a sense of proportion to what is happening in the field as you are finding it. But I don't think we need the boilerplate, necessarily. Although some -- there

1 are people around this table who may have a special 2 affinity for boilerplate. 3 MR. QUATREVAUX: Right. We will be happy to provide those. 5 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: It might be the Ops and Regs Committee, perhaps. 7 MR. QUATREVAUX: Could be. We are projecting 8 that by Labor Day we will have issued all 50 reports 9 for the year. We also have in progress a series of 10 client trust fund inspections. The purpose of those is 11 to determine whether grantees are in compliance with the Corporation's guidance, which is spelled out in the 12 13 LSC accounting quide. 14 I need to make a note because of a comment 15 that was made yesterday. This is not an audit. 16 are not going in there and counting the money and, you know, doing reconciliation of checking accounts. 17 18 Instead, we are looking at the controls, which are what 19 LSC guidance is all about. 20 And we have issued four final reports thus 21 We have completed two additional site visits. We 22 found that all grantees, all four were in general

compliance, although we did note areas for improvement of controls.

2.2

With respect to the case statistical reporting audits, we have issued a report of our audit of Prairie State Legal Services. You should have received that.

As you know, it found that closed cases were overstated by approximately 6 percent. We have now issued four final reports covering the '97 data and we have also issued two draft reports on '97 data. And the final reports for those drafts will be coming out fairly soon.

We have also completed site visits on three audits of the '98 data. The draft reports will be issued this month. It is only preliminary data, but thus far, the results are not encouraging. We have three more site visits planned for fiscal year '99, including one that is in progress right now. And I will have more to say about these audits later today.

My last topic for the session here is just to mention in the area of strategic planning that we did, and I apologize for the delay, but we did earlier this week send to you updates of the family of plans that we

maintain.

And the principal change in those is that we are going to extend case statistical reporting audits into the year 2000, whereas we had not planned to. We had in fact planned to do program integrity audits in the year 2000. What we will do is attempt to complete five case statistical reporting audits in the year 2000, fiscal year 2000. And we will conduct one program integrity audit and then use that as a basis for further audits in the following year, fiscal year 2001.

I would appreciate any input that you might have on these plans, particularly with respect to the schedule of projects, and feel free to provide that input anytime by any means this summer.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Maria Luisa.

MS. MERCADO: Yes. I just want to clarify on the CSR audits that you are doing for '98 data, the '98 data wasn't issued until November of '98, right? So they wouldn't have used it for the year.

MR. QUATREVAUX: Well, I think it would be better if management would speak to that, but my

understanding is that it did require grantees to apply 1 certain things, particularly, I think, supervisory 2 review, in their '98 data. 3 So I think it did have some impact on the '98 5 But you are quite right, it was issued in 6 November. The year is over at the end of December. So 7 to a degree that there was something that we might 8 have --9 MS. MERCADO: Well, I just wondered whether if 10 when you are making a report, there is some byline or 11 statement that we would note that the data went out to 12 the grantees November of '98. And however your 13 sampling equals out to that time period. I am just 14 trying to make sure that it accurately reflects what --15 your audit. 16 MR. QUATREVAUX: Oh, yes. Yes. The baseline 17 for testing is always what the Corporation's 18 requirements are. We use the Corporation's 19 definitions. 20 MS. MERCADO: Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I didn't get it in time, 22 but I would like to have an opportunity to have you

present the next year's -- the next -- the fifth year out and the changes to your five year plan at our next opportunity.

I think this would be a good thing to make sure that we do so that we understand what you are proposing to do, you have the benefit of our input, to the extent you care to take it. But nonetheless, it is an important document and we all want to be on board with it. So let's just find an opportunity for that.

MR. QUATREVAUX: Well, I will plan on doing it in Seattle.

Our next opportunity, although I want to hold open the possibility, if enough people can get in in time or delay their departure, to have a working session on strategic planning. And that would be a good opportunity to just take a little bit of time there if you are coming -- if you are -- I know you have travel plans.

So just keep it in mind. It is not a mandatory. In fact, we are not even sure we can work the schedule. But if you are coming back or change

1	your plans and are around, and there are a number of us
2	around to deal with it, it might be a good time to do
3	it sooner than later.
4	MR. QUATREVAUX: All right. I would be happy
5	to.
6	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And one of our objectives
7	for the Seattle meeting, in developing a Board agenda,
8	will be to minimize the corporate business and maximize
9	the opportunities for learning and exchanging
10	information while we are in the field. But we still
11	have a fair amount of Board business to do. And if we
12	don't get to that before then, then we will definitely
13	put it on the agenda for Seattle.
14	MR. QUATREVAUX: Well, perhaps if the Board
15	does get together following the festivities, it might
16	be possible to do something the next morning and then
17	still be able to keep the travel commitments.
18	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Good. Okay. Well, let's
19	see what is feasible.
20	MR. QUATREVAUX: Very good.
21	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Any other questions of the
22	Inspector General?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. QUATREVAUX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Next is item 11, consider and act on the Board's meeting schedule for the year 2000. That is found at Tab 20 of your meeting book. And the dates, as I understand them, reflect staff's best estimates of conflicts least likely for the year 2000, notwithstanding any Y2K bugs.

A couple of words, though, of explanation, I think, are in order about why we are scheduling or proposing to schedule a meeting in Minneapolis, notwithstanding the additional cost represented by a trip to that location.

And John, do you want to step up to that? We discussed this beforehand and didn't agonize about it, but certainly debated it internally a bit. And I think that the recommendation from management was there are a number of reasons why it would be worthwhile for this Board to visit -- to have a Board meeting in Minneapolis in the year 2000.

MR. MCKAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we in part prepared this list for the Board based on earlier discussion last year as we were trying to select appropriate cities for the out of Washington meetings. I think Minneapolis was originally mentioned in part from a provisions point of view programmatically.

There are a number of very exciting projects underway in the State of Minnesota. Principally, they extend beyond just the activities of the LSC recipients, but to the creation of sort of an access to justice network in Minneapolis and involvement of stakeholders, maybe on a scale we haven't seen anywhere else in the country.

The cost difference is purely an anachronism of air fares. Last time I checked, Minneapolis was a pretty big town and it is served by a pretty big airline, but under the government rates, this is just the way it shakes out. So while it is more expensive, I think there is a pretty compelling reason to go there, but we would certainly defer to the Board. Although again, this is a result of your prior discussions.

1	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Well, I think we ought to
2	be able to develop an agenda with sufficient advance
3	planning to reduce the number of staff required to
4	travel to Minneapolis if we were to look at it as a
5	to get costs down a little bit more. And just that is
6	something we can maybe work on. But this assumes 25
7	staff members traveling, right?
8	MR. MCKAY: Something in that range,
9	Mr. Chairman.
10	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: But we don't know now I
11	mean, this is an aspirational target, to paraphrase
12	somebody else we have heard today. I am just saying
13	there may be ways to reduce the costs.
14	MR. MCKAY: We will look very carefully at
15	reducing any anticipated cost.
16	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: But it depends on the
17	business we have at the time.
18	MR. MCKAY: Well, it depends on, Mr. Chairman,
19	with all due respect, we are talking about \$8,000 and a
20	national board here purely related travel expenses. To
21	me, that is not a significant worry to the Board to
22	conduct a meeting to gather the kind of information

And I think it would be unfair to the programs in Minnesota not to go for that reason. We will look carefully at the number of staff attending and other expenses associated with the meeting.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Okay.

2.2

MR. ERLENBORN: Let me compliment the President in not suggesting that we have it in January.

MR. BRODERICK: Mr. Chairman, can I ask -this applies not only to the 2000 list, but also to
Seattle. And my comment on Seattle might be too late.
Our discussion the other day was that when we are on
the road, we ought to take the time, to the extent we
have it, to visit programs.

And it seems to me if we are traveling, for instance, to Seattle, Washington, I had down in my book, and maybe incorrectly, that Friday and Saturday in September are the days we have set aside, which doesn't leave a lot of time for the sorts of things that I think we ought to be doing, or some of us anyway.

And if we are traveling to Austin, Texas or

San Francisco, California or Minneapolis, Minnesota, it seems to me we ought to be doing some of the kind of fact-finding and investigation that the President talked about.

And so I just wonder if it would make sense when we are on the road, as long as we are traveling that distance, to leave time so that we are not pressed and we don't have time. It would have been interesting, I think all of us agree to that -- we just didn't have the time here in Denver to make the kinds of inspections that I think we would have liked to have made. And I just wonder if it is possible to extend it.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I think the answer to that is yes. There is a subtext to that also that we discussed yesterday, which is if we can do better at advanced planning of the work of the committees so that we schedule the committee more efficiently and anticipate needs for information or other issues so that the committee work can be efficiently done in a more compressed time period, rather than running each committee end to end. Again, we can make some of that

time.

I think one trick will be identifying opportunities for site visits and then giving Board members the opportunity for those who can come in the night before, perhaps, to do it, but not locking into the Board meeting necessarily itself.

But I think that John got a pretty good sense yesterday, John McKay got a pretty good sense yesterday of the sense of the Board in trying to make sure that we take maximum advantage of the opportunity presented by travel to these out of the district sites to work with us.

That will tax Nikki Addaway a bit also because some of us are not as seemingly cooperative as she would like us to be in giving her advance notice of our travel plans. But there is a circularity to it because it helps out the agenda in what is going on and who is coming in when and leaving when.

MR. MCKAY: I would just suggest that Board members ought to -- where they see Friday, Saturday on the Austin, Minneapolis, and San Francisco meetings -- and you should also do the same for Seattle -- add

Thursday to your calendars and try not to book additional time there. And we will take your guidance accordingly.

2.2

We will revise slightly upward the expense of the meeting for hotel. And I absolutely concur. And we would gladly add this -- this would involve at least adding a half day to your schedule. You will have to plan on additional travel return time from the West Coast for two of those meetings. Going out is going to be the easy part, coming back is going to be difficult.

And so we will need some commitment on your part to participate. And I would just urge members, Board members not to think of the site visits as optional because we really don't want to put your good name and offices on the line and then not have adequate representation from the Board. So I think part of what I heard yesterday was a desire to do more field visits. We concur. And that will just take more of your time.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Okay. While she is standing, I just want to say thank you again to Nikki for all of the work in helping get us here. And especially when it is out of town, I know it is a lot

1	more work, but thanks.
2	MR. MCKAY: Well, we have an inquiry,
3	Mr. Chairman, from one of our Board members who is not
4	present, Tom Smegal, that May and June not be
5	considered for future Board meetings. And his reason
6	is that that is "prime time for weddings and
7	graduations." He certainly has a point, although I am
8	not sure whether the Board would want to block two
9	months off of its scheduling.
LO	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The problem is that July
L1	and August are prime time for vacations for some
L2	people.
L3	MR. MCKAY: The principal recommendations you
L 4	got from the staff were really built around national
L 5	holidays, obvious religious celebrations, and others.
L 6	And actually, it got pretty narrow to make these
L 7	selections to you.
L 8	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: June 23, 24 gets you sort
L 9	of late in the month for weddings and that sort of
2 0	thing. My inclination would be to say, "Tom, we
21	tried," but it is

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: We are giving him

22

1	
1	five-sixths of this, or whatever the numbers work out
2	to be. We are giving him all of May and the first
3	three weeks of June.
4	MR. ERLENBORN: I always thought it was great
5	when you had an excuse not to go to a wedding.
6	Apparently not.
7	MR. MCKAY: We will let the record reflect
8	that we gave this serious consideration.
9	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: My inclination would be to
10	go with the schedule as proposed.
11	MOTION
12	MR. ERLENBORN: Move its adoption.
13	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Is there a second?
14	MS. MERCADO: Second.
15	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Any further discussion?
16	MR. MCKAY: May I have, Mr. Chairman, just
17	your authority to, with respect to the out of
18	Washington meetings, amend that to include up to a half
19	a day addition on the preceding day.
20	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Yes.
21	MR. MCKAY: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor of the

1	schedule as amended.
2	(Chorus of ayes.)
3	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
4	(No response.)
5	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. We have a
6	schedule for the year 2000.
7	MR. MCKAY: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: We are not flying anytime
9	earlier in the year, are we? No, January 28th. I
10	guess that is all right.
11	All right. Consider and act on the report of
12	the Board's Operations and Regulations Committee.
13	Ernestine.
14	MS. WATLINGTON: Yes. I am going to need the
15	help of John in some of this. We met and we reviewed
16	45 CFR Part 1641 and we present it to LaVeeda editing
17	and reviewing it after they have made the corrections.
18	You have a new copy of it since she passed it out,
19	Laurie did. And if there is any questions on anything
20	that went on it, you could check with her on any
21	revision that was made.
22	And she worked very hard on the typing all day

1	yesterday and evening making the corrections that was
2	done. And LaVeeda committed herself that she will go
3	over them. So that one we can we would like to
4	present it to the Board for recommending it.
5	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Which one, Laurie? Do we
6	have it in front of us?
7	MS. TARANTOWICZ: You should have it in front
8	of you. It is 45 CFR Part 1641. I left it at your
9	places at lunchtime.
LO	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I don't, but now I do.
11	Okay.
12	MS. WATLINGTON: And I am offering that as a
13	motion to accept the final rule on that one.
14	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Do you want to give us a
15	little summary of what it does and the changes that
16	have been made since the Board got the working draft in
17	its Board materials?
18	MS. TARANTOWICZ: Sure. Part 1641 is intended
19	to implement the authority of the Inspector General to
2 0	remove, suspend, or bar independent public accountants
21	upon a showing of good cause from performing audit
22	services after notice and opportunity for a hearing.

That language appeared in the Appropriations Act in 1 1996 and subsequent appropriations acts. 2 As you know, the committee considered this 3 rule in September '98. It was published in the Federal 4 Register as a proposed rule in February. 5 Unfortunately, we received no comments. But the 6 committee considered it in April, changes were made to 7 the rule, and it should have been with your Board 8 9 materials for your review before this meeting. Yesterday the committee considered the rule 10 again, made additional changes, most of which, if not 11 all of which, were not substantive, but were merely 12 clarifying changes. 13 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And if I understood 14 Ernestine correctly, LaVeeda asked for the opportunity 15 to exercise her usual prerogative as chair, since she 16 is not here, to see those last textual changes and make 17 18 some additional changes of that. MS. WATLINGTON: Her commitment that she will 19 do that. 20 21 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Are there any questions of Laurie or Ernestine or John Erlenborn? 2.2

1	The Ops and Regs Committee approved the rule as
2	modified. And we have the edited
3	MS. WATLINGTON: The final version.
4	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The final version now. And
5	what we are being asked to do is adopt it.
6	MS. WATLINGTON: Right.
7	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: As a regulation.
8	MS. WATLINGTON: And she will promised to
9	do the editing. You know, how even after they do them,
10	she still likes to edit them over again.
11	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Right. We proofread things
12	after we pass them from time to time.
13	MS. WATLINGTON: Correct.
14	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right.
15	MOTION
16	MR. ERLENBORN: Move its approval.
17	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Is there a second?
18	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Any further discussion?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor of
22	adopting 45 CFR Part 1641 as presented and amended, say

1	aye.
2	(Chorus of ayes.)
3	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those opposed?
4	(No response.)
5	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. Thank
6	you for your patience and hard work.
7	MS. WATLINGTON: Thank you. And on number 5,
8	the CFR Part 1628 recipient fund balance, there was
9	a Suzanne can give an explanation on that. We just
10	reviewed it and we put it back to be reviewed again at
11	the next meeting.
12	MS. GLASOW: Actually, I gave John Erlenborn a
13	statement on that. Do you want to read that, John?
14	MS. WATLINGTON: Okay.
15	MR. ERLENBORN: Where did I put it?
16	MS. GLASOW: If not, I
17	MR. ERLENBORN: I have it here somewhere.
18	MS. GLASOW: Basically, the committee reviewed
19	public comments on the rule, on the proposed rule, made
20	several mostly clarifying changes and structural
21	changes. However, they have sent it back to staff.
22	There is one more issue they would like us to research.

1	And that is whether we should go permit a recipient to
2	have a fund balance over 25 percent in extraordinary
3	and compelling circumstances. And they would like us
4	to look at that and see what other federal agencies do
5	and come back at the next committee meeting.
6	MR. ERLENBORN: Mr. Chairman, I was unable to
7	attend the committee meeting yesterday. So I didn't
8	participate in this, but let me say that just from my
9	experience on some not for profit corporations, it is
10	really at times quite necessary to have maybe a larger
11	fund balance at the end of a fiscal year than might
12	ordinarily be the case. And I think this additional
13	flexibility is warranted.
14	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Well, let's see what comes
15	back.
16	MS. GLASOW: We will see what the federal
17	government does and come back with a recommendation.
18	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Thank you,
19	Suzanne.
20	MS. WATLINGTON: And on the third plan that
21	was presented to us, I am definitely going to let John
22	explain that one because he has been working with the

1 staff on that one. CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: But does he know what 2 happened in committee to it yesterday? 3 MS. MERCADO: It passed. I was an ad hoc 4 committee member. 5 MR. ERLENBORN: With some semantic or 6 grammatical changes suggested by Mr. McCalpin, as I 7 8 understand. Always. MS. WATLINGTON: 9 MR. ERLENBORN: Mr. Chairman and members of 10 the Board, in 1988, the Corporation established a 11 403(b) thrift plan. This 403(b) section of the 12 Internal Revenue code provides for not for profit 13 14 corporations to have this type of plan that is somewhat similar to other defined contribution plans that are 15 authorized under different sections of the Internal 16 Revenue Code for other types for for profit 17 18 corporations. The provisions in the plan at the present time 19 20

provide for a contribution to be made by the

Corporation that equals the contribution that is

required by the employing agency of those who are

21

22

participating in the Civil Service Retirement System.

2.2

In other words, the level of contribution has historically been established to track the contribution that is made by a department or agency for those employees who are still participating in the old -- we now call it the old Civil Service Retirement System.

There was an increase from 8 percent to -- no, excuse me, from 6 percent to 8.51 percent, actually more than a year ago, in the Civil Service contribution. The genesis of this amendment or resolution is to bring our contribution up to that which has been the level of contribution under the CSR for some period of time.

I participated with some of the staff in discussing this because they knew of my interest in pension matters. There will be a 2.51 percent increase in the Corporation's contribution. I don't recall now, but Joan, that amounts to something like maximum of \$60,000 a year?

MS. KENNEDY: That is correct.

MS. WATLINGTON: It was presented also at the finance committee to give the idea of the cost in that

it was the -- I think you said it was for 12,000 for 1 2 this year? MS. MERCADO: 12,000 for this fiscal year. 3 And no more than 60,000 for next year. 4 MR. ERLENBORN: So the amount of the 5 additional contribution is not great. The original 6 proposal was to leave the qualifying voluntary 7 8 contribution the same as it is at the present time. 9 That is 1 percent. 10 It means that any employee in the Corporation who wants to participate would have to voluntarily 11 agree to set aside or have automatically deducted 1 12 percent of their compensation. And then that is now 13 14 currently matched by 1 percent by the Corporation. then everyone gets an additional, I guess at the 15 present time, 5 percent -- 6 percent pension. Isn't it 16 1 in 5 for a total of 6? 17 MS. KENNEDY: No, it is 6 and 1. 18 19 MR. ERLENBORN: A total of 7. Okay. And I 20 said 2 1/2 percent a little while ago. It is a $1 \frac{1}{2}$ 21 percent increase that we are asking for. From 7 to

8 1/2. So I apologize for that error. So to recap,

22

if an employee voluntarily agrees to have withheld from their compensation 1 percent, they get a 1 percent match by the Corporation and then the additional 7 percent. Additional 7 percent.

Now this -- when we discussed this, it occurred to me that the non-highly compensated employees might be intrigued to put in the 1 percent to participate and get the additional contributions made by the company -- by the Corporation. But it would really be helpful for those non highly compensated if they had an incentive to contribute more on their own behalf.

So I made a recommendation, which was agreed to by those who participated in the meeting and the administrator of the plan agreed that this would probably be a good thing to do, and that is to raise the level of qualifying voluntary contribution from 1 percent to 2 1/2 percent, 2.51, I believe it is, to be accurate.

That means that to participate in the plan, you would put in 2 1/2, roughly, percent instead of the 1 percent. You would get that matched and then the

additional contribution would be made to everyone who participated.

so there would be, in effect, about a 1 1/2 percent additional contribution, which would probably not bother any of the highly compensators who today have the authority -- have the ability to contribute more than the 1 percent and probably most all of them do realizing the great power of tax free compound growth.

And so the highly compensated with the ability to do it have been making these additional contributions. The proposal here before you today now will reflect that the qualifying contribution will be made -- will be increased to 2.51 so that the non highly compensated would have an incentive to -- not only to participate in the plan, but to get a larger amount total of their contribution together with the Corporation's contribution.

A larger amount again, which would relate then to a larger benefit at the time that they retire, which I think would be greatly appreciated by them then although it might not be today. So this is incentive

for them to do something good for their future.
MS. WATLINGTON: And the recommendation of the
committee was that it become effective July 1.
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: That is what the proposed
resolutions says.
MR. ERLENBORN: If anybody has any questions
about my inarticulate presentation, I would be happy to
try to answer them.
MS. WATLINGTON: I am not sure I remember
everything you said, but I am very impressed by the way
you presented it.
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And does everyone have a
copy of the proposed resolution?
MS. WATLINGTON: It was in there.
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Oh, it was in the Board
yes. And this is what was passed by the committee.
MS. WATLINGTON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: So do we have a motion to
adopt the resolution regarding amendment of the
Corporation's 403(b) thrift plan as presented?
Corporation's 403(b) thrift plan as presented? M O T I O N

1	MR. ERLENBORN: Second.
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Any further discussion?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor?
5	(Chorus of ayes.)
6	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. The
9	resolution passes.
10	MS. WATLINGTON: And that is all the things we
11	discussed at the meeting.
12	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Thank you very
13	much.
14	Next we have consider and act on the report of
15	the Board's Committee on Provision for the Delivery of
16	Legal Services. Bucky.
17	MR. ASKEW: Well, everybody was there this
18	morning. So I don't think there is any need to rehash
19	what we all saw and heard. The only thing I would
20	report is that we will be I will be working with
21	Danilo and Mike to plan something for the Seattle
22	meeting, which should be very easy to do. Given

everything that is going on in the State of Washington,

I think it is just a matter of picking something that
will further our discussion, further our learning
process.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And John McKay and Victor and I will be sure to confer with the committee chairs in advance of the meeting so that we make sure that the work of the committees is coordinated so that we can facilitate these visits.

MR. ASKEW: Great.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Next is the Finance Committee. Consider and act on the report of the Finance Committee. Maria Luisa.

MS. MERCADO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Most of you were here yesterday. So I am not going to go through detail of the proposed revised consolidated operating budget. Most of you should have gotten a copy of the resolution, which is basically to adopt the revisions. The budget that you have goes to the six-month period of expenses through March 31, 1999.

And the Corporation is asking us to approve the revisions to the budget, which basically is adding

\$17,000 in grant funds from other funds available, which used to be money in the special emergency fund category and it will now become the grants from other funds available category.

1.2

And that will be incorporated into the full budget so that, in effect, the consolidated operating budget will now be for a total of \$302,097,934. And that is divided out to be \$290,080,981 for the deliverance of legal assistance, \$9,840,131 for management administration, and \$2,176,422 for the Office of Inspector General.

And we are basically asking the Board to approve the revisions in the budget. They were reviewed with the comptroller and you should have the items -- in particular, which doesn't have a page number, but it would be one, two -- it would be the fourth page that deals with the proposed revised FY '99 budget. And it is the bracketed items in the second column of budget revisions.

The basic ones, executive office \$233,000, and general counsel \$168,000, 46,000 in government relations and public affairs, \$153,625 in

1	administration and human resources, \$19,000 for the
2	comptroller, \$165,500 information technology, \$110,100
3	in program performance, \$9,600 in information
4	management, and \$64,825 in compliance and enforcement.
5	Those would be the budget revisions. And of
6	course, the parens would mean that that money has been
7	transferred to another category. And we are requesting
8	these budget revisions and adoption of the revised,
9	consolidated operating budget for FY '99.
10	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And the recommendation of
11	the committee is in the form of the resolution that has
12	been circulated already.
13	MS. MERCADO: That is correct.
14	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Do you want to
15	put that in the form of a motion?
16	MOTION
17	MS. MERCADO: So moved.
18	MS. WATLINGTON: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Motion to adopt the
20	consolidated operating budget with marked revisions for
21	fiscal year 1999 has been moved and seconded. Is there
22	any other discussion or any other questions?

1	(No response.)
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Hearing none, all those in
3	favor?
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Opposed?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: The ayes have it. The
8	resolution carries.
9	MS. MERCADO: Mr. Chairman, we also received a
10	budget request for FY 2000, which is, of course, for
11	the total amount of \$340 million. And all of you
12	should have received a handout. And it is basically
13	for your information as to the 340 million budget
14	request that is itemized. It should just be a one
15	sheet deal, and it is just for your information.
16	And of course we have already had the report
17	from Mauricio as to how that appropriation process is
18	going through Congress. I don't know that we will get
19	our 340 million yet, but that is what our budget
20	request for FY 2000 is.
21	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Thank you very
22	much.

Any questions of Maria Luisa? 1 (No response.) CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Next we move on to --3 4 MR. MCKAY: Mr. Chairman, just on that note from Maria Luisa and the Finance Committee, just to 5 indicate for the Board that we did receive word that 6 7 the Senate subcommittee on appropriations, and I 8 believe the full committee now, has passed out the number of \$300 million, which is our current level of 9 10 appropriation. 11 We expect that we may have action as early as 12 July in the House. We don't know yet what numbers the 13 House subcommittee on appropriations is working with. 14 We consider that number in the Senate to be good news, 15 given that the budget cap situation will keep the Board informed of any developments in that way. 16 17 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Okay. Next we have from 18 John Erlenborn a report on the status of the work of 19 the special panel established to study and report to 20 the Board on issues relating to LSC grantees' 21 representation of legal alien workers and the

requirement that they be present in the United States.

22

MR. ERLENBORN: Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the Board members will recall at an earlier Board meeting we authorized the creation of this Commission. We found some recruits throughout the country.

2.2

It turns out that they are all law professors or ex law professors. And with great expertise in immigration law, which is very important, and also in the construction of -- statutory construction, because we have a question here as to the interpretation of the change in the appropriation language, that at one point in the early eighties said that the alien workers must be resident in the United States.

And then I think it was in 1986, as part of another proposed amendment, was offered to an immigration bill. And the main amendment was not adopted, but the one part that somehow or other crept in there was changing the word "resident" to "present." So it now says the alien must be present in the United States to be authorizing the grantee, legal services grantees for using Legal Services funds to represent the aliens.

It arose in the -- or let me say from 1986

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc. 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 1250 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 (202) 296-2929

C-09229

until the question arose probably late last year, early this year, no one questioned the meaning of that change or the meaning of the law. And many grantees have represented aliens, particularly H2A workers who may not have been present continuously in the United States.

The way the question arose, however, was -- I think this was mentioned earlier in the Board meeting today, there was a grantee in Georgia who sent two or three lawyers down to Mexico to talk to prospective H2A workers to give them information about their rights and possibly recruit them as possible clients when they did come to the United States.

There was a great hullabaloo about this. The President of the Corporation acted, acted promptly, and that subgrantee -- it was not a grantee, it was a subgrantee -- was no longer authorized to use Legal Services funds. And funds went to the main grantee. And they are now administering that.

MR. MCKAY: I just should indicate -- excuse me, Mr. Erlenborn, but the recipient was in North Carolina.

MR. ERLENBORN: Oh, North Carolina. I said Georgia. That is right.

MR. MCKAY: Excuse me.

MR. ERLENBORN: It was North Carolina.

Correct. Well, anyhow, the Commission was formed and the question then before the Commission is what kind of guidance can we give the Corporation in interpreting the meaning of the limitation that the alien being present in the United States.

And there is a tendency or was a tendency for us to say, "How do we define presence." That really is not the question. When you view this language and its application, it isn't what does present mean, the question is when.

When must the perspective client be present in the United States? At the time that the cause of action arose? At the time they sought representation? Or maybe for a period of two or three years while the case is pending in court and before some government agency. Well H2A workers, by definition, are only here for a matter of months, then they go back to their home, whether it be Mexico or somewhere else.

And the effect of saying they must be present continuously throughout the entire representation would be clearly to say H2A workers would never be able to get representation or practically never be able to.

Another important thing to remember is that this is not limited to H2A workers. It is all legally resident aliens. They are not citizens, but they are here legally under one or another of the provisions of the immigration law. There are about five or six different classifications.

And so you can think of hypothetical situations. You have someone, let's say, as the spouse of an American citizen and is here legally resident in the United States. And let's say that person is on vacation when something happens, maybe some action that violates a contract. And at that point a cause of action was created.

But the spouse happens to be out of the country, comes back -- maybe only out of the country for a few days, comes back and a strict interpretation, if you say they must be present, at the time of the initiation of the cause of the action and throughout

the entire representation would affect that type of a legally resident agent. It isn't just the H2A workers.

So this has a much broader implication. Well,

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Commission met in Washington for an additional meeting. We agreed upon two hearings out in the field. We have had them, one at Duke University in North Carolina, one at Stanford University in California.

We have five members of the Commission. We have a sixth person, law professor, who is the reporter. I told her she has the real job. You know, the members of the Commission will listen, ask questions, debate, and come to some conclusion, but she has to actually write the report, which she is in the process of doing.

We also have a consultant to the Commission. His name is Romano Mazzolli or Ron Mazzolli, former member of Congress from Kentucky, who was one of the principal movers in the -- what is known as IRCA, the immigration law that was passed in 1986.

And he has been invaluable for background as to what the Congress -- how they viewed some of the

things that they were doing and some of the negotiations that went on that led to the adoption of the language that we are now faced with.

2.2

We are in the process of drafting the report. At one time, we thought we might be able to have it to present to the meeting here in Denver, but that was just pushing it too hard. There is really no reason to hurry. There are no lawsuits pending, there are no things that require any immediate attention.

And I might say, by the way, that there is also a question which the Corporation will have to decide and we may give you alternative methods of implementing the recommended interpretation by the Commission.

For example, a general counsel opinion could be given saying that it should be interpreted in this way. Or it could be done by regulation adopted by this Board more formally. And there are pros and cons of doing it one way or the other. And so we are not going to try to settle that in the Commission, but maybe give you the alternatives and then together, with the President, the Board can decide the best way to handle

1 | it.

I believe that the report will be ready -- I am quite certain it will be ready for the next meeting of the Board. We will probably have one last meeting. We have had one telephonic meeting of the Commission, we will probably have one last meeting in Washington where we can actually all sit down at the same table and look over and massage and make changes in the wording of the Commission report.

I think it is also interesting to just contemplate what the impact of this might be. And the fact is that however we interpret this, it does not seem to be susceptible to direct attack. I don't know that anyone would have standing to file suit to question our interpretation.

Even those who may be the party to a lawsuit in which an H2A or other alien is being represented through Legal Services funds I don't believe have the standing to raise the issue as to whether the alien has the right to be represented by the Legal Services Corporation or those that are funded by the Legal Services Services Corporation.

I think we must also, however, be sensitive to the fact that there is another forum, and that is the Congress, in changing the language, although they may have difficulty in doing that once they realize that it applies to more than just H2A workers, unless they want to adopt different qualifications in H2A over other aliens.

It has been a fascinating process. For me personally, very gratifying. The members of the Commission are expert in their field, they have been just great people to work with, and I am going to miss them when it is all over.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Nancy, did you want to add anything to John's report?

MS. ROGERS: Only that John has done such a fabulous job. He has been very careful and very thorough through all the aspects of this.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Thank you. You stole my words. I wanted to say also just from all reports, and we don't have the written report yet, that first the Commission itself has just been very impressive both in its constitution and in its operations and

deliberations.

And I think that the hand of a master is at the helm in the form of the chairman, John Erlenborn. And I just want to thank John and Nancy and the other members for serving so well. And we look forward to the report. And we thank you for it.

MR. ERLENBORN: Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing I would like to say, I forgot to mention, because I think it is important that notice of the hearings went out and in many ways, including in the Federal Register. And anyone who wished to make comments, written comments, was invited to do so. And anyone who wanted to appear and give verbal comments to the Commission at one of these two meetings was invited to do so.

Everyone who asked to be heard before the Commission was given that opportunity. And there was only actually one organization that represented farmers or agricultural producers. And that was the North Carolina Farm Bureau.

And actually, the witness for the Farm Bureau said, in questioning, that well, representing the H2A

workers for something that occurred here when they were here and even if they went out of the country isn't what bothered them. What bothered them was going out of the country to recruit clients or potential clients. In other words, what had happened in that incident down in Mexico.

I have the feeling that some of the urgency or maybe not -- I shouldn't use that word, but some of the feeling that we had to take action because this was going to be a hot issue, it may have cooled down and it may be that agricultural producers are not going to be greatly in opposition to whatever we recommend.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Any questions of John?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Then we thank you for the report and we will look forward to the final product.

Last on this agenda item is the consider and act on the appointment of Danilo Cardona as the acting vice president for programs. And although Danilo is well known to all of us and well admired and respected by all of us, I think it is appropriate for John McKay

to explain why he has selected and recommended Danilo as the acting vice president.

MR. MCKAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to offer to the Board my recommendation for the acting position of vice president for programs and to ask the Board to confer that officer position on Danilo Cardona, who has served the Corporation for years with distinction as the leader in its current form of compliance and enforcement.

He has sort of jealously guarded a flame at the Corporation, which the Congress has looked to us, perhaps more closely in recent years, but which has always been at the foundation of the services we provide. And that is to make sure that the limited resources that we have are done in accordance with the regulations of this Board and the will of the Congress. And he has done that in an excellent way.

He has asked that he be allowed to return when his term of service is over and we select a permanent vice president for programs to compliance and enforcement. And I have agreed. During this time, Danilo has moved upstairs to the 11th floor. Some of

the additional burden falls on his staff in compliance and enforcement and they are up to it, although he continues to serve, in effect, as the director of that office during this period.

I also want to mention to the Board that this also requires other staff to step up and provide additional leadership; in particular, Ted Faris and Mike Genz who have been here and participated in this meeting, Bob Gross who continues to do a terrific job leading in the area of state planning.

So we are very pleased that Danilo has agreed to take on this additional burden, and he has already, I think, exhibited the kind of leadership that we would expect from him. So I am very pleased to present his name to you. I know that his colleagues and friends at the Corporation that work with him consider this to be an honor, although Danilo may see it in addition as a burden.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And if appointed, will you accept?

MR. CARDONA: On an interim basis, yes, sir. (Laughter.)

Iliversified Reporting Services, Inc. 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 1250 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 (202) 296-2929

C-09240

1	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Any questions?
2	(No response.)
3	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Hearing none, I would
4	suggest that we put this request to a vote by
5	acclamation.
6	MOTION
7	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: So moved.
8	MR. ERLENBORN: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor of
10	appointing Danilo Cardona as acting vice president of
11	programs.
12	(Chorus of ayes.)
13	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Voted by acclamation.
14	Congratulations, Mr. Vice President, sir.
15	MS. WATLINGTON: He has been very, very
16	emphatic in letting you know he wants to get back to
17	his regular job.
18	MR. MCKAY: If I could just say, Danilo has a
19	pair of cowboy boots that he frequently wears to the
20	office. And we are not sure whether there is going to
21	be extra strength behind those boots, but we look
22	forward to your service. Thank you.

1	MR. CARDONA: Thank you very much.
2	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Good luck.
3	We are now at the breakpoint before going into
4	executive session. Why don't we entertain a motion to
5	go into executive session and then declare a five
6	minute recess and then come back.
7	MOTION
8	MR. ERLENBORN: Combined motion so moved.
9	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Okay. Combined motion.
10	All of those in favor?
11	(Chorus of ayes.)
12	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. We are now in
13	recess, coming back into executive session.
14	(Whereupon, at 3:35 p.m., the meeting was
15	adjourned to closed session.)
16	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: We are back in open
17	session. Let's take one minute. Nobody leave the
18	room. Let the record show the public is now back in
19	the room.
20	Consider and act on other business. I think
21	the one thing I mentioned before, we will, as soon as
22	we find out what the White House has in mind by way of

an event on July 27th, I think what we will try and do is go down there and meet. And once that gets flushed out a little bit, we will let everyone know and also advise everyone of the desirability or advisability of having a brief session perhaps devoted to strategic planning at that time too.

2.0

2.2

MR. MCKAY: And I would just suggest,
Mr. Chairman, that -- and I will canvas any of you who
are interested and talk with our Board chair, but the
idea I have now just off the cuff is that since we are
talking about a Tuesday event at the White House, our
initial planning has been to try and do on the same day
an event on the Hill.

That may not work out. And so I am thinking that Board members ought to maybe consider a travel on -- possibly on the Sunday, be here on Monday and Tuesday. I think it is going to be a wonderful two or three days in the history of the Corporation.

We tried to plan without a date certain. Now we have a date certain, as certain as it can be with the President of the United States and the First Lady. But I think with the date of Tuesday, we can do an

awful lot with that.

We are very committed to going up to the Hill and making sure this is a bipartisan celebration of the 25th anniversary. And I think we ought to plan and build around that. Maybe a dinner or something on Sunday night that we can bring some stakeholders and other folks who -- we have a lot of people that want to celebrate this anniversary with us.

Not all will be allowed to go to the White House. Not all will be able to attend the event on the Hill. And I am thinking that we can do maybe a series of events that will be a wonderful time for us and for our clients.

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$ ERLENBORN: Do we know what time of the day in terms of --

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: No, we don't or type of event even.

MR. ERLENBORN: Breakfast?

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: We don't know a thing. We have traded calls.

MR. MCKAY: We are hoping for mid morning to late morning, which would be best in terms of news

time. And our consultant really, who was working closely with the White House through Mauricio's offices, I am certain will be lobbying for that beginning Monday morning.

CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: On other business, this is an afterthought, but forgive me for the afterthought. Mauricio had mentioned that one of the targets for -- one of the goals for the anniversary year is to do a variety of things to enhance pro bono volunteer legal assistance. It seems to me that it would be wonderful if we could incorporate into that initiative a further initiative for client assistance and self-help.

And secondly, I don't know where we are on evaluating private attorney involvement programs at grantees, but I know from personal experience in a variety of fronts that the better the quality of the PAI program, the easier it is to involve lawyers at any level.

And if we had a few additional models or ways to deal with that, this is the year's project, not an event, but it is something that we may want to schedule for Provisions or may want to ask John to report on or

do something on the pro bono. But also when we talk 1 about pro bono, also client self-help. 2 MR. MCKAY: Let me pass that on to our 3 director of PAI assessment, who is Anh Tu. 4 5 (Laughter.) MR. MCKAY: And so I think all members of the 6 7 Board --CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: She is traveling on her 8 9 birthday today. She is gone. 10 MR. MCKAY: Yes. I think all members of the 11 Board understand what has happened there. It is one of 12 the -- it actually is in our work plan to evaluate and report to you on PAI this year. I think the important 13 14 aspect is to work in the client assistance part of your 1.5 suggestion. And I will take that back to Danilo and 16 meet with Anh. 17 Anh and I will actually be spending some time 18 together in Arizona in the next couple of days. 19 will discuss it with her. We don't want the top of her 20 head to explode, but we do have additional resources. 21 We have some wonderful new staff on the programmatic 22 side that I am anxious for you all to meet.

But I know -- I just -- we CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: 1 will not achieve a meaningful increase in numbers of 2 attorneys participating in PAI activities without a 3 commensurate increase in the quality and outreach of 4 the PAI programs that you administer to all the 5 6 grantees. 7 MS. MERCADO: That is true. I mean, the program in Texas is consistently one -- the pro bono 8 9 involvement has been with Texas Legal Services. And the basis for that is because they have full-time PAI 10 staff that coordinates with the private bar setting up 11 clinics, you know, doing that kind of work. Although, 12 some of the funding is by private foundation and some 13 of it is by Legal Services. 14 CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: And this is not something 15 for a lot of work, but I think --16 17 MS. MERCADO: Eut I mean, if you expect to move, do it voluntarily out there. And it has to be 18 19 coordinated. No. We know that and I am a 20 MR. MCKAY: little disappointed that we have not been able to bring 21

this to you at this point, but we will reload.

22

1	absolutely agree with the Board that it is very
2	important for us to go back and look at PAI right from
3	the ground up, the percentages, what is really
4	happening in the field. And we do need to do that.
5	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I do not mean to even
6	suggest criticism. I think that the quality and the
7	quantity of the work that is going on at the
8	Corporation right now is absolutely staggering and it
9	is inspiring. And I am sorry for saying this, but we
10	have three very nice staff members in the room, but
11	nobody else in the room. But it is truly remarkable
12	and something of which we should all feel very proud.
13	MR. ERLENBORN: Are you saying the current
14	present company excepted from the
15	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: No.
16	MR. FORTUNO: We will make sure that the
17	transcript is widely distributed.
18	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Was that the
19	public comment that I just heard?
20	(Laughter.)
21	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. Five thirty,
22	Room 1502, for those of you who would like to join us

1	for a brief cocktail reception.
2	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: 15 or 1602?
3	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: 1502. You could try 16,
4	but the refreshments might not be as nice.
5	MR. ERLENBORN: Actually, if you go to 1602,
6	it will even be a briefer encounter.
7	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: Nancy, thank you for having
8	us so long on the telephone. I know that is difficult.
9	MS. ROGERS: Well, thanks for including me and
10	have a good evening. I am sorry to miss.
11	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All right. We will look
12	forward to seeing you next month.
13	MS. ROGERS: Okay.
14	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: I need a motion to adjourn
15	now.
16	MOTION
17	MR. ERLENBORN: So moved.
18	MS. WATLINGTON: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN EAKELEY: All those in favor?
20	(Chorus of ayes.)
21	MR. ERLENBORN: Bye Nancy.
22	MS. ROGERS: Bye-bye.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

O25 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 1250
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 296-2929

C-09249

(Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., the meeting was
adjourned.)

* * * * *