

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

COMMITTEE ON PROVISION
FOR THE DELIVERY OF LEGAL SERVICES

Sunday, September 17, 2000

10:09 a.m.

San Francisco Marriott
55 Fourth Street
San Francisco, California

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ernestine Watlington, Chair
Maria Luisa Mercado
F. William McCalpin
Douglas S. Eakeley (ex officio)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

John T. Broderick, Jr.
John N. Erlenborn
Edna Fairbanks-Williams

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT:

John McKay, President
Pat Hanrahan, Office of Program Performance
Michael Genz, Director of Office of Program Performance

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT (con'd):

Robert Clyde, Executive Director, Ohio Legal Assistance
Foundation

Joe Dailing, Executive Director, Prairie State Legal
Services

Estella Casas, Executive Director, Greater Bakersfield
Legal Assistance Foundation (California)

Glenn Rawdon, LSC Office of Program Performance

Randi Youells, Vice President for Programs

Anh Tu, Program Counsel, Office of Program Performance

Stephanie Choy, Executive Director, Public Interest
Clearinghouse

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
Approval of Agenda	4
Presentation on State Planning	
Pat Hanrahan, Office of Legal Performance	
Robert Clyde, Executive Director, Ohio	
Legal Assistance Foundation	8
Estella Casas, Executive Director, Greater	
Bakersfield Legal Assistance	
Foundation (California)	25
Joe Dailing, Executive Director, Prairie	
State Legal Services	35
Approval of minutes of Committee's meeting of June 25, 2000	59
Report on technology initiative and grant awards	55
Glenn Rawdon, Office of Program Performance	61
Briefing on changes in LSC's services in Indian Country	
Randi Youells, Vice President for Programs	87
Report on the development of revisions to the CSR system (the LSC Results Project) and the development of new performance measures	
Randi Youells, Vice President for Programs	105

MOTIONS: 4, 59, 103, 113

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIR WATLINGTON: We'd like for the people to get
3 seated so we can get started. We'd like to start this
4 meeting.

5 My name is Ernestine Watlington, and we have Board
6 Members Maria and Edna, and Bill McCalpin, and our president
7 of the Board, Doug Eakeley, and our president of the
8 Corporation, John McKay. Our committees, we have a quorum of
9 the two committee members.

10 M O T I O N

11 CHAIR WATLINGTON: We will have the approval of the
12 Agenda.

13 MS. MERCADO: So moved.

14 MR. EAKELEY: Second.

15 CHAIR WATLINGTON: It's been moved and seconded,
16 the approval of the Agenda. Just have some name changes, but
17 it's no changes.

18 At this time, I'd like to present Ms. Pat Hanrahan,
19 Program Counsel of Program Support, replacing Bob Gross. I
20 was told he was expecting a baby within a month, so he is not
21 with us today, and she will present to the Panel this
22 morning.

1 MS. HANRAHAN: Thank you. I'm Pat Hanrahan, and
2 I'm with the Office of Program Performance of LSC. I was
3 asked to come in -- I was in Spokane for a couple of days and
4 asked to come down here, which I'm delighted to do, to
5 moderate this panel on state planning.

6 As I understand, the genesis of this panel --

7 MR. EAKELEY: Get a little closer, please.

8 MS. HANRAHAN: A little closer.

9 MR. EAKELEY: There's background noise that's
10 fairly substantial, so you need to speak into the microphone,
11 so that not only the people behind you can hear you, but so
12 we can, also.

13 MS. HANRAHAN: Okay. The genesis of this panel is
14 that we had heard about problems of state planning at the
15 Board of the Corporation and some of the bumps in the road,
16 but not as much emphasis on the benefits, the excitement, and
17 the positive changes that have come about through state
18 planning. And Randi Youells pulled together this panel of
19 individuals who have been central to state planning in their
20 states and, actually, one who has participated in planning
21 efforts in another state, to describe for you not only some
22 of the bumps, but also some of the high points and the

1 excitement of state planning and the positive changes for
2 clients that have occurred as a result of it.

3 I just briefly wanted to remind you that state
4 planning has been, although something we have talked about at
5 Legal Services for a number of years, really formally
6 presented to the programs through our two letters in 1998,
7 which set out the topics we wanted programs and other members
8 of what we call the state justice communities to study and
9 report to us about in their states. And that included access
10 issues and a mission for programs and for providing justice
11 to -- access to justice to clients. It included the private
12 Bar involvement. It included training for staff and
13 volunteer lawyers. It included resource development and
14 included configuration and technology. All of these are
15 critical issues to the health and welfare of our programs, as
16 well as to providing services to clients. And these
17 individuals will report on the progress their states have
18 made in all of these areas. So I'd like to introduce them to
19 you.

20 In the center is Bob Clyde. He is the Executive
21 Director of OLAF, the Ohio Legal Assistance Foundation, which
22 is a public/private foundation, whose mission is to establish

1 equal access to justice by improving and enhancing the
2 delivery of civil legal services to impoverished Ohioans.
3 Since 1999, OLAF's funding totaled more than \$15 million for
4 its programs. Bob has been active and involved in
5 Legal Services' efforts since the early '70s. He was the
6 executive director of Northeast Ohio Legal Services for 12
7 years. He was then a public defender and, in that capacity,
8 he also helped establish OLAF, and has been the director
9 there -- its first executive director and director since
10 1994.

11 Estella Casas is also with us today. She is the
12 Executive Director of Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance.
13 She has also been a staff attorney there, an ombudsman --
14 ombudsperson coordinator, and has also worked in the senior
15 law center of that program.

16 Joe Dailing, who is on my right, is the Executive
17 Director of Prairie State Legal Services, and as with my
18 other colleagues, has been involved in Legal Services since
19 he was a lawyer, I think. He was executive director of Rock
20 Island County Legal Referral Bureau and has also through the
21 years been a consultant to Legal Services Corporation. He
22 was also a consultant to the Asia Foundation and presented a

1 paper on an international symposium on legal services. I
2 thought that was sort of interesting, too. Maybe you can
3 talk about national and international planning.

4 MR. DAILING: They didn't have money, either.

5 MS. HANRAHAN: They didn't have money, either?

6 Last, but not least, is Ahn Tu, my colleague from the
7 Corporation. She also works in the Office of Program
8 Performance and has been an LSC partner in the work in
9 California, particularly. So she is here. Also, she and
10 Estella will present the works that Central California has
11 done. So I'd like to start with Bob talking about state
12 planning in Ohio. Thank you.

13 MR. CLYDE: Thank you, Pat, and thank for the
14 opportunity to do this and to talk a little bit about the
15 state that I was born and raised in and have spent my entire
16 professional career, although I would correct one small
17 thing. Pat indicated that after having left my legal
18 services program in Youngstown, I was a public defender for a
19 while. While I think there may be merit in being a public
20 defender, I technically worked at the state public defender's
21 office, but it was in the capacity of running the civil
22 funding mechanism for the state of Ohio, which was then

1 administered by the state public defender. So I've never
2 really done any criminal cases, and I don't anticipate that I
3 ever will, even though I know some, and perhaps many, of you
4 have.

5 Just talking a little bit about Ohio and some of
6 its demographics, because we are kind of out there in what
7 many regard as the Midwest, it occurs to me that perhaps not
8 everybody knows that Ohio is a state with over 11 million
9 population. It is probably ranked about sixth in the country
10 in size. It has three major metropolitan areas over a
11 million each, Cincinnati, Columbus and Cleveland, and four
12 others between 500,000 and a million in population, Dayton,
13 Toledo, Akron, Canton, Youngstown, and I'm forgetting one
14 other. It's a diverse state in terms of those major
15 metropolitan areas and then a very large area that is rural,
16 probably 60 counties that are rural. It has approximately
17 1.2 million people who are below the poverty line, or as we
18 measure poverty for our funding purposes, 1.7 million below
19 125 percent of the poverty level. That is the level below
20 which clients are eligible for state funds.

21 Now, Ohio has been doing state planning or planning
22 of one form or another probably in a coordinated fashion

1 since the middle '80s, or early '80s, actually. It was after
2 the 25 percent reduction in federal funds the first time that
3 we undertook -- and it's always been, until recently,
4 resource-driven. We undertook to try to move legislation
5 through the Ohio legislature, creating, and ultimately
6 succeeded in creating, in 1985, a mandatory IOLTA program
7 with a filing fee surcharge. That, as I said, was a
8 breakthrough at the end of '84, after a two-year-long effort
9 involving primarily the legal services providers at the time.

10

11 We achieved the legislative accomplishment at the
12 end of '84, over the opposition of the organized Bar,
13 primarily the state Bar, the major judges' associations, and
14 the clerks' association. This was a very significant
15 accomplishment. The filing fee surcharge, however, was
16 designed to bridge to IOLTA funding coming online and was
17 designed to sunset after two years. Many of us who were
18 involved -- and I was then involved -- in the effort to get
19 this legislative breakthrough thought that the sunset
20 provision would be something that we would work on later. We
21 accepted it as a bridge funding mechanism, but thought for
22 sure that we would try to get rid of the sunset provision. A

1 year after it did sunset, we had a dollar reinstated of the
2 \$10. Three years later, in '89, I believe it was, we added
3 \$3. So we had a four-dollar filing fee surcharge, which was
4 generating about \$1.8 million for the state. This was in
5 addition to three to three and a half million in IOLTA funds.

6

7 At the time we got the three-dollar increase -- and
8 I think this is important for you to know -- the state Bar
9 association reversed itself and joined us in the effort. And
10 because we were willing to allow them to take -- to do a
11 legal needs study -- a comprehensive legal needs study, we
12 authorized and agreed that \$150,000 of this new surcharge off
13 the top would go to pay for the study. The state Bar was
14 going to contribute additional funds. The major metropolitan
15 Bar associations in Ohio would do the same. With all of
16 that, we had the state Bar becoming our partner again,
17 bringing the Supreme Court along in a very strong way with
18 the legal needs study to, I think, actually took over
19 responsibility for moving our funding and our planning
20 forward significantly.

21 The legal needs study that resulted was done by Bob
22 Spangenberg, who many of you know has been very active with

1 the ABA, and Bob's study, known in Ohio as the Spangenberg
2 Study, found that only about 70 percent of the civil legal
3 needs of the poor were being met -- not an unusual finding.
4 I think it's pretty consistent with legal needs studies that
5 have been done throughout the country. And that finding and
6 I think 34 policy recommendations became the genesis for the
7 Supreme Court and the state Bar really to join hands and
8 appoint a statewide committee, not unlike, I think, what
9 Washington and others have experienced, to look at how we
10 could improve the delivery system and increase access for the
11 poor in Ohio. So it was major buy-in by the Chief Justice
12 and by the state bar. The Chief appointed a civil legal
13 needs Implementation Committee, which was thought to be
14 responsible for implementing the policy recommendations in
15 1991. That implementation committee actually had some major
16 accomplishments. It increased the filing fee surcharge in a
17 legislative budget victory from four to \$15, resulting in an
18 additional five to six million for state funding for legal
19 services.

20 And just as it was on the verge of going out of
21 business, it also had started an ultimately successful effort
22 to increase the IOLTA program to involve title insurance

1 agents' escrow accounts, which raised our IOLTA annual
2 proceeds from about 2.7 million to 8.5 million annually.
3 That's come over the last few years and after the
4 Implementation Committee had gone out of business. The
5 Implementation Committee also tried to convince the Ohio
6 legislature of the need to pass general revenue -- adopt
7 general revenue funding for Legal Services, which was
8 unsuccessful. It also tried to convince the state bar to
9 endorse a pro bono rule that would have had lawyers -- as
10 kind of a modified ABA model rule, would have had lawyers
11 contributing 50 hours a year or -- it was a play or pay rule
12 -- making dollar contributions. But because the
13 Implementation Committee recommended it as a mandatory
14 reporting rule, it was rejected and ultimately tabled by the
15 state Bar. We have never tried to go back to it.

16 I guess as its last act, and perhaps one that I
17 consider very important, the implementation committee
18 recommended the creation of the Legal Assistance Foundation,
19 which is the foundation that I now direct. It was designed
20 to be a permanent entity that would focus on the civil legal
21 needs of the poor, and access, and improving access to
22 justice.

1 So that's kind of a continuum of planning
2 experience that we've had in Ohio that brings us to the
3 '97-'98 planning initiative by the Legal Services
4 Corporation. Most of that effort that we had for those 13
5 years or so was resource driven, and most of that came out of
6 crisis, a shortage -- severe shortage in resources.

7 The implementation committee and then the
8 Foundation had deferred consideration of issues that would
9 get to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the
10 providers in the delivery system. Knowing that we would
11 exhaust a lot of effort in improving resources, and when we
12 got to the place where we felt like we couldn't do anymore,
13 we began to turn our attention in Ohio to efficiency and
14 effectiveness. And what we did, with a buy-in from our
15 grantee providers, was to move to a site visit peer
16 evaluation system. That effort was about one year in the
17 making when I had a conversation with John McKay, who
18 suggested that there might be a need to do some serious
19 thinking about consolidations, particularly among some states
20 like Ohio, that had a relatively large number of legal
21 services providers. At that time I think we had 15 or 16. I
22 urged John to hold off -- I think John would admit that --

1 because we had undertaken this effort at doing an evaluation
2 of our grantees, and I thought it only fair for us to
3 conclude this effort, which was designed to be a three-year-
4 long effort, so that we knew what our baseline was for our
5 providers. Ultimately, as I see it, what John and I talked
6 about very early, probably in late '97, before the '98
7 planning letter, got softened and turned into the '98
8 planning initiative, which I think it's fair to say was
9 received with some skepticism and I think probably at best a
10 lukewarm reception by our providers and myself. Once again,
11 we were heavily invested in doing our analysis of the
12 delivery system and hoped to be able to finish that analysis
13 before we embarked on any major plan for change.

14 But, nonetheless, because it was a mandate of the
15 LSC providers in Ohio, and those providers are our providers,
16 there is little difference. We have three additional
17 providers that are not LSC grantees in Ohio. They had to do
18 it, and we tried to assist in that effort. And I think that
19 I can say that it has been a pleasant surprise, the outcome
20 that we have achieved. The legal aid grantees took the
21 planning mandate seriously. With some help from the planning
22 consultant, who is Randi Youells, who had been working with

1 us as a consultant on our site visit evaluations, we kind of
2 miraculously came up with a plan that would consolidate the
3 14 legal services, then legal service providers or LSC
4 grantees, into seven regional programs. This meant a whole
5 lot of merger and consolidation and it may be close to the
6 most -- I'm not sure, California could rival -- but it may be
7 close to the most comprehensive, in terms of the numbers of
8 programs involved, the numbers of mergers, and the issues
9 around consolidation of programs within a region.

10 And, John, maybe it would be appropriate for you to
11 not only to turn the overhead on, but you've got that piece
12 that I gave you. Oh, you already passed it out, okay. So
13 that gives you some background about our programs.

14 I don't usually do overheads, but I thought it
15 might be useful for you to look at the configuration of our
16 regions now, as I talk about this portion of planning in
17 Ohio. Those black block areas with multiple colors within
18 them are the seven regions. Within those seven regions,
19 there are a number of different providers that have merged or
20 are a part of a consolidated delivery system within the
21 region. For example, on the left part of the state, the area
22 that includes Dayton, near the southwest part of the state,

1 and it's in pink, we had two rural programs that are now, I
2 guess, something like 17 counties in the westernmost portion
3 of the state. Those two rural programs, Allen County,
4 Blackhoof Legal Assistance, which was headquartered in Lima,
5 Ohio, merged with the pinker program of about nine or ten
6 counties, which was formally known as Rural Southwest Legal
7 Services or Legal Services Of Southwest Ohio to form a
8 17-county merged program with Dayton agreeing to provide
9 advocacy services for the entire 18 counties.

10 What's unique about that luck in particular is that
11 Dayton, which had long had fairly good advocacy capacity, was
12 going to give up its LSC funding in this consolidated
13 arrangement, be state-funded entirely. The state funds would
14 be increased to make up for the lost federal funds. They
15 have a super board. It's a little bit like what John Ross
16 was just telling me, I think, that New Hampshire has done.
17 They have a super board that will adjust the funding, but
18 Dayton will now use its advocacy capacity to provide service
19 for all 18 counties. In addition, the two programs have
20 agreed to have a common, centralized intake hot line, and
21 that centralized intake hot line will be also headquartered
22 in Dayton. So they have a cross-program capacity now for

1 intake, which I think will be vital to the advocacy service
2 that they'll be using to supplement in the other 17 counties.

3

4 Just to go quickly through the four regions in
5 which there were consolidations, because I think that really
6 is the highlight of what's been going on in the last year and
7 a half. To the north of the Dayton area, in green, is the
8 area that involved Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, which
9 is known as ABLE, the Toledo Legal Aid Society, which is in
10 that county that the line is going down to from ABLE, and a
11 county that had been part of Cleveland's Legal Aid Service
12 area, which is down in the southwest corner of the green
13 block, and another county in the northeast corner of that
14 block, which was a single county, state-funded program. That
15 has now all -- they're in the process of finalizing -- I
16 think will by the end of the year have finalized a merger of
17 all of those into an entity called Legal Services of
18 Northwest Ohio. ABLE will continue as a state-funded entity,
19 and ABLE will continue its advocacy capacity for all of those
20 counties, similar to what Dayton will do for the counties to
21 the southwest. Cleveland, to the right, in the
22 brown tones, gave up three counties that were not contiguous

1 to the south, but picked up two counties in two single county
2 programs. To its west, the county that's marked Lorain was a
3 single-county program, and to the far east, in the northeast
4 corner of a county called Ashtabula, which had been, as many
5 of you may know, kind of a thorn in the Legal Services
6 Corporation's side. And I'm told that the resultant merger
7 is likely to end the litigation that was spawned by the old
8 Ashtabula County Legal Aid, one of the good, positive results
9 of that.

10 The program in the yellow tones, that block below
11 Cleveland, is probably the area that was the most difficult
12 in our planning and implementation that's been going on for
13 the last year. That involved five programs, and the five
14 programs have come up with a plan to create two programs, one
15 of which will be LSC-funded; the other, non-LSC or
16 state-funded. That has, I think, been close to finalized
17 with a lot of help from OLAF, and the consultant that we
18 provided was Gary Simpson. Gary actually has worked with
19 four of these regions in the consolidation and merger
20 efforts. It was very hard because there were five programs
21 reducing to two, three programs giving up total autonomy to
22 another program, all of them having to agree to the breakout

1 in LSC and non-LSC funding. There's been a lot of risk
2 associated with giving up one major funding source.
3 Actually, this is true of all of those regional operations.
4 But to their credit, in order to achieve the capacity that
5 they had lost with the restrictions in '96 and knowing that
6 our funds had not been restricted until the congressionally
7 attached restriction was attached to our funds, these various
8 regions have, I think, gone a long way -- these three
9 regions, and I think Cleveland is about to do something
10 similar -- have gone a long way to try to recreate a capacity
11 that they had lost with the '96 restrictions. I'm very
12 pleased with that outcome.

13 But with those mergers and consolidations, there
14 have been other successes. The hot line that I described as
15 centralized in Dayton for the 18-county program is actually
16 being -- a model has been in the works and being created in
17 the northwest program at Legal Services of Northwest Ohio,
18 and ABLE. ABLE, likewise, has been working on the hot line,
19 the creation of the hot line, and they will have a common hot
20 line -- common, centralized intake system serving those 14 or
21 15 counties. Similarly, the yellow area, the central
22 northeast, as we call it, which, by the way, includes Akron,

1 Canton, Youngstown, Warren, Wooster, and Mansfield, is also
2 creating a hot line that will be housed at the non-LSC
3 provider, which will be at Youngstown or Wooster. Those two
4 programs have become one.

5 So many of us in Ohio regard that as a very
6 exciting kind of development that we did not anticipate when
7 we were thinking just about mergers, and what our
8 consolidations and what efficiencies and improvements could
9 be achieved by the merger itself. And yet it is an outcome
10 which I think is highly desirable, my board and my program
11 are quite pleased with, and we are giving a fair amount of
12 additional resources to try to bring this about, which I'll
13 say one last thing before I turn this over to my fellow
14 panelists, is that in addition to having seen our state
15 revenues increase from about 4 to 5 million all the way up to
16 \$15 million annually and to the point where we are 3 to 4
17 million more than the Legal Services Corporation funds Ohio,
18 we've gotten additional funding from the Supreme Court of
19 Ohio. To the best of my knowledge, there's only two states
20 that have achieved this, Minnesota and Ohio. There may be
21 others that are doing it, but it's through the attorney
22 registration fee process that Ohio, right after Minnesota

1 earmarked certain of its registration fee dollars for Legal
2 Services funding, and I think probably bring in between
3 800,000 and a million dollars for that purpose in Minnesota
4 -- Ohio set aside \$375,000, which comes to OLAF for
5 discretionary fund use. That, in the last few months, has
6 been increased to \$500,000.

7 The Supreme Court is very pleased with the progress
8 that we have shown in Ohio. And our budget to the Supreme
9 Court, both in the initial 375,000 and in the current
10 500,000, talks about our peer review, site visit evaluations,
11 our statewide pro bono development, which is what we're doing
12 out of OLAF, and technology improvements. And a substantial
13 amount of the 375,000, now 500,000, is going toward those
14 technology improvements. So the hot line development and
15 some of the technology needs that they have now as a result
16 of that will be able to provide some resources for them as
17 they continue to develop their model.

18 So let me stop now and turn it over to my fellow
19 panelists, and then perhaps we can have an exchange, if you
20 like, after. Thanks.

21 MS. HANRAHAN: Thank you, Bob, very much. It was
22 really interesting hearing about Ohio, and I think we should

1 move now to Estella, who will talk about a region in
2 California, which would, I think, make a nice contrast to a
3 state-based state planning effort.

4 MS. TU: Good morning. Before Estella begins her
5 presentation, I would like to add a little bit of
6 introduction to Estella, who is a friend of mine due to my
7 work in California. But more than that, she is an inspiring
8 person for me. When I came to work in central California,
9 that is the region that I know least about. That is the
10 region that I came to know it as having wide competition
11 among programs. Thanks to the leadership of the members of
12 the programs there, most of all thanks to Estella's
13 leadership, I think you will hear from Estella one of the
14 great successes of the California story

15 Before giving the mike to Estella, I also would
16 like to introduce Stephanie Choy, who is the Executive
17 Director of the Public Interest Clearinghouse, who is a
18 partner with LSC in state planning in California. Stephanie.

19

20 MS. CHOY: Thank you.

21 MS. CASAS: Thank you very much. I very much
22 appreciate the opportunity to address you this morning.

1 Before I talk a little bit about our experience as a region,
2 I thought it would be beneficial to take just a few moments
3 to put the regional planning in the context of statewide
4 planning. State Planning in California, like in other parts
5 of the country, continues to be very much a work in progress.

6 As we previously reported to you in our state planning
7 documents, because of California's size and the complexity of
8 its population, the state plan subdivides California into
9 five distinct regions. There's no question that the vital
10 planning for the development of an integrated, comprehensive
11 delivery system is very much taking place at the regional
12 level. Of course, this regional planning is being done
13 against the backdrop of the statewide planning process. In
14 fact, at our August 1999 statewide planning meeting, there
15 was an increasing concern by the legal services programs that
16 because of the rapid, collaborative, innovative things that
17 were happening at the regional level, there was a growing
18 concern that more needed to be done to ensure continuity and
19 communication among the regions. And for that reason, the
20 Legal Services Coordinating Committee was formed at that
21 statewide planning meeting. And that committee has been
22 given the directive basically to not only monitor, but also

1 to drive the state planning process to ensure that things
2 that need to happen at the state level, in fact, occur.
3 Things, for example, like ensuring and doing a critical
4 analysis of where the gaps in services may exist as the
5 regions proceed in integrating services within the region.

6 I must also say to you that California has had some
7 significant victories over the last couple of years that will
8 increase the ability for us to provide high quality -- more
9 high quality legal services. The Commission on Equal Access
10 to Justice, which is a broad-based group of individuals
11 committed to finding long-term solutions to the enormous task
12 of increasing representation for California's poor and
13 moderate population, was very successful in working with the
14 Legal Aid Association of California and the statewide
15 leadership in securing first-time state funding through the
16 Judicial Council budget. Ten million dollars were secured
17 last year and was again budgeted and awarded this year.
18 Already the advocacy has begun to try to augment this
19 allocation next year.

20 But regionally, there have been some enormous,
21 innovative collaboration efforts that have taken place. In
22 the Central Valley, Central Coast, agricultural region, of

1 which Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance is a part, the
2 five partially-funded LSC programs came together, and we
3 formed the California Rural Justice Consortium. The
4 five-member programs consist of California Rural Legal
5 Assistance, Central California Legal Assistance, Channel
6 County's Legal Services, Central -- Legal Aid of the Central
7 Coast, and Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance.

8 I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce
9 Chris Schneider, who is in the audience, my colleague, and he
10 is the Director of Central California Legal Services. And I
11 am glad that he is here providing, I'm sure, some synergy
12 support as I share my thoughts with you.

13 Collectively, CRJC, which is what we are commonly
14 referred to here in California, serves approximately 17
15 counties and represent the vast majority of the rural poor in
16 California, representing a poor population of approximately
17 903,000 people in California. One of the most daunting, and
18 clearly the first task, that CRJC had, was to develop, if we
19 were to be successful in regional planning, a trust
20 relationship. As Anh alluded, there had been some fierce
21 competition in our region. One of the most difficult times
22 for me personally as an employee of a legal services

1 organization, was driving -- taking a very long drive from
2 San Francisco, where we had just had our project directors
3 meeting, and just having found out -- and by the way, the
4 application to LSC was due probably in a two-week period --
5 but having just found out that our colleagues at California
6 Rural Legal Assistance would be submitting a bid against our
7 service area and another service area in the Central Valley.

8 This was very difficult for us, even though psychologically
9 we understood why CRLA was doing so. Nevertheless, that was
10 a very, very difficult reality, particularly for an executive
11 director who herself had served as an intern at the Delano
12 CRLA office. But even then, both GBLA, which is Greater
13 Bakersfield Legal Assistance, and CRLA understood the
14 importance that how we behaved at that point would not only
15 potentially destroy each other, but perhaps more
16 significantly, would have a negative effect at the state and
17 national level for Legal Services.

18 So I'm happy to report to you that we took that
19 competitive process seriously, but in the process we never
20 once publicly said anything negative about our sister
21 organization. And so it was against that backdrop that we
22 had to go into the state planning process.

1 Obviously the partners had extensive meetings, and
2 we took a big risk. In August of 1999, we brought together
3 the five staffs from all five programs and we collectively
4 put together a joint CRLA/CRJC conference that had as its
5 focus both a substantive training, but also a forum for our
6 staffs to take ownership of a regional planning process that
7 must, and had to, include reconfiguration. And I have to say
8 to you at this point that I have an enormous respect for my
9 colleagues from all of these programs, because that was a
10 turning point for CRJC.

11 The very next month, having received a mandate from
12 our staffs to move forward, we were able to come together at
13 Bakersfield and through the facilitation of John Arongo, were
14 able to come up with a vision and a structure for how we
15 could move that vision forward. Frankly, I have to say to
16 you that the only reason I believe that we had a breakthrough
17 in creating that vision is because we stopped thinking about
18 LSC. We stopped second-guessing what you wanted from us and,
19 instead, we took a hard look of what we understood about our
20 region and what we understood about what the needs were of
21 our clients, and we had an incredible session.

22 Now, I do not want to give you the impression that

1 these were easy discussions, but I remember that one of the
2 things that we wanted to accomplish is to bring to the
3 forefront the needs of rural poor in the Central Valley. We
4 wanted their plight to be considered equally on par as the
5 plight and the needs of people from more urban areas. And
6 the fact that I am sitting here today, talking about the
7 Central Valley, is an indication of the kinds of breakthrough
8 and accomplishments that we are having at CRJC.

9 Now, CRJC has had some meaningful dialogue with the
10 Corporation, and, of course, one of the biggest challenges
11 that we have had have been in those instances in which the
12 Corporation and the partners have not seen eye to eye. And
13 there have been critical moments. And recently the
14 Corporation has announced a three-program configuration, and
15 that three-program configuration will now serve as the
16 impetus for further developing the kind of seamless delivery
17 system that we want to see in the Central Valley.

18 I started off saying to you that one of the biggest
19 challenges we had at CRJC was to develop a trust
20 relationship. To put where our progress is today, I have to
21 share some of the most significant developments that have
22 occurred. This is the same two directors that were competing

1 for each other. I received a telephone call in January --
2 must have been in December, from my colleague, Jose Padilla.

3 It was a courtesy call to tell me that the long-time
4 director from the Delano CRLA office had submitted his
5 resignation, and that for at least a period of time during
6 the time that they would recruit to have that position
7 filled, the Delano office would not have an attorney.

8 I then got off the phone with Jose, I had a
9 communication with my board chair, and I immediately called
10 Jose back and I said that our board of directors had
11 committed, if he was interested, to continue to provide
12 through our legal telephone counseling system, extend our
13 services into the Delano area during that interim of time
14 until he found an attorney. And he, without hesitation,
15 accepted that invitation.

16 Today, a week ago, CRLA and GBLA have opened an
17 office in Arvin, California. Arvin is a community located a
18 few miles from Bakersfield, which is the home to a
19 significant farm worker, migrant population. The CRLA
20 migrant program will be working shoulder to shoulder with
21 GBLA advocates at the same storefront office to ensure that
22 farm workers receive a coordinated, full range of legal

1 services. That is progress, and that can only occur when we
2 stop thinking about the motives that you may have for state
3 planning and where we stay focused on the needs of our
4 client.

5 Now, we have no doubt that there will be further
6 bumps in the road, but one of the things that I am impressed
7 the most about CRJC is that while each of us have big egos --
8 and we must, because, in fact, we are with Legal Services.
9 We take pride in the work that we do, and so we not only have
10 program egos, we have individual egos. But I have to say
11 that Jose Padilla, Chris Schneider, Bob Miller, Mr. Itay --
12 Kirk, as well as Mary Thurwalker, when we made the decision
13 to leave our egos at the door, the boundaries became less
14 significant. Now the focus is basically on what is it that
15 each of our programs brings to the table, what are the
16 strengths that we bring, what is the leadership that we
17 bring. When Chris Schneider represents shepherders,
18 including shepherders residing within Kern County, I do not
19 feel threatened. I am glad that he is there, and that he is
20 able to bring the kind of leadership that he is there to do.

21 When Jose Padilla brings forth resources from his
22 program, I do not feel threatened because I know that the

1 resources that he is bringing to the table are going to
2 benefit my clients. Some people might say that that is
3 naive. We are willing to take that chance. Our hope only is
4 that the Corporation will now give us the kind of time and
5 stability that we need in order to make this work in progress
6 hopefully something that you can, down the line, look back on
7 and feel proud of the work that we have done.

8 I want to stop at this point because I know that
9 there are other folks, but I wanted to give you a snapshot of
10 the kind of progress that we have made at the regional level.

11 But, again, I want to stress to you that while significant
12 progress has been made, it has not been without some bumps in
13 the road and without a number of shouting taking place in
14 rooms. But it is that mutual respect and leadership that
15 comes not only from the directors, but from the staffs, that
16 is permitting us to move forward in a client-centered focus.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. DAILING: Now for a change of pace, I've got
19 some overheads, so I am going to come up there and talk.
20 I'll try and talk loudly -- that's usually not a problem --
21 so that everyone can hear. If you can't hear, let me know
22 and then I'll steal your mic.

1 I'm from Illinois. It's that part of the country
2 that's between the East and the West Coasts, that you never
3 hear about. We're very quiet people. The Illinois state
4 planning came with no major opposition and no major support.

5 We decided, being practical Midwesterners, that we would
6 file the report and see what happened, and see whether this
7 would be a -- something that disappeared in the night, as
8 some things do, or whether it's something serious.

9 In Illinois -- here's an example of -- or here's
10 the programs -- configuration was never really a major issue.

11 Cook County, Chicago, right, there were two programs until
12 sort of Cook County Legal Assistance Foundation imploded last
13 year. It is now one program. The yellow county below is
14 actually a subgrantee of Prairie State, and the green part is
15 Prairie State. There is a small program in the west, and
16 then the rest of it is Land of Lincoln. So there was never
17 really a major push to consolidate. I want to give you a few
18 examples of how Illinois is a little different, and I think
19 each state is a little different.

20 Our poverty population is 1.3 million. LSC funding
21 is almost 11 million, and there's probably another 11 to 13
22 million of non-LSC funding from another source of state, or

1 another source of money. All of the programs in Illinois are
2 60 percent or less dependent on LSC funding. I'm going to
3 talk a little bit about Alabama later, which is a very
4 different situation.

5 We have -- the LSC programs have a long history of
6 working together cooperatively on grants. We got an
7 unemployment grant. We got a DD grant. We have a farm
8 project grant. So that the five LSC programs at that time,
9 working together was not a new phenomenon. The change came
10 in working with other non-LSC-funded programs. It is a very
11 different and complex situation from Cook County and the rest
12 of the state. I just want to briefly go over that.

13 The resources of non-LSC legal resources in Cook
14 County -- this is one of five -- contain about 24 programs,
15 some of which are very, very small. Some of them are one- or
16 two-attorney programs. I don't want to give you the idea
17 there are a huge -- there are a huge amount of resources
18 there, but some of them are very small. So these are some of
19 the things that were available in Cook County.

20 There's the Center for Disability, Elder Law, the
21 Chicago Bar Foundation. There's a Community Economic
22 Development Law Project. There's programs representing

1 divorce and domestic relations. One program is specifically
2 devoted to domestic violence. Some elder law, some
3 employment programs. Environmental, estate planning,
4 guardianship, guardianship of minors, housing foreclosure,
5 immigration, and some of these are volunteer programs as
6 well, pro bono programs as well. There are 11 pro bono
7 programs in Cook County alone. There are also some
8 landlord/tenant, real estate mediation, Social Security and
9 public benefits, special education, advice on taxes. That's
10 Cook County.

11 Outside of Cook County, which is the rest of the
12 state, here's what available. In DuPage County, the Bar
13 Association has its own legal aid party that works in
14 cooperation with Prairie State. They do mainly domestic
15 relations. We do everything else.

16 In Will County, as it's said, a subgrantee of
17 Prairie State, they adopt all of our policies. Then
18 downstate, covering the whole state is a pro bono center,
19 which works with everyone. So it's a very complex political
20 picture.

21 And so what we were trying to do, and I think what
22 the state planning process did, was to sort of energize some

1 things that had been going on for a while. But particularly
2 in 1993, the CBA, Chicago Bar Association, and state Bar had
3 both been working at cross purposes to get state funding.
4 And the state planning began to force us to work together,
5 and it was a major accomplishment to get the CBA and the ISBA
6 to agree on a single bill to go before the General Assembly.

7 And the other thing that they did was establish the Illinois
8 Equal Justice Project. I want to reinforce what Estella
9 said. Once we began to look beyond what LSC required and
10 focus on what was good for Illinois, it made a lot more sense
11 in planning to move forward. So the Equal Justice Project
12 was a very broad base, and all these committees were
13 laypeople. There were clients. There were social workers.
14 There were police. There were lawyers. There were all sorts
15 of people working on what were three areas.

16 The non-adjudicatory problem-solving was obviously
17 an alternative dispute resolution. The user-friendly pro se
18 adjudication was to get the state agencies to resolve the way
19 in which they handled consumer complaints and to simplify
20 some procedures. And then, of course, pro se was something
21 that's now on the national level as well, has moved forward.

22 The Legal Services delivery system was guess what? We

1 didn't talk about consolidation, and we didn't talk about
2 merger because in Illinois, those words have historically bad
3 meaning. We talked about confederation. And this came from
4 the people who were on the panel, saying, "There are a lot of
5 Legal Services programs here. It's important you don't
6 duplicate what you are doing." And out of that came the
7 Equal Justice Project -- or Equal Justice recommendations,
8 which made a series of recommendations to the governor, the
9 Supreme Court, and the Legislature, to lawyers, to Bar
10 associations, to Legal Services programs, the corporations
11 and foundations, to look at this problem and to see the
12 difficulties of access and representation that low income
13 people in Illinois were facing, and to step up to the plate
14 and make this an issue for the State.

15 And lo and behold, in March and February of 1998,
16 both of the major Bar Associations and a number of the county
17 bar associations adopted these recommendations and we went
18 forward with a piece of legislation called the Illinois Equal
19 Justice Act. And maybe getting all those lawyers to agree on
20 one piece of legislation was, in itself, the major
21 accomplishment.

22 This legislative finding was taken from the Equal

1 Justice Project recommendations, that "Equal justice is a
2 basic right that is fundamental to democracy in the State,
3 and the integrity of this State and this State's justice
4 system depends on protecting and enforcing the rights of all
5 people."

6 This set up five areas in which there was going to
7 be funding, only really two of which related directly to
8 civil legal services. Legal information centers in
9 courthouses -- well, primarily in libraries and other areas,
10 regional legal services hot lines -- we're all operating hot
11 lines or telephone counseling services, alternative dispute
12 resolution centers, self-help assistance in courthouses, and
13 then funding for civil legal services. It established an
14 Equal Justice Foundation, which then established a
15 commission. It was to receive monies from the State and
16 other entities, to divvy it up and give it to any of these
17 five areas.

18 This is one of those situations in which you got to
19 watch the ball all the time, because in Illinois there is
20 really a separate funding mechanism for alternative dispute
21 resolution. And had we been smarter, we would have taken
22 that out of there because any one of these projects could

1 take all of the money that's appropriated.

2 So what we have right now is the Foundation is now
3 making its first -- well, the bill first passed -- if you
4 work with legislatures, it's easy to get things passed if
5 there's no money attached. And so in 1999, despite the
6 opposition of a very conservative president of the Senate,
7 his was the only dissenting vote, the legislation passed
8 through twice.

9 Part of the reason why they put in these five
10 different areas was to disguise the fact it was money for
11 Legal Services. Having worked on the bill, it was real clear
12 that every legislator in the room knew that that's what it
13 was for, and that's really all that they were concerned with,
14 was civil Legal Services. So, in 1999, it passed, was signed
15 by the governor. And this year, we went back and the
16 governor recommended a million dollars for appropriation --
17 our original bill was four million -- and with some budget
18 cuts that had nothing to do with us particularly, it passed
19 out 500,000 appropriation for this year. It's a major
20 victory, but it's not the only kind of victory that's been
21 going on out of this.

22 I just want to highlight some of the things that I

1 think are important accomplishments. First of all, there's
2 advanced communication among legal services providers. There
3 is now a statewide technology committee that is for all the
4 programs and includes non-LSC and LSC programs as well. They
5 are currently developing a model desk reference manual that
6 all of the intake sites will use, all the hot lines will use,
7 so there will be similar information available. They've
8 established a statewide website. The Technology group is
9 studying a proposal for a technology center for law in the
10 public interest.

11 The other thing the planning process has done is to
12 integrate some resources that existed in Southern Illinois,
13 which I am reminded at SIU down in Carbondale, Southern
14 Illinois University, has had a self-help center that's
15 Web-based, Internet-based, where people can go on and pull
16 down pleadings and packets on different types of legal
17 problems for pro se representation. That was started by a
18 former Legal Services attorney from Land of Lincoln, but was
19 sort of existing out there. The same time in Chicago, the
20 Bar Association was developing and set up a committee to
21 develop pro se packets in Cook County. So what the process
22 did was to bring those two groups together, as well as what

1 the Illinois Supreme Court was doing, and that was to begin
2 to look at the process and how courts needed to adjust to pro
3 se litigants, who are there. It's just a question of whether
4 they are ready to deal with them or not.

5 SIU is also dealing with experiments with distance
6 learning for clients, to see if -- all of the junior colleges
7 in Illinois are hooked into a network. It is conceptually
8 possible to do trainings across the state through that
9 network. So SIU is looking at that. Northern Illinois
10 University College of Law has established a legal clinic in
11 Rockford, where I'm from, and we will work cooperatively
12 together on that.

13 Last November, for the first time ever, the
14 executive directors of all 34 legal services programs in
15 Illinois met for a two-day seminar, a two-day workshop at --
16 to talk about what we could do cooperatively together. The
17 first thing we identified was, of course, training, and we
18 thought that a training survey, we need to put that together,
19 and to look at ways in which we can share. The other area is
20 community legal education. A lot of that is
21 already on the statewide website. We've consolidated that.
22 Also available on individual program websites.

1 Substantive legal task forces have been expanded to
2 include non-LSC providers. And a pro bono center, we're
3 looking at pro bono now and seeing if this is the best way to
4 provide pro bono support as well. Of course I mentioned the
5 funding, but I think the biggest change and most significant
6 change in Illinois has been one of attitude, and that is to
7 begin to look at the problems of low income people not based
8 on a perspective of Prairie State or West Central or Land of
9 Lincoln, but to begin to look at them from a statewide
10 prospective. I think it's very significant because poor
11 people have the same problems all over. If we can devise
12 ways and work together that we can more effectively and
13 efficiently deliver those services to people, that will be
14 very helpful for all of us. The biggest problems, of course,
15 are time and money. This takes a lot of time. It takes
16 money.

17 Pat mentioned when I went to the conference in
18 Korea, it was interesting because there were people from the
19 Republic of Korea or South Korea, the Philippines, Germany,
20 and I was the United States guy. All of us had the same
21 issues; money, the problem between impact work and service
22 work and keeping staff and all those sorts of things. So

1 it's a universal problem. So those are the biggest problems.

2

3 Let me move quickly to Alabama. I've been doing
4 some work with the Alabama programs in the situation -- to
5 diversify their funding. LSC contract with MIE, and I work
6 for MIE part-time. Alabama is a very different state in many
7 ways, because I pointed out all the resources in Cook County
8 and elsewhere in the state that were non-LSC resources. The
9 programs in Alabama are almost 90 percent dependent on LSC.
10 If these programs don't deliver the services, it's a small
11 program in Birmingham which represents some juvenile things
12 and, of course, the Southern Poverty Law Center. That's it.
13 And they're beginning to learn how to work together. They
14 have a very big program around here, a small program here,
15 and a sort of medium-sized program there. And they made me
16 promise to tell you they're doing some good things there.

17 First of all, they're beginning a campaign, a
18 private bar campaign, which we're also doing in Illinois,
19 too. It's been reasonably successful. So we're in the
20 process of raising money from private attorneys. I can say
21 that having interviewed a whole bunch of people in the state
22 of Alabama, lawyers, there is a real support among the

1 private Bar for Legal Services. I think the Alabama lawyers
2 recognize the problem, they recognize the good work these
3 programs are doing, and are willing to recognize it by giving
4 some money, which is always the hardest thing to give.

5 I'm also told to tell you that for the first time the
6 Alabama legal services programs went together and did a
7 combined annual report. While seemingly not significant,
8 believe me, it was. I think this is an excellent way in
9 which they're starting to work together. They were also in
10 the process yesterday or Friday, their technology committee
11 met for the first time on their statewide website. The
12 legislature provided \$100,000 to fund the developer for the
13 state, both for legal services funding and for pro bono.
14 They're doing statewide training. And the other thing I
15 guess I should mention that I think is critical in both
16 states, and that is the support of the organized Bar. In
17 Alabama, the executive director is a very, very strong
18 supporter. The new president has made funding for legal
19 services his major agenda. In Illinois, plus Chicago, and
20 the state Bar legal services is a primary issue on which
21 they're all concerned.

22 So I think we can't underestimate the significance

1 and importance of the organized Bar in this whole effort, and
2 they're also sometimes the one who come from the outside and
3 say, "This doesn't make any sense. You got to do this
4 better." So that's it for my presentation. Thank you.

5 MS. HANRAHAN: I wanted to thank all of our
6 panelists. It's been a very inspiring presentation, and I
7 really appreciate it. I've learned a great deal, as I'm sure
8 everyone else in the room has. I think that one thing that
9 comes through for me very clearly is that each of you and
10 your colleagues in state planning have been very courageous
11 in the face of enormous changes of a lot of distress
12 sometimes as crises occurred, and just in taking a new look
13 at the way we've been doing things for so many years and
14 asking, "Is this the best way for now," which I think is a
15 very scary thing to ask and an even sometimes more
16 frightening thing to answer. So we really appreciate your
17 sharing with us those experiences.

18 And before I open up for questions, I just wanted
19 to read a quotation from Justice Cardoza, which I think, even
20 though he wrote it in 1920, talks a little bit about state
21 planning and what you all have experienced and I think what
22 others are going through. this is from a series of papers on

1 access to justice that I got at the Access to Justice
2 conference in Washington. It's a very interesting group of
3 papers that really takes sort of a legal -- a law review look
4 at access to justice. It's the first I've ever seen. It
5 talks about -- sorry. Oh, dear. "When social needs demand
6 one settlement than another, there are times when we must
7 bend symmetry, ignore history, and sacrifice custom in
8 pursuit of other and larger ends." I think that's what
9 you've done, and I thank you. Are there any questions from
10 the Board or others?

11 MR. EAKELEY: I thought the presentations were not
12 only information, but extremely informative. I was left with
13 a series of questions, but one that I would like to pose back
14 is something that Estella first mentioned and Bob reinforced,
15 which is words to the effect that once we move beyond what we
16 thought the Corporation required by way of state planning and
17 looked at our clients' needs from a statewide perspective,
18 then we were able to make progress. My sense of what the
19 preparation required of participants in communities of
20 justice state by state was precisely the latter; namely, look
21 at your own needs and resources and colleagues and come up
22 with a plan that would maximize the application of those

1 resources to the needs of the clients within the state. It
2 suggests to me that there was a little discontinuity between
3 the policy underpinnings of state planning and the receipt of
4 the message in the field, or did I miss something?

5 MS. CASAS: Well, I'm going to take a crack at
6 responding to that. I think one of the things that you have
7 to remember is that you are still a funder. And while there
8 has been some meaningful dialogue and this process can be a
9 partnership between the field programs and you, and obviously
10 you're striving to do that, there's also a history sometimes
11 that funders may have ulterior motives. So that, too, has to
12 be considered. I mean, this is a process. That's why I said
13 at the beginning it's a work in progress. So I think that
14 although that may be the intent, we, too, had to go through a
15 process that questioned why is this being done. And once
16 we're able to move beyond that -- and I would say you have to
17 remember that you are still a funder. And with any funding
18 entity, whether it's a foundation or anybody else, you have
19 to take a look at you're allocating grants and so what is it
20 that the funder wants. Unfortunately, those of us in the
21 field, sometimes it took a little bit longer to hear that
22 what you were really communicating was a reaching out of a

1 partnership. And I think that although it's been slow in
2 coming, I think it's -- we're getting there.

3 MR. DAILING: I just wanted to say that in our
4 context, it was important that this not be just identified as
5 an LSC process, because we're working with a whole bunch of
6 non-LSC programs who don't want to be told by LSC what to do.

7 And so it was important, I think, to point out to everybody,
8 there are certain things we have to do as LSC grants, certain
9 questions we had to answer, but that the process is much
10 larger than that, and we have to build on that. This is a
11 base, and so we need to move beyond that. So it was in that
12 sort of framework that we had to sell it to other people, but
13 I think most importantly to free ourselves from that concept.

14 Yeah, there were those areas we had to cover, but it was
15 more than that. It had to be something that made sense to
16 Illinois, and those areas could not be limited. One
17 articulates a whole bunch of policy issues, and other people
18 hear things differently. For the non-LSC programs, this came
19 out as "Oh, yeah, well, you know, LSC is telling us what to
20 do. We don't like it." So we had to sort of move beyond
21 that. It was in that sense I meant it.

22 MR. ASKEW: I mentioned this earlier in one of our

1 prior meetings, but, Estella, John Arongo's article in the
2 MIE journal, and I'm sure he was referring to work he had
3 done with your group of programs, as well as in other states,
4 but there was a quote in there that John had about state
5 planning and how once you get beyond trying to figure out
6 what it is what LSC wants and focus on what your clients'
7 needs are and what you can do collaboratively, and what you
8 really need to do as a group of programs, that's when the
9 real good work or productive work around state planning
10 begins. I think there were a couple of things to that. One,
11 some programs were sort of paralyzed trying to figure out
12 exactly what it is the Corporation wants here, and how do we
13 please the Corporation, and what do they mean when they say
14 this. Once people got beyond that and started thinking about
15 let's not worry so much about that. Let's worry about what
16 can we do together and how do we solve these problems, is
17 when the really good work began. So it wasn't necessarily a
18 negative statement as much as that we need to figure out here
19 what we know best about our client community.

20 Secondly, I think -- maybe you could agree or
21 disagree with me -- I think without the catalyst of the Legal
22 Services Corporation, much of this wouldn't have happened in

1 some of these places, and so perhaps you could speak,
2 Estella, from your perspective, if the corporation hadn't
3 been there with the program letters and pushing on state
4 planning, this wouldn't have gotten underway. We can't make
5 it happen for you, but at least we can help it get started
6 and put you on the track to getting this done.

7 MS. CASAS: I think that there are -- some partners
8 would probably indicate that while there had always been some
9 dialogue going on with the project directors, there is no
10 question, and from my personal perspective, that the state
11 planning process, as uncomfortable as it is, did forge ahead
12 -- forge us to move ahead. Certainly programs have been very
13 parochial in the way they deliver services. The boundaries
14 dictated the extent of the services.

15 And so some of my colleagues may not agree, but
16 from my perspective I recall talking with my project director
17 colleagues in the Central Valley. We would meet, we would
18 talk, but there wasn't necessarily a coordinated impetus in
19 terms of developing strategies and in following through with
20 those strategies. And I think that the regional planning
21 process has enabled us to move forward.

22 I might say when you're up here making the

1 presentation, there's a lot you want to cover. As long as I
2 have gotten the mike back -- you don't give a lawyer a second
3 chance at this. I gave you highlights, but, you know,
4 there's wonderful things happening that I don't think would
5 have happened without state planning. We met again at the
6 CRJC/CRLA conference in Santa Cruz earlier this year, in
7 August, and we are moving beyond clearly some of the basic
8 planning aspects of our strategy. One of the things that
9 happened at the conference is that we have moved forward with
10 substantive areas that the three programs for next year are
11 going to be working on, and we're going to take co- or
12 tri-leadership responsibility for these substantive areas,
13 and they're going to be in the areas of community health,
14 economic development and public benefits. We've made a
15 commitment that if we're serious about integrating our
16 services, we have to make some financial investments, which
17 for programs like the Central Valley, finally funders are
18 looking at the Central Valley because that's clearly where
19 the huge population growth is taking place, and we have a lot
20 of Colognians, which is residents from the most poorest of
21 the poor in California.

22 But for a long time resources went into the larger

1 urbanized area. Clearly by developing a regional strategy,
2 we're going to be much more successful in bringing in
3 resources. We do have the challenge that even though we may
4 be willing to provide more of a coordinated delivery system,
5 to some degree we're still hampered by the fact that because
6 we're in some of the most rural communities, some of the
7 technology is just not there. But having said that, we have
8 videoconferencing equipment right now, sitting on the floor
9 at Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance, Central California
10 Legal Assistance, and the CRLA office in Sacramento. That is
11 going to open up an enormous opportunity for the Central
12 Valley, not just for Legal Services, but for other non-profit
13 entities that we're going to be able to partner with.

14 So, you know, one of the other difficult tasks that
15 we had as a CRJC is that we are it. Unlike in Los Angeles or
16 the Bay area, where there are a lot of non-LSC providers, in
17 the Central Valley, pretty much the access to legal services
18 is the Legal Service provider. So one of the biggest
19 challenges we have is making sure that as we develop our
20 integrated delivery system, we also work outside of our
21 region because that is going to ensure that we really
22 supplement what we can provide as legal services providers.

1 Would all of that have happened without the nudge from state
2 planning? Probably not

3 MR. ERLLENBORN: As an Illinoisan, I have to comment
4 on how, when you look at that map, you realize that Illinois
5 was not pushed into consolidation. It seemed to me that the
6 organization of legal services in Illinois was
7 forward-looking in avoiding the multiplicity of programs,
8 which is really quite in contrast with other things Illinois
9 has done. For instance, the multiplicity of counties, of
10 townships, of special tax districts, like school districts, I
11 think Illinois went just exactly the opposite way. So that
12 was impressive to me.

13 Also impressive was I think there were four
14 delivery systems on that map, Cook County, DuPage County,
15 Will County, and the rest of the state. Is that about right?

16 MR. McKAY: No, Congressman. As a former resident
17 of DuPage County, no, DuPage is part of Prairie State.

18 MR. ERLLENBORN: Oh, part of Prairie State?

19 MR. McKAY: There is an autonomous program running
20 there, the Bar Association. Will County is a subgrantee of
21 Prairie State. So it's really Chicago, Prairie State. At
22 Land of Lincoln, there is a small program over in Galesburg.

1

2 MR. ERLNBORN: Well, I, of course, zeroed in on
3 DuPage County and Will County because that was my first
4 congressional district.

5 MR. DAILING: I remember.

6 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Are there anymore questions? If
7 not, we will have a ten-minute break here and then I'll come
8 back for the rest that you want to go through. I think
9 everyone wants a small break.

10 MR. MCKAY: That was interesting. Thank you.
11 Thank you all, very much.

12 CHAIR WATLINGTON: It was a wonderful information.

13 (A brief recess was taken.)

14 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Let's get started now. Would
15 people please take their seats. In trying to expedite the
16 meeting and so anxiously getting to the planning
17 presentation, state planning, I overlooked something that
18 Edna reminded me. I know she'll keep you straight. We
19 forgot the approval of the minutes of the meeting of June
20 25th.

21 M O T I O N

22 MS. MERCADO: Madame Chair, I so move that we

1 approve the minutes of June 25th as submitted.

2 MR. McCALPIN: Second.

3 CHAIR WATLINGTON: It is seconded.

4 MR. McCALPIN: Approving the minutes.

5 CHAIR WATLINGTON: And the agenda.

6 MR. BRODERICK: So moved.

7 CHAIR WATLINGTON: It's been moved and seconded
8 that the minutes be approved of the June 25th meeting. At
9 this time everybody in favor say, "Aye."

10 (Chorus of ayes.)

11 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Opposed, the same.

12 Motion carried.

13 On the agenda, we approved it, but we didn't carry
14 through a motion there. So I'd like that to go on the record
15 of the approval of the agenda. And it was seconded -- it was
16 nominated and seconded, but we didn't go through the -- all
17 in favor say, "Aye."

18 (Chorus of ayes.)

19 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Opposed, the same.

20 Motion carried.

21 Now I'd like to present Mr. -- Glenn -- how he
22 said, your meat is either raw or done, so it's done. So it's

1 Rawdon, Office of Program Performance, on LSC's technology
2 initiative and grant awards.

3 MR. RAWDON: Thank you very much for having me
4 here. At the last board meeting in Washington, D.C., I
5 presented a short presentation talking about the technology
6 initiative grants we were doing from the new appropriation we
7 got from Congress this year. We are further along in this,
8 and so I wanted to talk to you -- kind of review a little bit
9 about what we were doing and talk to you about the awards
10 that we have now made under the program.

11 If you'll remember, Congress appropriated an extra
12 \$4.25 million for us to distribute to our programs this year
13 to help them with technology and particularly concentrating
14 on the pro se, self-help areas. One of the goals is to
15 promote 100 percent access of clients to legal information,
16 and another goal was to encourage recipients to use
17 technology to improve the access to justice for our clients
18 to our programs.

19 Again, we got a total of \$4.25 million. We decided
20 to divide this up into three categories for distribution.
21 The first of those would be for model technology programs.
22 The second is for new, innovative projects, and the third is

1 for integration projects. And I'll explain a little bit more
2 about each of those three.

3 The grant terms can be up to three years. Now for
4 the model technology programs, what we wanted to do was to
5 pick two or three different programs, basically toward states
6 that would serve as models for using technology to deliver
7 legal services to our client target community. We wanted to
8 find states that would provide seamless intake and referral,
9 that would do statewide websites, and would develop lots of
10 pro se information, integrate with pro bono information and
11 such, that would provide statewide technology support to
12 their programs, so that we could show how working as a state
13 to provide the support is more efficient than each program
14 trying to provide it separately. And, also, to do statewide
15 training programs using technology for staff.

16 You all know that when we have training programs
17 with staff now, bringing everybody in from outlying offices
18 can be very expensive. We want to find ways to do statewide
19 training so that we have more effective advocates, without
20 spending lots of money for transportation and lots of their
21 time coming into the training. The maximum award in this
22 area could be \$625,000, and we have funding for two or three

1 projects.

2 The next category was innovation projects. In
3 other words, we want people to think of new, innovative ways
4 to use technology to achieve our goals of 100 percent client
5 access. So we wanted to create different structures in the
6 state that would enhance this for pro se legal information,
7 and we wanted to give special considerations in pro se with
8 working with state court systems. Because as you know, pro
9 se information for our clients, giving them good forms will
10 not help if these forms are not accepted by the state courts,
11 if they're not supported by the state courts. So we're
12 trying to encourage this partnership between our programs and
13 the court systems, and the grant terms can be up to three
14 years. And the maximum award in this category was \$175,000.

15 The last category was for integration. As you work
16 with state planning, as we do consolidations and mergers of
17 the programs, there's lots of issues that are going to arise
18 about how do we integrate what was previously three programs
19 or four programs that have not merged into one or are now
20 working together, how do you integrate this so that they're
21 not all repeating everything, so that there's more
22 coordination in the effort for the delivery of legal

1 services. Some of the examples would be a statewide
2 technology plan, integrated seamless intake.

3 Now everybody has talked about LSC is trying to
4 push central intake. We're not interested so much in central
5 intake systems as seamless systems, systems so that for the
6 client, when they call a number, wherever they need to be
7 they are routed there using technology, so that they don't
8 have to make repeated phone calls, saying, "Oh, no, you
9 called the wrong program. You got to call this program," or
10 "No, our intake hours are these hours or these hours." We
11 don't care if the intake workers are in different areas
12 around the state as long as, to the client, it's seamless and
13 very, very responsive to their needs. And, again, we were
14 giving special considerations when they would be working with
15 this with the state court systems. Because many of the state
16 court systems are putting Web forms up there, are trying to
17 help clients with pro se, we want our advocates to be part of
18 this process.

19 Now in setting up the review of this, we set up
20 different criteria. One, of course, was the project purpose,
21 what were they trying to accomplish. How innovative was it?
22 How feasible was it? Because with only \$4.25 million, we

1 don't want to fund projects that don't look feasible in their
2 purpose. Replication potential. When we only have 4.25
3 million, we want to make as much mileage out of this as
4 possible. And the way to do this is to be sure that what we
5 develop in West Virginia or what we develop in Pennsylvania
6 can be used by programs in other parts of the country without
7 having to spend all that money again. So we look very
8 strongly to be sure that what we pay for in one state will be
9 provided free or at low cost and useful to other states.

10 Another thing is community of involvement. As part
11 of the statewide planning process, we want to be sure that
12 there are lots of community partners. And as we talk more
13 about some of the projects that we funded, you'll see what we
14 mean about including other partners. Reducing
15 disparities. We've all heard of the digital divide. In
16 other words, many of our clients do not have ready access to
17 the Internet. They do not have computers in their homes, so
18 we want to look at ways not only to get more information on
19 the Internet, but to make this information more accessible to
20 our clients as well. Then we want evaluation and
21 documentation. In other words, we want to be able to show
22 what we've done with this money and evaluate this to show the

1 actual benefit to our client community.

2 We received 59 applications for funding from 37
3 states. We had 12 states that had multiple applicants. We
4 had 17 applications to be model programs, 31 for innovation
5 projects, and 11 in integration projects. Now, we set up a
6 review process so it wouldn't just be a couple of us at LSC
7 making these decisions. We got a panel of people from around
8 the country, both in the Legal Services community, in the ABA
9 community. We got lots of support from other partners in
10 this, and we did a review process which I'm kind of proud of
11 because it was unique. Instead of flying everybody in for a
12 big meeting, we met using technology by setting up Web
13 meetings in conjunction with conference calls, and did the
14 review process for a lot less money than what we had
15 anticipated. But in doing this, we wanted to be sure that we
16 looked at projects that would meet the criteria that we set
17 out. Then once this was done, we made the recommendations
18 concerning the state planning issues that were involved and
19 then presented those recommendations to John and then we had
20 the final approval.

21 Now we received 59 applications, like I told you.
22 We've made 32 awards. We've appropriated a total -- of the

1 4.25, we've appropriated 4,149,765. I'll tell you later
2 about the \$100,000 that's left over, what that's going to be
3 used for in this process. We had 27 states that are
4 receiving grants, so you can see there's a large
5 distribution. There were two states that had more than one
6 program that were awarded, and there multiple awards to these
7 different programs here. DNA, which I'll tell you about
8 their project; the Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New
9 York, and Ohio State Legal Services. If Bob is still around,
10 he'll see that he was one of only three that got two awards.

11 Here's the distribution. So you can see that we have a wide
12 distribution.

13 Now there are two model state programs that are not
14 on this map because they have not been announced yet. The
15 decisions have been made, but they've not been announced. So
16 they're not included. And then you can see the distributions
17 in blue are the innovation projects, in green are the
18 integration projects, and then states that had multi grants
19 are in stripes in the different categories. Just wanted to
20 give you an idea of the distribution. You can see that the
21 distribution was all across including the central parts of
22 the United States as well, and Hawaii, which was one of our

1 model programs.

2 In the different categories, you can see that we
3 came very close to our goal here. We were just slightly over
4 the 1.25 for the model programs. Innovation went over
5 because, if you'll remember, we only had 11 applicants for
6 integration. So if we had awarded everybody that applied
7 money, they would not have been able to take up that whole
8 category. So we made up the difference in innovation. Now
9 one other thing that we did, too, if someone applied to be a
10 model program, which we encouraged every place to do that,
11 that wanted to, but when you got that many applying and only
12 two or three that are going to be successful, we don't want
13 that to be an all or nothing situation. So we also
14 encouraged everyone of the places that applied for a model
15 state to give us what we call a "carve-out." In other words,
16 part of their project, they could be in either the innovation
17 category or the integration category, and so that they
18 wouldn't be left out in the cold if they didn't become one of
19 the model states. So that's where some of the difference
20 comes in on the extra innovation projects. Or states that
21 applied to be models didn't -- weren't successful there, but
22 did have projects that could be funded as innovation or

1 integration projects.

2 Now, the activities funded. We have activities all
3 over the board on technology that we're going to be looking
4 at. Wide Area Networks for system integration. In Colorado,
5 we're going to be working with them to do some Wide Area
6 Networks. We're going to be doing this in New Mexico, with
7 ideas of setting up mechanisms so that we can help our
8 programs communicate better within their states or within
9 their regions. Voice Over IP. Again, this is technology --
10 I won't bore you too much, but this means you can use your
11 Wide Area Network to talk to each other and not have to pay
12 service charges anymore to the phone carriers in there. So
13 we are funding some of those projects to help because it's
14 going to help immensely for seamless statewide intake,
15 because it means you'll be able to route a call to any one of
16 our programs in the state over a Wide Area Network, with no
17 long distance charges. So that we can intake workers
18 throughout the entire state doing intake for our clients
19 without having to pay long distance charges and without
20 having the clients make local phone calls.

21 Website development. We are doing model templates
22 for website development in several states so that what we

1 learn there can be distributed freely or at little cost to
2 any other states that would like to do statewide websites.
3 So that if there are six programs in the state and a client
4 wants information on a landlord/tenant program, they don't
5 have to find one particular site in that state that serves
6 their area. They can go to one site for the entire state,
7 maybe put in their zip code, and be taken immediately to the
8 right program and the right information for their particular
9 area.

10 We are also going to work on some regional intake
11 systems. One of our systems that we're doing in Florida is
12 going to be a partnership with a private company, where
13 initial screening for eligibility and referral will be done
14 by a private company. And if that's not suitable for the
15 client's needs, they're routed to the program in Florida for
16 additional legal services. So we're trying some innovative
17 approaches to this. Another one in West Virginia will be so
18 that a client can apply for services online. If they're at
19 the shelter and it's in the middle of the night and they need
20 legal services and the worker there is helping them, they can
21 fill out the application, eligibility information and it will
22 be routed to our program in West Virginia so that then they

1 can be screened for eligibility and called back the next day
2 and helped with their legal problem, and save all the time
3 that the intake worker normally would have to do that. If
4 that is successful and we find out it works well, then we can
5 replicate that across the country. If we find out that our
6 clients don't really respond to that very well, then we'll
7 know that this isn't something that we want all the 50 states
8 spending money on developing. We're trying to learn things
9 from these projects.

10 Video conferencing. Let me give you an example.
11 In our model program in Hawaii, they've been very successful
12 with pro se clinics. I found this hard to believe, but
13 Victor assures me it's true. When someone comes into one of
14 their clinics and sits down and goes through the class, 88
15 percent of those people complete the pro se process and
16 either receive the divorce that they're looking for, or the
17 bankruptcy they're looking for, or whatever it is. That's a
18 very high percentage for pro se representation. It's because
19 of the follow-up that they do with the clients to be sure
20 that they get help after the seminar. But one of the
21 problems they had is it's only working in Oahu because it's
22 difficult for people from the other islands to get in for

1 these clinics. We're going to be setting up video clinics at
2 each office so that the clinic coordinator in Oahu can hold a
3 clinic, a pro se clinic, and reach anybody in any island and
4 then do the follow-ups without them having to spend any money
5 to come to the main office in Hawaii. If we can learn how to
6 replicate this in Hawaii, where they're separated by water,
7 we can do the same things in our programs all around the
8 country in setting up pro se, self-help clinics to help them
9 so that they can do this.

10 Another one of our projects that we're going to be
11 doing is setting up a virtual office in every county in the
12 state. Now I think that's very ambitious. They're working
13 on all kinds of partnerships. It might be a nutrition site.
14 It might be a social services provider. But if there's not
15 a Legal Aid office in that county now, there will be a site
16 where they can go and have access over video, and sit face to
17 face and talk to an attorney at one of our programs. We're
18 going to see how this works, and I think it's very ambitious
19 to think that every county in the state now can have an
20 office for Legal Services representation. We're very excited
21 about some of these projects that we're doing.

22 And also for the training. Again, when I was in

1 Oklahoma, working as a managing attorney, and we set up
2 training, everybody from the far corners of the state would
3 come in. We couldn't get started until 10:30 because it took
4 so long to drive, we had to let out at 4:00. Now this can be
5 done with video conferencing with links from each of the
6 offices. So that we won't have to spend time sitting on our
7 tails anymore, spending all that effort getting to a
8 training. We'll actually be able to use that time helping
9 our clients, and the trainings will be very, very effective.

10 It will be easy to have an hour-long training on some
11 subject for every advocate. And also it will be useful for our
12 special projects that we do where we have a task force in the
13 state, maybe working on housing or migrant terms or whatever.

14 Over a large state, they can all get together with video
15 conferencing and do this. We are very excited about these
16 projects.

17 So what's it going to mean to our client? Faster,
18 seamless intake, more access to advocates with less travel,
19 more self-help information and forms, increased court
20 assistance because several of these projects are working with
21 the courts. Like in Orange County and like in Lehigh,
22 Pennsylvania, the actual computers will be in the courts

1 themselves. Advocates will be better trained and better
2 informed, more pro bono involvement and efficient use of the
3 resources.

4 Now, I'm not going to cover all of these in-depth,
5 but there's still a lot of work to be done even though we've
6 made the decisions. We got to get all the grant terms and
7 conditions. One thing that we're doing that is somewhat
8 unusual for the grants is we're setting up mileposts. In
9 other words, we're not going to just say, "Okay, you get a
10 check for \$175,000." We're going to say, "Okay, how much do
11 you need to get this started, what do you expect to do, and
12 when do you expect to have it done?" We're going to be
13 overseeing each one of these grants to be sure that what
14 they've promised us can be done is being done, and is being
15 done on budget, so that before the next payment is received,
16 we'll actually see the progress is being made. Because we
17 want this to be successful, we're going to oversee this very
18 closely.

19 Then when this is all done, we're going to be
20 disseminating the results. I explained to you about the
21 100,000; 50,000 of that will be used for the evaluation
22 process, so that someone will be coordinating with each one

1 of the grantees the evaluation process, so that we can show
2 exactly what has been done, what has been gained by our
3 clients with the use of technology.

4 One thing I've run across in technology planning is
5 that people always say, "Well, look, we have an extra
6 \$100,000 from the state legislature. Let's hire two or three
7 new attorneys." We want to say, "Sometimes technology is a
8 better use of this money." We need empirical information to
9 show that spending dollars on technology actually helps our
10 clients, and we hope through this evaluation process to be
11 able to do that.

12 Now, another thing, too, is that this allows LSC to
13 be a coordinator for many different projects around the
14 country. In other words, working with groups on data
15 standards; working with groups on ways to present self-help
16 information; ways to develop community involvement. One of
17 the things that we're going to be doing with the other
18 50,000, which will actually go out as part of the grants, but
19 will cover our conference fee for the grantees, is to bring
20 them in -- we're working in conjunction with the State
21 Justice Institute, the National Center for the State Courts,
22 the Open Society, to put on a conference next month for our

1 grantees on how to make partnerships between the state court
2 systems and our programs to provide self-help information and
3 pro se forms. We want to see these partnerships grow. We're
4 going to find places that have done well. We're going to
5 target some of our grantees that are doing these projects,
6 get state court people in, get other community partners in.
7 We're going to sit them down in a room for two days, and
8 we're going to help them solve the problems that they had in
9 working together, so that our clients will benefit. Because
10 when they go into court with a form that they've gotten from
11 a LSC website, the court and administrators will all be
12 familiar with this and there's not going to be any hurdles to
13 them in getting these papers filed and presented to the
14 court.

15 Another thing that we'd like to do is get a
16 knowledge base of what we've done, publish this on our
17 website so that any of our participants that are interested
18 in something like Voice Over IP can go in and say, "Oh, they
19 have been doing Voice Over IP," and state why, and "Here's a
20 contact name. I'm going to call them, see how it's worked,
21 what hurdles they've had," so that we're not spending money
22 over and over relearning this information that we can work

1 nationwide. And LSC can be a coordinator of this effort to
2 let our programs coordinate nationwide on these.

3 Also at the conference, we'll be bringing many of
4 the other grantees in so that they can all start learning to
5 work together on technology. And we'd like to be able to
6 show how successful this was to Congress so that we can get
7 additional appropriations for this technology money to help
8 our clients.

9 And so I passed out a handout that summarizes the
10 awards that have been made. There are three here you'll see
11 that have not been announced yet, but I have given you the
12 amount of the awards and a description of the awards.
13 There's going to be some press conferences coming up between
14 now and the end of the month that will actually announce
15 those final ones.

16 Let me tell you just one example. I told you a
17 little bit about Hawaiians in the other one. One of the ones
18 that I am really interested in is DNA. This is the program
19 that serves primarily the Navajo and the Hopi reservations in
20 Utah, Arizona and New Mexico. What we're doing with them,
21 because they have had such a digital disparity out there with
22 connectivity. Here we complain because we have a 56K modem

1 connection and it's slow. There, they're lucky if they can
2 dial up long distance and get connected at 14K. It's just
3 awful.

4 So we are funding a project that will be putting
5 satellite connections to the Internet in the nine different
6 DNA locations, and we are coordinating this with a project
7 done by the Department of Commerce. We've worked closely
8 with them. They have a program called the TOP Program,
9 Technology Opportunities Program, that is going to be putting
10 computers and satellite access into 110 additional sites in
11 the community chapter houses all over the Navajo and Hopi
12 nations. When we finish, we will be able to provide in
13 native Navajo pro se self-help information, and native Hopi,
14 to the entire reservation, including a computer connection
15 for the Hava Supi on the floor of the Grand Canyon.

16 These are far-reaching programs. Yes, we are very
17 ambitious with this, but as you can tell, I'm very excited
18 about it, and I think our clients are going to really benefit
19 from this access to information. And we're doing everything
20 we can to overcome this digital divide for our clients
21 through our technology of initiative program.

22 So that's my summary on the program. I'd be glad

1 if you've got any questions.

2 MR. McKAY: May I just make a comment, Madame
3 Chair?

4 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Yes.

5 MR. McKAY: I'm sure that board members, after
6 reviewing the report, may have some additional questions.
7 But I just wanted to acknowledge Glenn's hard work, Tim
8 Watson's hard work, Mike Genz and Randi Youells, for a
9 tremendous amount of work to make this all happen. I think
10 the cooperation and work with other entities is one that
11 Glenn hit lightly, but actually has taken a lot of Mike's
12 time, in particular, Glenn's time, Tim and Randi's, and we're
13 pretty proud of this. This is work -- we wanted to get this
14 all granted out before we went into our final negotiations on
15 our appropriations because our hope is that by demonstrating
16 that we can administer these funds on a discretionary basis
17 to the benefit of our clients, that that will just be obvious
18 in a very bipartisan way on the Hill. And I want to commend
19 Glenn, in particular, for his work. I don't mean to cut off
20 any questions if board members have them.

21 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Bill?

22 MR. McCALPIN: I appreciate that the effort and

1 likely result will be to increase the demand, increase the
2 number of clients seeking service. What are we doing about
3 being able to provide that service?

4 MR. RAWDON: Well, what we're hoping is that
5 through the partnerships with the state court -- we realize
6 that with \$300 million that we get appropriated, we're never
7 going to meet all the demand. I mean, not where you can have
8 the traditional bundled legal service that we talk about,
9 where the client comes in and sits down in front of the
10 attorney, the attorney takes the case and goes all through.
11 But with such things -- if we take the clients that can be
12 helped through pro se and self-help, with the clinics, the
13 information that comes in on the websites, with the forms
14 that we can provide them, by the time that we are going to
15 save the court administrators by not having to explain all
16 this, if we can help them, using this technology, it frees up
17 the advocates for more of the traditional Legal Services full
18 representation. And so that is our hope. We know that more
19 people are going to be calling when we create these better
20 intake systems, and so what we have to do is to have
21 information for those that can be helped with self-help and
22 do that in such a way that it is not taking advocates' time.

1 When I was in Oklahoma, I spent a lot of time
2 talking with clients to help them on pro se matters. If this
3 could have been done on the Web by Web information, or by
4 working with community partners that could be trained to give
5 them this information, I could have been spending more of my
6 time on cases. That's our hope.

7 MR. McCALPIN: Apparently it's going to require
8 more work on the part of courts and administrative agencies,
9 too.

10 MR. RAWDON: Well, it is, but right now they are
11 already having -- we hear from the courts. This is why the
12 National Center for the State Courts and the state justices
13 do our partnering with us because the courts are feeling a
14 great burden from all the requests for help for pro se
15 representation, and they don't have the facilities either.
16 So if we partner with them to see what we can do -- like in
17 Orange County, where we are putting in these kiosks, when
18 they walk into court and they say, "How do I get my own
19 divorce," then they'll send them over to the kiosk, which
20 will be funded by LSC and the Orange County project. And
21 they will go through information to tell them how to proceed
22 to take their case through the court if they can't get

1 traditional representation. I mean, it isn't a magic bullet,
2 but it is going to be a greater step for access for our
3 clients we believe.

4 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Are there any more questions?
5 Thank you, then.

6 MR. RAWDON: There were two other quick things, if
7 I could tell you about technology. As far as the state
8 planning, we are working with all of the state responsible
9 people at the OPP to target five states that we're going to
10 work with more closely next year for statewide technology
11 planning. Another project that I'm really happy about, I
12 told you at the last board meeting about the Lexis
13 partnership that we did to get low-cost access to legal
14 information for our advocates. We've improved that agreement
15 with them now so that before there was a tier-type of kind of
16 confusing price structure. Now any LSC-funded program that
17 wants can get a set rate for Lexis, which would be, like, \$38
18 or 45, depending on what the service they get, and this is
19 also going to be expanded to any other civil provider of
20 legal assistance. It doesn't have to be just an LSC program.

21

22 Now, to give you an idea of what this means, I

1 heard from two programs in Ohio the week before I came here
2 that said one program alone was saving \$21,000 in one year
3 with this new pricing plan that we did. Another one was
4 saving 11, conservatively. If our programs take advantage of
5 this, I think that in one year alone, they will save a
6 million dollars on what they have been paying for Westlaw
7 access and other types of access to this information, from
8 what they've been telling me. And this money can go back
9 out into the field. So in addition to spending this money,
10 LSC is looking at ways to make partnerships that will save
11 money for our firm and so more of it can go back into basic
12 services. Thank you very much.

13 MS. YOUELLS: Glenn, can you talk a little bit
14 about you're doing with state planning?

15 MR. RAWDON: Right. What we are trying to do as we
16 work on this technology is to coordinate with Bob Gross,
17 because he is the coordinator at OPP on state planning, to be
18 sure that everything that we do with these grants meshes with
19 what's being done with the rest of the state planning,
20 because what we want to see is that technology is a vehicle
21 to assist in state planning I've been told by some directors
22 that when nothing else works well on state planning, at least

1 the technology people seem to be able to coordinate. So this
2 is why we're working with Bob and the other SRPs on targeting
3 these five states to see if we can't facilitate state
4 planning by using technology. So that everything -- each one
5 of these grant applications for each state was distributed to
6 the state responsible person for that state, and then their
7 input was sought to see how this would affect state planning
8 and further state planning in that particular effort. So
9 we're trying to make sure that we're not working at cross
10 purposes or even separately, that everything is all
11 coordinated into one, large effort at LSC to improve access
12 for our clients.

13 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Thank you. We now have Randi
14 Youells, Vice-President for Programs. And Mike is with her
15 instead of Carolyn Worrell, in your program. And first
16 she'll be reporting on a briefing on changes in LSC's
17 services in Indian Country. And the next should be
18 development of the CSR system, and also on LSC's diversity
19 initiatives. So I'll let Randi.

20 MS. YOUELLS: Thank you, Ernestine.

21 The first topic I'm going to talk about is
22 something that came up at the last board meeting, and we

1 thought it was appropriate to revisit it because it did
2 generate some questions that we did feel perhaps we didn't
3 answer as best as we could, so I would like to talk about
4 that first. Then I'd like to talk a little bit about CSRs
5 and the changes we're going to be making, both in the
6 short-term and long-term. Then I'm going to talk a little
7 bit about the diversity initiatives we started at LSC.

8 Let's talk about Native American Indian funding
9 first. I think most of you, because you have been around as
10 long as I have, know that the Native American Indian
11 programs, which serve a very special population, they have
12 unique legal needs and, among the poorest of the poor, are
13 funded at greatly disparate levels. And that's largely due
14 to historical accident. For fiscal year 2001, we
15 are recommending the following initiatives. I just want to
16 go over them with some clarity and then let you ask me any
17 questions you might have about them. There are three
18 separate initiatives that impact upon our services to Native
19 American Indians. The first would be to raise the funding
20 floor for 13 programs to \$10 per poor person. There are 13
21 programs currently that provide special legal services to
22 Native American populations, that are funded from a low of

1 \$2.77 per poor person to a high of \$9.88. That's the new,
2 consolidated Native American project in Arizona.

3 We are recommending that we raise the floor on
4 funding for these programs to allow them to substantially
5 increase the amount and variety of legal services that they
6 provide to Native American Indians. The total increase
7 required for the next fiscal year would be \$952,134.

8 The second initiative would be to expand service areas
9 from a county or reservation to an entire state. We have
10 certain small service areas in states like Minnesota,
11 Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wyoming, in
12 which we fund those entities in those states, those
13 organizations, to provide services to a reservation or to a
14 tribe or to particular counties. We are recommending that we
15 expand the service area from the county or reservation that
16 they're currently charged with providing legal services to
17 and that we develop within them the potential and obligation
18 to serve Native American Indians in the entire state. Of
19 these states, of the ones I just talked about, three of them
20 would receive additional funding for the expansion, Montana,
21 Nebraska, and Texas. Minnesota would receive a small
22 increase that would take them to the \$10 per poor person

1 level. The three remaining states, Mississippi, South
2 Dakota, and Wyoming, are currently funded above the
3 ten-dollar threshold. This would be implemented next year,
4 but it is important to understand that Wyoming already serves
5 a statewide service area and that since we can only expand
6 service areas when they are in competition, would expand in
7 Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wyoming, of these three states,
8 only Nebraska would receive additional funding for the next
9 year. So the total increase ultimately would be \$285,983.
10 But the total increase for 2001 would be only \$31,481.

11 The third initiative would be to create new Native
12 American service areas in New York and Florida. As I think
13 you are all aware, those states have substantial Native
14 American populations, they have a number of reservations, but
15 they currently do not receive special earmarked funding
16 directed to complex Indian law issues. This funding would
17 provide services for several hundred Native American Indians
18 in both of those states. They would be two completely new
19 service areas. We're recommending that each of these service
20 areas be funded at \$250,000. This is slightly higher than
21 the \$10 per poor person that we discussed in initiative one,
22 but many of us have been around Legal Services for a very

1 long period of time and we understand that in order to
2 provide quality legal services to low income people, we have
3 to have core staffing. We believe that \$250,000 would allow
4 the development of a project in each of those states that
5 would fund three attorneys. We believe that that's the
6 minimum necessary to provide effective services. We also
7 believe that the \$250,000 would allow for start-up costs and
8 the purchase of equipment that has to be done whenever you
9 start a new Native American Indian project or any Legal
10 Services project.

11 Several questions came up at the last board
12 meeting, that I'll try to answer. Then if you have new ones,
13 you can throw those at me, too. One of the questions came up
14 was whether or not we intend to do this even if we do not get
15 an increase in our appropriation. We said at that time, and
16 I think we'll say again, that at this time we are confident
17 that we will get an increase in the appropriation, but we are
18 not ruling out the possibility that we would still want to go
19 ahead and make sure that this vulnerable population was taken
20 care of even in the absence of any increase in appropriation.
21 That final decision has not been made yet. And, again, we
22 are just waiting because we are extremely confident that that

1 appropriation next year will go up and we won't have to
2 address that question.

3 The other question that came up, I think I've
4 already referred to, and that is why \$250,000 in the two
5 states in which we are creating two new service areas. And
6 that just goes to the fact that as a part of my experience in
7 providing legal services over the last 25 years, if you're
8 going to do it, you might as well do it with a possibility
9 and potential of success. And \$250,000 would allow us to
10 hire three attorneys for that project.

11 Mike is here to help answer any questions that you
12 might have. We felt bad last time that we probably hadn't
13 done as most effective a job as we could have in presenting
14 this information to you, and we wanted to revisit it I will
15 be revisiting it again in the Finance Committee this
16 afternoon, so I'm on the agenda for this exact same
17 presentation. You probably should have videotaped me. Are
18 there any questions that I can answer?

19 MR. McCALPIN: You talk about funding Native
20 Americans at \$10 per eligible poor person. What is the level
21 at which we fund everybody else in the country?

22 MS. YOUELLS: It's \$8.26. If you'll let me, Bill,

1 let me just address that. I understand that at first blush,
2 you look at that and you think, "Wow, that's kind of an
3 inequity right there." But the population of Native American
4 Indians in the next census is projected to rise at over 20
5 percent. Whereas the population, the rise in low income
6 Americans who are served by basic field, is not projected to
7 rise at that fast rate. So part of that was a reflection of
8 that; that if we're going to start trying to take care of the
9 gap that exists in Native American Indian projects throughout
10 the nation, that historical gap, with one program being
11 funded at \$2.77 per poor person, you might as well try at
12 this point to begin to address the gap in terms of what we
13 know the census is going to tell us, and that is the number
14 of Native American Indians will increase, far in advance of
15 the increase in low income Americans. That's why that
16 decision was made.

17 When you talk about Native American Indians and you
18 talk about funding, it's sometimes hard -- you look at a lot
19 of different census data and you have to make some guesses as
20 to what is going to happen. We've talked to the Bureau of
21 Indian Affairs, we've hired a consultant, we've grappled with
22 the census data, and that would be our conclusion, that it is

1 going to increase at a far higher rate than the basic
2 population.

3 MR. EAKELEY: Isn't it the case, also, that Native
4 American problems lack -- uniformly or consistently lack
5 outside resources?

6 MS. YOUELLS: Absolutely.

7 MR. EAKELEY: Just very few other places to go to
8 supplement the federal funds?

9 MS. YOUELLS: That's absolutely true. In fact, in
10 some states -- and we're trying to address this through state
11 planning, Doug -- in some states, the state planners have
12 not done the best job that they could have done in bringing
13 in the Native American projects into the fold and making sure
14 that when you look at the number of lower income people in
15 the state and the legal needs in the state, that that
16 includes the special populations. Many times Native American
17 projects have been in competition for scarce dollars in basic
18 field. Basic field might be more in a better position,
19 because of their location in urban areas, to make the case.

20 MR. McCALPIN: I think I'll -- there's something I
21 don't understand. I thought that the way the Congress set up
22 the appropriation is there's a set sum for field programs,

1 and there is a poverty population, and they divide the latter
2 into the former, and that establishes a basis. Now I would
3 have assumed that the Native Americans are included in the
4 population base, the poor population. So why are they not at
5 the same level as everybody else?

6 MR. GENZ: They took them out of the statute in
7 1995, Bill. There was specific language that said that the
8 proportion of funding for the Native American programs that
9 existed at that time would continue. That proportion was 2.5
10 percent, would continue on after that. That was a floor.
11 That was the minimum.

12 MR. McCALPIN: Thank you.

13 MS. MERCADO: I'm just real curious. I know you
14 said the majority of the population census doesn't show the
15 same increase in poverty. But if you look at special
16 populations, it would be. You are talking in general about
17 all the other basic programs versus a specialized area,
18 right? Because in the Southwest, you're going to have a
19 greater number of poor --

20 MS. YOUELLS: Yes.

21 MS. MERCADO: -- as well as in some of your big
22 urban centers. So I'm just wondering how census looked at

1 that.

2 MS. YOUELLS: Nationally. The figures that I just
3 gave you would be national figures. Ten percent for the
4 basic field population, about 23 percent for Native American
5 Indian percent. So certainly you're absolutely correct, and
6 that's something we will have to be dealing with as an
7 organization down the line, as we have in other times when
8 the census figures come out. Since we do give funding based
9 on a per capita poor person basis, if we do see substantial
10 increases in the percentage in numbers of low income people
11 in the Southwest, as certainly is being projected, and lower
12 increases and perhaps even decreases in the Rust Belt, that's
13 something that this Board will have to deal with at that
14 time. That's correct. Shall I go on to the next two?

15 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Yes.

16 MS. YOUELLS: The next two are also something near
17 and dear to this Board's heart. They deal with the measuring
18 of performance among our grantees. Let me just give you a
19 little history lesson, not that you probably want one because
20 you are more familiar with CSRs than I probably want to be.

21 Several months ago, we set up a project and an
22 advisor council composed of field representatives,

1 representatives from the ABA, representatives from the NLADA,
2 and we invited them to help us devise a new way to measure
3 program performance. We were driven at that time by a couple
4 of competing goals, which I think we realized in time were
5 somewhat competing.

6 The one was to address some promises that we had
7 made to the Congress of the United States, when we filed our
8 report in April on CSRs, that we would come up with some ways
9 to more carefully measure the work of our grantees, that we
10 would look at cost per case analysis, we would look at
11 outcome space measurement, and we would implement that in
12 2001.

13 The other was the promise that we made in the
14 Strategic Planning document that this Board adopted, that we
15 would begin much more carefully to measure the performance of
16 our grantees across the board, in terms of how we improved
17 access and quality, which are the two highlighted goals in
18 the Strategic Plan.

19 When I first began to work with this advisor
20 council, it became obvious to me, and in retrospect, it
21 should have become obvious to me earlier, but I guess I was a
22 little slow, that if you are going to meet the goals of this

1 Strategic Plan, that's going to take some work, and that's
2 going to take some effort, and that's going to take some
3 thought. It's going to have to be carefully constructed, and
4 it's going to have to be constructed in the field by in and
5 it has to be constructed so there aren't tremendous errors.
6 That still left us with the obligation that we had to meet
7 the promises we had made in April of this year to the
8 Congress.

9 So what we have decided to do is bifurcate what
10 used to be the performance measurement project, and now we
11 have two separate projects going forward almost
12 simultaneously. The first is what some people internally at
13 LSC called CSR Plus. I personally hated that name, so I just
14 unilaterally changed it, and it's now called the LSC Results
15 Project. And that is to make some small and minor
16 adjustments in how our grantees report their work under the
17 current, existing CSR system to capture other work that is
18 not just case-specific. So, for example, we will be looking
19 at capturing community legal education. We will be looking
20 at capturing hits on websites. We will be looking at
21 painting a better picture to the Congress about the
22 complexity of the work that our grantees perform for our

1 low-income clients.

2 That is going to be a largely internal project that
3 is being headed by Danilla Cardona and Mike Genz. It
4 involves quite a few LSC staff, both people who have
5 technological expertise, like Glenn Rawdon, who you just
6 heard; Bob Gross, who comes from the state planning
7 perspective; Chris Sundseth, who is a budget analyst, and
8 they will be making quickly some recommendations for making
9 some adjustments to the CSR system so that we can implement
10 them in 2001, and so we can fulfill our promises to Congress
11 that we made in April of 2000.

12 The Advisor Council, which is a fairly large group,
13 has been asked -- we have asked them in the memo that I
14 copied you on last week, to self-select if any of those
15 members are particularly interested in working on this
16 portion of the project, We would like a core group to
17 continue to advise us, and we've asked them to self-select.
18 But that project is moving forward and we're proceeding right
19 now. The Results Committee has had one meeting. They've
20 gathered some information, some fairly valuable information
21 as to how some of our grantees already measure community
22 legal education, because they do; how they already measure

1 website hits, because they do. So we're taking a look at
2 current practices and trying to quickly decide how we can
3 make adjustments to the CSR system.

4 However, I think everybody agrees that the CSR
5 system is flawed. It provides one, small, little window into
6 the work of our grantees. It does not really measure
7 performance. It does not really performance and allow us to
8 compare grantee from grantee. It doesn't allow us to meet
9 what we promised in our Strategic Plan, to increase access
10 and enhance quality. It doesn't really allow us to
11 understand if we are meeting those two goals.

12 So on a parallel track, we are going to be doing
13 the Performance Project, which will be a project to design a
14 system that will ultimately replace the CSR system, and that
15 will be a better way of capturing the complexity of our work.

16 That's a longer-term project. It's going to be kicked off
17 fairly soon, but it's going to evolve and change, probably,
18 as all projects do, over the next several years. It will be
19 guided both by consultants -- we will be, probably because of
20 workload, hiring consultants to help us with that, but it
21 also will be managed heavily through intervention by myself
22 and Mike and other people at LSC. So it will be a joint

1 project, and we will be working very closely with the Advisor
2 Council and with field programs to ensure that they are
3 integrally involved in whatever we design as we come up with.

4 We've made promises that we will pilot test, both at the
5 front end, which is "What are you doing now," and "How can we
6 build a system that helps what you're doing now," and at the
7 back end, when we actually test out the new system.

8 I should tell you also as I conclude my
9 presentation on this that NLADA and CLASP have also, on a
10 parallel system, been working on their recommendations to us,
11 both about CSRs and then I think largely about CSRs, and then
12 they probably soon will be turning their attention to the
13 larger project, the Performance Project.

14 Last Friday, I did receive a communication from
15 them by e-mail that contained varied recommendations as to
16 what the Results Committee should be looking at. So we are
17 acutely conscious that when we talk about these issues, it
18 resonates in the field.

19 I, as you know, spent years in the field. And the
20 whole concept of measuring performance is one that freaks me
21 out, so I understand why they're freaked out, and we will do
22 whatever we can to make sure they are consulted every step o

1 the way and that they have input. That, of course, doesn't
2 mean that every decision we make, they'll like, But it means
3 that they will be involved in the process as we move forward
4 on that.

5 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Okay, Bill has something now.

6 MR. McCALPIN: Randi, I read the memorandum that
7 you sent out dated September 13th. As I looked on Page 4,
8 under Assumption No. 1, and you talked about "Measures used
9 to set targets and monitor the performance will be driven by
10 a commitment to (a), dramatically increase the provision of
11 Legal Services." It seemed to me that you were looking at
12 the problem which the ABA is looking at as a result of
13 the adoption of the MDP resolution at the annual meeting in
14 New York earlier this summer.

15 MR. EAKELEY: Pause it and explain. No fair using
16 acronyms outside of Washington, D.C.

17 MR. McCALPIN: Multidisciplinary practice. I got
18 the impression that Randi knew what I was talking about.

19 MS. YOUELLS: Yes.

20 MR. EAKELEY: Would you let the rest of us in on
21 the secret?

22 MS. YOUELLS: No, we'll just have a private

1 conversation.

2 MR. McCALPIN: You know, there are those who think
3 that Legal Services are services provided by a lawyer, or
4 maybe even in a courtroom, or a representative in the
5 courtroom or an administrative agency. On the other hand, we
6 know that there are a lot of things that people think about
7 that legal services may be provided by a paralegal.
8 Sometimes you think about advance directives as a legal
9 service and if you're admitted to a hospital as a patient,
10 you're handed an advance directive by a clerk in the
11 hospital. Do I get the impression from this that our
12 definition of "legal services" is going to be anything that's
13 done by a program?

14 MS. YOUELLS: I'll answer that two ways, Bill. The
15 first is this language comes directly out of your Strategic
16 Initiatives document, so when I began to set out what the
17 Performance Project was all about, the first thing I wanted
18 to say is we are conscious of your Strategic Plan, and that
19 will guide everything we do. So this language comes directly
20 from that. I'm just quoting that.

21 MR. McCALPIN: Mea culpa.

22 MS. YOUELLS: And the second is, as I think you

1 know, because you and I were neighboring states in Missouri
2 and Iowa, I, too, believe in the multidisciplinary approach
3 to the Legal Services practice. I do believe that the
4 services that we provide to our clients are many times not
5 provided in core; that community legal education, alternative
6 dispute resolution, the hits on the website, are all part of
7 that rich fabric of legal services that our programs provide
8 everyday. And you have my assurance that as this project
9 moves forward, that we will keep those things in mind, and we
10 will not be constrained by a one-dimensional definition of
11 "legal services."

12 MR. EAKELEY: Good luck.

13 MS. YOUELLS: Thank you. Now diversity?

14 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Yes.

15 MS. YOUELLS: The third project I want to talk to
16 you about is diversity initiatives, and it comes out of a
17 couple of -- the etiology comes from a couple of things.
18 First, as you know, our president is committed to diversity,
19 both within the staffs of our Legal Services grantees and in
20 terms of making sure that the services we provide to clients
21 are culturally sensitive and are provided in such a way to be
22 received well by cultural groups and lawyers that represent

1 cultural populations that we serve.

2 Second, I think some of you who have known me for a
3 long time know that one of the issues that has most affected
4 me during my long career at Legal Services is the whole issue
5 of the role of women in the Legal Services community.

6 Third, the other issue has been the role of race
7 and how racial discrimination, which is certainly a part of
8 our society, affects our Legal Services program, affects us
9 and affects the services that we provide.

10 So those are three issues that we have been kicking
11 around for some time. Let me tell you how we are going to
12 proceed, so you're aware of what's going to happen. In
13 October, there will be a program letter on diversity, and we
14 will be announcing to our grantees -- and they've heard this.

15 President McKay announced it at Berkeley, at the Sudlaw
16 Conference -- we will be asking our grantees to take a look
17 at the diversity within their own work forces, and the
18 diversity in the communities that they serve, and make some
19 plans through state planning and through their own planning
20 process, to look at how they are going to improve services to
21 populations that might not be well-served currently by Legal
22 Services programs or how they're going to adopt ways to make

1 sure that women and people who represent racial minorities
2 are brought into Legal Services and are put on a leadership
3 track, and that they are nurtured forward. So that program
4 letter will be coming out in October.

5 We also have a commitment with NLADA that we will
6 actually be moving forward with them in two capacities. One,
7 in terms of race discrimination, in which they will take the
8 lead. Wilhelm Joseph and President McKay have had numerous
9 discussions about ensuring that as we move forward into the
10 next millenium, that minorities within the Legal Services
11 community, their leadership is nurtured; and that they do not
12 leave; and that they become project directors and litigation
13 directors and managing attorneys. And we understand that
14 that is not happening the way that we would like it to happen
15 right now, so we are going to develop some leadership
16 capacity and have NLADA take the lead on issues related to
17 race discrimination. We will partner with them, of course.

18 Similarly, LSC is going to move out and initiate a
19 study of gender issues. As they affect women who work in
20 Legal Services, I think it's well-known that the large
21 percentage of people who now fill the staff attorney ranks
22 are women. What might not be as well-known is the number of

1 project directors that are women, for some reason in this
2 last year, decreased. Perhaps not markedly, but it did
3 decrease. One concern of mine is the whole nexus with state
4 planning, and why that happened, and why, as we merged and
5 reconfigured, we saw the number of women project directors
6 decreasing.

7 Then there is the whole issue of the fact that so
8 many of our clients that we serve are women, and they present
9 women's issues to Legal Services' programs. So we will be
10 looking at gender issues, both in terms of our own staff
11 compositions, but also in terms of the overwhelming
12 percentage of clients that we serve are women and children.

13 Those are the three initiatives that are kind of
14 moving forward. They're in the very early stages of
15 discussion and any involvement that the Board would want to
16 have with it, of course, would be welcome by me and I think
17 we did communicate with you and -- Maria Luisa.

18 MS. MERCADO: Yes. I'm very pleased that it's
19 going out as a program letter because I think that everyone
20 in the field sort of has had the discussion. And being a
21 woman and being a minority, Latina, and then on top of that,
22 being from the migrant population, you certainly are in a

1 very, very serious minority, as far as leadership is
2 concerned. I think that that's something that both at NLADA
3 conferences, the ABA -- the ABA just had their summit on race
4 issue in the legal profession -- I think that everyone
5 recognizes, from the private Bar to the Legal Services
6 community, we still have a difficulty in mentoring both,
7 whether it's women or minorities, into leadership positions.

8 One of the factors that I would want us to make
9 sure and look at, that we don't get caught up in -- and I
10 think there's a potential that we might have some of those
11 issues come up with some of the merger-type situations in
12 state planning -- is that you don't pit women gender issues
13 against racial or ethnic minority issues, because,
14 unfortunately, that's always sort of been sort of my history.

15 Do I pick on women's issues or am I stuck because I am
16 Latina, having to deal with those issues? And sometimes they
17 are different, very different.

18 And so one of the jokes that we use to say a lot
19 about all of the federal contracting and state contracting
20 was that in order to get diversity, was that the big firms or
21 the big contractors would subcontract with a white woman to
22 get and leverage those contracts. And that was the minority

1 role, thereby excluding racial and ethnic minorities in those
2 positions.

3 So we have to be real sensitive to those issues in
4 making sure that we aren't pitting one against the other, and
5 that we're, in fact, doing a parallel, if you will, road in
6 trying to provide leadership opportunities for all included.

7

8 MS. YOUELLS: Absolutely. I couldn't agree with
9 you more.

10 Okay, thank you. You all were easy.

11 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Okay. Thank you, Randi.

12 MS. YOUELLS: Lots of work.

13 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Yes. We have made it through
14 the agenda, through consider and act on other business, so
15 it's hard to believe. Is there any other business of the
16 Board?

17 MR. EAKELEY: I just -- we have lunch next, but we
18 also promised our host at CRLA not to overdue the lunch
19 because there will be, I am told, a very elaborate and
20 delicious spread awaiting us at the special event this
21 afternoon.

22 CHAIR WATLINGTON: There was one thing I wanted

1 Randi to explain, why the panel was taped, was videoed, that
2 we didn't have a chance --

3 MS. YOUELLS: I'd be glad to. I think you all are
4 aware that we go out to states, do a lot of state planning.
5 We attend a lot of meetings. We make presentations on state
6 planning. And we thought that since we had this illustrious
7 panel here today, it would be silly of us not to take
8 advantage of their talents and skills and actually tape them,
9 so that when we do go out and talk to people in different
10 states, that they have the benefit of hearing about state
11 planning, not just because of what we say or reflected
12 through our eyes, but reflected from the eyes who have
13 followed very different paths to the development of a
14 comprehensive and integrated delivery system. So we will be
15 taking that on the road with us once it's edited.

16 MS. MERCADO: Yes, I think that's a really good
17 idea. I think it would helpful -- I know some of the
18 presenters did do, like, a small summary on it. I think it
19 would helpful to have those kinds of summaries available as
20 to the actual nuts and bolts, if you will, of how they
21 process that with the different partners in the state
22 planning. But I think one of the very evident things from

1 those three presenters, to me, was how differently all states
2 did that, and consequently. again, encouraging all the states
3 in doing state planning that it doesn't have to be a cookie
4 cutter approach, but, in fact, something that applies to
5 their client community and the other resources that are
6 available in that particular state.

7 MS. YOUELLS: I said for two and a half years that
8 it's person and situation-specific, and I mean that. I has
9 to be person and situation specific You have to take each
10 state where they're at and move them forward from that place
11 in time.

12 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Are there any other Board
13 comments or additions?

14 MR. EAKELEY: Good meeting, Ernestine.

15 CHAIR WATLINGTON: It's open for public comments.
16 Anyone?

17 MS. MERCADO: Or public.

18 CHAIR WATLINGTON: Well, then, we'll adjourn the
19 meeting.

20 M O T I O N

21 MS. MERCADO: I move that we adjourn.

22 MR. EAKELEY: Second.

1 CHAIR WATLINGTON: It's been moved and seconded
2 that the meeting is adjourned. All in favor say by saying,
3 "Aye."

4 (Chorus of ayes.)

5 CHAIR WATLINGTON: The same. Opposed, the same.

6 Motion carried.

7 (Whereupon, at 12:43 p.m., the meeting was
8 adjourned.)

9 * * * * *