1	STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF ALBANY
2	
3	
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE CHIEF JUDGE'S
5	HEARINGS ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES,
6	THIRD DEPARTMENT HEARING
7	
8	
9	PROCEEDINGS held in the above-entitled
10	matter on the 17th day of September, 2013,
11	at 10:00 a.m. at the Court of Appeals,
12	Eagle Street, Albany, New York.
13	
14	
15	BEFORE: HON. JONATHAN LIPPMAN, Chief Justice of the State of New York
16	
17	HON. A. GAIL PRUDENTI
18	Chief Administrative Judge
19	HON. KAREN K. PETERS
20	Presiding Justice, Appellate Division, Third Department
21	
22	DAVID M. SCHRAVER President, New York State Bar Association
23	
24	
	Denominal house Collinson D. W. J.
25	Reported by: Colleen B. Neal

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Good morning. It's a delight to see all of you. Before we have our first witness testify let me just give you a little background. This is the 2013 Hearing on Civil Legal Services. As you know, these hearings are under the auspices of the leadership of the judiciary and the profession in this state.

I have with me Karen Peters, the Presiding

Justice of the Third Department; Chief Administrative

Judge A. Gail Prudenti, on my left; and all the way to the right is David Schraver, who is the President of the New York State Bar Association.

The reason why we have the leadership of our court system and the profession preside over these hearings is because they are essential to the cause of equal justice in our state. There is a crisis in this country in relation to civil legal services for the poor and these hearings are designed to quantify what that crisis is here in New York and then proceed from there a process that I will explain to you.

The hearings were put together in large measure by the Task Force to Expand Civil Legal Services in our state. Our chair is here, Helaine Barnette. Where are you, Helaine? Good to see you. And you've done such a terrific job. And I believe from the Task Force Steve

Banks is here, Camille Enders, Anne Erickson. Fern
Fisher? No. Okay. Denise Kronstadt? No. And Lillian
Loyd. I saw her, I know Lillian. Thank you all.

Really the Task Force has done wonderful work and we're so pleased that you can be with us today. I think around the country our access to justice efforts are such a large measure of the work of the Task Force.

Let me also say that what this is all about is not just a crisis in terms of representation for defendants who have a particular lawsuit -- let me also say that I would be very neglectful if I didn't mention Judge Victoria Graffeo, my colleague, who is all the way in the back, it's hard to find her, but I see her there. And Judge Graffeo has been the co-chair of our advisory committee on the 50-hour pro bono rule.

The lawyers and Judge Graffeo are also heading a group on in-house pro bono work and in so many other areas and done just a spectacular job in the cause of equal justice in our state and on behalf of promoting civil legal services.

Let me sort of summarize what's been going on; that people fighting for the necessities of life, whether it be a roof over their head, their physical well-being, their livelihoods, the well-being of their families, fighting for the basic essentials of life, cannot get

legal representation in our state and in our country. At best we are meeting 20 percent of their needs.

And if you look at an organization as well-known and spectacular as The Legal Aid Society in New York City, you can see Banks there, they turn away eight of nine people who come to them in search of legal representation. So this is a terrible situation, and a bad economy makes it worse.

And what's happening on the civil side of our courts is that -- now on the criminal side we all know we recently celebrated the victory battle of Gideon versus Wainwright, which ensures that people in criminal cases, defendants, have a Constitutional right to representation.

In civil cases, at least now, there is no constitutional right. That's why people around the country have been talking about a civil Gideon. And we're just not there and not close to being there. Again, more people than not, depending on where you are -- Lillian's situation is a little different, Anne's a little different, Steve's a little different, but every place is the same story, that we cannot accommodate the people who come seeking representation in matters. This is not because they tripped over a crack in the sidewalk in front of the courthouse, these are very essential. Evictions, foreclosures, domestic violence, consumer credit cases.

All the things that really matter.

And the judiciary and the profession recognize our unique role and our unique responsibility in this role. The bottom line is if we can't have equal justice in our courthouse, if everyone can't be represented and have their day in court, then we might as well close the courthouse doors. There's nothing more important. It has no meaning without a level playing field.

So that's why we're very proud of the template that we've developed in New York. We're due to a joint resolution of the Legislature, we hold these hearings every year. The resolution asks us to inform the Legislature as to what the needs are in terms of civil legal services, then we're holding hearings, the Task Force provides a report, and then we put in the judiciary budget a request for funds not to completely meet the need, because there isn't enough money in the world to completely meet the need, but to close the justice gap between the resources available and the desperate need.

We've been very fortunate over the first three years of our efforts, where the first year the Legislature gave us twenty-seven and a half million dollars, the second year forty million dollars, and last year fifty-five million dollars for civil legal services in our state, and we thank the Legislature and the Governor for

making that a reality. It is by far the highest amount of funding for legal services in the country and yet the tip of the iceberg.

So the other part of it where I mention that there just isn't enough, even in Comptroller DiNapoli's vast war chest that he has down the street over here, there just isn't the funding that we need.

So there's one other thing that is very important and that is the volunteer pro bono efforts of the Bar and we're so thankful to President Schraver and the State Bar and all of the local Bar Associations for contributing over two and a half million hours of pro bono work at least that we know.

We just started a reporting system with lawyers so we can get a sharper idea with their registration the report on how much pro bono work that they do so we will know better exactly what we're doing in pro bono and how that complements the money we're getting from the state.

And Judge Graffeo has been instrumental in terms of our putting together an effective system for the 50 hours of pro bono that we're asking from law students, or requiring from law students. We have a wonderful program that we believe is going to be replicated shortly around the country. California is next and New Jersey we believe will happen very soon.

We have a program of older lawyers also do pro bono work, Albany lawyers, Emeritus Program, the State Bar has so many programs that are so helpful in terms of pro bono work complementing the money that we get from the

state.

So again, all of this is about everyone gets access to the courts. That's what we're interested in, equal justice, a level playing field. And I think it's fair to say that every society is judged by how it treats its most vulnerable litigants. And for us too here in New York, we should be judged by how we treat the most vulnerable among us. What could be a greater test, a greater challenge.

So what we're doing today, starting with

Comptroller DiNapoli, is trying to figure out what is the

need so in this year's budget that will come in December

we can quantify that need, put in monies to the

Legislature and hopefully get a good result. We've been

so pleased with where we are so far, but there's so much

more to be done.

So without further ado, I welcome you all to the hearing which is going to be from 10:00 to 1:00 today. We have six different panels. The Comptroller is a panel in and of himself as opposed to the other multiple people in the panels.

1 2

But I do want to say that from both a professional and personal experience I know Comptroller DiNapoli is one of the most committed and dedicated people in this state to the cause of justice for everybody in our state, treating everybody with respect and dignity as a legislator, as a Comptroller and Re-Comptroller. Tom DiNapoli I think stands for everything that's good in public service in this state. It is an honor and a privilege to have him here.

I'm so pleased that in this first hearing this year, and there's four hearings around the state, it is appropriate that the lead witness, Comptroller DiNapoli, is such a wonderful steward of our state finances, and again someone committed to all the values that we care about in this state, particularly in the judiciary and the agenda that we have which is that everyone be treated equally. And I think that's a hallmark of what Comptroller DiNapoli stands for.

Tom, Mr. Comptroller, thank you so much for being here and we're delighted and honored by your presence.

HON. DiNAPOLI: Thank you, Chief Judge, you humble me with your kind words, I thank you for that.

It's a privilege for me to be with you in this beautiful and historical courtroom where the history of New York has

been made and continues to be made. And I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you.

We submitted written testimony, but I will read it for the record to make it official. So good morning, Chief Judge Lippman, Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti, Presiding Judge Peters, Bar Association President Schraver, and the cast who joins us. I'm honored to be with you today at the Chief Judge's Hearings on Civil Legal Services in New York.

As the Comptroller of the State of New York, I'm the Chief Fiscal Officer of the state. My office engages in continuous oversight of the state budget and is responsible for auditing the payment, as well as the results, of money spent.

New York State's enacted budget for state fiscal year 2013-14 projected to total \$96.4 billion, not including federally-funded spending. This figure, known as the State Funds portion of the budget, represents all state taxes and non-tax revenues that are available for spending during the fiscal year in areas where federal funds are not available.

The state continues to face budgetary challenges. We have seen real progress in recent years, both in the state's short-term financial position and in the effort to move toward long-term structural balance.

But projected outyear gaps remain significant, at \$1.7 billion in the next fiscal year and \$2.9 billion in each of the following two years.

The very difficult fiscal challenges that we have confronted during and after the Great Recession have had negative impacts on virtually every state program, certainly including the one we're addressing today.

Still, in the midst of the continuing challenges the current state budget includes increases for many important programs.

Even in tough times we find ways to provide for essential services. For example, school aid is rising by 5.3 percent on a school-year basis, and Medicaid is rising by 3.3 percent this fiscal year. These are the two largest areas of the state budget, and we all agree are very important. So, too, are civil legal services. Even in difficult times we can and should find ways to support this essential program.

Traditionally, the primary source of funding for civil legal services has been the interest on Lawyer Account Fund. As all of you are well aware, an extended period of low interest rates, among other factors, has reduced this funding stream dramatically. Planned expenditures from the IOLA fund this year are only \$7 million, compared to nearly \$32 million just a few years

ago.

Chief Judge Lippman has come to the rescue year after year, this year targeting \$40 million in the judiciary budget for appropriations for support of civil legal services and an additional \$15 million for IOLA for a total of \$55 million.

Why it is important to fund civil legal services? The reality is -- and Chief Judge certainly framed the discussion partly a few moments ago -- a vast number of New Yorkers cannot afford a lawyer. And without a lawyer they cannot adequately navigate legal problems involving some very fundamental needs we often take for granted, including housing, family stability and personal safety in domestic relations, access to health care or education, or subsistence income and benefits.

Who are the people who need lawyers? Well, they are our neighbors. They're victims of natural disasters like Superstorm Sandy and Hurricane Irene who are trying to rebuild their homes. They're veterans, many of whom are disabled, returning to us from honorable service in Iraq and Afghanistan, trying to rebuild their lives.

They're workers in urban, suburban and rural communities, many of whom earn not much more than minimum wage and need lawyers to represent them in their daily struggles. And those who are unemployed need lawyers just as much as

anyone else.

New York has been at the forefront for providing low-income legal services. Civil legal assistance for the poor in the United States began in New York City in 1876 with the founding of the predecessor to the Legal Aid Society of New York. And under your leadership, Judge Lippman, we remain in the forefront. Since your selection as Chief Judge you have been tireless in your efforts to shine a light on the legal needs of lower-income New Yorkers and to provide them access to quality legal assistance.

While my role as Comptroller does not include recommending specific levels of expenditures I have the responsibility to see that the tax payers' dollars are used cost-effectively. It is said that you often have to invest money to save money. I support Judge Lippman's efforts in this spirit, not just because they help lower income New Yorkers, but because they are in the best financial interest of the state.

The economic consequences to the state of the lack of civil legal services are significant. According to the Office of Court Administration the lack of representation for low and moderate income New Yorkers places a huge burden on the courts.

In 2010 there were 2.3 million unrepresented

litigants whose lack of representation slowed judicial proceedings for all litigants, including businesses that suffer economic loss every day their legal disputes are not addressed.

In our state Supreme Court the Office of Court
Administration has established standards for timely
disposition of cases, from the initial request for
judicial intervention to disposition. For expedited cases
the standard is 23 months; for standard and complex cases
the standard period is some months longer. Some cases are
resolved more quickly than the standard period, while
others can take months or years longer.

One of the hallmarks of a positive business environment is a judicial system that resolves disputes without undue delay. To the extent that we can ensure all litigants appropriate legal representation, we enhance both the fairness and timeliness of our state court system for the benefit of all New Yorkers.

The lack of appropriate representation is a particular issue in certain kinds of cases. Statewide, 49 percent of New Yorkers are unrepresented at statutorily required settlement conferences in foreclosure cases.

Representation by counsel is still unavailable for borrowers in thousands of consumer credit cases filed in New York City; for too many parents in child support

matters in rural, suburban and urban areas; and for the overwhelming majority of tenants in eviction cases in all four Judicial Departments.

Providing civil legal services can help prevent the downstream societal and financial impacts that stem from problems such as domestic violence and homelessness. For example, representation in domestic violence matters can cut down on the costs associated with lost work days, hospitalization, treatment by physicians, emergency room visits, ambulance and paramedic services, physical therapy, and mental health treatment.

While New York was not hit by the housing market decline and foreclosure crisis as hard as some other states were, both the state and the nation continue to suffer repercussions of that decline and the resulting foreclosures.

Many economists tell us that the lingering weakness in housing markets is one reason our national economy is not growing as strongly as we would like.

Representation in foreclosure proceedings ensures that low-income homeowners have a fair chance at retaining their homes, thereby stabilizing a still-troubled housing market.

Representation of the custodial parent in child support proceedings not only allows parent and child to

live with food, shelter and dignity, but protects taxpayers who otherwise would have to pick up the bill.

The evidence of the monetary return to the state of investment in legal services is plentiful. The United States Department of Commerce estimates that every dollar brought into the New York economy generates a multiplier effect of 1.48. Civil legal services help generate badly-needed SSI and other benefits. When these dollars come into the state low-income families and individuals use the money to purchase necessities like food, rent and clothing. These expenditures in turn support local businesses at the same time they assist those in need.

NERA Economic Consulting analyzed 2011 data provided by the New York State Interest on Lawyer Account Fund and estimates that in terms of benefits won the total flow of funds brought into New York in 2011 alone is \$378 million. Expected future benefits may raise that figure by many additional millions of dollars.

This figure includes federal funds brought into the state in the form of direct federal benefits for individual clients, such as SSI, Supplemental Security Income; SSD, Social Security Disability Insurance; Medicaid, unemployment compensation, earned income tax credits and veterans benefits, much of which represents a return of our fair share of the federal taxes that we pay.

1 2

Using the Department of Congress multiplier,

NERA concluded that the benefits received in 2011 yielded
an overall positive impact on the state economy of \$561

million. New York is not unique in this respect. Studies
performed on behalf of civil legal services providers in

Massachusetts, Maryland and a number of other states
conclude that such services generate substantial increases
in federal revenue.

Since this is clearly a national phenomenon, one might reasonably ask what is the federal government doing to expand access to these services? The answer is not what we would hope for. The Legal Services Corporation is the single largest funder of civil legal aid for low-income Americans in the nation. Established in 1974, LSC operates as an independent nonprofit corporation that provides grants for high-quality civil legal assistance to low-income Americans. It distributes more than 90 percent of its total funding to 134 independent nonprofit legal aid programs with more than 800 offices. Unfortunately, LSC grants amount to less than 27 percent of New York's legal services funding. And the trend is not good.

In fiscal year 2011 Congress gave the Corporation \$378.6 million for basic field grants. In 2012 that decreased to \$322 million. In 2013 it decreased to \$316 million. For fiscal year 2014 the U.S. Senate

proposes increasing the field grants to \$400 million; but the House of Representatives wants to decrease that to \$272 million.

And what should we do to move forward here in

New York? Well, certainly first and foremost let's

support the Chief Judge in his very important efforts.

And second, also the Chief Judge touched on earlier, let's

continue to find nonmonetary as well as monetary

solutions. And this also has been a Hallmark of Judge

Lippman's tenure.

While we cannot achieve our objective with volunteers alone, tapping into the spirit of volunteerism is a key component. It not only combines cost-effectiveness with quality, it demonstrates the dedication of the legal profession to the furtherance of justice.

Pro bono attorneys are indispensable in the effort to ensure access to justice for our most vulnerable and needy residents. My congratulations to the New York State Bar Association, and its members, for its robust pro bono response. The Association promotes pro bono participation through a variety of recruitment and recognition programs, like the Empire State Counsel Program, reserved for Association members who, during the calendar year, contributed 50 hours or more of free legal

services.

These services are provided directly to persons of limited financial means. They also go to organizations whose services are designed primarily to address the legal and other basic needs of persons of limited financial means, or to increasingly the availability of legal services to vulnerable and/or low-income individuals.

Our seniors, retired or active attorneys, are leading the way also. The Unified Court System's Attorney Emeritus Program works with the organized bar and legal services programs to place attorneys in good standing, who are at least 55 years old with a minimum of 10 years experience, with pro bono opportunities.

During the two-year registration period,

Emeritus attorney volunteers commit to serving 60 hours of unpaid legal assistance under the auspices of a qualified legal service provider, bar association or court-sponsored volunteer lawyer program. And you need not have years of experience to become part of the solution.

On September 14th of last year the Court of
Appeals adopted a new rule requiring applicants for
admission to the New York State Bar to perform 50 hours of
pro bono services. What better way could there be not
only to meet the needs of our low-income residents, but
also to start off thousands of legal careers with a

built-in sense of the spirit of volunteerism and giving back, something that may help define the entire careers of the newest members of the legal profession.

In conclusion, I believe we must support appropriate funding for civil legal services because doing so is fair and equitable. Our failure to do so would exacerbate the already-too-large justice gap that exists between the well-off and the poor. But that is not the only reason. There is an additional reason that is especially important from my perspective as Comptroller. The numbers show an investment in civil legal services is a smart investment. The payback and benefit, in both qualitative and quantitative measure is very clear.

I appreciate this opportunity to testify before you. If you have any questions, I'm pleased to respond.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you,

Mr. Comptroller, we really appreciate it. Let me ask you in the central message that we've been trying to get across in the last -- certainly this is the fourth year of trying to do this, is that this really is a question of improving the financial health of the state, the bottom line of our state, but it's so hard to get that message across, in bad times particularly. There's a tendency to say well that's really a good thing, I understand people need help, but we have lots of priorities in terms of

people needing help and the money is just not there.

How do you get across that this is on top of doing the right thing; which I think everyone wants to do, particularly those in government. How do you get across that this really is a dollars-and-cents issue? What we've tried to do is do some of these studies that really put it in certainly discreet areas as to what the benefits to the state are; the classic example which I think is the better problems that come in. But it's hard. When you're trying to balance the books we know there are certain expenditures, but it's hard to quantify that the benefits to the state are so much greater.

HON. DiNAPOLI: You're right, it's very hard.

But I do think given the tough time we continue to

navigate through both from a mental and certainly in

people's personal lives as well. Everyone needs to

understand the need to look at all issues from the

perspective of what's a dollars-and-cents impact. And I

do think the studies that have been out there not only in

New York but detailed studies in other states, but a very

similar kind of research, you know, first of all, as you

point out, in terms of leveraging benefit dollars from the

federal government, the benefit is clear and you can

quantify a great deal of that.

And I think part of the message is really the

points we hear about so much in New York, and we have for decades, New York sends a lot of money to Washington and we never get back our fair share. It's a circumstance that may be a forever dynamic because we're a wealthier state so we may never come out fully ahead. But there's always the concern how can we more effectively leverage where we have a foot in the door with so many federal programs.

So I think looking at other states and their studies, they validate the same kind of model, the various kinds of federal benefits that are out there we will leverage more dollars. So I think being more consistent in the message that we're getting something we're really not entitled to.

And although I touched on it, I certainly think we can spend a great deal more time documenting the numbers of our veterans that are part of this issue as well. We talk a great deal about honorable service and we know that with the recent conflicts people are coming back very injured and disabled. And everybody talks about the heros, but in very tangible terms we need to recognize that if you look at those that are homeless, facing mental health issues, posttraumatic stress disorder, substance abuse so on, is very often our veteran population. So again because the federal government is willing to provide

benefits in that area another sense of the priority of honoring that service and leveraging the dollars becomes a very, very important one.

So I think citing more of the data that's out there and again validate not only by the New York members but by other states, but I also think there's the point that I touched on in testimony is an important one as well because everybody is going to look at their self-interest, right; so, anyone who has an interest in a matter before the court certainly suffers when there's a delay and certainly from a business perspective we often get complaints because they're trying to resolve a matter and can't get a resolution.

If the courts are being clogged because of this unrepresented population and that's jamming up the system, for lack of a more artful way of saying it, that is a way in which everybody suffers. So we all strive to have New York have a better sense about a place to do business and a more hospitable climate. The efficiency of the courts is very, very important.

So I think making the connection to the ways in which we all have a say even for those who perhaps say it may be right but we can't deal with it now because of the economics. Certainly the numbers in terms of drawing down benefits are clear in terms of the impacts on the state's

economy and revenue of the state and the efficiency of the courts, how important and essential that is to all stakeholders in our state. And I think emphasizing those important points is a way to bring it home that there is a larger benefit, not just to the individuals and the families who will be served by these services.

think a couple of times the role in terms of the business community. We've been able to quantify and say that for every dollar invested six dollars is returned to the state. But I think what people fail to realize too, and you said it a number of times in your testimony, is that the bottom line of individual businesses are really served by providing legal representation to the poor.

We've had people come in sort of counterintuitive to say well why would a head of a big corporation care about legal representation to the poor? But basically they come in say, the head of the biggest banks or whatever, if you're letting people fall off the cliffs those people, apropros your testimony, are not in the communities spending money at the local stores, putting money into the bank, doing all the things that make us a thriving community. So we're trying to do both, to get across to the state this is a wise investment, but way beyond that it's multiplied through the financial

health of the community and all the different business entities.

HON. DiNAPOLI: And certainly people and families that are in crisis they don't disappear, they will show up somewhere else if their issues aren't resolved in a positive way, whether it's the health care system or social services system, they will show up, and very often with more critical issues and it will certainly be much more costly.

So having positive resolution on these issues, giving them positive legal representation hopefully they will come to a point, with other kinds of assistance that's out there, where they will no longer be in crisis in the long run, and that benefits our bottom line substantially.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Comptroller. Any other questions?

HON. PRUDENTI: Can I just ask you one quick question, please? And Comptroller, I have to take this opportunity to thank you and to thank other members of your staff who are just so professional and so helpful with regard to pointing out to us ways we can do business better, as well as answering any questions we have with regard to funding from the state, so I appreciate that.

But as I know you are well aware that we are in

the midst of preparing our budget going forward and of course that will be a request that I will speak with the Chief Judge about with these hearings from Civil Legal Services. So I just want one question from my view as Chief Administrative Judge in what I purchase. Can you tell me the projections for state revenue for this fiscal year, have we met those projections?

HON. DiNAPOLI: Certainly where we're at at this point in the budget cycle we seem to be on target and that's a good sign. One of the challenges is that we had a significant bump-up in revenue ahead of projection earlier in the year, much of that having to do with the tax activity because of change on the federal level and of course the day to pay the taxes, April 15th.

So whether or not all of that will hold up through the balance of this year, through March 31st, we still have been urging caution. But compared to where we are at at this point in the fiscal year a few years ago where we would be dealing with shortfalls and the need for the Legislature to come back and make their cuts or slowing down payments or putting off state aid to localities, we're certainly not in that kind of a crisis mode.

So much of our budget plan is very much tied to the swing of the overall economy. And as we all can

appreciate, more of the indicators are certainly on the positive side than they've been for a number of years.

We're certainly in a recovery mode statewide, although the extent of recovery is uneven depending on which part of the state you live in. But I have to say right now all things seem to be holding together. That's good news.

But as I indicate, even with the good news of the current year we still have a budget gap. So the challenge still for New York is -- and I give credit to the Governor and the Legislature, they have been successful in the past three budgets in being more responsible on the front end in terms of more of a realistic approach on revenue projections, the budgets have healed together.

But because of the expected rising cost in a number of areas we still see outyear gaps. Are they 10 billion gaps we had recently, no, but there are still gaps there, so our hope is that we will not only end the budget year balanced, but hopefully we'll see an arch uptake in the economic activity of the state that might result in a decreased projection as far as what the outyear gaps for the next year and the couple years after that.

So it's fair to say so far so good. We're not out of the woods yet. We're doing our budget now too. For all of us we have to assume the kind of fiscal discipline we've all had to exercise over the past few

years, that's not going to end any time soon. So it does become a competition of priorities in where you choose to -- if you wanted to do an increase where you choose to make that decision. That's why I pointed out in the early part of my testimony even during tough times there have been increases in programs. Certainly when you're talking about something like education aid, over a 5 percent increase, you're talking about \$20 million plus, a big chunk of the budget.

So there obviously are programs that state policy makers are determining to be important enough to get increase. And obviously in terms of dollar amounts when we're talking about the civil legal services a small fraction of some of those big programs have seen some healthy increases in the context of a very, very tight budget climate.

So what that would suggest is understanding an overall environment is one of concern and needs to be conservative in our estimates, but even in tough times programs that have been deemed to have value have seen increases. Keep making the case. Keep fighting hard for this program.

HON. PRUDENTI: Thank you, Comptroller.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Comptroller DiNapoli, for your insightful testimony. Puts it into

context really of where all of this fits into the bigger picture of the state economy and the state budget. We're very happy that you have to contend with that, we have our own issues to deal with.

But thank you for gracing us with your presence and for your supportive statements. We do feel that this is such an important point to talk about, prioritizing and where there needs to be wise investments that on the one hand are real dollars, but on the other hand in the short and long run very much contribute to the economic health of the state. So thank you, it's been a delight to have you.

HON. DiNAPOLI: It's been a privilege to be with all of you and thank you for your great work.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Comptroller.

The next panel is the Dean of Albany Law School Penelope

Andrews, and Denise Gonick, the President and CEO of MVP

Health Care.

MS. ANDREWS: Good morning to the panel and thank you for the opportunity for me to testify on the role of law schools --

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you for coming in because we need our home team here, Albany Law School.

MS. ANDREWS: I'm pleased to be here and I applaud you and the Task Force for your attention to this

critical issue.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you for coming, we really appreciate it. Go ahead.

MS. ANDREWS: You had mentioned in your remarks that there was certainly a lack of funding. There's always a lack of funding. And I would like to think that law schools to some extent close the gap. So what I would really like to do is talk a little bit about the role of law schools and then mention some of our programs at Albany Law School.

So let me start just by saying that this issue is something that I feel personally very passionate about. I grew up in South Africa where access to the courts is very limited. And as a student this was something that I felt -- this was the reason for my being a lawyer.

I think that we all agree that law schools, as significant institutions in our society, have a responsibility to instill a sense of service and commitment to justice in our students. And this has been a tradition of law schools and Albany Law School, I'm proud to say, has followed this tradition.

So let me just outline quickly a few of our programs. I won't go into all the testimony, I'll just summarize some of what we're doing at Albany Law School. Let me first mention the Albany Law Clinic & Justice

Center. At the clinic we have a pro bono program, our faculty and research and scholarship in collaboration with the community, these are all very important. And the clinic is at the center of it.

As you know, clinical education is an important part of a law student's training. And every year at Albany Law School through the clinics one-third of our students assist hundreds of individuals and families who might otherwise not have legal presentation. And it is my commitment to increase the number of students to a hundred percent of students who are involved in representing individuals and families.

In addition to providing this vital service,
Albany Law students are learning to practice law with
compassion and sensitivity to the needs of their clients.
In this way they are able to represent people who are
often economically and socially marginalized and who
typically lead vastly different lives to those of our
students.

Let me just quickly mention the other clinics.

We have the Civil Rights and Disabilities Law Clinic, we have the Family Violence Litigation Clinic & Immigration

Project, we have a Tax and Transactional Law Clinic, we have a Health Law Clinic. And then of course there's the Law Field Placement Program which supplements the clinical

work and the clinical program.

Even before Chief Judge Lippman announced that all law students must perform 50 hours of pro bono service to be admitted to the New York Bar, Albany Law School had a vibrant student-run, faculty-supported, pro bono program. We at Albany Law School applaud Judge Lippman's rule and believe it will be instrumental in creating an even deeper commitment and passion for pro bono work in many students as they move through their careers.

In response to the rule, Albany Law School committed its resource to hire a full-time pro bono fellow who supports our student and faculty in the pro bono society. In our pro bono program students commit to completing at least 15 hours of service through a project each semester, although many students volunteer in the 50-to 100-hour service range. Last year, 200 students completed nearly 2,500 hours over the course of the year.

We are working collaboratively with The Legal Project to fund and hire post-graduate fellows who will work full time with their Domestic Violence Project. And this is possible as a result of funding from the Office of Court Administration which will be used to leverage additional support from law firms and businesses to fund the program in the long-term.

We are also very excited that with the Third

Department The Legal Project, Legal Aid, we are setting up a health center to work with individuals and communities who are unrepresented. So that is sort of just a snapshot of the clinics and our field placement and pro bono.

Let me just talk a little bit about the faculty. We have several faculty, and I won't tell you what everybody does, but let me give a few examples of our faculty's work in this area. Professor Connie Mayer serves as the Law School's representative on the Statewide Law School Access to Justice Council which is part of Judge Lippman's Task Force to Expand Access to Civil Legal Services in New York.

Professor Dorothy Hill integrates access to justice and access to the courts routinely in an Introduction to Lawyering classes, including a lengthy dedication about dedication to justice and the public good as an essential characteristic of an expert lawyer. In this past semester she used a case example of access to justice issues faced by many transgender individuals.

I could continue, but the point is that Albany
Law School is deeply committed at all levels to ensuring
access to the courts. Continuing this work and supporting
our students who want to pursue public services takes
resources. Our students are weighed down by their student
loans. There are some mechanisms that alleviate the loan

after the student performs a certain number of years of service. We also have a limited Loan Repayment Assistance Program for students who want to pursue a career in public service and public interest. And one of my goals as the Dean is to raise more money for the program.

Ensuring access to justice is central to the mission of the law school. Our work -- in our clinics, through our pro bono program, and by our faculty -- has a direct impact on the community. But more importantly, it helps students identify a passion for justice, and for service, that will make a difference throughout their careers. Based on recent history and the path of our alumni, we know that Albany Law students go into public service, continue to engage in pro bono work and answer the calls to close the justice gap as a direct result of their experience at Albany Law School and we are proud of this tradition.

But our work at Albany Law School would not be possible without the partnerships of those organizations and institutions that provide access to the civil legal services in the great State of New York. The combined efforts in training, mentoring, advocacy and service with these organizations and institutions make our efforts at Albany Law possible and meaningful.

Let me conclude by saying that I have been the

president and Dean at Albany Law School for just over one year and there are many things that I am heartened by in this role. One is being part of the community of those who provide access to legal services to marginalized, struggling and poor New Yorkers. I am particularly heartened by the commitment of Chief Judge Lippman and this committee, and so I applaud you. And thank you for allowing me this opportunity to testify before you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Dean. And thank you for your commitment and for your terrific remarks.

Let me ask you a question. We speak to a lot of deans and we talk to a lot of people, I do certainly, around the country in the law school community. There are deans who say quite directly that law schools are not in the access to justice business. What do you think, Dean, are law schools in the access to justice business?

MS. ANDREWS: Oh absolutely. If you believe in the rule of law and you believe that as a society, a democratic society, and the citizens in the democratic society should have access to the courts, then that is the business of law schools. And law schools train students to work to provide access in a variety of areas in government, in practice, in business. So I believe that that is our role and that we should be vigorously

graduating students who are committed to the rule of access to justice.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: We are in total agreement with you. Let me ask you another question. I think you touched on it in your remark. There clearly is a disconnect in this country and here in New York between the kids, the students, who are coming out of law school, loads of lawyers, deeply in debt, and yet the jobs are certainly not as plentiful as they were before the economy took a nose dive. And there is on the other end this desperate need, that these hearings are all about, the civil legal services. And I've been working -- in fact, I've been working with Judge Graffeo on a couple of thoughts that we've been thinking about in terms of how to solve this clear problem that we have. I think disconnect is the right word.

Do you feel that in your everyday what you're doing as a Dean of a very prominent law school, do you feel that where you're training these kids you're not only training them in the disciplines, but in the values of what it means to be a lawyer, and they come out and yet jobs are difficult to come by and burdened sometimes by tremendous debt, and yet how do we get them over to meet this need? We can instill in them the value of understanding that being a lawyer is also about service to

others, but how do we -- this fundamental problem that you're confronting, that we're confronting, how do we deal with it? Does it drive you every day? Is it part of what you're dealing with as the Dean of Albany Law School?

MS. ANDREWS: I think the quintessential challenge for law school deans and law schools in this century and in the next few decades is how to remedy the disconnect that you mention. There is clearly a great need for legal service by many members in the community and yet people talk about there being too many lawyers. So I think the challenge is to marry those two forces. And I don't think it's an easy challenge. I think law school tuition is of great concern. This is what we have right now.

So as a law Dean my challenge is to ensure that the values have a place to go because the point is students graduate and they want to do this work and they cannot. So that's the challenge and that's what I'm committed to, to ensure that we're able to distribute the needs in the community, and not just be idealistic but actually put that into practice.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And you know as we all talked about when we meet with the deans and certainly in New York we talk about what we need to do with the curriculum to change it, to make it more responsive to the

need that's out there, but I'm sure that will happen with all of the energy that's out there in terms of law schools and what we should do with the third year, make it more valuable, and some people even say maybe we should change the whole framework.

The problem is whatever we do even if we succeed is what happens afterwards and how do we channel the students who -- you know, we can indoctrinate them until we're blue in the face about what their responsibilities are as lawyers, but I think solving that goes so much to solving the problems that these hearings are all about, and also continuing our legal profession, that I know that President Schraver cares so much about, to make it a vibrant one in New York.

So it's all kind of interrelated and I guess it leads me to something else that you mentioned -- which will be my last question, and if anyone has any -- you talked about the relationship with partners. And I guess that's what strikes me, in both our efforts to gain funding for legal services and our efforts to produce more pro bono work, do you believe that -- I think sometimes people feel that law schools exist in a vacuum. And I think what we're starting to realize, I'm sure at the law schools, and certainly from our perspective and the courts and in the profession, that we really are in this together

and that we can't succeed without each other. Do you feel that you're grappling with these issues? That's what you see?

MS. ANDREWS: Yes, I think that clearly a lot of the opportunities that this quote unquote crisis has generated has been seen in law schools that everything is interconnected and that our partners, really we should be working closely with our partners to ensure that they have the resources to do what they wish to do and that we can do what we should be doing.

I'm heartened that President Schraver has taken on board the issue of legal education. And I think the trick is I have committed my deanship to one of student-centeredness. It's all about the students, the graduates, and the future of the legal profession. So I think that this moment has provided a great opportunity for us to really look at these opportunities and not as a cliché - this crisis we cannot waste.

So yes, I am heartened. I think that law schools have to be involved. I'm pleased that Albany Law School, because of our location, because of our legacy, has always been involved in the community. And we are fortunate to have very, very committed alumni, like Denise Gonick here, who really care about the school and the role of the school in the community.

think it's so interesting that a few years ago -- and Dave knows this -- we tried to take part, tried many years, the court system, tried many years gee let's get the academy together with the court system and the Bar, and yet there was a time that I think the academic community didn't realize the synergy, you know, we're educating the students. And I think sometimes there's always a silver lining, and I think in the crisis that we have in representation, the crisis that we have in the legal profession, has in so many ways brought us all together in recognizing that we have so much in common and that the problems, as you say, are interrelated. Thank you so much.

MS. ANDREWS: Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Any other questions?

Presiding Justice Peters.

HON. PETERS: Firstly, I want to thank you for taking the helm. You've done an extraordinary job in your short tenure here and we're pleased to have you in Albany.

As the Presiding Judge of the Appellate Division
Third Department I sign practice orders for attorneys and
law students who are in a great number of organizations
from district attorney's offices to Legal Aid Societies,
and I'm wondering if you can help me understand how you

think you can get the rest of the law students involved in clinical work? What do you think prevents them? Are they employed part-time and therefore struggling to earn a living; are they raising a family while they're in school; or have they just not adopted our philosophy which is that in order to have the joy of the practice of law you need to give back to the community that you serve?

MS. ANDREWS: You mentioned some factors:

Raising a family, working part-time to raise money. But I think there are other factors as well. One is first year is such an incredibly anxious time for students because grades mean everything, and there's the bar passage, and so those factors impede some of that.

But I think really it is about right from the start as the Dean and the faculty guiding students. Judge Lippman had mentioned indoctrination. I don't think it's indoctrination, I think our students -- in this country our students come to law school with a passion for service, I think what we need to do is harness that passion, that energy. I don't think our law schools have done a good job. Some law schools have, others have done a mediocre job, but I think collectively we can do more to harness the passion and the energy that students have right from the start. I think we wait a little bit and first year takes over and so on. But I think I'm

optimistic that we will be able to do more and encourage students to think about servicing the communities.

HON. PETERS: Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Before I go to Denise, I think that right from the start is the right approach. You're seeing it from the first year of law school and we're seeing it during law school so that when they enter the profession they have it in the fiber of their being of what it means to be a lawyer. So I think getting them from day one and getting them during those three years so it does come that they're able to be admitted to the bar they understand.

So thank you and thank you for being here and it's always a delight.

MS. ANDREWS: Thank you, Judge Lippman.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I meant what I said about being totally on the same wavelength about what the law school is supposed to be doing and what our profession is supposed to be doing. Thank you so much. Now Denise Gonick.

MS. GONICK: Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Denise, you've gone into the real world?

MS. GONICK: I have, yes. Thank you very much for the opportunity this morning to testify on the

importance to the business community.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: This is the Albany Law School panel. You understand that?

MS. GONICK: It is.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: That is the raison d'etre of your testifying, so go ahead.

MS. GONICK: Actually, I was going to share with you that there are really three perspectives that I bring to you this morning. First, as the president and CEO -- the new president and CEO, I should say, of MVP Health Care, I've been in this role for eight months now, this issue is important to me. I obviously have a bottom-line responsibility to that company.

Many of the comments that the Comptroller was making about return on investment and being able to make those connections I'm now living every day, so I understand how important that is. Secondly, the fact that MVP is a health care company is another way that I think these two issues are interrelated. When you're running a health care company you cannot ignore the community around you. The community is a direct influence on what people experience for their health. And then finally, as an attorney that was educated here in Albany and did practice in New York State, this issue is very important to me.

So let me just share a little bit about MVP. We

are a not-for-profit health plan that serves 733,000 members across New York, Vermont and New Hampshire, but most of our membership is here in New York. We have more than 1600 employees and they're all very committed toward improving the health and wellness of the people that we serve so that our communities can be amongst the healthiest in the nation. And we have laid that out as our new vision, that we will create the healthiest communities in the nation.

So central to that vision we believe is the desire to expand access to quality health care services for the most vulnerable. I think it's worth noting that we attempt to do this through all different means, including partnerships between public and private entities. Collaboration, in our experience, is the only way to get those things done. In MVP's case it is through the Medicaid Managed Care program, as well as the new subsidized Exchange program that will be coming live in 13 days on the new exchanges. Medicare Advantage programs for our senior citizens. Through each of those we think we're committed to creating peace of mind for people that their health care needs can be met through all different stages of life. Expanding Access to Civil Legal Services similarly supports a vision of equitable and healthy communities that benefits everyone.

5 6

In many respects, the health care challenges parallel those of the court system and access to justice. The current economic climate has caused a lot of despair for many people within our communities. The expanding number of low-income families is at record levels and more individuals and families are temporarily poor or out of work after many years as income providers. Many are facing new health care and legal issues, amongst other challenges, because of this.

At MVP we focus very much on the health of our communities. We're recognizing that good health is judged and determined more than just by people's individual health behaviors and the actual clinical interventions that they might seek. So for example, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation has been collecting and analyzing data to measure the relative health of every county in the United States over the last several years. Socioeconomic factors, such as the rates of unemployment, the percentage of children living in poverty, and inadequate social support plays as important a role in overall health as the time one actually spends seeking medical care.

We understand, however, that health care needs are often secondary to basic needs like food, clothing, safety and shelter. A diabetes diagnosis, for example, might be an afterthought for someone who is preoccupied

with mounting bills, with threat of foreclosure or an unsafe living environment.

By ensuring access, equal access, to civil legal service a family can, at little or no cost, attain the assistance of a trained legal professional to navigate the very difficult system. When local systems aren't prepared to recognize the signs and symptoms of a lack of basic needs small legal issues can find their way out of local courts and into more advanced problems. Victims and other individuals struggling to meet their basic needs can even be seen as victims themselves or part of the problems themselves and be denied access to help.

When a community is made up of individuals who have equal access to health care and civil legal services, its strength is evident through improved outcomes: Health outcomes, home ownership, safety within the community, business growth, entrepreneurship and healthy schools with strong academic outcomes. Business grows as the community grows. Strong businesses who demonstrate their ability to do well attract other businesses and growth breeds new growth.

In closing, businesses want to do business in a community that ensures that justice is available to all.

In the Capital District the nonprofit community contributes substantially to the economic well-being of

the Capital Region. The local legal services providers,
Albany Law Clinic & Justice Center, Legal Aid Society of
Northeastern New York, The Legal Project of the Capital
District Women's Bar Association, Empire Justice Center,
the Albany County Bar Association, Unity House of Troy,
and the Workers' Justice Center all contribute in many
positive ways to the economic and social well-being of the
community.

Equal access to justice, without regard to income, is fundamental to our system of justice and integral to our society. New York State can serve as a model in access to legal services for all its residents regardless of income. Working together with legal services providers and law school clinics will ensure that justice is delivered, thereby creating stronger communities which I believe will foster healthier individuals and families, strong businesses, and positive outcomes for all. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you for coming.

Let me ask you this one basic question. How does the health care world interact with these kinds of providers?

In practice what do they have -- people don't understand that there's a connection. We understand the basic idea that some people sometimes have health problems and they

cannot access the resources that are available. But in practice do you interface with providers?

MS. GONICK: Oftentimes I think institutional providers, such as hospitals, and yes we work very closely with hospitals, can be a great coordinator or facilitator for people to find their way.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Because it's a labyrinth.

MS. GONICK: It is.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: You're talking about the new changes and it's a very complex system. People sometimes just can't do it themselves, isn't that the bottom line?

MS. GONICK: I think that's true. And I think it's confusing for people. Particularly in view of reform we've worked hard to try to provide more educational services for a wide variety of different educational levels. So we have a lot more that's available on our internet site. But also through our own expansion of our Medicaid program have people that do community outreach, go out into the community at places where you will find individuals, supermarkets, shopping centers and so forth, so that you also have that personal interaction to help people.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Any other questions?

Dave.

MR. SHRAVER: Let me just mention that yesterday I was in New York City meeting with chairs of a number of our sections in the State Bar, including the chair of our Health Law section, and we were talking about their efforts to get up to speed and the Affordable Care Act so they can provide continuing education to the members of the Health Law section as well as lawyers who don't practice in the health law area on a regular basis.

Sounds to me like there may be opportunities for collaboration here between the providers, the insurers, the law schools, practicing bar so that we can all try to understand this new world of health insurance and exchanges and educate both practicing lawyers and the law students who may be in a position to respond to the need of people at really all income levels to understand and access this new system. Is that something that anyone is focused on or that you thought about in how we can work together to do that?

MS. GONICK: I think that the insurers right at the moment are 13 days away from the law interview exchanges, have been very focused on providing education to employer groups and making it available for individuals. And I know that the State of New York has been as well through the actual Exchange. I think that

would be a very good next step. I'm sure you will see a hunger for people to be able to attend some educational sessions, panel discussions.

The other interesting thing about health reform is that this affects people quite personally. They get educated broadly on what the law is about, but in the end it's going to be their own -- it's not unlike doing your taxes, your own set of personal circumstances are what's going to drive what would be the best decision for you. So yes, that does lend itself to individual counseling.

HON. PRUDENTI: Just very quickly I would like to congratulate you on your appointment. It's with great pride to see that you were educated on Long Island and that you received your degree from Albany. In your new role do you see that role as one where you will try to create a cultured service among the individuals who work for you in the health care industry?

MS. GONICK: Absolutely. And thank you for your comments, I appreciate them. I think it is central to MVP's vision about being an important contributing member to the communities, and I think we have a unique responsibility because we are in that health care space, it is not a generic kind of business. And I'm trying to put programs in place that enable employees to have time to be able to volunteer on things that are particularly

important to them, but I'm also working on initiatives that MVP will support as a corporate entity and that we can work on collectively. I think that's important.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Let me just add to that.

Judge Graffeo has been here and we are working on, and I know the State Bar supports this strongly, making it easier for in-house counsel to be performing pro bono work. So we're going to be coming out with something in the not-that-distant future in that area which I think is kind of an untapped resource in terms of pro bono type work.

So thank you both. Thank you for the Albany Law School panel. It was a delight to see both of you and thanks for coming. And Dean Andrews, always a delight to see you.

Now let me call Mark Eagan who is the business panel all by himself. I know Mark that you have to get up to Saratoga so we're not going to waste any time and get you started on your presentation.

MR. EAGAN: Thank you. And Denise I think did a good job starting off with those --

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Mark is the President and CEO of the Albany-Colonie Regional Chamber.

MR. EAGAN: Indeed I am.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: What does that mean,

Mark?

MR. EAGAN: Our organization is the primary business advocacy organization for the Capital Region. We represent 2200 organizations that employ more than 110,000 residents of the four-county area that we serve.

The ultimate goal of the Regional Chamber is really community prosperity. Our goal isn't simply that businesses do well, our goal is for our citizens and our communities to do well. We look to serve as a catalyst for the growth and prosperity of our region by providing leadership, advocacy and resources. And we want every citizen to have opportunities for success.

I'm pleased to be here today to support funding for civil legal services for low and moderate income New Yorkers. The proper functioning of a free society and an efficient economy require availability of a fair and balanced legal system to adjudicate legal disputes and to preserve individual rights. This mechanism for resolving disputes must be available to everyone. Access to legal services at all socioeconomic levels is critical to community stability.

Legal assistance can be critically important for individuals involved, as issues related to marriage, divorce, immigration, child custody --

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Mark, let me stop you.

And don't feel, anybody presenting, that you have to give your whole testimony. We'll fill up your time, don't worry about that. You can read it if you want.

MR. EAGAN: That sounds good to me.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I want you to explain, because I think it's hard to really understand, and yet we have consistently over the years when you have business people like yourselves who come in, how is it people don't get it? How is it that a person gets legal assistance and that helps his local business?

In other words, people in the communities have all kinds of problems; they're going to be foreclosed on, they're going to be evicted, they have a matrimonial case, they have a consumer credit case, they have something in family court. How is it that those people getting legal assistance, what's the connection that brings you to want to testify here today? What does one have to do with the other?

MR. EAGAN: It's a great question. But really there is a direct correlation. You know, many of the folks who have access to these services are people who are employed. So they come to work every day and they have that burden or if they miss days of work because of the stress of not being represented it directly impacts that company's bottom line.

But in addition to that, you have to realize that we also have many of our smaller businesses who fall into this category. And we know we've been through many years of a recessionary economy, so many of those small businesses directly have relied on those services. Or even if businesses are going to be involved in a case, they want to make sure those on the other side are able to have representation.

And then I think, Judge, it goes to my earlier comments. Really the goal of our organization, even though we're a membership base, our base is a business community, our goal isn't just for businesses to do well, our goal is really for our region to do well, our people to do well.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Because it's really two-folded, kind of what I said, I don't know if you were here for the beginning piece, but we were talking about that we want to do the right thing. And I think forward-looking businesses, business organizations, want to do the right thing, want the community to be healthy and all of those things, and that's clearly our aim in promoting Civil Legal Services. Poor people, people of limited income need help.

MR. EAGAN: They do.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: But the other thing is

it's harder for people to understand that the bottom line, as you call it, is really affected if those people don't get that help.

MR. EAGAN: It is. And I think we know that it's all aspects of our community who have to be lifted up. And often those that are low to moderate income don't know where to turn to. And so the services that are provided -- and Denise spoke of it -- she referred to several organizations we're blessed to have here in the Capital Region.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: You find you're working with the providers in various interactions?

MR. EAGAN: We most definitely do. We most definitely do. I think then it goes to the comments, but really all added together the goals of those people who are in the unfortunate circumstance who need the help or those on the other side, ultimately we're all in it together.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: The concern that the business community has had with this issue has helped us tremendously because it's not the normal, you know, we call the do-gooders. We're all do-gooders, and that's great. People come and say we need, we need, we need, can you help? This person is terribly in need. And all of that is wonderful and we all want to do good, but I want

you to know that by your coming in, by others through these years of our being able to get public funding, this is what is counterintuitive that the Legislature, the other branch of government, are seeing this is not just -this is not just -- not that that shouldn't be enough in and of itself to see there are people in need and to say that there are people in need, it's your support, your understanding of the interconnection that has made them stand up and take notice and say gee maybe this thing does have a broad base and it's not just another need of which there are so many, but it's something that affects the bottom line health of our state in terms of the business communities and the different multitude of entities that make the life of any community in our state. MR. EAGAN: Well said. And I appreciate the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. EAGAN: Well said. And I appreciate the opportunity to testify today. Our region wouldn't be where we're positioned today and where we hope to go tomorrow without the support of these services. So thanks again.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Any questions?

MR. SHRAVER: I just have one quick question. We've been talking today about the importance of funding civil legal services. Along with that goes the actual funding of the courts generally so that the business

community, among others, have access to the courts to resolve their disputes and to seek to satisfy their basic needs.

I'm wondering whether you think that your members, the business community at large, understands these issues and understands the importance of funding the court system, funding civil legal services as a smart investment as in everybody's interest in helping to reduce the tax burden and so forth.

MR. EAGAN: I wish I could say the broad answer is yes. But I think really what it is is when it affects you personally. So I think with the cases of businesses if they have employees that have been impacted with legal services they're thankful that they are here and those are the folks who have probably testified in years prior to me.

I think that for businesses who have to use the court and they want it to be timely, they want it to be efficient, they understand the adequate funding that can occur. But until they're not there, you know, they want their tax dollars to be as low as possible. I think the folks most touched, and those that are most informed, do understand.

MR. SHRAVER: If there are opportunities where the State Bar Association, I'm sure the Albany Bar

Association as well, can help to get that message out to 1 2 the business community we welcome those opportunities. 3 MR. EAGAN: Thank you. 4 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Judge Peters. 5 HON. PETERS: In your capacity as the head of the Chamber of Commerce do you provide information to 6 7 employers who are attempting to acquire information 8 concerning organizations that their employees might need 9 access to? 10 MR. EAGAN: Yes. 11 HON. PETERS: Like Immigration Pledge or Disability Law Clinic? 12 13 MR. EAGAN: We do. 14 HON. PETERS: You do. So that you're providing 15 that information which can begin to foster that support. 16 MR. EAGAN: We really try and -- we don't 17 obviously directly provide it, that's why I'm here to 18 testify in support of the others. But oftentimes when 19 businesses don't know where to turn they start with us, 20 and the deeper and richer our tool box is the more helpful 21 we can be. 22 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I think it goes, Judge 23 Peters, one of the themes that is coming out of this is 24 it's all interrelated; whether the Bar Association, the

Chamber, whether it's the provider, whether it's the court

system, it really is. And I think it's what I was saying before to the Dean, sometimes crises bring us together to understand the interconnection. I think the civil legal services issue has been such a perfect example of that where the different parts of our community get it. If one doesn't succeed the rest doesn't.

Anything else? Okay, on to Saratoga. Thank you so much for coming by, we appreciate it.

MR. EAGAN: Thank you very much.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: The next panel is the judicial panel. Carmelo M. Laquidara from Rensselaer City Court and the Honorable Margaret T. Walsh from Family Court in Albany County and also an acting Supreme Court Judge in the Third Judicial District.

So we're delighted to have the two of you here representing your different courts. And as unaccustomed you are as to receiving questions rather than giving them we'll try to ask you a couple of questions because I have a good sense of what you're up against and I think maybe we have to at these hearings make sure everybody else does.

So let's start with the Rensselaer City Court.

What legal service is important to what you see every day
in your court? Why is this connected to the Rensselaer

City Court in your role as the judge?

HON. LAQUIDARA: Well I think, Judge, the two 1 main reasons that come to mind, one it just makes the court system run more efficiently having an attorney represent a litigant in a civil matter just makes the whole process run more smoothly. CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: How does your role change when you don't have an attorney? HON. LAQUIDARA: Well, it's a different balancing act. That's the other reason I was going to mention why this is such an important issue is because as a judge I have to try to remain impartial and neutral and CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Is that possible when people in -- I know there's no black or white answer. HON. LAQUIDARA: It becomes very difficult, Judge, especially when one litigant is pro se and the other is represented by an attorney. CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Exactly. You're supposed to be a level playing feel.

HON. LAQUIDARA: Right. And the pro se litigant I think looks to the judge for some sort of assistance in levelling that playing field when the other side in fact is represented by an attorney. So it makes my job --

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So you feel conflicted when that happens?

HON. LAQUIDARA: Yes, absolutely. Very conflicted when that happens because part of me wants to assist because the pro se litigant just oftentimes lacks the basic understanding of the law, procedures, rules of evidence and certainly it's difficult for them.

And I also think that the pro se litigant, especially when they're up against a represented litigant, I think they feel that the system is somewhat skewed towards the party that's represented by an attorney. And I try to of course maintain a neutral and impartial position, but I think sometimes they feel that because the other side has an attorney that they will be treated better or that they will have a less difficult time with their case.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Do you feel from your personal experience that what you see every day are a lot of people coming into city court unrepresented? And if so, what particular areas is it most likely to happen that they will be unrepresented?

HON. LAQUIDARA: I looked at the numbers in our court, Judge, and I would say 99 percent of the litigants who appear in front of me on civil cases are unrepresented.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And that covers the gamut of what kinds of cases?

HON. LAOUIDARA: Landlord-tenant cases, small 1 2 claims cases, commercial claims, even code violations 3 they're oftentimes unrepresented. The majority of them 4 are unrepresented. 5 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Is that mind-boggling to 6 you --7 HON. LAQUIDARA: It is, Judge. CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: -- in those kinds of 8 9 cases which are so basic to human needs? 10 HON. LAQUIDARA: Exactly. It is mind-boggling. 11 But certainly, as we all know, in criminal cases you're entitled to representation and free representation should 12 13 you qualify financially. 14 HON. PETERS: Do you do criminal work as well? 15 HON. LAQUIDARA: I do. Besides being a 16 part-time judge I am a criminal defense attorney and I 17 also handle civil cases. 18 HON. PETERS: If I might I just want to talk a 19 second about a subject matter that the Chief mentioned 20 when he began his remarks. He talked about a potential 21 civil Gideon which I think is a great term. And since you 22 do criminal work and civil work you therefore see a 23 situation where everyone has an attorney and then you see 24 a situation where no one has an attorney.

HON. LAQUIDARA: That's right.

HON. PETERS: Can you share with us whether you think it's critically important that both in civil and criminal cases people have counsel?

HON. LAQUIDARA: I think it's absolutely critically important. On the issue of civil cases we have a person's shelter is at stake. Whether they're going to have a roof over their head is at stake in a landlord-tenant case. And certainly that's as important as someone being represented in a criminal case.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Could it be that -- I want to make sure that you understand what we're saying.

That something could be as important as when their liberty is at stake, could a civil case be equally important in terms of the need to have representation?

HON. LAQUIDARA: I believe so, absolutely. The civil cases that come before civil court and superior courts of course I think are equally important. I think in the vast majority of city court or town and village court cases -- certainly people are incarcerated in criminal cases. That obviously happens. But in the majority of them probably not, there's other alternatives other than incarceration, and they're still entitled to an attorney free of charge if they meet the qualification. In civil cases they don't have that same ability.

There are countless times when I wanted to

assign an attorney in a civil case and I obviously had no authority to do so. I certainly have had some cases where, especially in summary proceedings, the pro se litigant was able to obtain the services of an attorney through Legal Aid or The Legal Project, and just the quality of the representation that they provide, the way that the case proceeded in my court was such -- it was so much more efficient. And clearly a better outcome was reached when the pro se litigant had an attorney through those organizations.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Let's get Margaret involved. Judge Walsh, what about family court; how does the lack of legal representation affect you in your role in family court?

HON. WALSH: Well, people are in family court talking about the custody of their children. And I can't always assign counsel in those cases.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: How does it affect your role?

HON. WALSH: Well, my role is to make sure that everybody is treated fairly. If one side has an attorney and the other side doesn't, I have to be sure not only that the pro se litigant is aware of and understands what's going on and what's expected and what is going to happen. But also, if you're asking the difficulty, might

as well start with the represented person looking I think at the judge and wondering why is the judge helping the other side? I have a lawyer, why is the judge -- is the judge now on that person's side? Of course not. Of course not. So we have to be very, very careful.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And how often in family court are people unrepresented?

HON. WALSH: They are unrepresented quite a bit. Quite a bit. It happens very often that people do not qualify for assigned counsel and they can't afford an attorney. A family that makes maybe \$45,000 a year with three children, three or four children, they don't qualify for assigned counsel, but in no way can they afford a retainer fee or another monthly bill.

with regards to families of modest means being in the situation where they truly cannot afford counsel when they come to the courthouse. Of course, our overriding concern is trust and confidence in the legal system. But from the operations point of view, from the Chief Administrative Judge's point of view, I would like to ask each one of you how much longer and how much more difficult do you think the cases are and how much longer do they take when you have non-represented individuals who appear before you?

HON. WALSH: They take longer in the courtroom

and they take longer in terms of weeks and months to resolve. There's a very significant difference because quite often people will attempt to get attorneys and they will come back over and over trying to save money, trying to borrow money so that they can have an attorney. And of course that drags the case out for quite a long time.

But just the process of explaining what's happening, we have to adjourn, adjourn, adjourn to see how things are going, as opposed to just having an attorney who could explain what the process is and then we can do things in a much more orderly fashion. So it really takes a toll on everyone when there isn't representation. And the children. That's the biggest deal. When custody matters are not resolved in a timely way it's the children who suffer.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Would the ideal situation be apropros -- concerning Judge Peters' question, would it make a world of difference to you if everybody who came in, similar to a criminal case, that when people came in they were basically represented? Would that change your job, your world, in your two respective worlds?

HON. WALSH: It would. And to be clear, there are people who don't need attorneys because they've reached an agreement on their own, so they can come in and

tell me what they would like. And I just talk about it with them and if it makes sense to me I certainly let them do it. But that's not always the case, so I think I would like the freedom, the ability, the discretion to appoint counsel when necessary. I would know that the People in front of me are all aware of all of their options and that would make my life quite a bit better so that I understand that these people really know what they're getting into.

HON. LAQUIDARA: I would add, Judge, that cases where two attorneys have come in, whether it's an eviction proceeding, a small claims matter, it always seems to reach a resolution and very quickly.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Never! You mean lawyers are of some worth?

HON. LAQUIDARA: Absolutely. Very much so. I'm constantly doing trials and hearings with the pro se litigants, especially when they're unrepresented on each side. It's a fraction of the amount of hearings that I do where there's two attorneys involved. It hardly ever will go to trial or a hearing. It's just a lot more efficient.

The other thing I would add is the staff, my clerks in court, are constantly barraged with legal questions by pro se litigants when they're filing their claims in court. And they, of course, have to walk a fine line in terms of not rendering legal advice as well.

5

4

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other thing I see with pro se litigants is often filing the same claim over and over when they've lost already in court, they attempt to re-file. And it certainly affects the efficiency and the amount of cases we're hearing every day in court. So I think it would cut down certainly the amount of hours that I would be there and could focus on other things.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Either of you have any thoughts -- there's training around the country and something that we're looking at here in New York is nonlegal help for people by experts in a particular area, whether it be foreclosure or, you know, so many other different possibilities. Do you think that some cases would not be before you if you had -- a lot of people can't afford a lawyer but the problems are not so complex, and what we're looking at are are there in each area where we could actually get people who aren't lawyers who could help a litigant to maybe keep some of these cases out of court and then save the real cases where lawyers can make all the difference in the world? Is that something that makes any sense to you? It's one of the areas that the Task Force made a recommendation on and they were looking at what we might do in New York.

HON. WALSH: We use trained mediators quite a bit and that's very, very helpful. Many of the problems

that come to my court are not legal problems, they are parenting issues that people have to resolve, and they can be resolved with a neutral third person. So when people go to mediation I think that is often very, very helpful, and they don't need to step in the courthouse doors really if they can get to mediation first. Often they come to the courthouse, go to mediation and the case is resolved.

HON. LAQUIDARA: We don't have a mediator or an arbitrator in our court, we're a modestly busy court and we don't have the resources. But I think it would be excellent to have that in every city court or local court. My fellow judges that do have mediators or arbitrators even on summary proceedings in their court in their very busy city courts throughout the state, they've told me it makes a huge difference certainly in the amount of cases that --

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: In some parts of the state they have people who -- particularly in relation to evictions and that kind of thing.

HON. LAQUIDARA: Right. And I think it would make a huge difference to have that in many courts as possible throughout the state.

HON. PETERS: If I might, I just have a quick question of Judge Walsh, and definitely both of you can answer if you wish. You mentioned the family that makes

\$45,000 a year and have three children and are illegible for assigned counsel. The middle ground here I wonder might be allowing assigned counsel in that situation with the litigants paying back the cost of the assigned counsel. I know when I first became a family court judge many, many years ago we had a system in place in Ulster County where that was exactly what was required of individuals.

Do you think that's a possibility, of having that middle ground where because, you know, they can probably afford to pay for an attorney at the rate the assigned counsel is getting paid, but they can't afford to pay an attorney in the market place?

HON. WALSH: Right. I think that is absolutely the way to go. Actually, our Bar Association has been in conversation with some attorneys in the area about developing a program just like that. Whether it's through an actual assigned counsel plan or through another community --

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Well, there are also the similar thoughts when you talk about private attorneys being helpful, there's low bono idea where you have systems by which they charge less, whatever it is.

However you get there, where the cost is just less. But the question is how you organize that and how that comes

to be.

But that's also a newly emergent kind of thought, how do you provide low bono legal help or nonlegal help but at least that's affordable to people.

When you talk about the family of four who earns \$44,000, that's like double the rate of poverty and don't go resolve a legal problem when you have that kind of income, and yet they're often working people earning a living, but yet they cannot afford it.

And that's why the providers, so many who are out in the audience, are trying to figure out, we're all trying to figure out what's the criteria, who do we give legal assistance to when you only have so many dollars. So if you're turning away eight of nine or two of four, how do you decide who gets the assistance?

But I think it is instructive -- and I'm so glad that you both came in today. I think it's instructive people understand how it affects all of us in this judging business what we try and do and try to understand that it clogs -- not only clogs the wheels of justice, but sometimes can make the Lady Justice uneven. And it's a terrible dilemma for a judge to face that situation.

So we want to thank both of you for coming in and graphically at the ground level explaining how this works and how it impacts you in your courtrooms. We are

proud of both of you and we are pleased that you both are here and thank you very much for coming in.

HON. LAQUIDARA: Thank you.

HON. WALSH: Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: The next panel, which is also something we glancingly talked about a little bit today, is veterans and how legal services could be of assistance to veterans. So having the Veterans' Services Organization panel and Joseph Sluszka and Courtney Slade. Joseph is the Executive Director of the Albany Housing Coalition, Inc., Veterans Housing and Services. Courtney is the Veterans Justice Outreach Coordinator at the Albany VA Medical Center.

Great to see both of you. Veterans have been an issue that we have had in some of the hearings around the state. We have had testimony from people who deal with the veterans' issues. When we talk about legal services it's rare that we divide it into a particular kind of person who has unique needs. Certainly there are some.

Joseph, why don't we start with you. Why are they different than anybody else and why are they in need of legal services from the average person in the street? We know the distinction between people who have a lot of money and people who don't, but what's this all about for veterans?

8 9

MR. SLUSZKA: Veterans have a unique need. Many of them, especially those who have served in combat in any war, whether it's Vietnam, whether it's World War II, Korea and now Iraq, Afghanistan, because they're bringing back home with them some issues of things that they saw, that they did while in combat.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: What kinds of issues?

MR. SLUSZKA: You know, the nature of the

military is that you kill your enemy. And when that

happens or when you experience your comrade and buddy who

is killed by the enemy it can and does, and studies shows

has a profound effect on your emotional well-being. In my

mind it cuts to the core of who we are as people in terms

of our humanity. And that's my personal view about that.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I gather it's obviously been exacerbated by the fact that we've had our United States military involved, in certainly the last number of years, in places a great distance away where they're very much in the middle of what they call boots on the ground in Afghanistan or Iraq.

MR. SLUSZKA: Yes. And the other nature of the current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan dissimilar to, for instance, the Vietnam War there really is no front and rear in this conflict. Driving down the road IDVs, explosive devices, are just there. In contrast, during

Vietnam there was a front, you were in the jungle. But then there was a rear and when your tour for weeks at a time, whatever it was, was over you came back to the rear where there was safety. And in Iraq and Afghanistan there is no safety.

In our organization I have on staff three gentlemen who served in Iraq, Afghanistan, and listening to some of their stories about coming back and driving and how difficult that can be for them, they see something that doesn't make sense to them, they're immediate reaction is to step on the gas and to swerve and get out of the way.

So those are the kinds of things that our veterans are bringing home with them. When Courtney speaks I'm sure she will talk about some of the great services that the VA is doing and that organizations like the Veterans' Center, the Vet Center, we have one here in Albany, are doing for combat vets to deal with those emotional issues that they are bringing home with them.

That's one piece of it. The other issue that some of our returning veterans are having -- and I deal primarily with homeless guys, and that's a different picture that I can get into as well. But some of the folks, young men and women, who are coming back home now when they left they signed a will, a power of attorney,

many of them. Some of the younger folks who had girlfriends gave the power of attorney to the girlfriends and they went out and got credit cards and spent a lot of money and then when the soldier comes home the girlfriend is gone from the scene and the soldier is left with this debt.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So how does this -- and let's switch over to you, Courtney. How does this translate to legal services? We understand, the public understands you're traumatized, you may have a mental health problem that comes you say from killing people, watching people be killed, whatever it might be being in action, how does this translate to legal services? What's that connection?

MS. SLADE: I can say for the veterans that we serve -- and we serve all veterans, including -- our highest demographic is actually the Vietnam era currently. But many of our veterans are facing criminal matters which I do outreach to our 18 counties that we cover, from the Canadian border down to Ulster County, in trying to link them, as Joe mentioned, with treatment options. But many of them are struggling with many civil legal matters that put them at risk --

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Maybe what, mortgage foreclosure?

MS. SLADE: Mortgage foreclosure, bankruptcy.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Matrimonial.

MS. SLADE: Matrimonial. All of that. A lot of variety. And it puts vets at the risk of homelessness.

And my program is under the goal from president and the secretary of the VA to end homelessness among veterans.

So I can just say from the partnerships that we've developed just in the last two years of providing civil legal services within the VA has greatly alleviated --

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: But do you provide it or do you rely on legal service organizations?

MS. SLADE: We rely on the partnerships with Legal Aid and The Legal Project.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So you link them into the local legal services?

MS. SLADE: Well, they actually come to the hospital which is really wonderful because many of our veterans come in on our van service. They actually get the medical care and also meet with an attorney that they've established an appointment with to avoid the stress of -- maybe they don't have transportation, maybe they don't have funds to get to a clinic in the community. And from what we've received is a great deal of positive feedback that that is available to them. And that's a huge piece.

And then the evening clinic that we have also -again, we're not providing it, the partnerships are, the
agencies that are here today, they allow for the veterans
to come at various times and it's been very, very helpful.
And a big piece of that is just alleviating the stress.
Affording them an opportunity to get the care that they
need regarding the symptoms that Joe had discussed and
also get maybe these areas that are just like the social
stressors.

HON. PETERS: Is there any federal reimbursement for the legal services provided to veterans?

MS. SLADE: No, I don't believe so.

HON. PETERS: It would be nice.

MS. SLADE: It would be nice. The directive, it's so new, it just allows us to provide space to meet their needs there, but it's a great opportunity I think for our veterans. And many of them are referred from our homeless program and many of them actually work probably with Albany Housing Coalition as well so there's a collaborative there.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: The link that we're looking at today is state funding for legal service providers which allows you to help them. I mean this is what you're trying to do. What we're trying to do.

HON. PRUDENTI: Sitting back and listening to

you, we've heard today about pro se litigants, people who represent themselves in court, whether it be in family court or landlord-tenant case, what you seem to be saying is these individuals aren't even capable of doing that, that they really need help and assistance from the legal community because they can't even go to court by themselves. They are, in certain circumstances, incapable of understanding the proceedings because what they're personally going through in their re-entry into society. So for them civil legal services are even more important.

MS. SLADE: In mentioning that a lot of the questions I get -- for a while my name was affixed to the flyer that we were distributing and the expert -- you had mentioned previously that the experts kind of just provide consultation or flush out what needs to be filled out, things like that. We've had problems resolved in our clinics just by breaking things down. And I don't know if necessarily I can say whether it required an attorney or not, but they broke down those questions for them because they felt overwhelmed by them because it had legal affixed to it; it had, you know, go to a court appearance affixed to it. So it's been very helpful.

MR. SLUSZKA: And Judge, from our experience with my organization, homeless veterans face -- and here in the Capital District there are probably, at last count,

around 900 homeless veterans. And again, our goal and our purpose, and we've been doing this, sir, for 22 years, but now I think there's light at the end of the tunnel actually, given what the Court had said and what we've experienced with our VA Secretary Shinseki who is challenging all of us across the country to end veterans homeless by 2015. What the VA has done is implement a series of housing programs that hopefully will accomplish that.

One of the barriers that we have seen over the years, and it remains today, especially for homeless veterans, is that we have a lot of mostly guys flying under the radar who don't want to get a job on the books who end up in the City Mission, who end up in our housing with our organization primarily because they're facing civil issues that they don't want to deal with or they don't feel they have the resources to deal with.

One of the things we've done over the years successfully is create a small group of pro bono attorneys to assist them. In the last couple of years we formalized that with the Legal Aid Society here. We've got a terrific attorney who is a veteran who is working with our guys.

So in order to solve the homelessness problem with veterans we need to get to one of the underlying

causes which are unresolved primarily civil issues. We also handle, within our organization through our Third Judicial District Vet Track Program, criminal matters, both in county courts and some of the city courts. And there we do that with other veterans who appear, and that works and works well and I want you to know that. That operation works and we are thrilled. I am thrilled.

But back to the civil end. It's more of a quandary. Some of the folks, because of their income, can be served by Legal Aid. Some, as I heard with the last panel, are kind of -- they're above that and they have nowhere to turn to and so it comes to us to try to plead with an attorney who is a veteran, because they're going to look more kindly toward providing the pro bono service.

And to Judge Peters', I think it was, remark, pro bono on kind of a graduated payment scheme I think would be very helpful for those folks. But unless the courts and those of us in the community resolve those underlying problems we will continue to have homeless veterans who are flying under the radar and who do not want the otherwise incredible housing and employment assistance that's available to them.

HON. PETERS: When you talk about flying under the radar, are you talking about, for example, a veteran who has a large outstanding child support bill for example

and doesn't want to be on the books because then a good portion of his paycheck is going to pay the funds of?

MR. SLUSZKA: Yes, absolutely. And one of the things we do with each of them when they are living with us is take responsibility for yourself and let's work out with an attorney a payment plan and let's get you back in court to resolve this. And this is something that's happened. They now have great jobs, they're able to pay their child support and have sufficient income to live their own lives. So absolutely.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So legal assistance is essential to all of these folks.

MR. SLUSZKA: Absolutely.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Any other questions of the panel?

MR. SHRAVER: To be clear, sounds to me like you were saying that to meet the legal needs or to address some portion of the legal needs of veterans in this area you rely on both lawyers who are employed by Legal Aid and pro bono private attorneys; is that right?

MR. SLUSZKA: That's right.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Are there any other sources of lawyers that you or legal services that you rely on and often use?

MR. SLUSZKA: Some of our veterans actually hire

attorneys. These are homeless folks who for whatever -some of them are receiving some compensation from the VA
for their war injuries as an example, and they're spending
that money, which would otherwise go to housing, for
private attorneys.

There are some veterans who when they file a compensation claim, which is done for free by an incredible group of folks from New York State Division of Veterans Affair and in each county level, if it's turned down there is some veterans, when they go to appeal it, see the TV ads and end up hiring a very expensive attorney to file the appeal where the appeal is actually free from where they originally filed the appeal. So that's an indication.

MR. SHRAVER: Do you have any connection with the Albany law school clinics with respect to trying to meet some of these needs?

MR. SLUSZKA: Yes. In fact, I did a panel I think two or three years ago when they first kicked off their veterans initiative and we stayed connected with them, yes.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you both for really highlighting I think what is again a theme that we've had over the years which is a great need for legal assistance for veterans, and the legal service providers

1 have done a great job. The State Bar I know put some 2 focus on this same issue and it's something vital. 3 again, we hope that we can provide some assistance in that 4 area. So thank you both very much. 5 MR. SLUSZKA: Thank you. CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: We're going to go to our 6 7 final panel. You can all come up, and see if we can get all the names right. You're bringing up your own cause so 8 9 we'll know if we get the names right. So let me see if I 10 have it right. We have Jason Keller and you have your 11 attorney with you, Jason? 12 MR. KELLER: Yes, I do. 13 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And that is your 14 attorney --15 MR. KELLER: Laura Dwyer. 16 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Laura Dwyer. And we 17 have Laurie Schaible, is that the way you pronounce it? 18 MS. SCHAIBLE: Schaible. 19 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And Laurie, is your 20 attorney with you? 21 MS. SCHAIBLE: I have a representative from 22 Empire Justice Center. 23 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And is that Saima 24 Akhtar? 25 MS. AKHTAR: Yes, sir.

1	CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And we have Tia Sullivan
2	Hock who is representing Michael DeBenedetti who can't be
3	here today, right?
4	MS. SULLIVAN HOCK: Yes, he was called into
5	work.
6	HON. PRUDENTI: That's a good thing.
7	MS. SULLIVAN HOCK: That is a good thing. So
8	I've come on his behalf.
9	CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And we have Michael
10	O'Donnell?
11	MR. O'DONNELL: Yes, sir.
12	CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And you're represented
13	by Kristie Cinelli.
14	MS. CINELLI: Yes, your Honor.
15	CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Let's start with you,
16	Michael. You don't have to read anything if you don't
17	want to. Tell us what your problem was and how you want
18	help. Or you can read it, however you want to do it.
19	MR. O'DONNELL: Sir, I outlined it before I came
20	here so I won't repeat myself, make a fool out of myself
21	so I
22	CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Just tell us in your
23	own
24	MR. O'DONNELL: Two and a half years ago my son
25	was taken away from his mother. Of course that eliminated

any possible visitation or anything else I could have with 1 2 him because they put him in Berkshire Farms, a boys' home. 3 I spent a half a year going back and forth to court, 4 taking a bus into Cobleskill, spending the night at the 5 hotel, getting up early enough to get to court on time 6 because there was no bus system to go to Cobleskill that 7 early in the morning. And then I would have to do the 8 same thing in order to get back to Albany where I lived. 9 So subsequently a half a year I was going to 10 court and I was known as the interested party. Not the 11 father or anything else, the interested party. CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: How did you feel at that 12 13 point? MR. O'DONNELL: What's that? 14 15 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: What did you feel at 16 that point? As a non-lawyer did you feel that --17 MR. O'DONNELL: I felt like I was busting my 18 head against a brick wall and --19 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: That's not a good 20 feeling. MR. O'DONNELL: -- there was no damage to the 21 22 wall, more damage to my head. 23 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So what did you do? How 24 did you connect to someone who could help you?

MR. O'DONNELL: I just kept doing the same thing

expecting different results, which I didn't get different results because every time I would go his mother wouldn't show up so they would put it off. Well, we have to adjourn this until next month. So that's another hundred some odd dollars to take a bus and stay in a hotel all over again. And I ended up doing that for six months.

One day I was at the coalition -- volunteering at the vet house I mean, volunteering, which I did weekly two-, three times a day because I didn't really have a job or nothing and so it was a good way to spend my time. And one day after, you know, coming back from court and everything with no accomplishments whatsoever Mike O'Brien and a couple other people went into the room and I asked, you know, basically what was going on, you know, like I was waiting for -- was stuff coming in and they said yes they're lawyers, they come and talk to the men in this house.

I talked to my counselor who was also there and he said yes and he went in and introduced me to Mike O'Brien. I told Mike O'Brien exactly what I was doing for six months and that I wasn't getting no visitation rights or -- he wouldn't even talk to me because he thought I was the reason he was sitting in Berkshire Farms. And I couldn't explain to him because I couldn't make contact with him over the phone or nothing else, I was cut off

completely from him.

Mr. O'Brien listened to what I had and everything else, of course I had all the stuff I got from the legal library and everything so when I was haggling at my own defense. So I would go in there and the judge would say, you know, I was an interested party. I wasn't his dad or I wasn't related to him or nothing else just because we have the same name, I was just an interested party. And that's as far as I was getting for six months.

Plus, you know, the expense it was costing me to go to court every month for his mother not to show up and then have to adjourn it or something like that. Or come back next month, we'll see what we can do. Well, who is going to pay for my expenses to get back home and everything. And, you know, I had to stay at the hotel. They only had one bus that went to Cobleskill so I would have to sit there for four or five hours waiting for the next bus to come through. And there's nothing to do in Cobleskill.

So subsequently Mr. O'Brien took the case right up, which really surprised me and everything. He started digging into the information I had and the papers I had and everything and he came to my house where I was living through the Coalition. Thank God they found me a place to stay and everything. I came to Albany homeless from

Oneonta. I came for the hospital, they replaced my left arm, from my shoulder to my elbow was artificial, and the same with my right foot. And so they took care of me and they're still taking care of me. I mean anything that I possibly need, especially from my mental aspect, they've been taking care of.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Your life was basically impacted greatly by the assistance you've been getting?

MR. O'DONNELL: Oh yes. There's no words to really explain that. As a matter of fact, when I went to court Schoharie County labeled me, because of my posttraumatic stress, as being mentally ill. So when the judge there asked me one day if I had any questions about what was going on and I was worried about the fictitious clock on the wall that's ticking against me as I was sitting there accomplishing nothing and I told him. He said well Mike you don't have to worry about that anymore, when you submitted these papers from Mr. O'Brien that automatically stops the clock.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So your legal services assistance is something -- could you be in a position you are today without legal services?

MR. O'DONNELL: No. No. Right now my son is living with me in our two-bedroom apartment and he's going to Albany High School. He would have been going to what

they call a transition program. But Mr. O'Brien stepped into that because he knows my son through doing all this work for him and said no this kid has hundreds on his report card, he doesn't need no transition, he probably could teach the teachers. I mean he cut six months out of my son, he would have had to go to Lark Street and transition program for six months for nothing.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thanks, Mike, for really explaining to people what it means to have legal services.

MR. O'DONNELL: I could talk about what it meant to me, only me, for four or five hours straight, because I mean it completely changed my life.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: We've heard that same story before and it is always moving and it always shows the real life impact that providers have.

MR. O'DONNELL: After spending six months beating my head against the wall and getting nowhere I had no faith in the judicial system whatsoever, they were just giving me a runaround. And his mother, which they took away for something she did wrong, supplying drugs and alcohol to a 12-year-old, they treated her like she was a queen.

HON. PRUDENTI: And how do you feel today about the judicial system?

MR. O'DONNELL: Well, now she called prior,

about an hour ago, reminding me it was her birthday.

Which Derrick called her that morning wished her a happy
birthday. You know, it is still his mother, I will not
and cannot keep him away from having communication with
his mother. I allow them to be together, go to see each
other and everything else, because it's always going to be
his mother.

HON. PRUDENTI: Do you have more confidence in

HON. PRUDENTI: Do you have more confidence in the legal system now?

MR. O'DONNELL: Definitely. I mean this is -- I mean like I'm still paying child support, but we're not going to worry about that. But it's the idea that every morning when my son gets up, gets ready for school and everything, the first thing I think of is Mr. O'Brien. He wouldn't be here at the home or going to school this morning if it wasn't for Mr. O'Brien.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: That's really very, very helpful. Let's hear from Laurie. Laurie, tell us just briefly how legal services has helped you.

MS. SCHAIBLE: I actually have testimony to read. I'm more comfortable reading.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: You can do whatever makes you more comfortable.

MS. SCHAIBLE: First I would like to say thank you so much to the panel for this opportunity, I'm very

grateful. I now live in the Town of Selkirk, but up until a few years ago I lived in the Town of Coeymans.

In 1986 my family was impacted by a traumatic event that changed our lives. Because of this event I was left on my own to care for my three young children.

Thankfully I was able to keep my home, but I left my job to stay at home and to help our family heal from this traumatic event.

I enrolled in welfare to receive benefits. My children were not school age at the time. I'm very grateful that these benefits were available to me when we needed them. I received assistance for close to six years, in one form or another, from HEAP to food stamps, child care, and cash assistance. For some of that time I did work, it was a graduating process.

Over the years I had asked for information on many occasions from Albany County regarding the services received and the related costs, but did not receive any type of information, itemized billing, whatever.

A few years ago, more than 20 years after I had received public assistance, I was in the process of selling the home and once again contacted DSS for information on the lien because of the benefits that I had received. This was a condition of getting the assistance at that time that I signed over my home. I let the county

basically put a lien on the house.

This time I did receive a response and this is the paper work I received from them, one single piece of paper with a piece of tape showing the total amount. No other information or explanations were attached. Luckily, I had kept most of the paper work. I did not know who to turn to or who could help me, and this was very distressing since I thought it could stop the sale of the home. I was also very sad to think that all these years I had been a part of the working class, also committed many hours of volunteer time in the local area which were not going to help in this situation, the money owed was the money owed.

Finally, after research, I found Empire Justice
Center, contacted Susan Antos and immediately I received a
response. A law student was assigned to my case, her name
was Jessica, and I owe her a great deal. She spent many
hours going over the paper work with me, researching
history and law regarding the benefits in New York State.

It turns out the county was asking me to repay three
federal benefits that are not supposed to be included in
the repayment: Food stamps, child care, and HEAP. There
were also child support payments that were not credited
correctly.

Susan Antos was instrumental in contacting the

appropriate individual at DSS to review the monetary charges and help determine what the end result would be. Suffice it to say the total I owed after selling my home was reduced by over \$20,000. If not for the assistance of Susan and Jessica I would not have received much money at all from the sale of the home. Clearly, for anyone \$20,000 is a lot of money to lose. For my family, it was critical for our ability to move on with our lives.

Empire Justice Center provided invaluable assistance, both legally in knowing who to contact and what charges were appropriate, and emotionally by assuring me they would help and would stand by me until resolution was achieved. I'm truly grateful for this contribution. If they were not there to help me I am sure the result would have been much different.

I am now working to hopefully inspire changes in the New York State welfare laws which would require all recipients to receive a yearly accounting of their benefits, and also to more clearly explain the rights citizens have in relation to welfare benefits.

I want to thank the Chief Judge and the panel for helping to provide these services to me and families like mine. It is very hard sometimes to keep going when you think you have nowhere to turn. And by making sure legal services are there you give us all a place to turn

in times of need. Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Laurie, I think your story again is such a direct firsthand account of what it means to get some legal help when you don't know what to do and have no ability to work things out. And sometimes things that are so complicated for you can be so simple when you have an attorney like the people at Empire Justice who come in and oh we know what to do.

So we thank you for coming in and telling us your story.

Let's hear Jason. What happened with you? You can either read it or just tell us, whatever you want.

MR. KELLER: My name is Jason Keller and today I speak as a client of the Saratoga Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York.

I have two small children at home with my wife and one with special needs who resides with his mother. I served in the military, but I also got into some trouble when I was younger, but I got my life back on track. I work in the construction field as a painter and remodeler, but I was let go due to lack of work from my last employer. He encouraged me to apply for unemployment insurance benefits, which I did, and I was shocked that, and actually kind of scared, when I heard from unemployment insurance benefits agency that I was fired.

Saying I was an independent contractor for part of the time that I work there and that I was actually fired for misconduct. There was an altercation between me and another coworker and I never received a warning of any sort, verbal or written.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So what did you do? You got this, you were shocked, what was your first instinct as to what to do?

MR. KELLER: My first instinct was to try to find a pro bono lawyer which literally nobody would help me, so I contacted Saratoga Legal Aid Society.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: How did you know about them?

MR. KELLER: Through another lawyer that my grandfather knows, Donny Boyajian. He told me to talk to Saratoga Legal Aid Society in my area. And I got a hold of Ms. Dwyer who from that point on took over the case. I had three hearings that were presided over unemployment. One was for the time limit because it took so long to fight for my unemployment. It was thirty days, took almost four months, and I didn't know what to do. I was scared.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: But in each of these hearings they were basically legal issues that someone had to deal with and if you walked in as what we call a

layperson, a non-lawyer, you would be totally lost. 1 2 MR. KELLER: I would be completely lost. 3 Ms. Dwyer found statutes that also my ex-employer had to 4 prove that I was an independent contractor, which I was 5 not. CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And this is a technical 6 7 legal issue. MR. KELLER: Correct. 8 9 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: We know, having had 10 those kinds of issues about whether you're independent 11 contractor or not. So what was the end result of it all? 12 MR. KELLER: The end result was Ms. Dwyer 13 found that he did not meet the deadline criteria. And 14 with that being said he actually had no choice but to 15 withdraw his other hearing against me. 16 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So what did it mean to 17 you? What happened in the end? Did you get the benefits? 18 MR. KELLER: I got the benefits. And the little 19 people, myself included, had a voice. 20 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Could you have, in your 21 wildest imagination, done this on your own? 22 MR. KELLER: Never. 23 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Much less get a favorable result. 24 MR. KELLER: Actually, I would not be able to 25

take care of my kids.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So having a legal service provider that gives someone a helping hand when they can't afford an attorney significantly changed your life.

> MR. KELLER: Significantly.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And again, couldn't be more evident the impact that legal services has on real people with real problems. These aren't the most unusual problems in the world, but they are problems that require the services of a lawyer.

And talking about a lawyer, let's get to our final client on the client's panel, but we're going to hear from the lawyer this time instead of the client; Tia Sullivan Hock. Tell us about Mr. DeBenedetti's problem and how you helped him.

MS. SULLIVAN HOCK: I just want to clarify, I'm actually the paralegal and legal services coordinator for our project.

> Terrific. CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Go ahead.

MS. SULLIVAN HOCK: I'm actually going to read his words because I think he grasps what kind of occurred here.

> CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Go ahead.

MS. SULLIVAN HOCK: Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and members of the panel, thank you for the opportunity to testify on the difference that receiving free civil legal services made in my life.

In August 2007, I, Michael DeBenedetti, stood on the yellow footprints at recruit Depot Paris Island where I had started my journey to become a United States Marine. During my time spent in the Marine Corps I was employed in 2009 to 2010 to Iraq. Towards the end of deployment I sustained a permanent back injury that limits what I can do in the civilian world and I was honorably discharged from the Marine Corps.

Due to my injury I have missed time at work which significantly decreases my income. During this time I was still waiting for my disability rating. I could not work and had no funds in which to pay my bills. I had missed enough time at work which led to me become behind on my mortgage.

Wells Fargo was the loan holder and I contacted them to explain my situation. They first stated they would be willing to work with me in deferring my payments. But after giving them every piece of information that they asked for, I still was receiving no help from the loan officer that was assigned to my case, consistently leaving messages with no return call.

When I eventually did get a hold of someone it

was never the loan officer assigned to my case and all they could tell me was that they themselves could not take a payment and that I needed to speak with her. This went on for more than a month which pushed me further behind. And when I finally did get in contact with her I was two months delinquent and at that time she stated there was nothing she could do for me. She stated that it was now out of her hands and she would have to speak with her loan department to check and see if anything could be done to defer these payments to the end of my loan now that my house would be in foreclosure.

At this point I had become fed up with getting the runaround from Wells Fargo and was sick with worry that I would lose my home. I asked my counselor at the VA what options I had and they suggested that I get in contact with The Legal Project. I called right away, and the same day I spoke with Tia, who treated with me respect and was quick to help me with setting up an appointment to discuss my legal matter.

I met with The Legal Project attorney, Christy, and she looked over my documents and gave me peace of mind knowing that she could help me to keep my house. Finally, I had some help. Within a week Christy made arrangements with the bank for a reinstatement fee. Once I received the reinstatement fee I could pay this and my mortgage

would be current and I would no longer be in foreclosure.

I was able to do this and get my house out of foreclosure.

I was so relieved. Slowly, my credit started to go back up again.

During the two-to-three month journey Tia,

Christy and the other Legal Project staff have been

nothing but respectful, courteous and professional. I

would definitely use their services again if I needed to,

although I hope I don't need to, and I would also

recommend them to anyone I know who needs legal help and

can't afford it. It's so important for people like me to

be able to get help from programs such as The Legal

Project.

In my case, I'm a veteran who served our country and who was injured when deployed and still was facing a terrible crisis in almost losing my home. If not for The Legal Project, I could have lost the home I worked so hard for. Please do all that you can to make sure that these important programs have the help that they need, so they can help people like me and all of the others who find themselves in situations beyond their control. My story could have turned out very differently if not for The Legal Project. Thank you for your time.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Tia. And I think the story that you tell for Michael is the same as

Michael O'Donnell and Laurie and Jason, and demonstrates the critical importance of legal services, whether it be the Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York, the Empire Justice Center, The Legal Project, and so many other providers around this state. And you've all been very helpful in demonstrating, again first hand, what legal services means to people in need in this state, people fighting for the necessities of life. And I think your stories really put a capstone on what we've heard all day.

We've heard from the Comptroller of the State of New York who told us about how the state's economy is bolstered, is made more robust by investing in Civil Legal Services. That they, in the end, serve the bottom line of our state, aside from doing something which helps people in need.

We've heard from the law school community that demonstrated just how important it is in conjunction with public funding for legal services that there be pro bono work; that law students understand while they're in law school from the very beginning why it's important to serve the community and do pro bono work and to help people in need.

We've heard from the business community which has told us how important legal services is not only to again doing the right thing and helping people, but to the

bottom line of businesses and communities around our state, how interested the business community is providing legal services to people in need.

We've heard from our judges who tell us how difficult it is to do their job when people are not represented in court, and to keep the playing field level. When a judge has to become the attorney at the same time as being a judge they cannot do their job.

We've heard from veterans which is just one category of clients who so desperately need legal services, particularly to meet their unique needs when they come back from action on behalf of our country.

And we've heard from all of you, which are just normal human beings who have a problem and need some help and sometimes just need the services of an attorney or a paralegal or basically legal advice and representation that will help them with the problems that they have.

So what we're going to do is take all this information and put it together in terms of the report that the Task Force is going to be making, in terms of the requests that we're going to be making to the Legislature, in terms of civil legal services. We could not do this without hearing from you, understanding what the problems are, understanding what we need to do to meet those problems. Again, the problems of human beings, their

basic needs regarding the essentials of life.

So we thank everyone for being here today at the first of our legal services hearings. There will be three more; one in Manhattan, one in Queens County, and one in Buffalo. And I think we're going to hear similar themes. But it is the cumulative effect of the testimony that we hear that allows us to try to meet the Legislature's request of us, which is really what are the needs in relation to civil legal services and what can they do to help to provide the kind of funding that results in providers having assistance they need to help citizens like this last panel and the problems you have.

I want to thank everybody for coming on behalf of the panel, we appreciate it. And it is our hope and expectation that we can get the Legal Services funding that we need to continue the progress we've made in New York, which I think has been a template in so many ways for other places around the country that are looking to do the same thing that we're doing; to meet the crisis in civil legal services, to see whether it's possible in this country to get to the point where maybe there will be something akin to a civil Gideon, meaning where everyone will have the right to representation in a legal issue that's involved, with the very least, the necessities of life, where people are facing the basic human needs that

we all have. So thank you all so much, it's been a pleasure to be with you. And thanks especially to this last panel for coming in. Thank you. (The proceedings in the above-entitled matter were concluded.)

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	I, COLLEEN B. NEAL, Senior Court Reporter in and for the
5	Third Judicial District, State of New York, DO HEREBY CERTIFY
6	that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my
7	stenographic notes in the above-entitled matter.
8	
9	
10	DATED: September 23, 2013
11	Colleen B. News
12	Colleen B. Neal, Senior Court Reporter
13	Albany County Courthouse
14	Albany, New York 12207
15	
16	
17	
18	
1920	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	