

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MEETING OF THE DELIVERY
OF LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

Thursday, January 28, 2016

2:50 p.m.

The Mills House Wyndham Grand Hotel
115 Meeting Street
Charleston, South Carolina 29401

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Father Pius Pietrzyk, O.P., Co-Chair
Gloria Valencia-Weber, Co-Chair
Victor B. Maddox
Julie A. Reiskin
John G. Levi, ex officio

OTHER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Charles N.W. Keckler
Harry J.F. Korrell, III

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT:

James J. Sandman, President
Ronald S. Flagg, Vice President for Legal Affairs,
General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary
Lynn Jennings, Vice President for Grants Management
Rebecca Fertig Cohen, Chief of Staff
Mayealie Adams, Special Assistant to the President
for the Board
Carol A. Bergman, Director, Office of Government
Relations and Public Affairs
Carl Rauscher, Director of Media Relations, Office of
Government Relations and Public Affairs
Janet LaBella, Director, Office of Program
Performance
Lora M. Rath, Director, Office of Compliance
and Enforcement
Wendy Rhein, Chief Development Officer
Joel Gallay, Special Counsel to the Inspector
General, Office of the Inspector General
John Seeba, Assistant Inspector General for Audit,
Office of the Inspector General
Daniel O'Rourke, Assistant Inspector General for
Investigations, Office of the Inspector General
David Maddox, Assistant Inspector General for
Management and Evaluation, Office of the
Inspector General
Ronké Hughes, Program Counsel, Office of Program
Performance
Herbert S. Garten, Non-Director Member, Institutional
Advancement Committee
Frank B. Strickland, Non-Director Member,
Institutional Advancement Committee
Robert E. Henley, Jr., Non-Director Member, Finance
Committee

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT (Continued):

Allan J. Tanenbaum, Non-Director Member, Finance
Committee

Joan Kleinberg, Manager of CLEAR (Coordinated Legal
Education, Advice and Referral), Northwest
Justice Project

Frank Tenuta, Managing Attorney, Iowa Legal Aid
Beverly Allen, Managing Attorney, Land of Lincoln
Legal Assistance Foundation

Adrienne Worthy, Executive Director, Legal Aid of
West Virginia

Andrea Loney, Executive Director, South Carolina
Legal Services

Leslie Fisk, South Carolina Legal Services

Adam Protheroe, South Carolina Legal Services

Gerald Jones, South Carolina Legal Services

Matthew Billingsley, South Carolina Legal Services

Rusty Infinger, South Carolina Legal Services

Rita Roache, South Carolina Legal Services

Stephanie van der Horst, South Carolina Legal
Services

Juanita F. Middleton, South Carolina Legal Services

Jamie L. Bell, South Carolina Legal Services

Angela Myers, South Carolina Legal Services

Kimaka Nichols Graham, South Carolina Legal Services

Mark Fessler, South Carolina Legal Services

Kirby Mitchell, South Carolina Legal Services

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

Robin C. Murphy, National Legal Aid and Defender
Association (NLADA)

C O N T E N T S

OPEN SESSION	PAGE
Approval of agenda	
2. Approval of minutes of the Committee's Open Session meeting on October 5, 2015	6
3. Discussion of Committee's evaluations for 2015 and the Committee's goals for 2016	Tabled
4. Review of LSC management proposal to review and revise Performance Criteria	Tabled
* Lynn Jennings, Vice President for Grants Management	
5. Panel presentation and Committee discussion on best practices for effective intake	6
* Joan Kleinberg, Manager of CLEAR (Coordinated Legal Education, Advice and Referral), Northwest Justice Project	
* Frank Tenuta, Managing Attorney, Iowa Legal Aid	
* Beverly Allen, Managing Attorney, Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation	
* Adrienne Worthy, Executive Director, Legal Aid of West Virginia	
* Ronké K. Hughes, Program Counsel, Office of Program Performance, LSC	
6. Public comment	Tabled
7. Consider and act on other business	Tabled
8. Consider and act on motion to adjourn meeting	Tabled

Motions: Pages 5, 6, 55

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

2 (2:50 p.m.)

3 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: According to the duly
4 noticed announcement for the Delivery of Legal Services
5 Committee, I now call this committee meeting to order.

6 So we have a quorum. And the first thing on
7 the agenda is the approval of the agenda. We're going
8 to make a change before we even do that. We're making
9 a change. Because a previous committee ran very late,
10 we are going to move this around.

11 We're going to move the panel presentation
12 first, and then we will do the other items. If we
13 don't have time, we're going to table the other items
14 till tomorrow after lunch. And we're also adding one
15 item to that, and that is just a brief review of the
16 PQV pilot project to involve clients. It's really just
17 an announcement, but we'll add that to the agenda as
18 well.

19 So as I've discussed, as amended --

20 M O T I O N

21 MS. REISKIN: So moved.

22 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So moved. Is there a

1 second?

2 CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: Second.

3 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All in favor?

4 (A chorus of ayes.)

5 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Okay. The next thing
6 is the approval of the minutes from October 5th. Do I
7 have a motion?

8 M O T I O N

9 MS. REISKIN: So moved.

10 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Are there any seconds?

11 MR. MADDOX: Second.

12 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All in favor?

13 (A chorus of ayes.)

14 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Okay. So now we will
15 go to the panel presentation. And I have Ronké --

16 MS. HUGHES: Yes.

17 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Thank goodness. Ronké
18 Hughes from the Legal Services Corporation is going to
19 introduce the members on the panel for this afternoon.
20 So thank you.

21 MS. HUGHES: Thank you. Thank you, Father
22 Pius and thank you, Gloria Valencia-Weber and the other

1 members of the board, for the opportunity to be here
2 with you this afternoon. My name is Ronké Hughes and I
3 work as program counsel in the Office of Program
4 Performance. And I'm here today with this wonderful
5 panel to discuss best practices for effective intake.

6 I am not going to do this in order, however.
7 We have Beverly Allen with us, a managing attorney at
8 Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation; we have
9 Joan Kleinberg, a manager of northwest Justice
10 Project's Coordinated Legal Education Advice and
11 Referral unit, or CLEAR; we have Frank Tenuta, a
12 managing attorney from Iowa Legal Aid; and Adrienne
13 Worthy at the end, there, executive director of Legal
14 Aid of West Virginia.

15 Before we begin, I would like to provide a
16 framework for the discussion this afternoon and start
17 with the LSC performance criteria. Performance area 2
18 sets forth the core values and tenets for creating and
19 maintaining effective relations with clients.

20 Criterion 2.1 addresses how grantees engage
21 and serve the client population, specifically exploring
22 whether intake is efficient, conducted in a way that is

1 culturally sensitive, and whether the approach to
2 client services is based on the need of the community.

3 Similarly, standard 4.1 of the ABA Standards
4 for the Provision of Civil Legal Aid, provide that an
5 intake system should be designed and operated in a
6 manner that focuses on treating clients with respect,
7 effectively identifying their legal needs, and promptly
8 making determinations about service.

9 As the panel discusses the intake functions at
10 their respective programs, there are some key themes
11 from the performance criteria and the ABA standards
12 that ground the best practices that we'll discuss.

13 Those are that the intake systems must be
14 tailored to the needs of the community. The
15 communities served are the paramount -- they are the
16 most important part of the intake system when you're
17 considering how to design it. The other part is that
18 the intake systems have to provide efficient and
19 effective service.

20 Another important component of an effective
21 intake system is going to be the technology that's
22 used, and the LSC technology baselines acknowledge the

1 important role of technology in legal aid service
2 delivery.

3 You're going to hear about four different
4 approaches to intake today. The approaches, while
5 different, each embody the principles found in the
6 performance criteria and the ABA standards. What you
7 will find is that there's no single intake model or
8 system that works for every grantee. Intake is not a
9 one-size-fits-all proposition. Instead, each community
10 benefits from the system that is designed to meet its
11 needs.

12 And with that, why don't we have our panel
13 begin by providing a brief description of your intake
14 system. And we can start with Adrienne.

15 MS. WORTHY: I'd like to give you just a
16 little bit of context for Legal Aid of West Virginia's
17 intake system based on our service area. We are a
18 statewide program that covers 55 beautiful mountainous
19 counties in West Virginia. About 1.8 million people
20 live in West Virginia. So as you will see from our
21 colleagues and where they're from, we're the smallest
22 state. Several of them are double or triple the size

1 of our entire population.

2 It pains me to say that the who we serve, the
3 statistics are horrible. And particularly as I was
4 preparing for this presentation, it reminded me about
5 the many negative factors related to West Virginia's
6 population.

7 In summary, we are among the poorest, the
8 sickest, the oldest, the least diverse, have the most
9 disabilities, most rural, and least technologically
10 connected state in the country. What that means is
11 there's lots of challenges for our staff of 120 in
12 terms of serving this population and getting them in
13 the door to meet their legal needs.

14 Our service area is spread, tip to tip, about
15 six hours, from Pittsburgh to Virginia, from Kentucky
16 to the Washington, D.C. suburbs. We have chosen to
17 have a centralized intake in Charleston -- the other
18 Charleston -- that is both a service office but our
19 administrative offices. We have nicknamed our intake
20 system ATLAS, and I know we're not supposed to use
21 acronyms, but that stands for Access to Legal Aid
22 Services.

1 Now, thinking about who we serve, I think it's
2 helpful not to think in the aggregate of the 330,000
3 people eligible for our services, but to think of an
4 individual. And so for the purposes of today, I've
5 thought of Brian, who is a veteran with a disability
6 living on a mountaintop in rural Pocahontas County.

7 Brian has lots of options in terms of getting
8 services from Legal Aid of West Virginia. We have
9 multiple access options, including, as of December,
10 online intake. Brian can make a phone call to us, and
11 both our online and our phone services are
12 mobile-friendly. There's lots of supporting
13 information for Brian on our website.

14 He can go through a local office. We have 12
15 regional legal offices situated around the state, so
16 Brian can get to a local office. Or he can get to us
17 through a partner agency, and in Brian's case, that
18 might be the VA medical center.

19 When Brian gets to talk to a staff member, his
20 first contact with us will be with an intake paralegal.

21 We also have in that unit four part-time attorneys who
22 work with us, a supervising attorney, and actually a

1 number of pro bono volunteers, including an emeritus
2 pro bono attorney.

3 We have a manager who oversees this intake
4 unit, the ATLAS unit, as a way to make sure that the
5 services that Brian gets are integrated with the
6 services throughout our program. And that person works
7 with all of our other units to ensure that that intake
8 unit -- folks are aware of all the variety of services
9 available to Brian.

10 So I'll stop there, and we'll talk about Brian
11 a little bit later.

12 MS. HUGHES: Thank you, Adrienne.

13 Beverly, can you please give us some
14 information about Land of Lincoln?

15 MS. ALLEN: Yes. Land of Lincoln Legal
16 Assistance Foundation serves 65 counties in central and
17 southern Illinois. We have five regional offices that
18 provided extended services to our clients, and then we
19 have a centralized intake, advice, and referral unit,
20 and one administrative office.

21 The centralized intake, advice, and referral
22 unit is called LARC, Legal Advice and Referral Center.

1 We are housed in the building with our central
2 regional office and our regional office. We have
3 approximately 103 employees at Land of Lincoln Legal
4 Assistance Foundation; 61 of those employees are
5 attorneys.

6 Seventy percent of our new applicants that
7 come into our program are served by LARC. We have
8 seven part-time attorneys, one full-time attorney, one
9 intake specialist, one administrative assistant, and
10 myself, the supervising attorney, that work at LARC.

11 I think in 2014 we had about 12,000 clients
12 that we served program-wide, a little bit over 12,000.

13 I would say that we have been in existence -- LARC has
14 been in existence since 1998, and as time has gone on,
15 we have tried to come up with innovative ways to serve
16 our clients. And one of those ways is through online
17 intake.

18 We have several avenues ourselves in which we
19 allow applicants to come into our program, and the
20 biggest one, of course, is via telephone; now, online
21 intake; and we still allow walk-ins into the central
22 regional offices. And we have court projects where we

1 do intake as well. And then we also do intake through
2 community outreach.

3 So we try to have as many avenues of access as
4 we possibly can to make sure that we reach as many
5 clients as we possibly can. Of course, the struggle is
6 that we can't reach everyone, but we are trying to
7 reach as many as we can.

8 MS. HUGHES: Thank you, Beverly.

9 And Frank?

10 MR. TENUTA: Thank you. Just a little
11 background on Iowa Legal Aid. We have a staff of about
12 120 people, including 64 attorneys, and we have ten
13 regional offices covering 99 counties in the state of
14 Iowa. This last year we closed approximately 16,300
15 cases, helping nearly 38,000 Iowans, including
16 children.

17 Our intake system is what we call a unified
18 intake system. And we call it intake.

19 (Laughter.)

20 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: What does that stand
21 for?

22 MR. TENUTA: No acronyms. And we actually use

1 staff in all of our offices to be part of the intake
2 system, which is why we call it an intake system as
3 opposed to an intake unit, because it's not a separate
4 group of people, although we do have a number of people
5 who work more in intake and some people who work less.

6 We also do intake -- people can walk in, they can go
7 online, or they can access our services by telephone.

8 We currently have five attorneys who are
9 primarily doing intake, and then we also have a couple
10 of part-time paralegals. And then we rely heavily on
11 our support staff to do the screening, which is the
12 name/address/income eligibility kind of thing. I think
13 we're moving towards using more intake paralegals.
14 That's one of the things we're looking at.

15 We also have -- our system is managed by two
16 managing attorneys who do that part-time, and I'm one
17 of those two managing attorneys. In addition, I also
18 manage our local office, and that's sort of in keeping
19 with the way we do things. Our staff is really
20 involved both in intake and client service.

21 MS. HUGHES: Okay. And Joan? Share with us,
22 please.

1 MS. KLEINBERG: Northwest Justice Project came
2 to our current intake system from a little bit
3 different direction than other programs. It was born
4 out of the state plan for the delivery of civil legal
5 services that was developed in 1995, back at a time
6 when there were some very dramatic changes happening in
7 the legal services landscape.

8 And the plan -- at that time there were some
9 consolidations. Northwest Justice Project was a new
10 program, developed with the intention of being the LSC
11 grantee. And within this plan, one of the roles that
12 was assigned to the Northwest Justice Project was to
13 serve as the primary entry point for low-income people
14 across the state of Washington who were seeking legal
15 aid.

16 And to carry out that role, we developed a
17 statewide hotline, which I'm sorry to say does have an
18 acronym name. We call it CLEAR, Coordinated Legal
19 Education, Advice, and Referral, although I like the
20 idea of calling it intake.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. KLEINBERG: And CLEAR is the primary point

1 of entry into the system, so that we work in
2 coordination with our own offices. And perhaps I
3 should back up just to paint that picture a bit.

4 We are a statewide program. We have 13
5 regional offices and four satellite offices around the
6 state. We have a staff of a little bit over 200 people
7 spread among those offices.

8 Back to CLEAR. We do intake not just for
9 Northwest Justice Project but for the network of 17
10 local bar-sponsored volunteer lawyer programs around
11 the state, as well as a number of other freestanding
12 specialty projects such as an unemployment law project,
13 one that does Social Security advocacy, and -- I'm
14 trying to think if there are others.

15 But we maintain information about all of these
16 programs in our database, and we're kind of the traffic
17 cops. People come in at CLEAR, and our goal is to get
18 them out to the right program on the first try so that
19 we're not churning people around.

20 One of the big changes that happened in '95
21 was there were a number of different doors somebody
22 could have walked into looking for help. And what we

1 wanted to avoid happening was for that person to go
2 into door number one and be told, no, we can't help
3 you; go to door number two. And they would say, oh, we
4 can't help you; try one and three. Time would be
5 passing as well as client frustration increasing. So
6 our goal is to get the person to the right place at the
7 right time, or to one of our own offices.

8 Something else that we thought of at that time
9 that we centralized intake, which was a very big change
10 within the service providers in Washington, was to try
11 to really work with maximum efficiency to centralize
12 tasks that were amenable to centralization, such as
13 screening and triage and advice, and free up the staff
14 in our field offices to really work on tasks that you
15 needed to be local for -- being in court, engaging with
16 community partners. So it kind of divided the work in
17 a different way than we ever had before.

18 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

19 Next I'd like to talk about the time, the time
20 that it takes for a client to get assistance from your
21 program. And I think that's important for each of you
22 to comment on. And why don't we start with you, Frank.

1 MR. TENUTA: Okay. Thanks. Our biggest chunk
2 of intake is done by telephone, which I think is what
3 probably most programs would find now. Of course, we
4 do some online intake and then also the walk-ins. But
5 since most of our people are telephone, our system is
6 set up so that they get to talk to an attorney when
7 they do the call-in and when they get screened.

8 So when someone calls in to get assistance,
9 they first will talk to an intake screener. And then
10 after the screening is completed, we have an average
11 wait time of about two minutes before they speak to an
12 attorney about their case. They're actually given the
13 option after about one minute of having a callback or
14 just waiting a little bit longer.

15 About 75 percent of our callers are talked to
16 by an attorney live on the first call-in. Another 25
17 percent are callbacks. And then we try to make
18 decision on -- they're provided advice on the spot when
19 they talk to an attorney.

20 So for most people accessing our services,
21 they're going to talk to an attorney, explain their
22 situation, and at least get some initial advice on that

1 first call. And then we try to make a determination on
2 actual representation within about a week.

3 And I think doing it this way -- I've been at
4 Legal Aid of Iowa for 30 years. And when I first
5 started doing intake, we scheduled appointments for
6 people, and a lot of them were no-show. Because the
7 people that we're helping, frequently they have a lot
8 of things going on, and what's the most pressing
9 problem right now? And some of those things might not
10 get addressed. And so we were losing a lot of people.

11 And of course, there's been a big progress in
12 how we do intake over time. But I think being able to
13 talk to an attorney when you call in has been a big
14 help in getting people that information that they need
15 right away.

16 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

17 Beverly?

18 MS. ALLEN: At the Legal Advice and Referral
19 Center, the applicants, most of them, speak to an
20 attorney right away, immediately. Except for our
21 foreclosure and divorce cases, they speak to an
22 attorney. For the divorce cases and our foreclosure

1 cases, most of them speak to an intake specialist.

2 It takes about five to 15 minutes to qualify
3 an applicant for our services, and then another 15
4 minutes to interview them, and approximately another 15
5 minutes or so to provide them with advice if they only
6 qualify for advice.

7 If they qualify for a referral to a regional
8 office, they are referred to a regional office that
9 day. And then they are also informed that they should
10 hear from the regional office within 48 hours, except
11 one office; they will speak to them the very next day.

12 But it's a pretty quick turnaround for the applicants
13 when they first initially contact our office.

14 MS. HUGHES: Okay. And Adrienne, if you can
15 tell us what's happening in West Virginia.

16 MS. WORTHY: Like Frank, our system is based
17 on most of our folks coming in through the phones. We
18 received about 15,000 phone calls to ATLAS in 2014.
19 When someone like Brian, who I referenced earlier,
20 calls, in our system they talk with a paralegal first,
21 and the focus there is on eligibility and learning
22 about the legal problem, and then we figure out where

1 we go from there.

2 Wait times for a paralegal, to get to a
3 paralegal, can vary. Folks can get an immediate answer
4 to their phone call, or wait times can be as much as 14
5 minutes. We are working to bring those call times
6 down, but one of the things that we've
7 implemented -- or two things we've implemented that
8 have been interesting, one is a callback system like
9 the others mentioned, where people can keep their place
10 in line, but instead of using up their cell minutes and
11 their time, they can receive a callback from us.

12 The other thing we've recently done is
13 institute some what we are calling Law Line, which are
14 approximately 60 messages that they can opt to listen
15 to while they're on the phone. We find a number of
16 people who are opting for that.

17 The messages are in a variety of different
18 areas. We even have folks who, once they've gotten to
19 a paralegal, have requested to go back into the
20 messages because they were in the middle of listening
21 to something. So we use that as a way to relay
22 additional information while people are waiting for

1 service.

2 Once people get to a paralegal, we do an
3 eligibility, figure out where they need to go. If
4 they're going to receive only advice and brief service,
5 they are likely to be spoken to by an attorney either
6 later that day or the next day. If they are being sent
7 to our local office, that referral will be made and
8 then the local office, if it is a non-emergency case,
9 will address their concerns within three business days,
10 is typically the turnaround time for us.

11 MS. HUGHES: Thank you. And Joan?

12 MS. KLEINBERG: We also handle calls live.
13 The path is to a non-lawyer screener, and then to one
14 of our advocates, most of whom are attorneys. A few
15 are paralegals. That system, for somebody who's in the
16 live process, the time from when they call in till
17 they've spoken with an advocate is probably about an
18 hour.

19 But I will say that the times vary wildly,
20 depending on the number of screeners who are in on a
21 given day and the number of advocates are in on a given
22 day. And we schedule to try to maintain steady

1 numbers.

2 We limit the number of people who can be out
3 on a scheduled absence for a vacation or go to training
4 or something like that, to try to maintain levels. But
5 human nature is such that illness and sick children do
6 happen, as much as we wish they didn't.

7 And so the wait times are very sensitive to
8 the level of staffing. And I think that's just a fact
9 of life. Again, we don't like it, but we live with it.

10 And if we have a perfect storm of very few of both,
11 then the wait times can become significantly longer.
12 On a really great day, when we have a really good ratio
13 of screeners to advocates, the wait times are very
14 short.

15 We do then refer cases on from the hotline to
16 our field offices for extended assistance. If it's an
17 emergency, the office will jump on it right away, and
18 we communicate that to them. Otherwise, their normal
19 course generally is I believe they hold case acceptance
20 meetings once a week. So there would be -- depending
21 on the day of the week that CLEAR spoke with the person
22 and the day of the week that office is doing their

1 process, there can be a several-day lag.

2 And then the only other thing that I would
3 mention is that we also have some systems where we are
4 calling people. So for example, we try to be sensitive
5 to time-sensitive matters. And so if somebody were to
6 call our front desk or call one of our offices and say,
7 "I have a hearing tomorrow; I really need help," we
8 have what we call advocate of the day. There's one
9 person who's designated to speak with those people.
10 But we find frequently great difficulty reaching
11 people, even when they're expecting a call, and so
12 those calls.

13 Also our online intake system, when people
14 have problems with housing or benefits issues, we will
15 call them. But again, it can sometimes take several
16 days to actually connect with somebody. So we prefer
17 the live model. It's the client's best route in to us,
18 but it doesn't always work for them.

19 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

20 So now I think it would be helpful for us to
21 share some of the best practices that have been
22 implemented at the various programs. And Beverly, can

1 we start with you?

2 MS. ALLEN: Of course you can.

3 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

4 MS. ALLEN: At the Legal Advice and Referral
5 Center, we also have multiple access points, telephone
6 being the main one, kind of like all the other
7 hotlines. And we also have online intake, which the
8 applicants have access to 24 hours a day.

9 At the Legal Advice and Referral Center, we
10 operate Monday through Friday half-days, from 9:00
11 until 1:30 p.m. We're open during the lunch hour to
12 allow working applicants to call in on their lunch
13 breaks.

14 In 2014 we launched the online intake as
15 another access point in collaboration with the other
16 two major legal services programs in Illinois and
17 Illinois Legal Aid Online and PSTI, which is the
18 company that provided our case management software.

19 Applicants who comply with home ownership
20 issues, we slightly modify our process with those
21 applicants. That queue that we have for our
22 foreclosure cases is staffed by an intake specialist

1 because most of those cases are referred to the
2 regional offices for extended services. And we also
3 have a divorce queue that's staffed by the intake
4 specialist for the same reason.

5 And our hours of operation for our foreclosure
6 calls is much longer because we are allowing people
7 with home ownership issues an extended amount of time
8 to get into our program. So those hours of operation
9 is from 9:00 until 4:00. All other applicants who
10 apply online, they are instructed to give us a call
11 back.

12 Now, the foreclosure applicants, we allow them
13 to set dates and times that they will be available to
14 be reached. We also like the live contact, and we try
15 to steer away from callbacks. But when they're
16 applying online, we give them the opportunity to allow
17 us to call them back. And actually, for online
18 applicants, that has been more successful when they
19 give us a date and time that they could be reached.
20 And then we will call them back.

21 All other applicants who call our hotline,
22 they call what we call the general queue, and they

1 speak to an attorney right away. We have a telephone
2 system that we acquired that allows us to monitor our
3 calls live so that we can see the call flow, the number
4 of calls that come in when our lines get full and get
5 busy.

6 We have reporting capabilities with our new
7 telephone system. And we also have the callback
8 feature of that telephone system that allow applicants
9 to call in, hang up the phone, but maintain their place
10 in line, so for those applicants who are using cell
11 phones so that they can save their hours on their
12 phone. And that has been very successful, the
13 automatic callback feature.

14 As I mentioned, we have four queues -- the
15 general queue, which is staffed by attorneys, the
16 foreclosure and divorce queue, which is staffed by
17 intake specialists and another attorney, and then we
18 have what we call the priority queue.

19 Those applicants who call the
20 foreclosure/divorce queue who do not qualify for
21 referral to the regional office for extended services,
22 they will be transferred into what we call the priority

1 queue so that they can be next in line to speak to an
2 attorney to receive advice.

3 The attorneys who are staffing the hotline,
4 they do everything, as I mentioned earlier. They do
5 the screening. They qualify the applicants for our
6 services. They will interview them to determine the
7 nature of their program. And then if they qualify for
8 referral to the regional office for extended services,
9 they will be referred to the regional office the same
10 day.

11 If they do not qualify for referral to the
12 regional office, then the attorney will attempt to
13 provide them with advice. If there's no advice to be
14 given, then we will try to find other resources to
15 refer them to. So we try to provide them with some
16 sort of assistance if we cannot give them the ultimate,
17 which is representation by one of the attorneys in the
18 regional offices.

19 The Legal Advice and Referral Center took on a
20 project last year where we used business process
21 analysis to basically take a look at what we're doing
22 at our hotline to make us more efficient so that we can

1 better serve our clients, and also to extend our
2 services in the housing and consumer area.

3 And when we did that, basically we changed
4 some of the ways that we do business. We changed the
5 way the managing attorney operates or manages the
6 hotline. We tried to make ourselves more efficient.
7 We went to a paperless operation. We created scripts
8 for the attorneys and the intake specialists to use.

9 We drafted canned advice notes for those
10 common issues that come across our desk every day. And
11 then we also tried to standardize the case acceptance
12 policies that the regional offices use to let us know
13 what types of cases they want referred to them so that
14 we can make our process a little bit more efficient.

15 And each day, as we grow, we try to serve as
16 many clients as we possibly can and become as efficient
17 and client-friendly as we possibly can.

18 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

19 And Joan, can you tell us what's happening at
20 NJP in terms of the strategies that you all are
21 recommending?

22 MS. KLEINBERG: Well, are we on best

1 practices?

2 MS. HUGHES: We are.

3 MS. KLEINBERG: Yes. I think I can give you
4 four pretty quickly.

5 MS. HUGHES: Great.

6 MS. KLEINBERG: One, and Beverly touched on
7 this, these days I think having a provision for people
8 who are using cell phones is critical. Otherwise
9 you're burning through their minutes and their
10 batteries, and they're on the phone when you get to
11 them because the battery died.

12 Intake systems have to make provisions for
13 people who have limited time issues. We have our
14 systems, but our clients' lives tend to happen on very
15 short notice. And so somebody can't be needing to call
16 in day after day till the call gets answered.

17 And so, as I mentioned, we have both the
18 attorney of the day system and our online intake system
19 as well can expedite connecting with somebody who's
20 working against a tight deadline.

21 Language access, critical. Our clients don't
22 speak only English. And so every intake system needs

1 the capacity to communicate with clients in the
2 language in which they speak. Telephonic systems tend
3 to use a telephone interpretation system, which are
4 actually pretty amazing, where you can conference in an
5 interpreter who speaks just about any language that you
6 can find.

7 And then, finally, a system has to have, if
8 it's a telephonic system, provision for people who have
9 access barriers to using the phone. And in our case,
10 even though we've largely shifted the intake function
11 to the hotline, all of our offices know that they are
12 expected to perform that function if there's somebody
13 for whom the hotline just does not work.

14 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

15 And Frank, what about in Iowa?

16 MR. TENUTA: Just a little bit more about our
17 online system. We started that in 2014, and we
18 actually started it sort of -- rolled it out slowly
19 before then. But that was when we really got it going.

20 And at that time, about 5 percent of our cases came in
21 through the online system in January of 2014; we were
22 up to 12 percent in December of 2015.

1 Online intake obviously makes it more
2 accessible for some people because they can get to it
3 any time. That's the nice thing about it. Anybody who
4 completes an online application, we use the A2J system,
5 and our database is Pika, and it merges it all in.

6 Our staff, our intake screening staff, will
7 then call everybody back and go over their application
8 and make sure that the information is correct, and then
9 get them connected with an attorney. They have an
10 opportunity to provide a time that they would be
11 available if there's a particular better time for a
12 callback. We also do walk-ins and, of course, the
13 telephone intake.

14 To go back to the online intake, we're finding
15 that it probably saves our intake screeners about 50
16 percent of the time that they spend with a client
17 because of the information already in. And of course
18 that means the client is also saving 50 percent on the
19 time, and they have a lot more flexibility as to
20 getting the information in. And then we're still
21 verifying all that and contacting them.

22 MS. HUGHES: Okay. Thank you. And finally,

1 Adrienne. What best practices are being implemented in
2 West Virginia?

3 MS. WORTHY: Let me tell you about four.
4 First of all, I mentioned the prerecorded messages that
5 we use called Law Line. We have more than 60 messages
6 that provide legal information both after hours and
7 while callers are on hold. And we have found that the
8 messages are very popular. We had more than 9,000
9 callers who listened to Law Line in 2015.

10 We were actually kind of surprised by that
11 number and decided, because they were so popular, we
12 have created a separate line where people who are not
13 necessarily waiting in the queue to apply but just
14 people who want to access the legal information can
15 call a separate number. And we're just about to roll
16 out some publicity around that, and we'll be interested
17 to see how that works.

18 Another thing that we do, as Beverly
19 mentioned, we pay a lot of attention to intake hours.
20 It's important that people be able to access us at
21 different times of the day. We do, of course, work
22 through the lunch hour.

1 But we also have worked out to have one
2 evening hour a week. And we do that in conjunction
3 with our state bar's Tuesday Lawyer Connect, where a
4 number of bar volunteers are in our offices taking
5 phone calls from the public.

6 At the same time that they're taking those
7 phone calls, if they feel like there is a client that
8 would benefit from legal aid services, we have a staff
9 member there and they can switch them over. And then,
10 of course, the public can call in to apply for services
11 at the same time.

12 The third thing I'd like to mention is we feel
13 like that when the hotline is working for applicants
14 externally or for the public, there has to be a high
15 degree of communication among our staff to make that
16 happen.

17 And so we've created something that we call
18 our client access advisory team, which has staff from
19 all over the program, each of our 12 offices, in a
20 variety of different positions where the system is
21 touched by clients. And these folks meet on a
22 quarterly basis really to do a lot of evaluation of the

1 systems that we have.

2 We met yesterday before I left to come down
3 here, and the focus of that conversation was on
4 additional Law Line messages, ones that should go, new
5 ones that we should create, as well as the wait time
6 issue, trying to figure out some ways to really address
7 that.

8 And then the fourth thing I'd like to
9 mention -- others have talked about online
10 intake -- we're pretty new to the game. We just
11 started on December of 2015. So we've had just about
12 two months of online intake.

13 And without any promotion externally except a
14 button on our website, we've gotten 331 online
15 applications, which is about seven a day. So we've
16 been pretty pleased with that because we do plan on
17 doing a campaign around online intake and other ways to
18 access our services in the spring.

19 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Just to compare, how
20 many calls do you get a day? Just so I can compare the
21 numbers. A lot more than seven, I would imagine.

22 MS. WORTHY: Yes. Very much so.

1 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: But you don't get like
2 a hundred calls. You're talking like maybe 40 or 50
3 calls a day?

4 MS. WORTHY: I'm not very good at math. But
5 we get 15,000 a year. So I'll let somebody else do the
6 math. We've been getting a lot of anecdotal positive
7 feedback on the online intake, and we've looked to see
8 how people are accessing our website to give us some
9 idea about how they might be accessing the online
10 intake.

11 And we see that about half the people are
12 accessing the website through their mobile phone, and
13 about 47 percent are accessing through a desktop
14 computer, and then the rest through a tablet. So as
15 we're thinking about online intake, that's certainly
16 going to be important.

17 And then just one other interesting stat.
18 Ronké had asked us to see if there's any demographics
19 that we can assign to the folks coming in through
20 online access. And so we went back and looked through
21 and saw that 85 percent of those who've applied, so
22 that's 85 percent of those 331 applications, were folks

1 who were under 40 years of age. And that compares to
2 about half of our phone applicants. So we'll be
3 monitoring things like that as well to see where that
4 takes us.

5 MR. MADDOX: Father Pius, can I just
6 interrupt? I've got to leave for a conference call. I
7 just want to say this has all been incredibly
8 interesting and helpful. I have an idea for how all of
9 you could dramatically increase your funding with
10 unrestricted funds, and that is just take your systems
11 to the cable company.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. MADDOX: Or moonlight as consultants. It
14 is very impressive.

15 MS. HUGHES: Thank you. So now I'd like to
16 talk about how intake is integrated into service
17 delivery. I think very often people think of intake as
18 a standalone sort of function, and I'd like the panel
19 rather to share how that looks at their program. And
20 Frank, let's start with you.

21 MR. TENUTA: Okay. Well, part of this really
22 has to do with how we're using technology in our intake

1 system. And so we don't have a call center with
2 attorneys or support staff or anybody. We have
3 essentially a virtual call center, where staff is
4 anywhere in any of our ten regional offices. And those
5 staff then are assigned to times on the intake.

6 And they keep in contact with each other
7 through a chat room, and there's a whole complicated
8 system, which I won't go through, in how the calls come
9 in, how they're assigned, how they get to an attorney.

10 We even have a separate room where we can assign cases
11 to volunteer attorneys so that they're involved in it
12 because we have a number of volunteer attorneys who
13 just do intake.

14 So we have this complicated system using
15 technology, the voice over internet phone system, of
16 course, and our email, and the chat rooms, as I
17 mentioned, to get the calls out to these various people
18 who are doing the intake. And then because our system
19 is such that the people who are doing the intake are
20 often the ones also providing services, there is that
21 close cooperation there as well.

22 So the intake attorneys provide a basic

1 advice, and then the cases are transferred. But it's
2 really not transferred because we use a single
3 database. Really, they're just -- I like to think of
4 our system as using technology to make our program one
5 big office.

6 I like to think about how we used to do
7 intake, and clients would come in or we'd talk to them
8 on the phone. And then we'd all go meet. How do you
9 do that using technology and keep all those people
10 involved?

11 So our system involves all these intake
12 people. And even though someone is in Dubuque and
13 they're interviewing the client, they give that initial
14 advice. They have a way to check what Sioux City staff
15 is available, what kind of cases that are available,
16 and then that case is sent on to me or, for some
17 offices, they use an intake reviewer that screens
18 through the case to make some kind of initial
19 determination.

20 And then also there's a more formal staff
21 meeting later on, where decisions are made about
22 whether we're going to provide assistance, or more

1 assistance, because everybody's going to get advice.
2 And then it all goes back so that if we're not going to
3 provide extended representation, the same person that
4 talked to them the first time is the one that gives
5 them, unfortunately, the bad news: Well, we can't give
6 you any more help here. But they don't feel like they
7 got thrown around to all these different places.

8 So that's one of the ways that at least we're
9 trying to make sure that that system of intake is
10 integrated in with the service provision. And I know
11 our program feels that that's very important because
12 you feel like you're part of it even if you're not
13 doing a lot of intake.

14 And I have a couple of attorneys in my
15 particular office who do intake full-time, and then a
16 couple of attorneys who don't. And there are staff in
17 all different offices in a similar way. And I think it
18 really helps us keep connected.

19 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

20 Joan, how is intake integrated into service
21 delivery at NJP?

22 MS. KLEINBERG: I think one of the most

1 salient features is that we don't view CLEAR in a silo.

2 So the CLEAR attorneys and paralegals are very much
3 part of everything else that we do at NJP. So they
4 serve on legal problem task forces, which is a great
5 way for them to be able to communicate to other people,
6 here's what we're seeing on the ground and here's what
7 people are bringing to us; and then also for them to
8 know what issues that the task force is interested in
9 and working on so that they can make connections when
10 they identify issues that the task force is working on.

11 They also work on what we call our strategic
12 advocacy focus, which is something that came out of our
13 last strategic plan, in which we identified barriers to
14 employment as a focus for a three-year period for some
15 fairly intensive work.

16 And so again, CLEAR people are involved with
17 the work groups that are working on strategic advocacy
18 focus and connecting the people who are coming into the
19 system with the strategic and affirmative work of the
20 program.

21 Also, as the central portal for not just NJP
22 but for a lot of programs, we keep in our database

1 information about all of the other providers in the
2 state -- what types of cases they're taking, what their
3 eligibility criteria area, and they have the ability to
4 open and close for referrals.

5 Again, the idea is that we don't want to be
6 churning clients. We don't want to send somebody to a
7 volunteer lawyer program in Tacoma with a family law
8 matter when they have just maxed out all of their
9 volunteers and they cannot handle one more case.

10 They can let us know: Close us down for a
11 week. Then it'll ease up and we'll be okay. And we
12 can do that automatically in our case management
13 system, which is basically -- say, don't let this one
14 show up as a referral, but next Monday open it back up,
15 and they will show up again.

16 I think those are -- I will say one other
17 thing that we've done. When we went to the centralized
18 system, where intake used to happen in all of the field
19 offices and then now is happening centralized, people
20 in the field offices did feel something of a loss, I
21 think, when they didn't have client traffic into their
22 offices quite in the same way.

1 And something that we just have started doing
2 in the last year is send out weekly reports to each of
3 our field offices, giving them information about the
4 cases that were handled and closed at CLEAR that they
5 never saw in the field office.

6 And that's been very helpful in having them
7 feel connected back to the clients in their area to be
8 able to see opposing parties whose names are coming up
9 frequently, and maybe the cases didn't rise to the
10 criteria in which we would refer the case to that field
11 office.

12 But when you start seeing a certain name or
13 company coming up a lot, then you start thinking about
14 whether there are some practices there that are
15 impacting low-income people. So that's been another
16 good integration.

17 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

18 So with the demand for services being so
19 significant, obviously there are going to be some
20 challenges. So I think it would be nice if we could
21 hear about what intake-related challenges the panelists
22 might be facing at their programs, and what strategies

1 they're using to meet them. And I'd like to start with
2 Adrienne.

3 MS. WORTHY: I think of two challenges. One
4 is the quality and quality oversight. We, as I noted
5 earlier, have a tremendous number of calls coming with
6 folks seeking services. And as a way to handle that
7 call volume, we have a custom-built call center that
8 has reporting capacities and realtime monitoring for
9 our supervisory staff.

10 Our supervising attorney looks at who's
11 working, how long they're on a call, the length of each
12 call and then with an application, and case reviews the
13 quality of the work.

14 It's really a challenge to oversee this work,
15 given the small number of staff that we have working
16 here, but also with the call volume and the number of
17 funding sources and ways that people can be served
18 within our program. So I'd say that's one of the
19 challenges.

20 The second, I think, relates more to West
21 Virginia, and that is how to expand the use of
22 technology in a way that meets the needs of the folks

1 in West Virginia as well as makes our program efficient
2 and effective.

3 As I noted earlier, we're one of the least
4 connected states in the country. And while many of our
5 folks have cell phones, the availability of high-speed
6 internet, even in urban areas, can be very spotty at
7 best.

8 So while technology is an important piece of
9 our access strategy, we know that we still have to have
10 our local offices; that we have to have mobile-friendly
11 online access; that particularly in our very rural
12 areas, we have to work through service partnerships.

13 And we have a lot of those, ranging from
14 domestic violence programs to our local Department of
15 Health and Human Resources to veterans' regional
16 centers. And so those public partnerships are really
17 important as a way for people to access services.

18 And the other thing I would note as it relates
19 to all of this, I feel like culturally, West Virginians
20 are very much into storytelling. And so we know that
21 our systems have to be respectful of that urge to tell
22 stories about their situation and accommodate that, and

1 that all of those access points need to be respectful
2 of that.

3 MS. HUGHES: Thank you.

4 We have about seven minutes left, so at this
5 point, although I know that the panelists have more
6 that they can share, I'd like to see if there are any
7 questions.

8 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Thank you, Ronké. This
9 is Father Pius. Again, I just wanted to express my
10 gratitude to you all, to follow up on what Vic said.
11 This was just a very helpful and informative panel.
12 And especially, Ronké, I think this was presented very
13 well, I think exactly the right issues we wanted to
14 hear and in a good and organized way. So a special
15 thanks, Ronké, for what you've done to organize this.

16 I'll just ask, it's interesting to me. When
17 we think about technology in the legal services world,
18 we immediately think internet. Right? But it's
19 interesting, in hearing you all talk, is technology in
20 telephony and the advancements in technology in
21 telephony, if I'm pronouncing that word right, is much
22 more critical for something like intake. And being on

1 top of that and aware of that and aware of the options
2 is really important.

3 And it's one of the things, I think, is
4 missing, for example, in our performance criteria.
5 One, our performance criteria was really done before
6 online intake, so there's nothing in our performance
7 criteria about online intake.

8 But also, then, being aware of that technology
9 and reviewing that technology periodically to make sure
10 that you're making the best use of it seems to be
11 absolutely critical for a decent intake system,
12 question mark, I guess. I don't know. Maybe that's
13 just a statement. But it sounds like you're all
14 nodding in agreement, so I won't make that question.
15 So I'll just mark for the record they're all nodding in
16 agreement.

17 (Laughter.)

18 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I like it when people
19 nod in agreement.

20 All right. Are there any questions? Gloria?

21 CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: Yes. I join Father
22 Pius in appreciation for what you've revealed to us.

1 The complexity of dealing with this is at times very
2 difficult for us to understand when we're just reading
3 paper reports.

4 I do like that you've called attention to
5 something that we sometimes overlook. I was just at
6 the TIG conference in San Antonio, and a number of
7 people there reported, for instance, on the latest Pew
8 survey that stated that 85 percent of American
9 population are within access of internet, broadband or
10 some form.

11 But it's that 15 percent that is missed in
12 rural areas, almost totally missing in many of the
13 Native American areas in Indian Country. And dealing
14 with those is going to be continuously a struggle
15 because some of it is just elements we're not able to
16 affect.

17 We can't change geography and flatten
18 mountains and stuff like that. So whatever you have to
19 offer about ways to reach those without those internet
20 and other more urbanized resources would be
21 appreciated.

22 And I would like to also ask a question of

1 Ronké. Thank you. I'm looking at the performance area
2 criteria 1 that you had them very much address. There
3 is one element, and most of what we've heard is about
4 internal -- how we do our business, what we're
5 struggling to develop, and what we think we're doing
6 well.

7 There is one element there that is external.
8 That is, what is the reputation of the program among
9 the client and community groups? And if you could tell
10 me, and any of these directors, how they go about
11 assessing that. How do you learn what external groups
12 evaluate the things you're doing, what we give you the
13 grant for?

14 MS. HUGHES: Sure. That is an excellent
15 question. I will say that in the work that I do as
16 program counsel, we go about with our program visits
17 interviewing a broad spectrum of individuals in the
18 community when we do a site visit to get a sense for
19 how integrated the program is with the community that
20 it's serving, and what the perception is of the
21 community -- I'm sorry, of the program -- by other
22 stakeholders in the community.

1 I think that there may be some other
2 perspectives. And we were going to address evaluation.
3 Just for the sake of time, we nixed it.

4 CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: I don't want you to
5 get in that deep. But I couldn't hear what they say.

6 MS. HUGHES: Sure.

7 MS. KLEINBERG: If I could add one thing. We
8 ask callers how they heard about NJP. And I can't cite
9 the numbers for you, but the vast majority -- I think
10 if you combine these two categories it's a vast
11 majority, which is they are a former client, which
12 means they were willing to come back for further
13 service, which is a good sign, or they heard about us
14 from friends or family.

15 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I'm just curious, too.
16 Is that true for all of you? Most of that, you would
17 find out that's how they found about you, friends and
18 family or former clients?

19 PANELISTS: (Nodding heads affirmatively.)

20 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Interesting.
21 Interesting.

22 MS. ALLEN: At Land of Lincoln Legal Advice

1 and Referral Center, we send out surveys to every
2 fourth applicant that we provide advice to. And of
3 those surveys that are returned, 80 to 95 percent rate
4 our services from good to excellent. So we try to keep
5 the gauge as to what they think of the services that
6 we're providing via survey.

7 MR. TENUTA: Yes. We do that as well. We
8 survey about 30 percent of the people who go through
9 our intake application system. And we get 17 percent
10 of the surveys returned, which is a pretty good
11 percent, and pretty close to 90 percent rate us as
12 good, very good, or excellent. That's over -- since we
13 started doing the surveys in 2008. And I noticed the
14 numbers that the other people had were very similar.

15 MS. HUGHES: The other thing that I would
16 mention is that a lot of the external assessment comes
17 during the strategic planning and needs assessment
18 phase for each program. And so I know that with the
19 programs that I interact with regularly, focus groups
20 are a part of that needs assessment process.

21 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Okay. We're running
22 into the grantee presentation time. Are there any more

1 questions or comments? John?

2 MR. LEVI: It's just not really for this
3 group. But I would like to know, do we know actually
4 how many of our grantees don't have an online component
5 to their intake?

6 MS. LABELLA: I don't have that at my
7 fingertips. But we are able to access that data from
8 the grant application process, which we just completed
9 for the 2016 year. And so we can get that for you.

10 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. Just a followup
11 email. I'd just be interested about what percentage.

12 MS. LABELLA: Yes.

13 MR. LEVI: I think it would be helpful. And
14 this certainly gave powerful --

15 MS. LABELLA: Right. And I think the
16 experience that these grantees have expressed with
17 online intake is definitely one across the board, that
18 they have statistics to show that it increases the
19 efficiency.

20 It shortens the time of the whole intake
21 process, and particularly the staff involvement on the
22 phone with completing the intake process. So it is

1 something that has been proven to have great efficiency
2 gains.

3 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And I agree. And even
4 to the technology for the telephones. I mean, if
5 you've got somebody who's just got a 1-800 number and
6 an answering machine, that's a problem. Right? And if
7 they're not having some of these technological add-ons
8 to their telephone intake, because that's the big
9 majority, that signals a huge problem, I think.

10 Anyway, any other questions or comments for
11 this panel? Julie, did you have anything?

12 MS. REISKIN: That's okay.

13 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry,
14 Julie. And you can certainly follow up individually
15 with them afterwards.

16 I really thank you all, not only for your
17 presentation, but really for the work that you do in
18 the field. You do an important service, as you all
19 know. And please go back to your home states and your
20 home programs and please thank them on our behalf for
21 all the great work that they do for the poor, and
22 please ask them to keep continuing gung ho in the work

1 that they do.

2 So thank you. You are the face of the legal
3 services to the poor, and you are a lifeline for so
4 many. So thank you for your time, thank you for your
5 presentations, and Ronké, thank you for a wonderful
6 presentation as well. Thank you.

7 MS. HUGHES: Thank you for the opportunity.

8 (Applause)

9 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And how long do you
10 want to wait? Do you want to wait five minutes?

11 MR. LEVI: I think we'll have five minutes.
12 And I think we'll defer --

13 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Actually, before we do
14 that, then --

15 MR. LEVI: We need to keep your meeting open.

16 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. Can I have a
17 motion to table this committee's meeting until tomorrow
18 afternoon?

19 M O T I O N

20 MS. REISKIN: So moved.

21 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Is there a second?

22 MR. LEVI: Second.

1 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All in favor?

2 (A chorus of ayes.)

3 CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Okay. This meeting is
4 tabled until tomorrow afternoon.

5 (Whereupon, at 3:49 p.m., the meeting was
6 adjourned, to reconvene the following day, Friday,
7 January 29, 2016, at 2:00 p.m.)

8 * * * * *

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22