

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SUNSHINE ACT MEETING

OPEN SESSION

May 23, 2002

2:00 p.m.

Room 11026
750 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Doug Eakeley, Chair
Hulett H. Askew
Edna Fairbanks-Williams
F. Bill McCalpin
Nancy H. Rogers
Ernestine P. Watlington
John Erlenborn

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT:

Victor Fortuno, Vice President for Legal Affairs,
General Counsel and Corporate Secretary
Laurie Tarantowicz, Assistant Inspector General and
Legal Counsel
Dawn Browning, Assistant General Counsel
David Richardson, Acting Vice President for
Administration, Treasurer and Comptroller
Randi Youells, Vice President for Programs

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
Approval of the agenda	3
Consider and act on Board of Directors' Semiannual Report to Congress for the period of October 1, 2001 through March 21, 2002	3
Consider and act on other business	25
Public comment	25

MOTIONS: 3, 25, 27

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2 CHAIR EAKELEY: The first item of business is
3 approval of the agenda, which is all of three items: consider
4 and act on the board of directors' semi-annual report,
5 consider and act on other business, and public comments.
6 M O T I O N
7 MS. WATLINGTON: So moved.
8 MR. McCALPIN: Move approval.
9 CHAIR EAKELEY: All those in favor?
10 (Chorus of ayes.)
11 CHAIR EAKELEY: The agenda is approved.
12 Now, everyone should have received a copy of the
13 semi-annual, the draft semi-annual report to the Congress.
14 MR. FORTUNO: You should have both.
15 CHAIR EAKELEY: Why don't we just take it page by
16 page and go through and see what suggestions people might
17 have for edits.
18 Foreword, any changes there?
19 MR. McCALPIN: Where are you?
20 CHAIR EAKELEY: I'm on the foreword, and then the
21 table of contents, then I get to the message.
22 MR. FORTUNO: Doug, I understand that LaVeeda is
23 expected to join us. Maria Louisa and Tom Smegal were not
24 sure whether they would be able to or not.
25 CHAIR EAKELEY: Okay. Well, we will pick up
26 LaVeeda's comments when she comes on.
27 Any changes to the -- we have made the message a
28 lot shorter this time but it's there, our regular message.
29 Any suggested changes?
30 MR. ASKEW: Let me ask a question.
31 On the beginning of the third paragraph, where it
32 starts with "LSC may continue progress," the second sentence
33 begins "Over the past six months LSC implemented structural
34 changes in four states." In various parts of the report we
35 refer to state planning and say things like we implemented,
36 or we initiated, or we carried out, or whatever, and I'm
37 wondering if that's really the right phraseology. Should we
38 say we facilitated structural changes or something along
39 those lines? Because it's really those states that decided
40 to make the change.
41 MR. McCALPIN: We may have approved, we may have
42 approved them.
43 MR. ASKEW: I am just looking for a different word
44 that better describes our role.
45 CHAIR EAKELEY: How about "approved"?
46 MR. FORTUNO: Randi?
47 MS. YOUELLS: That would be great.
48 MR. FORTUNO: Approved?
49 MS. YOUELLS: Approved is fine.

1 MR. ASKEW: And make that throughout the thing with
2 that.
3 CHAIR EAKELEY: That is good.
4 MR. FORTUNO: Well, was it anything more active
5 than approval, Randi? Was there a kind of a facilitation?
6 MS. YOUELLS: It was facilitated there and
7 approved. In three states we approved their plan and one we
8 did not. So maybe facilitated would be more accurate.
9 CHAIR EAKELEY: Bill, will you go with that?
10 MR. McCALPIN: Oh, yes, sure.
11 MR. ERLNBORN: Let me just ask, who actually has
12 the authority to establish the service areas?
13 MS. YOUELLS: LSC.
14 MR. ERLNBORN: Yes, that's why I think just
15 facilitated doesn't really fit, because we are the ones who
16 make the final decision.
17 CHAIR EAKELEY: Well, I could go back to
18 "approved," because what's wrong with approving our own
19 initiated changes?
20 MR. ASKEW: I think that's --
21 CHAIR EAKELEY: How about facilitated and approved?
22 MS. YOUELLS: Yes, I think, to both words.
23 CHAIR EAKELEY: Okay.
24 MR. ERLNBORN: It doesn't matter.
25 CHAIR EAKELEY: I will take it, facilitated and
26 approved. So facilitated and/or approved?
27 MR. FORTUNO: Well, this is just a thought, a kind
28 of a passing comment that we are -- that the message of the
29 board, the first paragraph, it is the third line. I guess
30 the sentence is, "During the reporting period LSC President
31 John Erlenborn received a letter requesting that he appear
32 before the House Judiciary Commercial and Administrative Law
33 Subcommittee currently chaired by," I don't know that you
34 need the "currently." I might just have "chaired by."
35 CHAIR EAKELEY: Agreed.
36 MR. ERLNBORN: I think we probably liked the
37 implication there, but it is not wise.
38 MS. WATLINGTON: We are moving "currently"?
39 CHAIR EAKELEY: We are taking "currently" out.
40 MR. McCALPIN: Would it be more appropriate to name
41 the full committee and then the subcommittee?
42 MS. BATTLE: Hello, everyone.
43 CHAIR EAKELEY: Hello, LaVeeda.
44 MS. BATTLE: Hi.
45 CHAIR EAKELEY: We are on the first paragraph of
46 the message in the SAR.
47 MS. BATTLE: Okay.
48 MR. ERLNBORN: I think you are right, Doug. It
49 would probably read, "The House Judiciary Committee's

1 Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee," because not
2 using the possessive, the full committee is the House
3 Judiciary Committee.

4 CHAIR EAKELEY: Right. Yes.
5 Okay. Anything else on that first paragraph, or
6 second or third?
7 LaVeeda, we have changed in the third paragraph,
8 second sentence, "LSC implemented structural changes" to
9 "facilitated and approved structural changes."

10 MS. BATTLE: Okay.
11 CHAIR EAKELEY: And we took out the word
12 "currently" in the first sentence of the first paragraph.
13 MS. BATTLE: Okay.
14 CHAIR EAKELEY: How about the --
15 MS. BATTLE: Facilitated and approved?
16 CHAIR EAKELEY: Right.
17 MS. BATTLE: Okay. All right.
18 CHAIR EAKELEY: Anything else on this first page or
19 the turn of the page?
20 MS. WATLINGTON: This is Ernestine. This is not on
21 that. I heard you say LaVeeda and the others, but no one has
22 said about why Edna isn't here.
23 MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: I'm here.
24 CHAIR EAKELEY: Edna is here.
25 MS. WATLINGTON: Oh, okay. I didn't hear you.
26 MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Oh, yes, I got signed on first
27 because I wasn't sure about my clock.
28 MS. WATLINGTON: Okay. I didn't hear your name.
29 They just said it when everybody was here.
30 MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: Okay.
31 MS. WATLINGTON: All right.
32 MR. ERLNBORN: That's because she was waiting for
33 you.
34 MS. WATLINGTON: Okay. I was making sure. Okay.
35 CHAIR EAKELEY: Any other changes on the message of
36 the board of directors?
37 MR. ASKEW: I am wondering, in the fourth
38 paragraph, and Randi, this is for you, where we talk about
39 the range of technological assistance, grantees, whether we
40 should mention the grant, just put a parenthetical reference
41 to the technology grant in there, because this doesn't --
42 MS. YOUELLS: Sure. Sure. That makes sense.
43 MR. ASKEW: -- that we gave money to.
44 MS. YOUELLS: Right, and we did.
45 CHAIR EAKELEY: So range of technological
46 assistance and grants.
47 MS. YOUELLS: Yes.
48 MS. BATTLE: It says broad range of -- including
49 grants, I guess, would be a good way to put it, because I'm

1 assuming we've done it in other ways as well.
2 MS. YOUELLS: Yes.
3 MS. BATTLE: Okay.
4 CHAIR EAKELEY: Okay, including grants, and then
5 commas. Next suggestion?
6 MR. ERLNBORN: Doug, a question. Are you going to
7 leave the two grantees in there, grants to grantees? It just
8 sounds a little awkward.
9 MS. BROWNING: You could change it to recipients or
10 programs, since we use them interchangeably, if that's
11 helpful.
12 MR. ERLNBORN: Did everyone hear that, what Dawn
13 was suggesting? Dawn?
14 MS. BROWNING: We could change it to recipients or
15 programs since we have used the three words interchangeably.
16
17 MR. ERLNBORN: Yes.
18 CHAIR EAKELEY: Yes, let's do programs. Okay.
19 Next paragraph. Hearing no suggestions, we are
20 really into -- well, the next page is background. No
21 changes?
22 Then management initiatives, page 4.
23 MR. ASKEW: In the last full line of the second
24 paragraph, my secretary, and I frequently refer to her long
25 departed grandmother for matters of grammar, but we think
26 that a range of services is singular, not plural. "A full
27 range is available." It is range with --
28 CHAIR EAKELEY: Right, understood. What paragraph,
29 Phil?
30 MR. ASKEW: The second paragraph.
31 MS. ROGERS: That's the third paragraph under state
32 planning.
33 MR. ASKEW: Yes.
34 CHAIR EAKELEY: "Is available."
35 MR. ASKEW: I think that the subject is range and
36 not --
37 MS. BATTLE: Services, you're correct.
38 MR. ASKEW: Then I would suggest that in the next
39 paragraph it might make more sense to reverse the sequence of
40 the last two sentences that talk about "the reduction from
41 262 to 170 and then consolidation enables it." In other
42 words put the consolidation first and then say what it does,
43 instead of the other way around.
44 MR. ERLNBORN: No objection.
45 CHAIR EAKELEY: No objection.
46 Dawn, holler when you either disagree or aren't
47 getting all of this.
48 MS. BROWNING: Okay.
49 CHAIR EAKELEY: Anything else under state planning?

1 MR. McCALPIN: No.
2 CHAIR EAKELEY: And competition?
3 MR. McCALPIN: I think -- what is my understanding
4 of the situation, I believe it is misleading to say at the
5 end of the first paragraph "LSC awarded grants to 107
6 competitors." I thought in a whole bunch of those there was
7 no competition.
8 CHAIR EAKELEY: How about applicants?
9 MR. McCALPIN: That's better, but I don't think
10 there were 107 competitors.
11 MS. WATLINGTON: It's applicants, right?
12 MR. McCALPIN: Yes.
13 MS. BATTLE: Or programs, actually.
14 MR. McCALPIN: Programs, whatever, but I think this
15 -- the way it's stated here conveys the idea that these were
16 all in competition.
17 CHAIR EAKELEY: That is a good point, Bill.
18 MR. FORTUNO: So what would you like to substitute
19 for "competitors"? Programs, applicants, or --
20 MR. McCALPIN: Either one, it doesn't make any
21 difference.
22 CHAIR EAKELEY: Well, it is still --
23 MR. McCALPIN: No, it is not the -- well, that's
24 not the full sum of applicants. It's all of them, I guess.
25 CHAIR EAKELEY: No, it is how many got grants.
26 MR. McCALPIN: Yes.
27 MR. FORTUNO: Randi, if we use "applicants," would
28 that be correct?
29 MS. YOUELLS: That would be correct.
30 MR. FORTUNO: Okay. So applicants it is, then?
31 CHAIR EAKELEY: Okay.
32 MR. RICHARDSON: Why don't you just say 107 grants?
33 MR. McCALPIN: They awarded 107 grants, you could
34 say that.
35 MR. FORTUNO: Would that be right, Randi? Didn't -
36 -
37 MS. YOUELLS: I am more comfortable with applicants
38 just because it conveys that we are putting people through an
39 applicant process, and not all of them were successful.
40 MR. FORTUNO: Did any applicants get more than one
41 grant?
42 MS. YOUELLS: Yes.
43 MR. FORTUNO: In which case we are better off
44 saying 107 applicants.
45 CHAIR EAKELEY: Let's go with 107 applicants, I
46 think.
47 Anything else on the discussion of competition?
48 How about technology efforts, pages 6 and 7?
49 All right, then I am up to program visits on page

1 7.
2 MR. ASKEW: I've got a suggestion. The second line
3 of that says, "We uncover innovative procedures."
4 CHAIR EAKELEY: Yes, right. Yes.
5 MR. ASKEW: I think it should be "analyze
6 innovative procedures," which makes --
7 MS. BROWNING: I'm sorry, could you repeat where
8 that is?
9 MR. ASKEW: Yes. Under program visits, the second
10 line.
11 CHAIR EAKELEY: How about evaluate?
12 MR. ASKEW: Or evaluate innovative procedures, yes.
13 MR. McCALPIN: That's probably even better.
14 MR. ASKEW: Doug, am I ahead of Mr. McCalpin here
15 with my comments?
16 CHAIR EAKELEY: No, you are really pushing your
17 luck.
18 MR. McCALPIN: Well, I really don't have -- I'm
19 going to have a broad one when we get finished.
20 MR. ASKEW: Uh-oh.
21 MR. McCALPIN: It's a warning.
22 MR. ASKEW: Right.
23 CHAIR EAKELEY: How about client-centered
24 initiative?
25 Research initiative?
26 Diversity initiative?
27 Characteristics of model intake systems?
28 Collection of data on matters, programs handled?
29 MR. ERLNBORN: That's an awkward --
30 CHAIR EAKELEY: Yes, maybe put in -- throw in a
31 "that."
32 MR. ERLNBORN: I don't get the sense right away,
33 reading that line.
34 CHAIR EAKELEY: Should it be "collection of data on
35 matters that programs handle?"
36 MR. McCALPIN: Where are you, Doug?
37 CHAIR EAKELEY: Page 9.
38 MR. McCALPIN: Huh?
39 CHAIR EAKELEY: Page 9.
40 MR. ERLNBORN: I guess it would be easier for me
41 to understand, for one, if you put in "that programs handle."
42 I guess that --
43 CHAIR EAKELEY: Yes, that's what -- I agree.
44 MR. ERLNBORN: It puts it in a different, a little
45 different content.
46 CHAIR EAKELEY: I would put "collection" in the
47 singular.
48 MR. ASKEW: Yes.
49 MR. McCALPIN: Why are you --

1 CHAIR EAKELEY: It's the heading, Bill, collections
2 of data on matters, programs handled.
3 MR. McCALPIN: Oh, yes, collection, yes.
4 CHAIR EAKELEY: On matters, and then we have
5 inserted "that programs handle."
6 MR. McCALPIN: Yes. Okay.
7 CHAIR EAKELEY: Equal Justice magazine?
8 MR. ASKEW: Yes. I think on the fourth line that
9 the "with" should be changed to "of." "Compelling interviews
10 of some of Washington's top newspapers."
11 MR. McCALPIN: I think "with," "interview with." I
12 won't argue with you, but I don't think it's improper.
13 MR. ASKEW: Well, I won't call for a vote then.
14 CHAIR EAKELEY: I think just to reduce the
15 redundancy of two "withs" in the same sentence we might want
16 to say "with compelling interviews of some." How would that
17 be?
18 MR. McCALPIN: Okay.
19 CHAIR EAKELEY: Not that you are incorrect, but it
20 just mixes it up a little bit, or is it your secretary's
21 grandmother?
22 MR. McCALPIN: You would be surprised how often we
23 refer to her.
24 CHAIR EAKELEY: Performance measures to evaluate
25 Justice committees?
26 Role-making activities?
27 Litigation report?
28 MR. McCALPIN: Update.
29 CHAIR EAKELEY: Litigation update, right, sorry.
30 Response to OIG program integrity audit?
31 Any changes to the tables?
32 MS. BATTLE: Do we normally put the litigation
33 update in our report to Congress?
34 MR. FORTUNO: No, but in this case because there is
35 interest in -- there has been so much interest in our
36 vigorously defending challenges to the restrictions and
37 faithfully implementing the restrictions, it was thrown in,
38 frankly, almost as an afterthought.
39 But in response to your question, no, that's not
40 something that typically appears in there and need not. That
41 was just, as I said, kind of an add-on just because there
42 seemed to be so much interest in it.
43 MR. McCALPIN: Let me say at this point, my general
44 comment was that it seemed to me that our general comments
45 were more extensive in this response than has been the case.
46 I haven't gone back and looked at all of them, but it just
47 seemed to me -- I went back and looked at the IG Act and it
48 seemed to me that the concept of that act was that we were
49 supposed to be responding to the IG's report.

1 Now, it does say that we can add any comments such
2 as -- determined appropriate. So I'm okay to do it, but it
3 does seem to me that this is much more a message to the
4 Congress than has been typically the case in our conveyance
5 of the IG report.

6 CHAIR EAKELEY: That is correct, Bill, but I think
7 we did that consciously and seized upon this as an
8 opportunity to communicate more to the Congress about what
9 we're doing than we otherwise would do at the appropriations
10 time.

11 MR. McCALPIN: I don't mean to suggest it is
12 inappropriate, and I think that the language of the IG Act,
13 Section 5(b), is broad enough to permit it, but I just wonder
14 how far we want to go and all. But, you know, we're so late
15 in the day that it doesn't make a lot of difference.

16 CHAIR EAKELEY: I think this makes sense as a part
17 of our communication strategy.

18 MS. BATTLE: The only concern I have about
19 communicating too much is setting a standard whereby we then
20 begin to report far beyond what the scope of the initial
21 envisioned requirements were for responding to the IG report.
22 I think it's good to, as a communication strategy, to make
23 sure that the Congress is informed about what we're doing. I
24 just wonder, do we need to tell them -- this looks almost
25 like a laundry list of every single thing that's going on.

26 CHAIR EAKELEY: Well, I think these are worthy of
27 note. It really isn't any more extensive than the last
28 several that we've done. I think what people may be
29 recalling are some of our sharper differences with the former
30 IG that found its way into his report, that we had to rebut
31 line by line, that took precedence over the kind of positive
32 reporting we're trying to convey here.

33 MR. ERLNBORN: I think the Congress probably
34 deserves a pretty extensive report. It is just strange that
35 they never put any provision in there for us to make this
36 report, semi-annual report, other than in conjunction with
37 the IG, which makes our report seem to be kind of second in
38 nature.

39 CHAIR EAKELEY: It still only -- if you just
40 collapse the spaces, it's less than ten pages single- spaced.

41 MR. ERLNBORN: Yes.

42 CHAIR EAKELEY: John or Maurice, have we heard
43 anything negative about reporting like this? Has anybody
44 commented adversely about this?

45 MR. FORTUNO: No. This is Vic.

46 MR. ERLNBORN: I never heard anything.

47 CHAIR EAKELEY: Yes.

48 MR. McCALPIN: As long as we're talking about this,
49 let me say that section 8(G)(h)(2) of the IG Act requires us,

1 as the head of the agency, to provide another report, a
2 different report, as of October 31st of each year. I don't
3 know that we've ever been called upon as a board to act on
4 that report. Have we been sending that in?

5 MR. FORTUNO: There are two semi-annual reports.
6 So we do -- you have in each instance --

7 MR. McCALPIN: This is not the response to the IG's
8 semi-annual report. This is an entirely different report.

9 MR. FORTUNO: How does that -- do you have that
10 before you, Bill?

11 MR. McCALPIN: It's section 8(G)(h)(2) of the IG
12 Act.

13 CHAIR EAKELEY: What does it say, Bill?

14 MR. McCALPIN: Well, it says, "Beginning on October
15 31, 1999 and on October 31 of each succeeding calendar year
16 the head of each federal entity, as defined, shall prepare
17 and transmit to the director of OMB and to each house of
18 Congress a report which" -- and then it has a, b and c --
19 "states whether it has been established in an effective IG
20 office, (b) specifies the actions taken by the federal entity
21 to ensure that audits are conducted of its programs and
22 operations in accordance with the standards for audit of
23 governmental organizations, programs and activities, and
24 functions issued by the controller general of the United
25 States, and includes a list of each audit report completed by
26 a federal or non-federal auditor during the reporting period
27 and a summary of any particularly significant findings; and
28 (c) summarizes any matters relating to the personnel,
29 programs and operations of the federal entity referred to
30 pursuant to executive authorities, including a summary
31 description of any preliminary investigation conducted by or
32 at the request of the federal entity concerning these matters
33 and the prosecutions and convictions which have resulted."

34 MR. FORTUNO: But Bill -- this is Vic. I think
35 that the IG Act as a mandate distinguishes between federal
36 entities and designated federal entities. We are a DFE, a
37 designated federal entity, and I think that the --

38 MR. McCALPIN: Except that 8(G) incorporates
39 section 5 -- well, it says, "Each federal entity as defined."
40 Well, maybe it isn't a designated entity. I don't know, but
41 I thought that it was broad enough to include us.

42 MR. FORTUNO: No. I think, and we will certainly
43 look at that and report back to you, but I think that the
44 provision you're citing relates to federal entities and does
45 not extend to designated federal entities, of which I think
46 there are 33 or so, and we are one.

47 MR. McCALPIN: I didn't read it carefully, perhaps.

48 MR. FORTUNO: But we will certainly look at it.

49 CHAIR EAKELEY: It is certainly worth double-

1 checking.

2 MR. FORTUNO: Yes.

3 CHAIR EAKELEY: Any other comments to the semi-
4 annual report?

5 Hearing none, do we have a motion to approve the
6 report as amended?

7 M O T I O N

8 MS. ROGERS: I so move.

9 CHAIR EAKELEY: Nancy Hardon Rogers.

10 MS. FAIRBANKS-WILLIAMS: I second.

11 CHAIR EAKELEY: Edna second.

12 All those in favor?

13 (Chorus of ayes.)

14 CHAIR EAKELEY: All those opposed?

15 The ayes have it. The report is approved. Thank
16 you all very much and Dawn, thank you.

17 MS. BROWNING: Thank you.

18 CHAIR EAKELEY: Next is consider and act on other
19 business. Is there any other business before this house?

20 MS. ROGERS: Which house is that?

21 CHAIR EAKELEY: Next is public comment.

22 MR. ERLNBORN: Let me run outside and look.

23 CHAIR EAKELEY: Everyone knows we're having dinner
24 Thursday -- well, the NLADA dinner is Thursday night, next
25 week, and Friday night we're having dinner with four of the
26 five nominees to the board.

27 MR. McCALPIN: Who will not be present?

28 CHAIR EAKELEY: Beverly LaBier broke her wrist last
29 week. She's from UVA.

30 MR. McCALPIN: LaBier?

31 MR. FORTUNO: Lillian LaBier. Yes, she's at the
32 University of Virginia Law School and is unable to attend
33 because she was going to be driving up, and she broke her
34 wrist and is unable to drive in that condition.

35 MS. WATLINGTON: This is our third dinner, our
36 going-away dinner, right? Well, I guess I have another
37 question. Do we have a full panel of 11 or 5?

38 CHAIR EAKELEY: No, we just have five nominees, and
39 they're only nominees, but they are formally nominated now
40 and we could formally invite them, which we have.

41 MS. WATLINGTON: Okay.

42 MR. ERLNBORN: I think that Kennedy has made it
43 very clear that he wants to have a hearing for the -- about
44 the nominees, but he wants them all at the same time, right?
45 Rather than divided into different timeframes. So we have
46 got to wait until the six are named before Kennedy will have
47 the hearing.

48 MS. WATLINGTON: So they want the whole 11 board
49 like they did us?

1 MS. BATTLE: Yes.

2 CHAIR EAKELEY: Bill McCalpin said he couldn't make
3 it. He's got to leave early on Friday. The way he put it
4 was, could not attend our last board meeting, and I had to
5 accuse him of wild-eyed optimism.

6 MR. McCALPIN: I said I was sorry I couldn't attend
7 the last supper.

8 MR. ASKEW: Board members for life.

9 CHAIR EAKELEY: Well, if there's no other public
10 comment, why don't we entertain a motion to adjourn?

11 M O T I O N

12 MR. McCALPIN: So moved.

13 MS. WATLINGTON: So moved.

14 CHAIR EAKELEY: All those in favor?

15 (Chorus of ayes.)

16 CHAIR EAKELEY: We will look forward to seeing all
17 or most of you next Thursday.

18 MR. FORTUNO: Before you all sign off, I had one
19 just interesting piece of information I thought you might all
20 get a chuckle out of, and that is that the property we were
21 vying for at 500 New Jersey Avenue, which we lost to Brandt
22 for -- I guess he purchased it for 6 million on December 31st
23 -- he has just turned around and sold it to the National
24 Association of Realtors for \$15 million. So he made a 9
25 million dollar profit for sitting on it for five months. No
26 improvements, just turned it around.

27 MR. ERLNBORN: What do realtors know about
28 property values?

29 MS. BATTLE: That's right.

30 CHAIR EAKELEY: LaVeeda, are you in your office?

31 MS. BATTLE: Yes, I am. I just wanted to find out,
32 does anyone have an update on John Broderick?

33 CHAIR EAKELEY: You missed it.

34 MS. BATTLE: I may have. I'm sorry.

35 MR. ASKEW: Maybe Doug can fill you in.

36 MS. BATTLE: Okay.

37 CHAIR EAKELEY: Yes, I'll come back.

38 MS. BATTLE: Okay. All right. I'm in my office if
39 you need me.

40 CHAIR EAKELEY: All right. I'll call you right
41 now.

42 MS. BATTLE: Okay.

43 CHAIR EAKELEY: Good-bye, everybody.

44 MR. FORTUNO: Thank you all.

45 (Whereupon, at 2:35 p.m., the meeting was
46 adjourned.)

47 * * * * *

48

49

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4