

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MEETING OF THE
PROVISION FOR THE DELIVERY OF
LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

Friday, January 25, 2008
1:06 p.m.

The Legal Services Corporation
3333 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Sarah M. Singleton, Acting Chairman
- Jonann C. Chiles
- Bernice Phillips (via telephone)
- Thomas A. Fuentes
- Herbert S. Garten
- Frank B. Strickland, ex officio (via telephone)

OTHER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Lillian R. BeVier
- Thomas R. Meites
- Michael D. McKay

1 STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT:

2 Helaine M. Barnett, President, ex officio

David L. Richardson, Treasurer and Comptroller

3 Patricia D. Batie, Manager of Board Operations,
Office of Legal Affairs

4 Karen M. Dozier, Executive Assistant to the President

Karen Sarjeant, Vice President for Programs and
5 Compliance

Victor M. Fortuno, Vice President for Legal Affairs,
6 General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary

Mattie Cohan, Senior Assistant General Counsel

7 Charles Jeffress, Chief Administrative Officer

Laurie Tarantowicz, Assistant Inspector General and
8 Legal Counsel

Ronald (Dutch) Merryman, Acting Inspector General

9 Tom Coogan, Assistant IG for Investigations

Joel Gallay, Special Assistant to the Inspector
10 General

Matthew Glover, Associate Counsel, Office of the
11 Inspector General

Tom Hester, Associate Counsel, Office of the
12 Inspector General

John Constance, Office of Government Relations
13 and Public Affairs

David Maddox, Assistant Inspector General for
14 Management

and Evaluation

15 Danilo Cardona, Director, Office of Compliance and
Enforcement

16 Michael Genz, Director, Office of Program Performance

Guy Lescault, Program Counsel, Office of Program
17 Performance

Bristow Hardin, Program Analyst, Office of Program
18 Performance

John Idleman, Senior Program Counsel, Office of
19 Program Performance

Cyndy Robinson, Grants Coordinator, Office of
20 Program Performance

Arthur Ford, Program Analyst, Office of Program
21 Performance

Glenn Rawdon, Program Counsel, Office of Program
22 Performance

1 STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT: (continued)

2 Joyce Raby, Program Analyst, Office of Program
Performance

3 Tim Watson, Program Counsel, Office of Program
Performance

4 Monica Evans, Program Counsel, Office of Program
Performance

5 Sean Driscoll, Special Assistant, Government
Relations and Public Affairs

6 Treefa Aziz, Government Affairs Representative,
Government Relations and Public Affairs

7

Linda Perle, Center for Law & Social Policy (CLASP)

8 Don Saunders, National Legal Aid and Defenders
Association (NLADA)

9 Julie Strandlie, American Bar Association (ABA)

10 Terry Brooks, Standing Committee on Legal Aid &
Indigent Defendants (SCLAID)
American Bar Association (ABA)

11 Deborah Hankinson, Chairman, Standing Committee on
Legal Aid & Indigent Defendants (SCLAID)
American Bar Association

Alan Levine, Esq., Kronish, Lieb, Weiner & Hellman

13 Colleen Owens, Justice Policy Center, Urban Institute

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	.	Approval of agenda	5
2	.	Approval of the minutes of the committee's July 27, 2007 meeting	6
3	.	Approval of the minutes of the committee's October 26, 2007 meeting	7
4	.	Staff update on activities implementing the LSC Private Attorney Involvement Action Plan - Help Close the Justice Gap: Unleash the Power of Pro Bono	10
7	.	Staff update on leadership mentoring pilot program - final report	21
8	.	Staff update on pilot loan repayment assistant program - first year evaluation	30
9	.	Chairman's update on committee's 2008 agenda	55
10	.	Public comment	57
11	.	Consider and act on other business	57
12	.	Consider and act on adjournment of meeting	57

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

2 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: I'll call to order
3 the meeting of the Provision for the Delivery of Legal
4 Services Committee.

5 In Chairman David Hall's absence, I'm going to
6 be chairing the committee today.

7 The first order of business is approval of the
8 agenda, which is on page 38 of the Board book. Do we
9 have a motion to approve the agenda?

10 M O T I O N

11 MS. CHILES: So moved.

12 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you, Ms.
13 Chiles. Is there a second? Herb?

14 MR. GARTEN: Second.

15 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you, Herb.

16 All in favor?

17 MR. FUENTES: Discussion?

18 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Yes, discussion.

19 MR. FUENTES: Did we not want to alter the
20 agenda as it relates to the chairman's report?

21 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: I have a few
22 remarks to make on number seven and then would consider

1 a motion to table after that.

2 I think the motion on the floor is to approve
3 the agenda as submitted. Any more discussion?

4 (No response.)

5 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: All in favor?

6 (Chorus of ayes.)

7 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: The agenda is
10 approved.

11 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: The minutes from
12 the meeting of July 27, 2007 were sent out to people in
13 advance. Have you had a chance to look at them?

14 MS. CHILES: Yes.

15 M O T I O N

16 MR. FUENTES: I move approval.

17 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Mr. Fuentes moves
18 approval. Is there a second?

19 MR. GARTEN: Second.

20 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Mr. Garten
21 seconds. Is there any discussion?

22 (No response.)

1 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: All in favor of
2 approving the July 27th minutes, say aye.

3 (Chorus of ayes.)

4 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Opposed?

5 (No response.)

6 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: The minutes of
7 July 27th are approved as submitted.

8 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: We also have the
9 minutes of October 26th. Is there a motion to approve?

10 M O T I O N

11 MR. FUENTES: Move approval.

12 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you, Mr.
13 Fuentes. Is there a second?

14 MR. GARTEN: Second.

15 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you, Mr.
16 Garten. Any discussion?

17 (No response.)

18 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: All in favor of
19 approving the minutes of October 26th?

20 (Chorus of ayes.)

21 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Opposed?

22 (No response.)

1 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: The minutes of
2 October 26th are approved.

3 Now we come to our main activities of the day,
4 which are some discussions from our staff.

5 Ms. Sarjeant, are you going to introduce
6 people?

7 MS. SARJEANT: I am.

8 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Go ahead.

9 MS. SARJEANT: Thank you.

10 Good afternoon. My name is Karen Sarjeant. I
11 am the vice president of Programs and Compliance, Legal
12 Services Corporation.

13 This morning the Board heard presentations on
14 several LSC activities relating to technology and
15 Native American funding and delivery and veterans'
16 legal services.

17 This afternoon, our focus is going to shift to
18 several other activities, also a part of the LSC
19 quality initiative.

20 This committee has been very actively involved
21 in the development of several of these activities. We
22 are extremely pleased to present to you and have the

1 opportunity to share with you this panel.

2 You will hear from Guy Lescault, who is at my
3 far right, who is a program counsel in the Office of
4 Program Performance. He will update the committee on
5 activities that have been undertaken to implement the
6 private attorney involvement action plan - help close
7 the justice gap: unleash the power of pro bono.

8 Then we will have Monica Evans, program
9 counsel in Program Performance, who actually managed
10 the leadership mentoring pilot project, and Evora
11 Thomas, a program counsel in Program Performance, who
12 was a very active participant in helping to guide that
13 project. They will update you on the final report from
14 the leadership mentoring pilot project.

15 And then Bristow Hardin, who is a program
16 analyst in Program Performance, will update the
17 committee on the first year evaluation of our pilot
18 loan repayment assistance program.

19 They will each re-acquaint you with the
20 project they are talking about, and we will begin right
21 now with Guy.

22 MR. LESCAULT: Thank you, Karen, Madam Chair,

1 members of the committee. For the record, my name is
2 Guy Lescault, program counsel, Office of Program
3 Performance, talking today to update the committee on
4 the activities taken by staff in reference to the PAI
5 action plan adopted by this Board last January.

6 I'll refer you to the material. On page 60 of
7 your Board book, which is the letter issued, 07-2, on
8 guidance to LSC programs for the development of
9 enhanced PAI involvement. It is page 60 of the Board
10 book.

11 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: I think it is 54.

12 MR. LESCAULT: I think it is 60, where it
13 continues. That is why I wanted to refer you to page
14 60. From 60 on, is the letter.

15 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: That means we
16 should ignore the 54?

17 MR. LESCAULT: Yes, ma'am.

18 MS. BARNETT: I would take 54 out, and what
19 you have is -- just take 54 out. You have highlights.
20 It's a mistake on our part.

21 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: We have that on
22 49, I think.

1 MR. LESCAULT: What I'd like to do is share
2 with you the process employed by the staff, the
3 formatting, and then we refer to some specific content
4 in the letter.

5 The main focus of the staff was the issuance
6 of the letter. That was to provide guidance to the
7 field, to our grantees, on the suggested
8 recommendations and approaches that this committee
9 entertained in 2006.

10 It was felt that a program letter would be the
11 best vehicle for sharing with the field the
12 recommendations that were made to this committee, and
13 therefore, we wanted the field to understand how to use
14 the critical resources available by expanding
15 opportunities for private attorney involvement.

16 We applied the revised LSC performance
17 criteria as a source. The letter was intended, from
18 what has been laid out, as non-prescriptive, but to
19 share as many examples with the field of opportunities
20 that they may not have thought about before on which
21 they could enhance the use of private attorneys in the
22 delivery mechanism.

1 What we found was that the letter should be
2 structured in large part to follow the recommendations
3 made during your Board's undertaking in consideration
4 of these issues in 2006.

5 Therefore, the letter tracks the
6 recommendations received from the four categories of
7 potential volunteers or other sources of support,
8 primarily those were the large at law firms, corporate
9 and government attorneys.

10 The second category being the small firms,
11 solo practitioners, adjudicate attorneys, and the third
12 panel that you heard from were the law schools and law
13 students as a resource that we have opportunity to
14 expand and involve in our delivery mechanism.

15 We had another category because there were
16 overreaching concerns by those three panels for the
17 engagement of the judiciary, bar associations, and
18 access to justice entities.

19 Finally, every one of the panels in all
20 categories emphasized the need for recognition.

21 In each category, we sought to identify an
22 example used currently by an LSC grantee. Therefore,

1 we thought that the peer pressure of your grantee in
2 your neighboring state or within you state doing this,
3 it might be something for you to explore.

4 There are ten examples. The LSC staff
5 employed the two strategies identified in the action
6 plan. One, upon grantee visits, the staff applied the
7 indicators of effective private attorney involvement as
8 referenced in the LSC performance criteria to obtain
9 examples to share with other grantees, and we partnered
10 with other organizations and collaborated on ten
11 conferences, make presentations of PAI, and to learn
12 from grantees issues concerning effective PAI delivery.

13 Some of those sessions included the ABA Equal
14 Justice Conference in Denver last year. The Southeast
15 Project Director meeting in St. Petersburg, Florida.
16 The Mountain States meeting, and the NLADA Annual
17 Conference this November in Tucson.

18 As a result of employing both of these
19 strategies, LSC was able to address the issues raised
20 in these sessions and provide specific examples of
21 noteworthy practices currently used by LSC grantees and
22 referenced to the LSC on line resource library and

1 other resources for private attorney involvement.

2 The letter is formatted to track, as I said,
3 the recommendations made to this committee in 2006.
4 Specifically, if I could refer you to page 62, where
5 you will see under recommendations A using large law
6 firms, corporate and government attorneys, the record
7 shows that the panel said that there should be an
8 effort made by grantees for sustained relationships.

9 We found that the example, which we had
10 previously published this year in the LSC update,
11 Austin & Byrd, an Atlanta based law firm, had a period
12 of engagement with Atlanta Legal Aid using fellowships,
13 and has now expanded to their corporate client base
14 where UPS is sending in-house counsel to also serve as
15 fellows. That is a long term sustained building, and
16 we think that other programs can see that as an
17 example.

18 Similarly, we found in collaborating with our
19 partners as referenced on page 67 of the Board book,
20 that we could use government attorneys. It's a new
21 field in which the ABA has taken work, and we shared
22 with grantees in this letter a link to that site, as to

1 how you may use government attorneys as is being done
2 in Ohio with our legal services grantee in Columbus.

3 A whole area of private attorney resources
4 that heretofore have not been tapped into.

5 Specifically, as we heard from small firms,
6 I'll refer you to page 69, where we have a new source
7 of retired attorneys, another area which the ABA has
8 been engaged. Our program counsel, Stephanie
9 Edelstein, has participated on the commission that was
10 established by the ABA as to how to most effectively
11 use those attorneys, inactive attorneys.

12 We have referenced that in the Utah Legal
13 Services program, how they are presently using that
14 sector to expand their delivery base, and with the hope
15 that the Board's visit this Fall to Utah, that you will
16 have an opportunity to see that firsthand.

17 The law schools and law students as outlined
18 in section C and on page 72, we were pleased to learn
19 that the Legal Aid Society of Louisville has expanded
20 its volunteer assistance with the Brandeis School of
21 Law at the University of Louisville, where they have
22 committed to providing a faculty member to work with

1 the program this Summer on skills training of staff.

2 On page 73, the judiciary and the Bar, we have
3 a reference to assist us in English proficiency by
4 LAFLA, our grantee in Los Angeles Legal Aid
5 Foundation's engagement with the Asia Pacific Islander
6 Unit Bar to provide language assistance to that segment
7 of the community.

8 As I said earlier, overreaching under section
9 E, we highlighted the recognition that was being done
10 by just one of our grantees, one example of many, where
11 they have in Tampa a variety of sources in which to
12 highlight the pro bono engagement of their volunteer
13 attorneys.

14 All of the links provided in the letter are to
15 our reconfigured resource information. On line, we
16 have reconfigured the private attorney involvement and
17 have posted these as examples.

18 As a result of issuing the letter, you can
19 download an example and mock the applicable to your
20 particular service area, as well as contribute to us
21 examples that we not know of as to efforts you are
22 undertaking.

1 The program visits and I think a sense of
2 competitiveness will generate additional examples to be
3 shared on the LRI, which is a developing source of
4 continually being updated. We can use our LSC update
5 to tell the grantees of additional postings on PAI for
6 which they may want to refer.

7 Specifically, two examples of the significance
8 of the letter. I spoke with the program director in
9 St. Louis, a program that you all visited two years
10 ago, I think. They have a need for affirmative
11 training of skill level on the staff.

12 They saw the letter as providing guidance to
13 something they had not thought about, and have gone to
14 the major firms to help pull together volunteer
15 attorneys to train their staff on skill advocacy.

16 I spoke to the project director and new
17 director in Columbia, Missouri, who is setting up a
18 senior law clinic at the law school that had never been
19 done before with that program, and is looking to the
20 government attorneys from the State Capital Workforce
21 in Jefferson City.

22 I think we will see major results from the

1 issuance of the letter based on those two examples and
2 others that I have just suggested.

3 I am very pleased to report that as a result
4 of your Board resolution adopted in April, that we have
5 a resolution supporting enhanced PAI with LSC funded
6 programs and issued a model for our LSC funded grantees
7 to adopt similar resolutions tailored to their specific
8 areas.

9 Some of the states I represent include Maine,
10 Washington, New Mexico, all of those states where
11 geographically it is not limited to one area.

12 Sean reported today that we are now up to 74
13 programs, and every day, we get another Board
14 resolution.

15 This is very indicative of the support in the
16 field for taking the effort to expand resources. I was
17 informed by John Constance that he has shared this with
18 our Government Oversight Committee, as examples of our
19 stewardship of our grantees' boards and their efforts
20 to obtain additional resources.

21 The updates, as you may have seen, have been
22 consistently putting out the list, referring people,

1 and you can download all of the resolutions from the
2 LRI.

3 In furtherance of the adoption of the Board
4 resolution, the Legal Aid of Northwest Texas convened a
5 pro bono summit on December 14th, at which the program
6 officer, Stephanie Edelstein, delivered the luncheon
7 speech on PAI enhanced opportunities.

8 I think that may set an example for other
9 programs to follow, and we will look at that closely in
10 the coming year.

11 Other efforts internally as it relates to your
12 action plan for the staff, we are looking at the
13 revised competition re-funding applications to require
14 perhaps a separate PAI action plan addendum, which
15 would give us more information to share with our
16 grantees as well.

17 The revised CSR Handbook, which was sent
18 around to all the grantees, is now being implemented,
19 has a new chapter ten referring to PAI statistics.

20 We will hear, I hope, like we did in Maine,
21 from Herb about the ongoing work with the ABA in terms
22 of a national recognition.

1 The law school faculty sabbatical, we are
2 continuing to explore and see what would make the
3 nicest fit in terms of our ongoing efforts of PAI
4 enhancement.

5 I hope that touches upon most of the actions
6 that we took over the past year. We will be meeting to
7 plan further work on PAI enhancement, and I would be
8 glad to entertain any questions.

9 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Does anyone have
10 any questions?

11 (No response.)

12 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: I'd like to make a
13 comment, Guy. When I saw in the update that the
14 program letter was out, I was glad to see that, and I
15 went to the website and found it and sent it to our
16 Access to Justice Committee or working group that deals
17 with pro bono.

18 I thought it was a very helpful program
19 letter. To everyone who was involved in doing it, I
20 believe it will be quite useful to people working in
21 the Access to Justice community.

22 MR. LESCAULT: Thank you.

1 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you.

2 Anything else? Ms. Evans, Ms. Thomas, who is going
3 first?

4 MS. THOMAS: I'll go first.

5 MS. THOMAS: Monica and I would like to thank
6 the committee for this opportunity to appear before you
7 this afternoon. It's been approximately a year since
8 we last spoke to you at length about LSC's leadership
9 mentoring pilot program.

10 You may recall that in 2004, the Board
11 requested that LSC staff explore the efficacy of
12 leadership mentoring within the context of the legal
13 services community.

14 Our premise was that leadership mentoring
15 could favorably impact recruitment and retention of
16 talented individuals to the legal services community.

17 The pilot's goals were to promote the
18 deliberate cultivation of a diverse trained and highly
19 qualified core of leaders in the legal services
20 community and to demonstrate that a deliberate and
21 thoughtful approach to mentoring will be a benefit to
22 our programs and to the larger community.

1 A significant feature of the pilot program was
2 the matching of participants across program, state, and
3 regional borders.

4 There was value in having mentors and proteges
5 come from different programs. Mentors were able to be
6 objective and proteges were able to freely share
7 challenges they were facing.

8 In 2007, we reported to you at the conclusion
9 of the pilot program, and at that time, you heard from
10 actual participants in the pilot program about the
11 value and benefits of their experience.

12 As part of the pilot's design, LSC explored
13 the effectiveness of a range of strategies and decided
14 to use two popular mentoring models, group mentoring
15 and one on one mentoring.

16 The pilot design included three group training
17 sessions held in conjunction with national events
18 sponsored by our partner organizations, the National
19 Legal Aid and Defender Association or NLADA, and
20 Management Information Exchange, and we refer to them
21 as MIE.

22 The first session was held in November of 2005

1 in Orlando, Florida immediately prior to NLADA's annual
2 conference.

3 The second session took place in March of 2006
4 in San Antonio, Texas in conjunction with MIE's
5 biennial middle managers' training.

6 The final group session was held in Charlotte,
7 North Carolina in November 2006. Again, immediately
8 prior to NLADA's annual conference.

9 By combining our leadership mentoring sessions
10 with these national conferences, mentors and proteges
11 have the opportunity to participate in both.

12 A variety of subjects were presented to the
13 participants including active listening, team building,
14 financial management, board development, diversity, and
15 an array of additional topics.

16 One of the learning activities was the
17 development of a private attorney involvement plan
18 based on a fictitious fact pattern. This project
19 allowed the participants to become intimately familiar
20 with an important legal services component, as you just
21 heard.

22 The full report of LSC's leadership mentoring

1 pilot program, which was provided to you in the
2 materials for today's meeting, describes the things we
3 have learned from this experience, and we encourage you
4 to review it and provide staff with your thoughts and
5 feedback.

6 What did we learn from the pilot program?

7 First, formal leadership mentoring programs are seen as
8 necessary to develop diverse high quality leadership.

9 Participants and executive directors
10 considered formal leadership mentoring programs
11 important for two overriding reasons.

12 One, potentially and most effectively learn
13 and develop necessary leadership skills through
14 intentional structured programs, and two, mentoring is
15 an important component of these programs.

16 The second lesson is that proteges and mentors
17 learn that high quality leadership can enhance the
18 quality and effectiveness of the services that grantees
19 provide to their client communities.

20 The third lesson is that LSC core competencies
21 of leadership are a valuable articulation of essential
22 leadership skills. The core competencies or similar

1 skill standards would be an important component of
2 future mentoring activities.

3 Participants indicated that the core
4 competencies are best seen as a standard for developing
5 leadership skills.

6 The pilot program demonstrates that several
7 components ought to be present in whatever model is
8 used by a legal services program.

9 These include understanding the purpose and
10 values of the organization and its leadership mentoring
11 activities, ensuring leadership support, creating and
12 supporting a sound mentoring relationship, coordinating
13 and evaluating the mentoring activities.

14 For the pilot program, it was important to
15 define what leadership mentoring meant in the context
16 of the legal services program and legal services
17 delivery systems.

18 Leadership mentoring needs the open support of
19 program leadership to be successful. As with any new
20 undertaking, it is important to communicate the goals,
21 objectives and anticipated outcome of the leadership
22 mentoring activities, and to explain what these

1 activities are designed to address, as well as the
2 benefits to be derived by all.

3 Leadership mentoring should not happen in a
4 vacuum. It should reflect the work environment of the
5 participants and address defined needs of staff.

6 Depending on the size of the initiative, it
7 should be staffed by a coordinator or manager who is
8 responsible for overseeing and promoting the mentoring
9 activities.

10 Finally, leadership mentoring activities
11 should be evaluated at several stages to assure that
12 the original goals and objectives continue to be the
13 focal point and to make appropriate adjustments as
14 needed.

15 MS. EVANS: There are also several things LSC
16 learned about implementing a leadership mentoring
17 initiative.

18 First, mentoring activities should be
19 developed with the flexibility to allow suggestions and
20 modifications from participants.

21 Second, ground rules are necessary to clarify
22 shared expectations and provide the foundation for the

1 mentoring relationship.

2 Third, the duration of the mentoring
3 experience is critical. A minimum duration of 18
4 months was recommended by most participants in the
5 pilot program.

6 Fourth, an effective approach to developing
7 mentoring activities is to combine elements of
8 different mentoring models.

9 The best way to appreciate the value of this
10 experience is to assess it in light of comments
11 provided by pilot participants.

12 They have said I never saw myself as a leader
13 with vision, now I do. I never thought I wanted to be
14 an executive director, now I do. I was shy about
15 saying that in public, now I am not. It took me out of
16 my shell and made me feel comfortable thinking of
17 myself as a leader in the legal context. It was the
18 kick I needed to believe in myself.

19 Participating in the pilot program helped me
20 to recognize some of the weaknesses in my own
21 approaches to management and leadership, and so I
22 applaud LSC and the staff who worked so hard to bring

1 this project together, for providing skills and
2 guidance at a time when I needed them the most.

3 It stimulated me to promote a formal
4 mentorship program within my organization and to
5 promote it at a statewide level. I had never really
6 considered that before. The mentorship I had always
7 focused on lawyering skills, not leadership skills.

8 Beyond what participants have said, what they
9 have learned through their experience is being
10 demonstrated in their accomplishments as emerging
11 leaders.

12 For example, one protege noted that as a
13 result of her involvement in the pilot, she was
14 nominated to work on a statewide pro bono committee.

15 Another was appointed to chair her program's
16 diversity committee. Yet another protege noted that
17 the exposure and networking commensurate with her
18 involvement in the pilot positioned her to become a
19 member of a statewide technology committee.

20 One protege was elected to serve on the NLADA
21 Civil Policy Group, and one protege has become the
22 executive director of an LSC funded program.

1 As we explore next steps, LSC is reviewing the
2 following considerations that build on the pilot
3 program:

4 The development of leadership mentoring
5 workshop sessions at national conferences.

6 The dissemination of additional guidance on
7 leadership mentoring to LSC funded programs.

8 The development of a site visit protocol that
9 incorporates leadership mentoring into the review
10 process

11 The development of a workshop session at the
12 2008 LSC Executive Directors' meeting, and a discussion
13 with our pilot program partners, NLADA and MIE, about
14 our roles in developing a national pool of individuals
15 to serve as mentors.

16 Our staff will continue to build upon LSC's
17 role in promoting the value and importance of
18 leadership mentoring with our grantee programs and
19 throughout the legal services community.

20 We would just like to thank you for your
21 interest in leadership mentoring, and we will happily
22 entertain any questions at this time.

1 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Do we have any
2 questions?

3 (No response.)

4 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you very
5 much for your presentation and all your work on the
6 program.

7 Let's see. Do we have a PowerPoint?

8 MR. HARDIN: Given your enthusiasm this
9 morning for that PowerPoint, I thought that I would
10 dispense with it this afternoon and also relieve you of
11 the need to be reshuffling your positions. By all
12 means, however, if there is any great demand for it, I
13 shall turn it on, to meet your needs.

14 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Just to have the
15 light shine.

16 MR. HARDIN: I just want to meet your needs,
17 clearly.

18 MR. HARDIN: As you know, I'll be addressing
19 the LRAP. I'm here because the person who would be
20 here delivering it, Cynthia Schneider, the deputy
21 director of OPP, is recovering from back surgery.
22 Otherwise, she would be here. I'm pitch hitting for

1 her today.

2 As you recall, we established this project
3 because of the long documented issue of the degree to
4 which high loan school indebtedness basically prevents
5 huge numbers of grads from even considering public
6 interest work. It has been documented by a range of
7 studies.

8 It is especially problematic for legal aid,
9 which pays among interest groups the lowest salaries of
10 all of these groups.

11 We started this program. The first year of
12 operations began in fiscal year 2005. The major
13 findings, perhaps for some, were not surprising.

14 First of all, LRAP significantly improves the
15 ability of programs to both recruit and retain staff.

16 Secondly, despite LRAP assistance, many
17 attorneys are going to leave their programs even when
18 they are receiving the LRAP because of a range of
19 factors.

20 Third, many attorneys plan to leave their
21 programs when LRAP ends because of the financial
22 pressures they will then be under, they will increase.

1 Lastly, law school indebtedness is not
2 necessarily the major factor that limits or adversely
3 affects legal aid programs' recruitment and retention
4 capacities. It is perhaps salaries, low salaries, are
5 the bigger problem, but also there are a range of other
6 issues relating to job satisfaction and related issues.

7 In terms of our design, basically we had 24
8 participating programs. These were programs who had
9 attorney staff that would be eligible for an LRAP.
10 These were programs that had experienced major
11 challenges recruiting and retaining staff, and also
12 they were varied in terms of their sizes, geographic
13 area, funding levels, urban/rural service delivery, et
14 cetera.

15 In those programs we had 72 participating
16 attorneys. These attorneys were eligible for
17 forgivable annual loans up to \$5,000 a year for three
18 years, as part of the pilot.

19 Lastly, we used comparison group programs.
20 That is programs that also apply to participate in the
21 program but could not participate because we had
22 inadequate funding.

1 These programs to a significant degree had the
2 same characteristics as those that did participate,
3 problems recruiting and retaining staff, mix in terms
4 of funding levels, geographic orientation, et cetera.

5 I should note that the main data that we used
6 were surveys that we did of participating attorneys,
7 directors of the participating programs, directors of
8 the comparison group programs.

9 When we had the combination of two types of
10 participating attorneys, one of them were recruits.
11 These were individuals that accepted a job at a program
12 knowing that an LRAP could be available to them, not
13 that they would be guaranteed an LRAP, but that an LRAP
14 could be available to them.

15 Secondly were what we called retention
16 attorneys. These were attorneys that had been employed
17 at the program prior to the establishment, and had been
18 with the program for one, two or three years.

19 On the one hand, we had to limit it to those
20 attorney classes, as it were, because of limited
21 funding, but also by concentrating on those groups, we
22 got to focus on the period at which attorneys were most

1 at risk, or programs were most at risk of losing staff.

2 The main period we found or other studies have
3 found that attorney staff leave is in the period of two
4 to four years at a program.

5 As we had in our first year pool, we had 26
6 recruits and 46 retention attorneys.

7 In terms of the indebtedness of participants,
8 the level of their crushing debt levels was similar to
9 what has been found in all sorts of other studies.

10 Only seven percent of the participants had law
11 school indebtedness when they finished school of less
12 than \$50,000. This is only law school indebtedness.
13 This is not what they have from undergraduate school,
14 which in most cases was significant as well.

15 Nearly half of them had in the range of
16 \$50,000 to \$75,000. We had about 30 percent that had
17 debts over \$100,000.

18 Again, this is mirrored in a range of other
19 studies that have been conducted by ABA in the State of
20 Florida, in the State of Ohio and Illinois.

21 In terms of looking at the salaries, what I
22 would do is I would contrast -- these would be data

1 from the National Association of Law Placement. I
2 would contrast salaries for civil legal services
3 attorneys, public defenders, and private firms. These
4 would be private firms with attorneys, 25 to 50
5 attorneys, which is the same level of those programs
6 that participate in the pilot.

7 The starting salary for civil legal aid
8 attorneys was \$36,000. That for public defenders,
9 which in my experience and my knowledge are not known
10 for high salaries, but their median salary in that year
11 was over \$43,000, or 20 percent higher than the civil
12 legal aid attorneys.

13 Lastly, private firms, the starting salary in
14 that year, median starting salary, was \$85,000, or 136
15 percent higher than the civil legal aid attorney
16 starting salary.

17 These gaps increase over time. After five
18 years, attorneys with five years of experience, the
19 civil legal aid attorneys make a little over \$43,000.
20 Public defenders make close to \$55,000. Private
21 attorneys make close to \$107,000.

22 The increase goes from public defenders, at

1 starting salaries for public defenders, 20 percent
2 higher than their counterparts in legal aid. After
3 five years, 26 percent higher. In the private firms,
4 it starts from being a gap of 136 percent to after five
5 years, 147 percent.

6 Something that is not surprising given the
7 salary levels and the amount of debt is the length of
8 attorney's law school pay off periods. Of those
9 participating in the program, only 12 percent expected
10 to pay their loans off in less than ten years.

11 Almost 60 percent expected it would take them
12 at least 21 to 30 years. Another seven thought it
13 would take them over 30 years. There you have
14 two-thirds that it would take them at least 21 years to
15 pay off their loans.

16 Perhaps not surprising, in terms of the
17 concrete impact on attorneys, participating attorneys,
18 we asked them how does your law school debt affect your
19 current financial well being. How does it affect your
20 long term financial planning. How does it affect your
21 personal and family options, buying a home, saving for
22 your children's college, your retirement, having

1 children, marriage, forming a family.

2 With respect to the current financial well
3 being, 59 percent said their law school debt undermined
4 their current financial well being; two percent said it
5 had no impact; 78 percent said it significantly or very
6 significantly undermined long term financial planning.

7 Again, only two percent said it had no impact.
8 Two-thirds said it significantly or very significantly
9 adversely affected their family and personal options,
10 and only five percent said it did not have that impact.

11 The LRAP did improve recruitment. There are a
12 couple of different ways of showing that. First of
13 all, 60 percent of the recruit attorneys said the LRAP
14 significantly or very significantly led them to accept
15 a position at their program.

16 Look at it the other way, 63 percent, over
17 three-fifths of the comparison group directors, these
18 were directors where no staff had a pilot LRAP, they
19 said the absence of an LRAP, 63 percent, said the
20 absence of an LRAP significantly or very significantly
21 undermined their ability to hire staff.

22 With respect to the participating directors,

1 71 percent said the availability of the LRAP
2 significantly or very significantly improved their
3 ability to recruit staff.

4 Perhaps even more impressive, 64 percent said
5 the LRAP significantly or very significantly improved
6 the quality of their staff that they were able to
7 recruit.

8 Attorneys' comments, just like Monica
9 highlighted some of the impact of the mentoring project
10 by highlighting attorneys' comments, some of the ones
11 that were made, as one attorney said, I would not be
12 able to afford this job without the LRAP.

13 Another said the prospect of working for legal
14 services and to actually help people was a big
15 motivation to work here. However, if it weren't for
16 the LRAP, this would not be a feasible alternative.

17 Lastly, perhaps bottom line, one stated that
18 the LRAP was essential to make a salary offer into a
19 living wage.

20 Also, the LRAP substantially improved
21 retention. Two-thirds of the attorneys reported that
22 it significantly or very significantly increased the

1 likelihood they would remain with the program for three
2 years. Ninety-three percent of the participating
3 program directors said the LRAP improved significantly
4 or very significantly their ability to recruit staff.
5 The other seven percent didn't know what impact it had.

6 They all said that on an ongoing basis, it
7 would significantly improve their ability to recruit
8 staff.

9 Again, the comments from attorneys provides
10 sort of a compelling concrete perspective on the
11 impact. One said that the LRAP allowed him to eat and
12 pay rent. Another one said they could now pay their
13 mortgage and utilities without using their 401(k).
14 Another one said it made it possible for me to keep my
15 job for now.

16 Another way of looking at the success of the
17 project is to look at the attrition rates, the rates of
18 attrition during the program year.

19 None of the 72 attorneys voluntarily left the
20 program during the program year. Two, however, did
21 leave involuntarily from the programs. They were
22 terminated where they failed to pass the Bar in a

1 timely fashion.

2 In contrast, at the participating programs,
3 they lost over 50 attorneys in the program year that
4 were not receiving the LRAP. None of the participating
5 attorneys left, but significant numbers that were not
6 receiving LRAP left.

7 Another way of looking at in terms of the
8 attrition is that 11 attorneys did, one could say, drop
9 out of the program after the first year, which means
10 they declined to accept a second year LRAP.

11 The reasons they dropped out provides, I
12 think, an important perspective on the retention
13 problems that programs face and why it is not just
14 about an LRAP, per se.

15 One left the program to have a baby. Another
16 one left because grant support for their position
17 ended. Four left because of the combination of
18 financial pressure as well as insufficient job
19 satisfaction. The latter was more important to them.
20 Four left because they were considering leaving the
21 programs because they didn't want to be in the position
22 of having to repay the loan if they did leave the

1 program.

2 As I mentioned earlier, many of the
3 participants expect they will be forced to leave the
4 program when their LRAP assistance ends.

5 One of the things I should highlight is that
6 in this pilot and from other studies that have been
7 conducted, it shows that the legal services community
8 does confront a significant, perhaps an impending
9 exodus of quality attorneys.

10 For example, NLADA did a national survey which
11 found that 40 percent of attorneys they surveyed
12 expected to leave their current employment within the
13 next three years.

14 A study in the State of Illinois said that 42
15 percent intended to leave within the next three years.

16 In Florida, 56 percent expected to leave
17 within five years. Considerable numbers of those in
18 the LSC pilot had said they had considered leaving
19 within the next three years.

20 As I said, perhaps the most important things
21 are the low salaries, because it's the low salaries
22 that make loan burdens so untenable. If legal aid

1 attorneys made as much as public defenders, for
2 example, the gap between the legal aid attorney salary
3 and the public defender salary, that would more than
4 pay for the average loan payment which participants in
5 our programs had to pay.

6 In relative terms, you can see how the
7 financial pressures can force our staff out of legal
8 aid programs into other areas, even of public interest
9 work.

10 Also, job satisfaction is a factor, which I
11 mentioned. That relates to challenging work, the
12 degree to which people perceive quality management,
13 important for what Monica and Evora talked about, the
14 availability of mentoring, professional development and
15 advancement opportunities, also supervisory and
16 administrative support, and also job stress and burn
17 out, which are very important factors.

18 All of this is talking to people that did the
19 Florida study and sponsored the Florida study. They
20 said job satisfaction issues may not have been so
21 significant if people made more money. These things
22 are very much interrelated.

1 Lastly, of course, there are factors beyond
2 programs' control, and that is that in order to serve
3 people around the country, in order to serve a client
4 population, programs have to have offices in
5 geographically isolated areas, and a lot of people
6 aren't necessarily enthralled with living there after a
7 while. They end up leaving for family reasons or other
8 reasons.

9 Also, people who make personal decisions about
10 their professional lives or their family lives that
11 lead them to leave legal services.

12 Lastly, the key lessons, we have found indeed
13 it dis-enhances recruitment and retention. I mentioned
14 the low salaries and the need for us to focus on
15 working with programs to enhance necessary job
16 satisfaction and fulfillment.

17 I'd be glad to take any of your questions.

18 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Do we have any
19 questions?

20 MS. PHILLIPS: I don't have any questions. I
21 just wanted to say hello to everyone.

22 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Hello, Bernice.

1 We are glad you could join us.

2 MR. MEITES: Sarah, I have a question.

3 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Okay, Tom. Why
4 don't you go ahead and then I'll pick up the people in
5 the room.

6 MR. MEITES: My question may not be directed
7 solely to the presenter, perhaps John Constance may
8 also be able to help us.

9 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: I'm not sure John
10 is here. Oh, there he is. I see him.

11 MR. CONSTANCE: The impact of the new
12 legislation?

13 MR. MEITES: Yes. If the proposed education
14 bill passes, what impact will that have on the picture
15 that the presenter just gave and what role would we see
16 LSC having in the future if the legislation passes?

17 MR. CONSTANCE: That second portion, Tom, this
18 is John Constance responding, that second portion is
19 for others to decide. I can just give you my
20 perspective on how this will proceed from the
21 standpoint of the budget cycle and timing.

22 The expectation would be that within the next

1 month or so, I believe the Higher Education Act
2 re-authorization will be up on the House Floor. It has
3 passed the Senate. Chairman Miller of the House
4 Committee has indicated that they feel they are going
5 to move rather quickly on it. He has also accepted the
6 Harkin Amendment regarding LRAP in terms of the House
7 bill.

8 I think the reason that many people feel that
9 it will be somewhat full speed ahead as far as funding
10 is that as you probably know, Senator Harkin is also
11 the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that
12 funds the Department of Education, and LRAP, the
13 proposed LRAP program will be administered by the
14 Department of Education.

15 On the House side, Congressman Obey, is not
16 only the chair of the full Appropriations Committee,
17 but also the chair of the Education Subcommittee there.

18 I think that probably the path is pretty clear
19 for funding. That being said, when something like this
20 is passed, a couple of things have to happen.

21 One, the Department of Education is going to
22 have to do regulations to implement it. They are going

1 to have to make application for funding up to the \$10
2 million limit.

3 The timing of that, again, it won't be
4 immediate, and I think an expectation that there is
5 going to be kind of an immediate pick up of this
6 program is probably not going to be the case, whether
7 it would be 2009 or 2010, by the time all that happens,
8 remains to be seen.

9 That's just my perspective at least on the
10 timing part of it.

11 MR. HARDIN: I could address, sir, your
12 question about the possible impact --

13 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Can people on the
14 phone hear okay?

15 MR. MEITES: Yes.

16 MR. HARDIN: That is \$10 million relative to
17 all the people in the country who might qualify for
18 this, it will be significant but it will still leave
19 many, many people with very high debt burdens, and with
20 the combination of low salaries, they will still need
21 additional assistance, even though it should not be
22 gainsaid how important and valuable that legislation

1 will be and that assistance will be.

2 Secondly, as you probably know, the
3 legislation enacted this year the College Cost
4 Reduction Act that was signed in September. It does
5 provide provisions that can provide significant
6 assistance to low income or lower paid high debted
7 borrowers, as well as there is some specific provisions
8 for public service workers.

9 Again, however, the extent to which it will
10 ultimately benefit is going to be contingent upon in
11 many ways how much of it can address the overwhelming
12 debt burden carried by many of our attorneys.

13 It undoubtedly, however, will be of value.

14 MR. MEITES: Let me just ask a follow
15 question, if I may. The legislation that is already
16 passed, do they have to go through the same process
17 that John described, with regulations and then request
18 for appropriations?

19 MR. HARDIN: No, sir. That's self funding.
20 The way they fund it is as part of a reform of
21 educational lending policy, so the way that is funded
22 is through they reduce the subsidies for the lenders.

1 Reduction in subsidies for the lenders is what is being
2 provided to support the reduced loan payments and
3 possible loan forgiveness for borrowers.

4 If they stay in public service for ten years,
5 the amount they have after that period can be forgiven
6 in they make appropriate payments in the interim.

7 MR. MEITES: Thank you.

8 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Frank, do you
9 still have a question?

10 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: You mentioned the gap
11 between let's say a typical legal aid lawyer or maybe
12 even a beginning legal aid lawyer and a beginning
13 public defender, what is that gap? Can you state that
14 in dollars?

15 MR. HARDIN: Yes, sir. In the beginning of
16 2007, January 2007, I believe that was about \$7,000.

17 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: The legal aid lawyer
18 would be what, \$35,000?

19 MR. HARDIN: \$36,000 and the public defender
20 was \$43,300; yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: With regard to our own
22 LRAP pilot project, as I read the material, it is a

1 grant of up to \$5,000, not necessarily always \$5,000.

2 It is for three years. What then?

3 MR. HARDIN: Two things, in answer to your
4 second question, what then. I can't answer that. It
5 depends upon funding availability. You do know we did
6 get an additional \$500,000 in this year's
7 appropriation. How that will be spent is a management
8 decision that I don't know has been made.

9 Secondly, to go back to your first question,
10 in terms of the --

11 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: I'm not sure I remember
12 the sequence either. I was talking about if a person
13 participates, let's say max's out --

14 MR. HARDIN: I recall. The first year, what
15 we had is because of the timing of the implementation
16 of the program as well as we counted other LRAPs, if
17 people received another LRAP, we reduced the LRAP
18 amount that they received through our pilot LRAP.

19 In the second year, since everybody was in
20 their programs for the full year, they didn't get the
21 small reduction that they would have gotten in the
22 first year, plus also we found from other LRAPs that

1 are run by other entities, they don't reduce the LRAP
2 they provide if someone else receives another LRAP.

3 We made those changes to be consistent with
4 those other programs, which now means that the
5 attorneys in the second year of the program all receive
6 the \$5,000 payment.

7 Again, that wasn't enough for many people.
8 They still have a large debt burden.

9 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: I thought that was
10 your point, the \$5,000 doesn't seem very much if you
11 owe \$100,000. What do you do after you have used up
12 your three years?

13 MR. HARDIN: That's part of the reason the
14 people, as I talked about, expect to leave perhaps at
15 the end of that period. They expect to leave their
16 programs.

17 Also, what they did say is that in order to
18 have a significant amount of people say that an LRAP
19 would help them today, they said they would have to
20 have an LRAP in excess of \$7,000.

21 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: Not only just for three
22 years.

1 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: They need more
2 than \$7,000 a year. I was just clarifying what he was
3 saying.

4 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: Right, and they need it
5 for more than three years, otherwise if they have a
6 \$75,000 debt load and if we retain them say for three
7 years using LRAP and then it cuts off, they are
8 probably going to bail out and go somewhere else and
9 try to make more money in order to meet that debt load.

10 MR. HARDIN: Precisely.

11 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: It seems to me the LRAP
12 program needs to have a longer shelf life in order to
13 be of real benefit to a legal aid lawyer, somebody who
14 is serious about being a long term legal aid lawyer.

15 MR. HARDIN: I can't disagree, sir.

16 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Are there any
17 other questions?

18 MR. GARTEN: I just want to point out this is
19 a pilot program.

20 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: Right, so we don't know
21 necessarily where it might lead.

22 MR. GARTEN: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN STRICKLAND: It's certainly better
2 than nothing, but it seems to me it warrants further
3 study. I don't think we can resolve that today. You
4 have certainly illustrated the point very clearly.

5 MR. HARDIN: Yes, sir.

6 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: What I found
7 interesting was where you were able to compare the loan
8 repayment assistance programs with the non-loan
9 repayment assistance programs and even other areas, how
10 often do lawyers who go with a private firm leave after
11 three years or after five years, despite the salary.

12 MR. HARDIN: Yes. We have that data. We just
13 didn't put that in here. Turnover in legal aid in some
14 ways, they leave for different reasons in different
15 firms, different types of employment.

16 MR. FUENTES: Sarah?

17 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Yes, Mr. Fuentes.

18 MR. FUENTES: In the development of our LRAP
19 program, was there ever a time when an element was
20 considered, a rule or regulation, ROTC type commitment,
21 that if one receives it, then you serve, you make an
22 agreement to serve for longer?

1 MR. HARDIN: Yes. People made a three year
2 moral commitment, a moral commitment to stay with the
3 program for the three years in which they were
4 receiving the LRAP.

5 It wasn't a legally binding contract, however.

6 MR. FUENTES: That's while you are receiving
7 the LRAP or having received the LRAP for three years,
8 you are going to serve --

9 MR. HARDIN: The former, while you are
10 receiving it, not after you received it.

11 MR. FUENTES: Was there ever an element or
12 program or policy as part of this that you would serve
13 beyond the time that you are receiving the check, or in
14 the other LRAP programs that you have looked at, do any
15 of them have commitments to further service for having
16 received this?

17 MR. HARDIN: To my knowledge, the other
18 programs do not have that provision. I could ask
19 Helaine if she remembers in terms of when we formulated
20 the program the degree to which we had discussions
21 about requiring people to stay after.

22 MS. BARNETT: No, we did not. The requirement

1 was to stay for the three years for which we were
2 funding, and if they did not stay and left --

3 MS. PHILLIPS: I'm sorry. I can't hear who is
4 speaking.

5 MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Bernice. It's
6 Helaine. I'm responding to Tom Fuentes' question that
7 in the formulation of the pilot, we did not require the
8 participants to stay in the program beyond the time
9 that we provided the loan repayment assistance.

10 MR. FUENTES: I must say when this first came
11 to the Board, I was under the impression that this had
12 sort of, for lack of a better term, a ROTC nature to
13 it, that you received this assistance with the idea
14 that you were going to be around subsequent to that
15 assistance.

16 I'm surprised today to come to realize that is
17 not the case.

18 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: I do think some
19 programs have that. I think our state program has an
20 element of that. You get so much money and you have to
21 serve two years, and if you don't, you have to repay a
22 portion of the money.

1 MR. HARDIN: Not to make a fine point, I think
2 the loan is to cover those two years. No? They just
3 get the flat loan? Okay.

4 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: That's my
5 understanding.

6 MR. HARDIN: We looked at the major programs.

7 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Ours is not major,
8 I'm sure.

9 MR. HARDIN: Forgive me for not being aware of
10 that.

11 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Are there any
12 other questions or comments?

13 (No response.)

14 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you very
15 much. Even without PowerPoint, it was very
16 interesting.

17 MR. HARDIN: You're very kind.

18 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: We are now up to
19 item seven. As was mentioned when we first started,
20 Tom and Bernice, I'll bring you up to date, number
21 seven is the chairman's update on the Provisions
22 Committee's agenda for 2008.

1 Since David Hall was unable to be here due to
2 illness on the part of his daughter, we are just going
3 to very briefly mention a couple of things we would
4 like to hear about during the April meeting.

5 One of which is I think we asked that the
6 technology plan for the programs be brought back to us
7 for consideration after programs have been heard from.
8 Also, we wanted to have some more information on the
9 Native American program issues, but apart from that, I
10 believe we should table this agenda item so that David
11 can lead the discussion on it, because I know he wants
12 to be involved in it.

13 M O T I O N

14 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Do I hear a motion
15 to table?

16 MR. FUENTES: So moved.

17 MR. GARTEN: Second.

18 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you, Mr.
19 Fuentes for the motion and Mr. Garten for the second.

20 All in favor, say aye.

21 (Chorus of ayes.)

22 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Opposed?

1 (No response.)

2 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Item seven is
3 tabled.

4 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Do we have any
5 public comment for the Provisions Committee?

6 (No response.)

7 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: There appearing to
8 be no overwhelming crowd approaching the table, we will
9 go on to consider and act on other business.

10 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Is there other
11 business?

12 (No response.)

13 M O T I O N

14 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: No. Would
15 someone like to move that we adjourn?

16 MR. FUENTES: So moved.

17 MR. GARTEN: Second.

18 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you, Mr.
19 Fuentes. Thank you, Mr. Garten.

20 All in favor of adjourning?

21 (Chorus of ayes.)

22 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Opposed?

1 (No response.)

2 ACTING CHAIRMAN SINGLETON: Thank you all. We
3 are now 20 minutes ahead of schedule.

4 (Whereupon, at 2:12 p.m., the meeting was
5 adjourned.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22