ORIGINAL

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

COMMITTEE ON PROVISION FOR THE DELIVERY OF LEGAL SERVICES

OPEN SESSION

September 18, 1999

2:45 p.m.

W Seattle Hotel 1112 Fourth Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hulett H. Askew, Chair Nancy Hardin Rogers Edna Fairbanks-Williams

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Douglas S. Eakeley, Chair John N. Erlenborn F. William McCalpin Maria Luisa Mercado Thomas S. Smegal, Jr. Ernestine Watlington

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT:

Shannon Adaway Danilo Cardona Kim Dixon John Eidleman Victor Fortuno Michael Genz John Hartingh James J. Hogan Richard P. Guy Joan Kennedy Joan Kleinburg John McKay, President Patrick McIntyre Eduouard Ouatrevaux David Richardson Leslie Russell Mauricio Vivero

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
Approval of agenda	3
Approval of minutes of the Committee's meeting of June 12, 1999	4
Public Speaker: The Honorable Richard P. Guy, Chief Justice, Washington State Supreme Court	6
Field presentation on centralized intake systems and state planning	29
Presentation by John Eidleman on intake systems	86

MOTIONS: 3, 5, 91

PROCEEDINGS

MR. ASKEW: Good afternoon. This is a meeting of the Committee for the Provision of Delivery of Legal Services of the corporation board.

Here present are committee members Edna
Fairbanks-Williams, Doug Eakeley and myself and Nancy
Rogers is with us by telephone.

Nancy?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. ROGERS: Good afternoon.

MR. ASKEW: Good afternoon.

I am going to go through two agenda items.

First, we have the approval of the agenda for today's meeting. I should make note of one change in the agenda, item 6, presentation by Bob Gross on technical assistance grants. Bob is not with us.

Mike Genz is going to make that presentation this afternoon.

With that change, I would ask if there's a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting.

MOTION

MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: So moved.

MR. EAKELEY: Second.

MR. ASKEW: All those in favor say aye. 1 (Chorus of ayes.) 2 MR. ASKEW: The agenda is approved. 3 Approval of the minutes of the committee's 4 meeting of June 12th. Let me note a couple of changes 5 in the minutes before we vote. 6 At the bottom of page 1, there are a number of 7 people identified who attended the meeting. Victor has 8 pointed out to me that some of the titles of those 9 people are not completely accurate. He has made 10 corrections, I am making corrections and giving those 11 to Elizabeth and to the court reporter so they can 12 be reported on the minutes of the last meeting, but 13 there are no substantive changes, just changes in 14 15 titles. MR. EAKELEY: Some people might think that's 16 17 substantive. 18 MR. ASKEW: Some might. 19 With that, does any other committee member have any comments or changes on the minutes of the last 20 21 meeting? 22 (No response.)

1	MR. ASKEW: Hearing none, I will ask if
2	there's a motion to approve the minutes with the
3	changes in the titles.
4	MOTION
5	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: So moved.
6	MR. EAKELEY: Second.
7	MR. ASKEW: All those in favor, say aye.
8	(Chorus of ayes.)
9	MR. ASKEW: The minutes are approved.
10	With that, we'll go to item 3 on the agenda
11	and welcome to our committee the Chief Justice of the
12	Supreme Court of Washington, Richard P. Guy.
13	If you don't mind, Mr. Chief Justice, I'm
14	going to give a brief introduction of you and then
15	we're looking forward to hearing from you.
16	Chief Justice Guy has been on the Supreme
17	Court of Washington since 1989 and has survived two
18	elections, as I understand it, and has begun serving as
19	chief.
20	And this is your first term as chief, as I
21	understand it.
22	JUSTICE GUY: Yes.

MR. ASKEW: Before coming to the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Guy has had a varied career in the law, serving at different times as a deputy prosecuting attorney in Spokane, in private practice. He served on the Superior Court bench and, as I mentioned, joined the Supreme Court in 1989.

2.2

I had the privilege of hearing Chief Justice
Guy in Atlanta at the American Bar Association
convention speak to SCLA, the Standing Committee on
Legal Aid, about legal services in Washington and I
must say it was a quite impressive, very knowledgeable
remarks. Obviously, he is very involved. And we also
heard from Pat McIntyre earlier today of the pivotal
role you played in the Access to Justice work here in
Washington as a justice on the Supreme Court.

So with that, I would like to welcome you and thank you for being here and thank you for what you've done for access to justice in this state.

JUSTICE GUY: Thank you. It is very nice of you to welcome me and have me here. What you do I think is very critical to our society. I know that many people are concerned on an individual basis with

the representation of people who are disadvantaged in the system and I am as well, but I think my concern goes beyond that and is really addressed to what I think is paramount in the preservation of a democratic republic and that is that if you don't have a system where people can be heard, where they can understand that there is a fairness that is apparent and that they will be accepted, you don't have much of a safeguard against government or against other individuals.

And, for me, it is essential that we have the ability for people, all people, to access our system on a basis that is timely and cost effective. And that's really kind of what I wanted to talk to you about today.

I had the opportunity to go back to
Washington, D.C. where we met with our congressional
delegation concerning funding. We have certainly in
the state of Washington sought funding for legal
services. It's a constant battle and it's obvious to
me also that regardless of whether you get \$300,000,000
or \$600,000,000 or we get \$12,000,000 in this state or
\$4,000,000, we'll never be able to serve all of the

needs. And so what I thought I might try to talk to you about today is looking beyond the financing toward issues of access and asking you whether or not you might be willing to join in attempts to provide access throughout the system; that is, making the system work better, which is one of the concerns that I have.

For example, I went before the board of governors of the Washington State Bar a year or so ago and I had a photograph that I had taken of what I guess you might term a paralegal office. It had a reader board outside, there weren't any lawyers in there and I don't think there were any paralegals, but there were people who helped people fill out forms. And it indicated \$75 for a will and so much for a divorce and \$125 for bankruptcy and those kinds of things.

Those people operated without any sort of control, there was virtually no supervision, there were no bonding requirements and whether they did good things or bad things, I don't know, but anecdotally I can tell you that there are cases, certainly in the bankruptcy field, where some real damage has been done to people by incompetence.

I can tell you that within our system the court commissioners that often handle the dissolution matters ask who help fill out the forms and if they're told certain people filled them out they know there's some sort of competence. And if there are other people, they know that there isn't.

2.2

The bar certainly was concerned about it, looked at it and basically felt there was very little that they could or wanted to do at that point, although I was told today by the former president of the bar, Wayne Blair, that the Washington State Bar Association has now defined the practice of law and is sending us a court rule on that issue.

And, as a part of that, they may very well ask us to do something with respect to people who practice law in a sense, but in a very limited sense.

In this state, we previously have done that in what's called limited practice where people can close real estate transactions, even though it's the practice of law. They are supervised, they take examinations and they are subject to certain ethical concerns and they have bonds that are posted.

So what I am suggesting to you is that it seems to me it makes a great deal of sense for you to take a look at how legal services are being provided in the marketplace and the fact that legal services do involve a great deal of competition today and it's not all being provided by lawyers.

And those of us who are at the American Bar
Association recognize that multi-disciplinary practice
is going to take place ultimately and we also recognize
that there are going to be reciprocal arrangements
between states for the practice of law throughout the
country. Congress certainly is looking at that issue.
We just passed a reciprocal rule in our state.

So what I am really attempting to do is say let's certainly concentrate on the money aspects, but there are other methods by which access can be provided and that's one of them.

Another proposal that I think makes some sense is the use of the Internet. For example, this is an area where micro technology is really a major industry and we see how the computer is in some ways mutating so that ultimately you're going to be able to speak to it

and it will speak back to you and you can access it through your fingerprint and it will then open up its net to you.

All these things are going to happen. They're going to be a lot simpler than they have been today which requires some sort of dexterity and knowledge of the keyboard. And I see the ability for people to access our courts through the Internet where we ultimately can address, say, small claims court issues, traffic tickets, things like that, through the Internet. It's a matter of, I suppose, some training and some people getting used to it, but those in my view are the things that can be done.

Arbitration and mediation. As you're aware, there's a service now that allows people who want to settle lawsuits for, say, \$15,000 or less really to do it through the Internet, where offers are made and counteroffers are made and settlements are arrived at and this is a method by which a lot of disputes, I think, could be resolved.

I also see the ability of judges or judges pro tem or even lay people to be at one end of the net and

resolve disputes that arise. I watch "Judge Judy" now and then and Judge Judy resolves a lot of disputes between people and fairly well.

I don't see any reason that we could not create community boards that would resolve disputes, where you have in effect storefront kinds of resolution centers or even auditoriums where people can come in and in effect take a number and agree to submit their disputes to that forum.

Within the system itself, we can provide mediation and arbitration services. In part, we haven't done it because we haven't thought about it. Part of the problem we have within the judiciary is that we've got a system that's a couple of hundred years old and we haven't wanted to change it very much.

Well, technology has changed, the demands of the public are changing it and the marketplace is going to dictate what happens. There is no longer any monopoly in government services and that includes us in the judiciary. And so what I'm saying is let's open ourselves up to different ideas and different methods of dispute resolution and look beyond the need solely

for money and look at other methods of dispute resolution.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Now, at the State Justice Institute in Williamsburg, the National Center for State Courts, Roger Warren, who is a director, has been working on access issues and I don't know whether or not you have accessed him, but he is looking at issues relating to access and some of the things that I'm talking about My suggestion is that we really do need to reach here. out more and more to those who are engaged in access issues, not only for ideas, but for assistance in promoting those ideas and I suggest to you that a national conference where people dealing with access issues, who have ideas who want to present them in sort of the way I'm doing now might be useful to you and then you could see whether or not they have efficacy and whether you want to promote them.

I have a proposal that I want to make to you. In the year 2001, the chief justices conference is going to be held in Seattle and the conference is on science and technology and obviously one of the places we're going to look is to Microsoft, to take the chiefs

and to take all of the court administrators. And there are 50 chiefs and 50 court administrators and Guam and Marianas and Puerto Rico and we meet and have our courses and our evaluations of what's happening in our society and science and technology is a big issue. We're going to look at genetics and biotechnology as But given the fact that the ability to use technology, and I'm talking about interactive TV and all of the different methods of presenting cases and presenting people's issues to forums for resolution is present here, I am proposing that we suggest to Microsoft that we get some help in in effect looking at access issues, looking at how technology can provide access to people from their homes or even from the legal services offices through the Internet and through interactive TV.

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Paul Steer, who is a very noted lawyer in

Seattle, and I were talking today and we think we

could go to Bill Gates II, the father of the Microsoft

chair, and talk to him about trying to create in

effect a forum of the next millennium for the

purposes of showing it to the chiefs and showing it

to the court administrators and in making it really an example of technological access, which is really your issue.

And if you're willing to work with us in the area of examining how we can through technology allow people, the user, to gain access to the courts and in effect permit a court or tribunal or pro tem or a lay person to help resolve issues with the use of technology, we're prepared to do it.

The chiefs have asked us to put together the agenda and put together the conference and we're prepared to do it and we're prepared to try to make it meaningful in terms of access.

Paul and I can get together with Bill Gates and discuss it and see if we can interest Microsoft in it. I am aware that Microsoft has been looking of late at issues relating to courts and the technology that would help us to better serve people.

We know, for example, and we're doing it some ways, we're doing electronic filing, for example. Some of the courts are addressing motions through e-mail. So the technology is there.

If we're talking about witnesses or expert witnesses or even witnesses in a civil context, there could be within offices studios where you can access the courts through interactive TV. All those things are not only possible, they are what's going to happen in any event.

Within our civil system where we have some real problems in our society because of the large numbers of criminal cases. We're going to have to do those things because we can't expect people, certainly in complex litigation, to sit around and wait until the courtroom opens up. You've got to have date certain. Your witnesses, wherever they are, should be able to testify from their offices or their homes or their laboratories or wherever they are. And so those things are happening now.

So I suggest to you that while I think that certainly the funding issues are significant, probably the most significant, they are not the only means of gaining access and that we have to look beyond that because there's never going to be enough money, there's never going to be enough sources and we really have to

generate new ideas in gaining access.

You may have done many of these things and you may have already thought of them, but I began to see when I was back in Washington, D.C. that the problems of gaining access if the only method that we're going to do is under established methods and through the use of money, it's not going to work.

We really have to change the system and that means the culture of the judiciary and we're prepared to help you do some of that. And that's about what I wanted to say to you.

MR. ASKEW: Well, thank you very much. Those are very thought provoking ideas. Frankly, the things you're suggesting could take up -- we could spend the whole afternoon talking about those because they are quite interesting and forward-looking.

You're mentioning several things that actually we as a board and our staff and president have been focused on, certainly in terms of technology, but also looking beyond the money, about how better services, more services, more access can be provided to our clients. And you're blessed here in Washington to have

a program that in some ways is on the cutting edge of some the technology issues. That may be something that by 2001 everybody will be doing, but certainly now, there are very few doing.

Ironically, Roger Warren, as you might expect, is a former legal aid lawyer.

JUSTICE GUY: No, I didn't know that.

MR. ASKEW: And his brother-in-law was former vice president of this corporation, John Tull. And so we do have connections to Roger and Roger is very interested in how the things he's working on at the National Center impact poor people and can be linked to legal services, but I'm not sure we've had as much contact with him or as much of a linkage there as we should.

We also obviously greatly appreciate the support from the National Center, the state courts, and from the conference of chief justices for the Legal Services Corporation and the motions that you adopt at your meetings supporting full funding and the effort you and many other chief justices have made in trying to get us as much funding as we can get.

I think we all agree with you that we'll never have all that we need and we need to look beyond that in terms of what we can do with the resources that we do have to make sure they reach as many people as possible.

Let me see if there are other committee members or board members who might have a question or comment to make.

MR. EAKELEY: I would love to see maybe not a formal invitation, but perhaps an opportunity to talk about having access to justice for low income persons on the agenda for your 2001 conference. I think the current chair of the conference is David Hale from New Hampshire.

JUSTICE GUY: Yes.

2.2

MR. EAKELEY: One of our board members, John Broderick, is a colleague of Chief Justice Hale's, and Chief Justice Hale -- it's Brock, I'm sorry. Justice Brock spoke at a congressional reception that we hosted after our White House reception in July, but beyond that, it seemed to me that the leadership you have shown and as represented in your Access to Justice

initiative and now institution is also replicable in other parts of the country. And I'm wondering how to borrow a page from that particular playbook and distribute it widely with encouragement for others to do likewise.

1.3

JUSTICE GUY: The chiefs conference is going to be in Rapid City next year, 2000, and the theme there is really family law, domestic law, which fits in very well with the issues of access and you might very well look at that for presentation purposes.

MR. EAKELEY: When the top court in the state starts paying significant, visible attention to access on behalf of the poor issues, a lot of other people who might not otherwise pay attention start paying attention and that creates a very different environment in which to gain not just attitudinal changes and cultural shifts, but also perhaps changes in approaches and the researches that need to go with them.

You can increase access with technology, but the more you increase access, the more there is a demand for either legal services to go with them by way of resources or that adjudicatory function, one way or

the other.

2.2

JUSTICE GUY: Well, we're going to deal with the latter because we see that we don't have the resources within existing judge positions to address all of the cases and we really see the need to bring in pro tems, temporary judges, and, frankly, lay people, knowledgeable lay people, and they're very competent to deal with some of these issues.

People get traffic tickets and they have mitigation hearings on that, basically why were you speeding, well, I was speeding because I was on my way to such and such. Those, I think, can be handled by e-mail, by the Internet, and dealt with by knowledgeable people. You don't have to use judge resources. And what that means for us in the system is that we can use that money, those resources elsewhere.

And I can see folks who want access to the system, but don't want to take time off of work or can't leave home or things like that, being able to access in that fashion, child care, all of those things.

And to me, those are access issues because the courts are there to resolve those problems and people shouldn't have to go to a single location. You look around in Seattle, go down 5th, the courthouse is there. Well, years ago, courthouses were the focal points for lots of activity, some entertainment and certainly the filing of papers and all of that. But in today's world, making people go to a central location makes no sense at all and I suggest to you that something else you might consider is the promotion of, in effect, satellite courts.

We can do it technologically because you can file your papers electronically. A satellite court can be in a shopping center, where you've got a vacant space. It's not that hard to set up a court with a clerk and a bailiff and a judge and run it from seven to nine and have people access it directly there, at a lot less cost than what we're doing now.

These are the things that I think we have to look at if we're talking about allowing people to come before a tribunal for dispute resolution. The reason I like the community boards idea, I saw it when I was a

trial judge in Spokane in the juvenile area and it was brilliant because you had folks that lived in the community and they knew the kids that lived there, they saw them, they saw them on the bicycle or in the shopping centers or wherever they were. And they also knew what the signs were when a kid started getting into trouble and they could bring them up short and they sort of watched them.

I think citizen involvement is very significant and you could put three citizens together in a tribunal and do a Judge Judy resolution and it's really mediation.

Those kinds of ideas in terms of access I think are pretty critical and you don't need lawyers involved in that. What you need is some staff support and it wouldn't be too hard for us to put that sort of stuff together.

MR. ASKEW: Let me mention one thing on the issue on the unauthorized practice of law that you touched on first. We have a commission in Georgia chaired by one of our justices of the Supreme Court and I've had to do some staff work for it and one of the

things we did was survey every state and what we found was everybody's frustrated with UPL and nobody, no state, feels it's found the solution to it.

2.2

Arizona has taken a most interesting approach which was to abolish all UPL statute and view it as an access issue and their position is if we could provide access to the poor and to the middle class, these people who prey on folks would go away because the market would be met by lawyers or by others providing those services under a regulated system as opposed to people operating with a non-regulated system.

That seems to me a growing sort of idea, which is it's really more of an access issue and if we could address those issues, as you are speaking to, then the growth of these other forms of delivering these services would dissipate because the market would take care of it.

It's a fairly radical approach and Texas has taken the exact opposite approach, which is trying to prosecute everybody, including software makers, but nobody has defined the practice of law. I would be interested to see the Washington State Bar's definition

because that's tended to be the problem, is that defining the practice of law is where everybody stumbles in terms of regulating UPL.

JUSTICE GUY: I'm told that it came out of the board of governors unanimously and it's more of an exclusion definition. This is not the practice of law, this is, facilitators, for example, are not the practice of law.

There was a bill in the legislature in the last session which was, I think, aimed more at tweaking the nose of the bar than anything else to have the legislature define what the practice of law it. Under our constitution, I think they'd have to write a constitutional amendment. But it is a public issue and it's one the legislature is concerned about because they see the guild syndrome, you know, the protectionist kind of thing. Frankly, I don't think it's accurate and I don't think that most of the people that are served by the paralegals are going to go to lawyers.

We could, and it was suggested to me today by Wayne Blair, the president of the bar, former president

of the bar, that we hold public hearings on the issue and we might do that. Frankly, I hadn't thought that through totally, but the bar did hold public hearings, it got a lot of comment. But it's -- I guess the thing that's troublesome to me is people are doing it.

They are in effect practicing law, they are doing so negligently and without any kinds of control and it becomes an issue of public protection.

MR. ASKEW: Well, thank you very much for taking time today. I know you were rushed to get here. We very much appreciate you coming and all you've done.

JUSTICE GUY: I want to thank you for what you're doing. I know that you are basically volunteering your time and a lot of effort and it's a very significant effort on behalf of the judiciary and that's my perspective and that's where I'm coming from and, on behalf of the judiciary, we appreciate what you're doing. I don't think we could function very well without having help, access help, including the pro bono help we get.

MR. EAKELEY: We look forward to your remarks this evening.

JUSTICE GUY: They may not be much different. 1 Thank you. 2 MR. ASKEW: Thank you. 3 Pat, I'm going to ask you and Joan and 4 5 whomever else you want bring forward to come forward. Welcome. 6 7 MR. McINTYRE: Thank you very much. We have a little outline of what we'd like to cover. Would it be 8 9 okay for me to distribute that? MR. ASKEW: Please. 10 11 Pat really needs no introduction after the last day and a half. 12 MR. McINTYRE: Let me first begin by saying 13 again thank you for the opportunity to meet with you. 14 15 We really appreciate it. 16 We're always very anxious to be sure that all 17 of you are aware of what we're doing and of the good 18 use that we certainly try to put the grant funds to and feel pretty confident that we are. But I also want to 19 20 echo what Chief Justice Guy said, even though I've said 21 it before over the last couple of days. The support 22 from the board and the staff at the corporation is

really vital to us and we don't, as much as we may grumble about an occasional requirement, the fact is that we do understand the difficulty of some of what you have to do to support us, that it's not an easy job.

And if we didn't say anything else, we would want to say thank you for that. And that's a very genuine sentiment and I say that for a lot of people.

MR. ASKEW: Well, thank you.

MR. McINTYRE: Let me say also that the state Access to Justice board, which is the vehicle of the Supreme Court that really oversees all access to justice activities, as it turned out, is having their annual retreat through this morning or until this afternoon.

They would all be driving at this point and they met all day yesterday, or certainly many members, I can tell you without a doubt that Judge Small, who is the current chair of the Access to Justice board, would most certainly have been here and I'm sure he would want me to say that he looks forward to seeing you this evening, he's sorry he can't be here for this.

Let me introduce Joan Kleinburg again for the record. Joan Kleinburg is the director of CLEAR at the Northwest Justice Project and not only does she have the official title, but the reality is she's the brains of CLEAR. So if we're going to talk about CLEAR, the person I would need to help me do that, and I'm very happy to have her, is Joan Kleinburg.

As you can see from the outline that we've provided you which is both to help you follow along and make notes, but also to jump in and get us back on track if we wander off, which we are sometimes wont to do, what we would like to do is a couple of things.

Many of you had the opportunity yesterday to actually view the CLEAR operation by sitting in and watching an advocate at work, talking about some of things, as I understand it, hearing the clients, hearing the problems live. That's an important slice of CLEAR.

I think it helps people to understand the day-to-day reality. But what we thought we could add to that today, as the outline illustrates, is to talk a little more in depth about the parts that you wouldn't see. In some ways, that's a tip of an iceberg.

There's a lot more that goes into getting us where we are today. There are a lot more interesting things about the system that we'd like to share with you.

2.2

The second thing we want to accomplish is to talk a little bit about the state planning process, which has just completed another round. One of the things on the agenda for the Access to Justice board this past couple of days at its retreat are to make a decision on the final draft of the revised state plan, which they have done, incidentally, and I am prepared to hand you the copy.

So I am sort of also the official delivery person for the state of Washington, to say here it is, here's our state plan. So we can talk a little bit about that. I know it's late on a long day and Friday's not the best day to try to generate interest and enthusiasm, but I think we probably will be able to do some of that.

One final thing and then we'll get rolling.

As you might expect, John Asher, that, of course, is
the Denver program that you last visited at your last
meeting, is a long-time friend of mine and so I don't

1	think I'm giving away any secrets to say that when I
2	started to think in earnest about, okay, they're
3	coming, what are we going to do, one of the people that
4	I made it a point to do was call John and I also got
5	the transcript of that meeting because I really wanted
6	to be well prepared and after I had read it and called
7	John, I know he wouldn't mind my sharing with you his
8	sage advice.
9	He told me that we'd do great, you know,
10	he said all those kinds of things and then he said,
11	"But, Mack, I got one thought I want to leave with
12	you."
13	And I said, "John, what is that?"
14	He said, "You know, comes Monday, they'll all
15	be gone and you'll still be there."
16	MR. EAKELEY: You know, that's interesting,
17	
	too, both of you are so totally reticent.
18	too, both of you are so totally reticent. MR. McINTYRE: I'm glad you noticed that. He
18	_
	MR. McINTYRE: I'm glad you noticed that. He
19	MR. McINTYRE: I'm glad you noticed that. He can't sing, though.

where it is, it starts out as an idea. In our case, the idea was strongly fostered by the Legal Services

Corporation planning process back in '95, the documents that came out, and the emphasis that was given at that time and the encouragement to programs who were going to bid, to think about technology and what it could do. That was the starting point for us.

MS. KLEINBURG: Well, I dug back in some of my notes of various talks I've given over the last several years to find out what we were saying at that moment now almost four years ago so this would have been that last week in October, first week in November, as we were, I think Mack explained to you, sitting in Law Fund's supply closet putting together our proposal for LSC funds. And at the same time, we were trying to create this concept and then to communicate it to all of our partners in the access to justice network here in Washington.

And at that time, when CLEAR was fairly embryonic, what we were saying to people that we thought it would do, the benefit that we saw in this thing that we were creating, there were three or four.

At that point in Washington state, we were looking at a system that had multiple service providers in each geographic location because at that point we were going to have, we hoped, two statewide legal services providers, NJP and Columbia Legal Services.

We also had in many communities across the state a volunteer lawyer program that was sponsored by the local bar association, and then we have a number of specialty programs or free standing programs, for example, an unemployment law project, an immigrants rights project. And so putting ourselves in the clients' shoes, we saw this could be a pretty confusing landscape.

And so our first goal and one of the benefits that we saw coming out of a centralized system was to streamline client access into that system in an environment where there were many providers. And what we wanted to avoid was a client walking down the street from door to door, knocking on each door, engaging with a staff person inside that door, having some kind of an interview, being told, sorry, we can't help you but go on down the street to the next door, maybe they can.

And while all of this is happening the client's frustration is growing, staff time is being used up, and the clock is ticking perhaps on a deadline to assert legal rights. So streamlining client access was one goal.

2.2

We also predicted at that point that we could gain some efficiencies which were particularly important because at the same time that all this change was happening you all remember there was a significant reduction in funding at that point, so we were looking for efficiencies.

And one of the ways we thought we could get that was through technology. For example, using a computerized case management system and just contrasting how we used to do intake with what we could do sitting in front of a workstation the way you saw the CLEAR folks yesterday, we'd have client records stored electronically so that if the client said I spoke with you last week, instead of jumping up and running down the hall and hoping that that paper file would be in the file cabinet where it belonged, we'd pull it up on the computer and save significant time.

We could do conflicts checking electronically without flipping through some file box that might or might not have had records. We would have research tools right there at the desktop, instead of having to go into the library and hope that volume 59 of the Revised Code of Washington as in fact on the shelf and not in somebody's office. We could do research.

We saw a way to automate mailings of our legal information publications which many of you saw on our web site yesterday by folding that into the electronic client record. And then we could avoid the need to handle intake sheets and do reentry of data from a paper intake sheet into a computerized system.

So we did see that there would be efficiencies and each minute that we could save avoiding some of the tasks manually meant more minutes for client service.

We also wanted to and predicted that we could reduce inappropriate referrals, that situation I said where somebody might have walked into one legal services office and be told we don't help you, but maybe they do down the street or here's a list of three you could try.

We thought by using a computer to provide information about what each of those resources provided that we could get the client to the right place on the first try and save everybody a lot of frustration and wasted time.

2.0

So that's where we sat in October 1995 when we were thinking up the system and thinking how this would benefit clients here in Washington state.

MR. McINTYRE: I think it's important to point this out that at that point we had another important decision to make which we were very clear about and that was you could attempt to do this using relatively unskilled people and try to make that a valuable system or you could opt instead to shoot for very experienced people, the thought being that the more experienced the people the more service you could provide immediately, the greater the likelihood that you could actually solve a problem and provide detailed, really mature, knowledgeable advice.

That is what we opted to do and it was very deliberate, so we want you to understand that that's how we set up the process going in because that has

implications for what we learned over time.

2.2

MS. KLEINBURG: At that time, we were much smaller than we are now. This was all very experimental and so our approach was to say let's come up with our model and let's pilot it and so we started it in eight counties and tried it out to see how that would go and then steadily expanded the service area of CLEAR as resources became available to match the staffing with the clients who would be using the system. And so it has grown since that time.

When we started, I think we had six attorneys who were what we say on line or on the line, folks who answered the phone, attorneys and paralegals, and over the years since then we've now grown largely with the help of state funding and a federal grant from the Administration on Aging to about 17 attorneys full-time equivalents who go on the line and we're now fully serving 38 of Washington's 39 counties and doing service on a more limited basis here in King County, which is the largest county in the state.

Our staff, as Mack was saying, we wanted to have experienced staff and we have a wide range of

staff experience in terms of quantity of years and also quality. And that's really brought a wonderful richness to our staff. So for example, our staff ranges from recent law school graduates, folks who had demonstrated a very serious commitment to public interest law while they were in law school, to several people who came to CLEAR from the attorney general's office, which was a wonderful connection for us. Two of them -- actually, all three of them at one time had worked in the child welfare division. And so they came with a wonderful knowledge of those systems that they brought to CLEAR.

One of our attorneys is probably a 13-year attorney who came to us from a private labor law practice, labor and employment practice, and so she brings another dimension and another whole set of skills.

We recently had somebody temping with us who we would have liked to have added permanently had a number of things worked out because of his skills in bankruptcy and insolvency and that brought another dimension.

And so we have a range of staff, younger, newer attorneys who have that wonderful enthusiasm and who are, you know, just eating up this wide range of areas of law and folks who bring to us years of experience and seasoning and practice out in the world as well as substantive knowledge.

2.2

And we're really striving to maintain that balance. We like the new blood and we like that seasoned, older, been out there, been in court, knows what those procedures are like.

MR. McINTYRE: So right now, about two-thirds of the staff, just to summarize, are pretty heavily experienced by legal services standards. And that was a big question mark going in. And what I mean by that is it was questionable whether people would find this kind of work adequately fulfilling and rewarding to keep them doing it. What we have found is that it is, I think for several reasons, one of which is that it's changing.

The whole system, as Joan says, is to some extent an experiment in some ways. We will say a little more about that, but it is very new and novel

and just listening to the things that Chief Justice Guy says, that's a big part of this. There are new things that are coming all the time. New capacities are coming into the system and that has the effect of keeping people energized and interested.

And, also as Jcan suggests, the diversity of the group and the breadth of the various kinds of experience is really, I think, a real charge for people that are doing the work.

Quickly, some of the things that you don't see. They're on the line from 9:30 to 12:30 and that's five days a week. It's not always fully staffed. You know, people have kids, take vacations, all of those things happen. The volunteers are out there to some extent. They make up for some of the little gaps.

So what happens at 12:30? You know, does everybody go home?

No. A lot of people choose to leave word about their problem and their need for somebody to call them back in a voice mail system, so in the afternoons, there's a need for people to check the callbacks, to contact those clients, to have conversations just like

they would in the morning, except they're not sitting there getting them out of the queue.

In many cases, they're doing research.

Where they can and their direct assistance is required, they're providing that. That is, calling landlords, calling case workers from state agencies, assisting clients in drafting, seeing that materials that we promise to send get sent out, that kind of thing. So those are all some of the things that you don't see.

Something that some of you heard about yesterday that we'd like to pass along to all of you is that as time went on, as we had the new law school people that Joan mentioned, we had a concern that if we were attract somebody no matter how good and experienced this is, it probably was not a fair thing to do to somebody to have them go for four years, be on the phone, benefit from the secondhand experience of others that they would hear about.

In other words, we didn't think it was a good idea to have somebody be a conduit for this great advice that had no firsthand knowledge of what the hell they were talking about. I mean, they may be giving

great advice, but the fact is they've never been in court.

We think that's not a good thing for people and that long term it wouldn't be adequately fulfilling. So we created what we call a mentor program and we take people off, the relatively inexperienced people go off of the CLEAR system for three to four months and they get an intensive experience where they're mentored by a very senior attorney and they handle a case load during that period of time. So that's one of the things.

The other thing we found out was that it made very good sense to give people geographic assignments around the state and to give them the opportunity to be able to take some time off and go for a few days to that particular area of the state and meet the individuals that they were making referrals to or trying to assist through cases. So they go out and talk to the courthouse facilitators. They go out and meet the volunteer lawyer program coordinators.

In some cases, they meet the local judges.

They go watch somebody. One of our advocates was

telling -- Bucky was sitting in -- that during her visit, she went and watched the pro se calendar and it made all the difference to her because she understood that in some counties our clients would have a tremendously good and helpful experience as a pro se while in other counties you would virtually be consigning them to failure as well as a humiliating and degrading experience. And that makes all the difference, of course, when she's trying to assist people over the phone. So those are some of the things.

2.2

MS. KLEINBURG: One of the other things that goes on in the afternoon is that the CLEAR advocates are also members of the statewide substantive law task forces that we have in Washington, so there's a children, youth and families task force, a housing task force, a medical assistance task force, an education task force, and those task forces meet typically quarterly to stay on top of changes in the law within the state, issues that are arising, and CLEAR advocates are full members of those committees and bringing a very interesting perspective because each of the other

advocates has a kind of very geographically defined view of the client community and CLEAR advocates come in with that wide angle view because of the volume of calls, volume of clients that we speak with.

2.2

And that perspective is proving to be a new perspective in those committees, but a very useful one, and what we're seeing happen now is that issues that are brought up by CLEAR, where we're saying we're seeing this happening, those substantive task forces are now discussing strategies to address those issues. And so it's feeding into advocacy efforts in that way and integrating CLEAR folks with advocates across the state.

MR. McINTYRE: We'll take a little question pause here, if you have any. If not, we'll move on.

MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Do these geographic meetings across the state change any of your priorities or anything, the problems that come up? Or are they just about the same all over the state?

MR. McINTYRE: Well, the way our priorities work is that we have the general state priorities and they are refined to some extent in local areas. So

certain things impact certain offices of the state more than others, but the priorities are broad enough to allow some flexibility at that level. But the answer to your question is yes.

2.2

Does that impact priorities? It does indirectly in the sense that that new information about a problem in that community or a particular spin on the problem would feed into our annual priorities review and then the proposals that we make to the board and the board's consideration of what the final priorities are would be influenced by that.

MR. ASKEW: Mack, you remember John Orango's writings about the types of people who are in legal services and the hands-on helpers, people who are there because of the help they can give to an individual poor person.

MR. McINTYRE: Yes.

MR. ASKEW: Was it a difficult transition for those people in your program who came from that perspective to make the technology and the new way of doing this, was that a difficult transition for them?

And how has it worked out for them, do you think?

MR. McINTYRE: Well, my sense is -- Joan would have much more firsthand knowledge, but from what I've observed, it has not been a difficult challenge. In fact, I would say that there's a very heavy percentage of those kind of people who find this work most rewarding.

I mean, I think what you're suggesting by your question is that somehow because the communications are, you know, other than personal, face-to-face, that there's some different level of satisfaction that comes to people who really want to have that kind of experience.

What we find is that there are very -- people feel like the relationships and the work that they do is very closely related to the clients.

MS. MERCADO: Do the advocates that you have working for CLEAR, are any of the cases that they give advice on it then turns out that they do need beyond advice they need legal help and going to the court process, do they take some of those cases or is that referred out to other attorneys?

MR. McINTYRE: No, it's referred out, but, of

course, it could be referred -- if it was in the Seattle area, for example, it would often be referred right to our field office that we have in our office.

That does raise another interesting point, a very good experience that we've had, and that is that the volunteer attorneys who come and man the line have in several cases, as I understand it, had difficulty finding somebody and done as much as they could and just said I'm taking the case, is it okay if I take the case, this person just really needs the help and even in some cases in far outlying counties where maybe they had a contact or a friend or their law firm had a branch office or something like that.

MR. ASKEW: We're going to pause for just a minute so that we can get Nancy Rogers back on the phone. She was cut off, unfortunately, so hopefully it will just take a minute.

(Pause.)

2.2

MR. ASKEW: I knew the answer to the question
I was asking you about the transition because the
paralegal I sat in with yesterday told me that she was
intimidated by this when it was first suggested and

thought that she would terribly miss the one-on-one contact with clients, but she feels much more rewarded now because she can help so many more people with the time that she has. And my guess was she is one of those hands-on helper sort of people and she is a convert to this now.

I think she went into it with a great deal of trepidation, both from the technology point of view, but also from what am I giving up here by doing this and now is absolutely committed to it.

MR. McINTYRE: There's a very difficult aspect to this work because for resource limitation reasons there are many places unfortunately in the state where what you can provide is simply not going to be enough. It's not that it's not helpful, but the person needs help.

They're not in fact going to be able to go in on their own and get an order and there's nobody there. We don't have an office, nobody has an office, there's no active pro bono program in some parts of the state. That's tough to take and it's especially tough to take for those kind of people who are the hands-on kind that

you mentioned.

I think that the only reason that they're able to continue doing the work despite those kinds of disappointments and pressure is because such a large majority of the time in fact they are able to make a rather big difference in people's lives with this.

We learned some hard lessons along the way, too, which we should briefly address and I want to stress one point that again was not an obvious thing. You know, to do this, it's not as though everybody was waiting out there with open arms in all those other programs to say sign me up, you guys be the intake system, we love this idea.

What the reality is is that people have done things over a long period of time, they are possessive about the ways that they do things. If you're a volunteer lawyer program and you've been getting funding partly from your local bar and partly from whatever, United Way, how do you get that funding and keep it going, you provide numbers, you know, at the end of every accounting period of how many people came in through your system.

There is a great fear initially that if somebody else is serving as that intake system then we're not going to look so good and our funding is going to be jeopardized, so there's that fear, there is the general dislike of having anybody do it differently than you think is the right way to do it, and then there's the general suspicion about efficiency and whether it's really personal adequately to do things over the computer and over the phone.

So Joan met with a lot of resistance and probably continues to some extent to have to confront that, so a large part of her job and of any program who is thinking about this on a large scale would have to expect is you have to go out there and you need to meet a lot of people, you need to learn how they do things, you need to bring them into the system and you really need to educate them about the benefits.

We've been fortunate in doing that, but

I wouldn't want anybody to misunderstand or think

that that's something you do quickly or easily.

It's the hard groundwork that you lay to make this

work.

What other lessons would you say are really important?

MS. KLEINBURG: Well, I've got some of the --

I was hoping for a segue directly from what you said,
Bucky, you know, about folks giving up that face to
face contact. Well, Norma in particular, because there
were other paybacks in that she was helping a lot of
people.

And there are a number of things that we've discovered that we had not predicted four years ago and I think that some of these are what makes the work rewarding for the folks who go on the line and I think the foremost one is the value of getting the client into immediate contact with an attorney or a very experienced paralegal who has the knowledge and the skill to help them with that legal problem.

And I think that's been really surprising to clients, that that phone gets answered not by several different levels of screening, but by an attorney or a paralegal.

And I think our folks really see that value of that immediate hookup because then it lets them do more

for the client. They can identify an emergency earlier 1 in the process, get some help out there. 2 Something else that we're really realizing is 3 how convenient this is for clients. And I'm not sure 4 which one of you, but somebody yesterday apparently was 5 sitting in with Millicent who had a call from a woman who was literally in labor calling from the hospital 7 with some questions about the birth certificate and the 8 9 implications of putting or not putting the father's name on the birth certificate for her ability to 10 11 collect child support. MR. McINTYRE: And that would be the right 12 time to call. 13 No, it's about nine months MR. McCALPIN: 14 15 late. Better late than never. 16 MR. McINTYRE: MS. KLEINBURG: But that woman was not going 17 to make it down to present herself in person to a legal 18 services office at that moment in time, but I think she 19 probably got the information she needed to make a wise 20

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

Because of the efficiencies we've gained, we

21

22

choice.

without it. And one of the efficiencies I think that we've realized that when we talked efficiency it was in a generalized way, but there's something extremely efficient about using the phone system and not having no shows or appointments lots that are too long or too short, but it's very self-regulating.

As long as we have a few calls in queue so that when that advocate finishes this call and hangs up, then the next one can come through, so their time is used very efficiently and we're finding that that's been a real plus for the volunteers also. Some of the feedback we've gotten from volunteers is I like volunteering at CLEAR because I come down to your office, even though I'm very busy, I take the time, I come down and from the minute I put on that headset and hit that button, my time is used doing what lawyers do, counselling people, helping them sort out their problems and there is not a wasted moment in there, and at the end of my time on line I go back to my office and I know I've done some good and I feel that my time has been well used.

Something else that has emerged and I think that there may be a copy of this in the materials has been our role and value to many of the volunteer lawyer programs.

In Washington state, we have a model that's a little bit different from many other states. In many states, the volunteer lawyer program is incorporated into the LSC grantee and so there may be a person who is designated as the pro bono coordinator and that's the person who recruits volunteers and gets the cases out to the volunteers.

In Washington state, our model evolved a little bit differently and we have now, I think, 24 volunteer lawyer programs that are sponsored by local bar associations, typically, in some cases, they're housed in community action programs, and their coordinators are typically not lawyers. And what many of those programs have found is the working with CLEAR so that they do their client intake by taking referrals from CLEAR, that they're getting a higher quality screening because those cases are screened by an attorney or a paralegal, so that when they're calling a

volunteer to say would you take this case, they're confident that it's a meritorious case with some legal issues that this volunteer attorney can do something about.

And so we're finding that we have very, very positive relationships with many of the volunteer lawyer programs that have really interfaced with CLEAR in a very constructive way so that we're doing what we do best and they're doing what they do best. They're recruiting lawyers, they're getting the cases out to the lawyers. Many of them now have more time to do that recruitment.

One told me she felt like she had time to make maybe two or three calls to place a case and then she'd kind of give up if people said no and now she can make five or six or just stick with it until she can get someone to take a case. So there have been shifts like that that have been very positive for clients and we're getting some good feedback about that.

We just got something from the -- actually, it was an IOLTA application from one of the volunteer lawyer programs out in a rural county just saying

how -- she says, "We refer all of our telephone clients to the CLEAR line for intake and screening. We found that with such a huge demand for services within the community, it was to our advantage to ask for help with our client load, rather than risk turning people away. CLEAR allows us to provide services to everyone. CLEAR handles not only our intake and screening, but can offer legal advice to clients as well, thus reducing our case load significantly. Cases they refer back to us for help always include suggestions on how we may best serve our clients."

And so it helps them then -- we frame the issues for them and so particularly when it's a non-lawyer trying to sell the case to an attorney, they can say these are the issues and this is what needs to happen. And they've found that to be very helpful.

MR. McINTYRE: I'm going to rattle real fast through what we see in the future kind of thing and a lot of it's already been suggested.

MR. McKAY: Can I ask one, Mack?

MR. McINTYRE: Yes.

MR. McKAY: When you first -- Joan, maybe this is best directed to you. When you first went out to the volunteer lawyer programs and said, you know, we've got this thing under this curtain here, we want to tell you what it's going to be, was there not some concern that it would just result in huge new case loads for them? In other words, if they all of a sudden started taking referrals from CLEAR plus what they were currently trying to do, it sounds to me like there was -- what you've really worked out is a tradeoff where you're doing some of their intake and they are now getting localized, high quality cases without having to work the screening.

But I would think that initially their fear might have been that if they sort of turn themselves over to CLEAR, CLEAR was just going to give them this overwhelming case load.

MS. KLEINBURG: I think it was a fear and I think it was in some instances a reality, initially.

And then some of the programs, some right from the beginning and some later on, said our primary mechanism for taking clients, rather than answering the phone

ourselves doing it, we'll give up that function and we will take referrals from CLEAR and that will be our client intake mechanism.

And so that was the way I think they ultimately achieved some balance. But I think there were offices that initially did get more.

MR. McINTYRE: Here quickly is where we're going, that we know we're going. I mean, it's obvious, you just need to walk down the hall, as you can see, this is all coming because it's starting to happen.

There are going to be people on the web site and the CLEAR line at exactly the same time and then you're going to split screen and you're going to have the same part of the web site up, the CLEAR advocate, the client is going to be out there saying, okay, I understand it to this point, but what does this mean. All of that stuff is starting to happen. We don't have to do anything.

It's absolutely clear that the so-called digital divide is being narrowed. It's receiving tremendous attention in the philanthropic community, it's a very attractive thing for people like Bill Gates

to want to be concerned about and a place to spend their money, so I think to the extent it was a gamble to go in this direction, the issue being whether there's going to actually be a concern in the public, another education system, to make sure that people are basically, you know, aware of how to use a computer, I don't think that's going to be a problem and I think public access, a lot of it is obviously increasing really radically. I mean, that's all happening fast. So those are some things that we could basically count on.

2.2

The capacity to utilize volunteers and to attract and interest them and put them to good use is unquestionably -- the difficulty for us is going to be having enough places to put volunteers and to figure out how it is you deal with quality control because one of the things we haven't talked a lot about is that there is spot checking that goes on of the CLEAR advocates so that you can see the quality of the advice and the recordkeeping and all of that. As long as we have the volunteers in-house and we have a limited number, we can do that as well in-house.

The bigger it gets, you know, unless you have additional supervisory staff, you have some limits there. We are already in the position to have outstations.

It doesn't have to be the case that the people who are doing CLEAR volunteering or the advocacy have to be on-site, it's only a matter of money and quality control that keeps you from having people setting up, for example, in a private law firm three stations, you know, whether it be in the farthest reaches of the state. It's all doable.

It's interesting to hear the chief justice talk about the electronic filing. I had a conversation with one of the CLEAR advocates this morning, one of the most experienced, who said, you know, if I could just file a notice of appearance right smack on the line when I'm talking to a lot of these clients, that would really be terrific because I know they're not going to be able to do it on their own, they're in real jeopardy, the clock is ticking, they can't find anybody, that would be a tremendous service, even if it bought us enough time to then get them help to fill out

the from. So that's coming.

I'm happy to hear the chief justice say that at least in some parts of the state there's some of that going on, but I can tell you it's really on a test basis at this point and it's not sufficiently expanded to where we can use it. But those are some of the directions we think we will be going, some of the ones we know we will be going.

The "what do we need to know" point on this outline is to remind us to say we know we would be among the first to recognize and to tell anyone there are a lot of unanswered questions about this. We don't have very good factual information about what happens to the pro se people that we try to help.

I mean, I can tell you who gets on and downloads something from the web site and makes a call and gets some instructions, but what we don't have any system to do now is to find out what happened to those folks. Did they in fact go get the protection order, were they able to resolve their own consumer problem based on the help. That's a big question mark.

The Project for the Future of Equal Justice, as you probably know, has funding from the Soros Foundation and is engaged in the first phase of broad national assessment of what it is hotlines and web sites and the like are able actually to provide to people and where they might be improved.

We have made clear to Don and others that we hope that we will be considered, you know a very serious candidate to be looked at. It's difficult for us to do the self-assessment just because of funding limitations. If there are other sources to help us do that assessment and get that information, that would be tremendously valuable.

We have tried throughout our existence to pass along the benefits of anything we learn and most especially our mistakes to save others. To the rest of the national community, we would certainly continue to do that.

MR. ASKEW: That's a segue to one thing I wanted to ask you about. At our last committee meeting, your friend and ours, Alan Hausman, appeared to talk to us at the end of the committee meeting and

one thing that's in the minutes from that meeting, and I'll read it to you, it says, "Some project directors are fearful that LSC, NLADA and CLASP are attempting to replace legal representation and specialized advocacy with a centralized, impersonal and brief advice system."

MR. McINTYRE: And some are. Yes, some are.

MR. ASKEW: What do we do to confront that nationally or how do we get people to see the reality of this as opposed to whatever their other vision of it is?

MR. McINTYRE: Well, I think we have the microcosm of that. You know, when I was saying earlier that there are skeptics, there certainly are skeptics and that was a part of the problem for us. You have that on a much larger scale.

I can offer you what is the most successful approach that we've taken, which is to be absolutely forthright about the extent to which there are unanswered questions but they are going to be answered, they are taken very seriously. We don't overstate the value of anything we're doing. To the extent that some

of it is experimental, we say so. And we share the value of our staff, particularly those who are the most skeptical.

You cited Norma. I would tell you I'll bet you that Norma got engaged in this on the strength of her belief in me and in Joan and in some of the others as legal services workers that she valued over the years and had a high regard. So basically she was going to try it out and see what really happened.

And I think you have to do a lot of that.

I think we have to have some of our best people, show

it with all the freckles and all, and then we just have
to say it doesn't do everything.

MR. EAKELEY: On that last point, though, you clearly -- there are clear advantages to doing more better and more efficient screening and intake and referral, not to mention brief advice and I think that the self-assessment component of that is vitally important for a whole variety of reasons. But you're also, as I understand it, when substantive cases -- when cases come in that are in need of more than brief advice or self-help, they get referred. They get

referred to the Northwest Justice Project or they get 1 referred to volunteer lawyers programs or elsewhere. 2 MR. McINTYRE: Right. 3 MR. EAKELEY: So you are an example or a 4 refutation of the notion that CLEAR is a substitute for 5 substantive legal advocacy on behalf of people, I 6 7 assume. Do you track those cases? That we refer? MR. McINTYRE: 8 MR. EAKELEY: The cases you refer to the 9 volunteer lawyers programs or how many cases in your 10 11 normal case load in your office come in through CLEAR, 12 for example? MS. KLEINBURG: We don't have a way to track 13 that statistically, although that's a feature that 14 15 we're building into new software that we're developing, 16 is the source of the referral, so that we can start looking at that. 17 MR. EAKELEY: I think one further answer to 18 the critics that say this is intended to substitute for 19 personalized substantive legal attention is note to the 20 21 contrary it helps us identify more rapidly and specify

more precisely what's needed and then makes sure that

22

there's a provider for that.

MS. MERCADO: Well, you also have a client community, I think overall, after the period of time that it's been in existence, that is probably going to look more favorably rather than sitting all day long on a walk-in basis to see somebody, if you're only scheduling one attorney to do intakes or whatever as opposed to a system that can refer out whether it's to your program or to Columbia or any other program to where they can get quicker assistance if they need it beyond pro se or beyond brief advice. And that seems to make it more efficient for them, for the client in the community to get that help.

MR. McINTYRE: Or, as Joan has suggested, and it's really quite true, people do understand that stopping the revolving door by having the first place say this is as much as there is, this is the situation for you, I'm telling you as a 17-year lawyer, here is the situation you're in, this is what's available, I'm not telling you to call anybody else, I'm not setting you up for a lot of heartbreak and disappointment, this is where you're at.

People find it difficult, I think, to understand that that's a service, and if you can do that, you know, in 20 minutes instead of two and a half weeks of frustrated calls and appointments and all of that, you really have done something valuable. But unfortunately, people are inclined to just sort of look at the final outcome and if it's not completely favorable to someone, assume that somehow there's been a failure.

One of the things that we had to overcome was people's tendency to act as though, when we were going into this, that back in '95 there was 100 percent meeting of need or nobody ever got a busy signal, you know, which of course is not the case. It's never been the case.

So you have to have a realistic approach to what this does and what it doesn't do. And I think as long as we're open about it, as long as we don't try to get locked into it or defend it where it's not adequate or even a very good system, then I believe that over time it will evolve into what it is capable of.

MS. MERCADO: And part of what you did from our on-site visit yesterday that we looked at that I thought was very important in this holistic, one-stop shopping for clients, poverty clients that need assistance, not just for the legal problem, but it may be that what they're calling about is that they actually need to be able to go to the Social Security office or they need to go to the housing authority or something totally different, city hall for some particular problem or another.

And I thought it was very helpful that the attorney that we observed that was doing that had immediately on her side all this referral of different kinds of agencies and entities that could help an individual with a particular problem and that is tremendous in itself, for people to know where it is that they need to get help for their immediate emergency.

So, I mean, it's broader than just the legal advice that you're doing, but that you're able to do it quickly because you've got trained individuals and experienced individuals that can give that information.

1	MR. McINTYRE: Right. And because it's all in
2	a database that makes it readily available and doesn't
3	rely on memory or a lot of mechanical steps.
4	Another thing that people don't often realize
5	is that helping a person to understand and decide that
6	the problem that they have, while serious, is not
7	really amenable to what we would all think of as a
8	legal solution.
9	Lawyers do that all the time. That's a
10	valuable service to people and one that lawyers and
11	paralegals that are experienced are uniquely well
12	qualified to provide. So I think it's a lot of
13	education.
14	Do we want to hear a little bit about the
15	state plan?
16	MR. ASKEW: Yes.
17	MR. McINTYRE: I'll just tell you a few
18	things.
19	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Well, I had one
20	question.
21	MR. McINTYRE: Okay.
22	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: When these cases are

referred out, do you have any checkup on them to see if
they were satisfactory or if the client was
satisfactory?

MR. McINTYRE: We did do a rather large survey
in. I think, May of 1997, as I recall, about that. And

in, I think, May of 1997, as I recall, about that. An we got -- really it was actually fairly strongly favorable, all the comments that we got from clients and organizations. A few critical, which we tried

to --

2.2

MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Oh, you get that anyway.

MR. McINTYRE: Yes. We also have it set up so that information that the clients get right at the beginning advises them how they can also use the telephone system to register complaints, basically go into our client complaint system.

We get remarkably few complaints from clients, but we don't have an ongoing client satisfaction questionnaire. It's something we talk about but haven't had the resources. It's one of the things that we would envision doing as part of an assessment, is to try to figure out how to do that.

1	MR. EAKELEY: You might make use of some of
2	the extra funds if we got the budget mark that we're
3	MR. McINTYRE: Yes. Absolutely.
4	MR. ASKEW: But in that way, CLEAR is no
5	different than a regular staffed branch office, either
6	in terms of referrals or in terms of pro se. I mean,
7	the fact that you don't know whether a client pursues a
8	pro se matter is no different than the branch office in
9	Atlanta who gives the clients the forms and sends them
10	on their way.
11	MR. McINTYRE: Right.
12	MR. ASKEW: But does it in person.
13	MR. McINTYRE: That's correct. Right.
14	MR. McKAY: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, how many
15	visits have you gotten from Alan Hausman, or not to
16	pick on Alan, but anybody else out in the legal
17	services community?
18	Because one of my impressions is that when
19	people use the expression hotline or telephone,
20	Tele-law or anything along those lines, they have in
21	mind something very different than those of us who made
22	the rounds at CLEAR saw yesterday.

1	Any idea? I know Bob Cohen in Orange County
2	has seen a number of folks who have come to visit, but
3	his system is different than your system because I've
4	been down there, too. How many do you suppose you've
5	seen?
6	MS. KLEINBURG: We've had visitors from other
7	states who are setting up similar systems, so it's been
8	from people who want to replicate or who want to learn
9	from our experience, rather than perhaps from skeptics
10	who are coming to learn more about it or see if it
11	confirms their worst fears or whatever. But, I don't
12	know, over the last few years, we've probably had five,
13	maybe. Folks from five other states come.
14	MR. McINTYRE: A lot of calls. We send out a
15	lot of materials. But, no, Alan hasn't come.
16	MR. ASKEW: Is it a burden on you to entertain
17	some of those people if they want to come look?
18	MR. McINTYRE: No, actually.
19	MR. ASKEW: We've got a few we're going to
20	send to you.
21	MR. McINTYRE: Yes. No, no, no. We're
22	MS. MERCADO: Well, you know, one of the

questions that I had was a cost question because of the hotlines that I'm aware of and that we've heard about or seen or whatever, I think that the bulk of them are not necessarily staffed by attorneys or paralegals, which makes a significant difference in the kind of advice that a client gets and the ability to resolve that problem much quicker. Because then you have additional comebacks or referrals.

And so the cost of that, I guess, is part of what I would want to look at, so that when someone is looking at an intake system, is it necessarily going to be cheaper than doing -- if you have experienced attorneys and paralegals like your program does versus just putting some support staff person or whatever to answer questions, get intake information, see whether they're qualified, but not necessarily giving them legal advice that they need in that immediate crisis situation. What is the cost analysis on that?

MR. McINTYRE: You could certainly run it --

MS. MERCADO: I mean, I know the answer,

but --

MR. McINTYRE: You could run it less

expensively. But, see, the issue for us goes beyond that because the question that we need to answer and continue to look at is given what it costs, what is the alternative? I mean, what would be better? What alternative would be better?

If we take that cost and that tells us that that means that we could have -- let's just hypothetically say three additional offices in parts of the state, each staffed with two attorneys, let's say.

And that's probably a fairly realistic trade off.

Do you get in fact a higher level of client service by doing that? I mean, that's really the issue for us. And to this point, we're pretty satisfied in our minds that the answer is, no, you don't. You don't in a just straight look at it, just in the numbers of contacts and cases you don't. But the other thing is you have to get real.

We have an area of the tri-cities area of the state where it is difficult to keep an office staff.

It's certainly a place where there's a lot of need, but ability to attract and retain people with little or no turnover has proven to be very, very difficult.

If you have an operation like CLEAR in a more 1 urban setting with more amenities for people and so on, 2 it's far easier to have a group of people that is 3 stable, high job satisfaction, and that support one 4 5 another. I mean, it's difficult to be the only -- let's 6 say you're out in an office southwest Washington, 7 you've got one attorney and one paralegal and that's 8 That's a tough assignment for people and hard to 9 it. maintain. So those are factors, hard to measure in 10 dollars. 11 MR. McKAY: Can I ask one more question? 12 MR. ASKEW: We need to go on. We have to go 13 on to state planning because we are anxious to hear 14 15 about that. MR. McKAY: Can I ask it real fast? 16 MR. ASKEW: Yes. 17 MR. McKAY: One of the calls that Bucky and I 18 observed were from out on the Olympic Peninsula, Mack, 19 and it occurs to me that one of the questions that 20

other questions around the country will ask if you're

an urban program, it would seem to make a lot of sense

21

22

to try and replicate what you're doing, but if you don't have an urban center or more than one urban center, it's got to be difficult to try and create the infrastructure to provide the service that Maria was just mentioning.

And I'm wondering if maybe some folks who aren't benefitting from either an integrated system of legal services programs or a combined program as you have would face some real difficulty in answering a call from someone from a rural area if you're going to try -- could you replicate this, for example, in area that was -- a program that was just going to serve the Olympic Peninsula?

MR. McINTYRE: I think it would be difficult.

I mean, I think there would be some particular difficulties there. That's a question I get asked by some programs that were in a state that we're talking about. You know, whether they could integrate and looking into it a serious way. And one of the questions they had was whether -- you might not start with the idea of the central intake brief referral as a way to get people together and based on the experience

we've had, my answer to them was it might work, maybe
there's something unique in your state, but I don't
think so.

I think what you need to do is to deal with
the integration first, if you're going to integrate in

the integration first, if you're going to integrate in some other way. I don't think you start with this as the vehicle to do that, if that relates to your question. I just think it's -- yes, it's a little more challenging.

MR. McKAY: Thank you.

MR. McINTYRE: State planning. Okay.

Well, a couple of things. One is I want to just tell

you that where we're at in the state planning process

and share with you our latest document officially.

It's been approved by the Access to Justice board and

I'm here to deliver copies which I can do when I finish

here.

We're very pleased to be done with the process and I want to tell you quickly a little bit about the process.

This particular go-round, we have had -- we have now involved more than 700 stakeholders throughout

the state of Washington. We sent out initial materials probably about a year ago. We put it on line. We allowed people to participate on line and many hundreds of them did it that way. That was a new thing for us.

We had the Access to Justice conference, a statewide conference that we have here, which had about 300 attendees thais past year. They all had the then-current draft. There was some discussion of it in one of the plenary sessions. People took it away. There was another round of input and then finally after all of that input the draft has gone to the Access to Justice board.

I need to reiterate because it's so important and I know that maybe some of this will be looked at by other programs, a little about the way the process works and some of you are undoubtedly sick of hearing it, and I don't mean to say it to be boastful or to preach about it or proselytize, it's just that I'm so convinced after the experience here that it's basic, that I've got to keep saying it, and that is the reason state planning worked here in the way that it did is because there was agreement on the underlying values,

that that was seen as the starting point for everybody, that once everybody is on the same page about what it is the system should have, then you can talk about what it looks like specifically or who plays what role. But until you get to the point of identifying key values, it's just not possible to do it.

2.2

We're only human beings, everybody does have egos, everybody is defensive about change. That's reality. And the only thing that will motivate people that we find is they really believe in a set of values. And so I just want to reiterate that one more time. It drove the process in the beginning. It continues to drive the process and I think it's what makes things work and it's been that way, again, this go-round.

I hope that you'll see the value of where we've gone. The information and suggestions from the corporation about the planning process have been very much taken to heart this time around. They're very helpful.

I think you will find that we were able to integrate the kind of the layout of land that the corporation suggests with some of our own unique

approaches to this to come up with a document that really is good.

You'll hear more about it tonight. Let me just give you sort of an overview of the things that it means for the Northwest Justice Project as the LSC grantee and these are really highlights that I now about, but there are at least three or four new directions that we will be thinking about as a result of the Access to Justice board's recommendations.

One of them I've already mentioned and that's the assessment. It's very specific and there is a broad recognition throughout the state that while the CLEAR system and the web site are serving as valuable new tools and everybody sees a lot of good, everybody also understands that we're going to have to make some hard decisions as time goes on about how they expand, where they expand, what ways they expand, how much money you put into them, what are they really doing.

So we have a very specific charge to determine what it is that system is doing, with a special emphasis on looking at how do pro ses fair trying to

use CLEAR and the web site. So that's one implication for us.

The second one has to do with ABA Ethics 2000, the Fordham conference which is looking at the ethical implications for civil legal services delivery, which John I know was an active participant, Alan Hausman is very involved and another group of us in the ABA Ethics 2000. You heard the chief justice here tell you that the state bar association has just delivered a recommendation that there be a specific rule on what constitutes and what doesn't constitute the practice of law.

The new version of the state plan is very specific on a strong role for the Northwest Justice Project in being an active participant in how those various decisions are coming out so that they're very fully informed with the implications that they have for the delivery systems that we're involved in. And so that's a direction we'll be in.

A third specific recommendation that comes out of the revised state plan is a very, very hard look at the way we are currently funding the volunteer lawyer

programs, the 24 programs that Joan mentioned. And the way that we've been doing that, since our beginning as an LSC grantee, is that we have been as part of our PAI plan directing sub-recipient dollars to those programs which are pretty largely used to partially support the coordinators of the programs.

But there's been a concern that came out of the process that the requirements that that imposes on some very -- in particularly, on some very small and real shoestring budget volunteer lawyer programs in terms of the compliance requirements.

And here I'm not talking about restrictions,

I should -- I'm talking requirements as opposed to

restrictions. But the recordkeeping and documentation

requirements that come with the dollars from us are

pretty significant and it probably won't be a surprise

to you to know that when the CSR review came up and we

had to do the survey which included all those 24

programs, in some of their cases, it was really a

significant imposition and so we are charged to take a

very hard look at whether it makes any sense to use

Legal Services Corporation dollars for those purposes

1	and that's another aspect of the state plan that we
2	have to look at.
3	So that's some highlights of what it means for
4	us in particular.
5	Any questions about any of that?
6	MR. EAKELEY: I just made a note to myself
7	that we've got to go back and ask ourselves when the
8	last time we looked at the necessary or unnecessary
9	burdens that the corporation's regulations impose on
10	grantees that may or may not be necessary. So that has
11	been on our agenda, but it just gets highlighted again.
12	MR. McINTYRE: Good. I appreciate that. That
13	would be very helpful to us.
14	May I deliver a copy of the plan to you all so
15	that I can say I did?
16	MR. EAKELEY: Who is your program officer?
17	MR. McINTYRE: It's Carolyn.
18	MR. EAKELEY: Are you going to have the
19	feedback letter ready before we leave tomorrow?
20	MR. McINTYRE: I will just place them here.
21	How would that be?
22	MR. ASKEW: Good idea. Thank you very much.

MR. McINTYRE: Anything else?

MR. ASKEW: Thank you both very much. When John suggested we come to Seattle, I was enthusiastic because I like Seattle, but now I see the method to his madness.

This has been a very educational experience for us and quite rewarding. It's the kind of thing we need to do in more of our meetings, to go out into a program and see what you're doing, but also see some of the new things that are happening and how they're working and we particularly appreciate you hosting us, but more than that, what you're doing here and the honesty you've shown us in terms of what's happening here and the implications for the future, both for you and for other programs.

I might mention Pat's also involved with the MIE and the current issue of the MIE Journal has several articles in there about these sorts of issues and some criticisms, I think, in there of some of this and it's well worth reading.

I'll promote that a little bit for you because that's another thing you're doing.

MR. McINTYRE: I appreciate it.

MR. ASKEW: But it makes very interesting reading, including a long article about the Oregon state planning process, which I think was modeled after your process, but I don't think it gives you any credit in there for it, but it's a very interesting article about their Access to Justice conference in Oregon.

MR. McINTYRE: Well, let me just get out of your hair and tell you we've enjoyed having you and I wasn't sure we would, to be frank, but it was okay.

I mean, we had a good time.

The staff has felt very good about meeting you all and whatever you said or however you acted towards the staff, they definitely feel appreciated today and not at all threatened or anything like that, so I thank you for that.

I did put a copy of our state bar journal, I think it's for the month of May. Let me explain why I did that because that issue is devoted to what we call the Access to Justice network here and it also includes a really very good article by the chief justice about

1	some of his thinking, but in more depth and with more
2	detail than you heard today.
3	So thanks very much. Appreciate the
4	opportunity.
5	MR. ASKEW: Please thank your staff for us
6	also.
7	MR. McINTYRE: We will do that.
8	MR. ASKEW: Right.
9	MR. McINTYRE: We'll see you tonight.
LO	MR. ASKEW: All right. John and Mike, do you
11	want to come forward? No?
L 2	MR. EIDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I guess a
L 3	question I would have is the strictness with which you
L 4	keep time limits. I have prepared about a half-hour
L5	slide show concerning intake systems. I'd be happy to
L 6	proceed if you want me to. Mr. Genz has
L 7	MR. ASKEW: We're going to keep this committee
L 8	meeting going until five unless somebody has an
L 9	objection to that.
2 0	Our dinner is at six, but I think they may be
21	using this space for dinner and they may start putting
22	pressure on us to get out of here so they can set it

up, but if not, I think you should go ahead as you've planned, John.

MR. EIDLEMAN: If you'll bear with me a second, we need to get the equipment over here.

(Pause.)

2.2

MR. EIDLEMAN: I apologize. I haven't done this before, so bear with me.

(Pause.)

MR. EIDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you very much for the opportunity to appear in front of you today and talk to you a little bit about the history of intake systems.

An observation I'd like to make, I think one thing we've seen in the last few days is that the attitude that programs have about brief service, advice and referral really has changed over the last five or six years. I think in the past they were seen as something necessary that had to be done in order to get to what was considered the most important work, which was extended representation. And now I think we realize that the advice, brief service and appropriate referral is really something very important many

clients need desperately and that will help them work their way through the system and find access to justice.

It's not to diminish in any way full service which obviously remains very important, but I think there's just been a shift and more emphasis is being put on the brief service.

I've called this a brief history of intake systems and since I don't have many skills in technology, I don't have Joan Kleinburg here to help me, I decided I would have a muse. I figured Steven Hawking, anyone who could figure out quarks and black holes can probably help me get through an intake system.

This doesn't mean that intake systems are black holes for our clients, but I think at some time they feel like they are and they have trouble working their way through that system.

Well, what is the intake system? To me, it's the whole panoply of services that start from when an applicant first asks to get services and works their way through the advice system all the way up to the

full service. It's the gateway to the Access to

Justice. So intake is the process of determining
eligibility, analyzing the nature of the problem and
determining the appropriate next steps.

What are those next steps? Well, it could be referral, appropriate referral, if the individual is ineligible and can't be helped. If they are eligible, the counsel and advice, brief service, extended service or referral to pro bono, pro se or other organizations.

When I decided to call this a brief history of intake systems, I thought that was rather audacious and I started thinking about what is access to justice and what was access to justice in the beginning? Well, in the beginning, there weren't a lot of people and the decisionmaker had an intimate relationship with those people. As a matter of fact, there was only one rule that had to be followed.

Unfortunately, man and woman --

MR. ASKEW: John, let me stop you, unfortunately. We've been told that we have to abandon this room or we won't be able to have dinner tonight and dinner invitations are out and it involves a lot of

people. We have two options. One is to do this 1 tomorrow morning during or before the board meeting --2 MR. EAKELEY: Well, I think we've got time in 3 the board meeting schedule --4 MS. MERCADO: I do, too. 5 MR. EAKELEY: -- to work this in. 6 MS. MERCADO: Yes, I think so. 7 MR. EAKELEY: So this is --8 9 MR. ASKEW: Why don't we make this the report from the provisions committee tomorrow on the 10 11 agenda? MR. McKAY: Although we're intrigued by the 12 clip art. 13 I figured that late in the day MR. EIDLEMAN: 14 that this would be the only thing that would keep you 15 awake. 16 MR. ASKEW: I apologize, but we'll make this 17 the report of the provisions committee, which is 18 19 already scheduled on the agenda tomorrow and you'll have the full time to dc what both of you planned to do 20 tomorrow, okay? 21 22 Thank you very much.

1	With that, let me call the meeting see if
2	there's a motion that we adjourn the meeting of the
3	provisions committee.
4	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: So moved.
5	MR. ASKEW: Is there any new business? Any
6	other business?
7	(No response.)
8	MR. ASKEW: Nancy, thank you for being with
9	us.
10	MS. ROGERS: Thank you.
11	MR. ASKEW: Is there a motion that we adjourn?
12	MOTION
13	MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: So moved.
14	MR. ASKEW: And a second?
15	MR. EAKELEY: Second.
16	MR. ASKEW: All in favor say aye.
17	(Chorus of ayes.)
18	MR. ASKEW: The meeting is adjourned.
19	(Whereupon, at 4:30 p.m., the committee
20	was adjourned.)
21	* * * *