TH	COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK IRD DEPARTMENT
THE CHI	EF JUDGE'S HEARINGS
ON CTVIT	L LEGAL SERVICES
OIV CIVI	
	COURT OF APPEALS
	20 Eagle Street Albany, New York 12207
	Albany, New York 12207
BEFORE:	
	IIONIODADITE TONAMIIANI I I DDMANI
	HONORABLE JONATHAN LIPPMAN, Chief Judge
	HONORABLE LAWRENCE K. MARKS Deputy Chief Administrative Judge
	Deputy Chief Administrative duage
	HONORABLE KAREN J. PETERS
	Presiding Justice of the Appellate Division Third Department
	Dividion inita Deparement
	GLENN LAU-KEE
	New York State Bar President
	Colleen B. Neal
	Official Court Reporter

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you all for being here, it's a delight to see you. This is the last of our four annual civil legal services hearings that we're having. We've already had one hearing in Manhattan, one hearing in Staten Island, a hearing in Rochester, and today is our fourth and final hearing of the year in our State's Capitol here in Albany.

Seated with me presiding at this event to my far right is Glenn Lau-Kee, president of the New York State Bar Association. Next to him is Justice Karen Peters, the Presiding Justice of the Appellate Division Third Department right here in Albany. And on my left is Lawrence Marks, the First Deputy Chief Administrative Judge who will be presiding today in the absence of Judge Prudenti. A. Gail Prudenti, our Chief Administrative Judge, will be one of our witnesses. So this is a great event that we get both Judge Prudenti and Judge Marks here with us.

These hearings are held because there is a justice gap in this state and in this country and the justice gap is between the finite legal resources that are available and the desperate need for legal services by the poor and people of limited means.

As many as three out of four people who come to our legal service providers are turned away because the

provider has a lack of resources. Last year 2.3 million people came to the courts of the State of New York without legal representation. These are people who in difficult times are faced with the necessities of life; legal matters involving the roof over their heads, their physical safety, the well-being of their families and their livelihood. They literally threaten to fall off the cliff, pushed to the way side in these difficult economic times without legal representation to help them.

It has a great cost to our society and our communities around the state, the Constitutional mission of the judiciaries that foster equal justice, and that's why we sponsor these hearings every year in association with the leadership of our Bar, the State Bar, and the local bars around the state. You have the leadership of the Judiciary and the legal profession who preside over these hearings.

Central to what we're doing as a judicial system, as a judicial branch of government, is the equal justice that we provide to each and every person in our state. It is not tangential to what we do, it is fundamental to what we do central to our Constitutional mission.

In recognition of that role the Legislature has passed a resolution asking the Judiciary and the Chief

Judge to hold these hearings and also asking us each year to report on the amount of financial assistance that we need in the Judiciary budget to support civil legal services for the poor.

To assist us in these efforts that we are making in New York to close the justice gap I've appointed the Task Force to enhance civil legal services in our state, chaired by Helaine Barnett, who is sitting in the first row. And what the Task Force does is help us prepare for the hearings, digest the testimony that we get and help and make recommendations to us in a report that comes out on December 1st at the same time that we present our budget submission to the Legislature.

The result has been the New York template to approach this problem that involves public funding. And we are very proud of our partners in government and the Legislature and Executive for providing \$70 million in assistance this year, \$55 million given out in direct grants by the Judiciary, and another \$15 million that we give to IOLA to give out grants given that their funding has been reduced so greatly by the low rate of interest on lawyers' escrow accounts that fund IOLA's resources. This has resulted in many, many, many thousands of clients being helped by our legal service providers.

Judge Prudenti is going to report in some detail

on what we use those monies for and the assistance that's provided. At the same time with the help of the State Bar Association we are reaching out for pro bono work on the part of the bar to complement the public funding that we get; whether it be the Empire State Counsel Program, whether it be the Lawyers Emeritus Program, whether it be our relaxation of the rules for corporate counsel who can now practice in New York even if they're not admitted for pro bono work, whether it be the 50-hour program that is required for each aspiring lawyer that wants to be admitted to the Bar, the pro bono scholar program. All of these things are designed with the help of our really outstanding Bar in New York to support pro bono work, to complement public funding.

And we also are taking a number of other steps, including the use of non-lawyers to assist lawyers in terms of the delivery of legal services in our Navigator program, and the new rules that we put into place to govern foreclosure proceedings and consumer credit proceedings which go to ensure that there is a level playing field on those proceedings where overwhelmingly individuals are not represented by lawyers. We are working towards the day when everyone who has a problem that needs the assistance of civil legal services relating to the various essentials of life is able to have a

lawyer.

Our past hearings over the years and this year has included the testimony from public officials, business leaders, providers, academics, judges, the bar, and clients of legal service providers. We have measured the need, we're trying to do what is the right thing to do to help those in need and also what is the best thing for our state and our economy and the well-being of a society and our community. We've undertaken studies, cost benefit analyses of the different ways that legal service monies have helped our state and we are going to see more of that today in the testimony.

So I welcome you all, and I particularly want to welcome today the Legal Services Corporation which is holding, with its Chair John Levi and its President Jim Sandman and the members of the board, the Legal Services Corporation is holding its quarterly meeting here in Albany, and we're honored by their presence. This is the largest single provider of legal services funding in the United States. They are instrumental in waging this war, and it really is a war, on the justice gap and how to provide essential legal services for the poor.

They have proven themselves over 40 years. And I am so pleased myself to be in Washington for the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation which former

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton spoke at, it was a great event and a testament to the great work that the Legal Services Corporation does, and they are an inspiration and certainly a beacon of hope for providers around the country. So we welcome you to the hearing.

I want to recognize the presence of my colleague, Victoria Graffeo, who is where? Right there, right in the middle in the back. She has been so critical to our 50-hour program, our Pro Bono Scholar Program, the corporate counsel change in our rules, and she has been a fighter for equal justice in every way and I'm so pleased that she's here today and so pleased that we can have this hearing at the Court of Appeals in Albany.

I mention the other members of our Task Force who are here: Fern Fisher, Lillian Moy, Camille Siano Enders, Anne Erickson, Barbara Finkelstein, Sheila Gaddis, Adriene Holder, Denise Kronstadt, Chris O'Malley, and Raun Rasmussen.

Let me welcome now with no further delay our first witness, she is Martha Minow who is the Dean of the Harvard Law School which some of you may have heard of around the country, one of our most prominent law schools, and we're so pleased and happy to have her with us. She has been a leader in the area of equal justice. She's the Vice Chair of the Legal Services Corporation. She

recognizes so well that law schools are so much a part of this battle for access to justice for all. And Harvard Law School and our law schools around the country play such an important role in shaping the values of the next generation of law students.

I particularly note the terrific report that she chaired for Legal Services Corporation on pro bono work, it really provided many thoughts about creative solutions to encouraging pro bono. We're honored to have her as our lead-off witness. Dean Minow, the floor is yours.

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: Thank you so much. And I guess to introduce myself again my name is Martha Minow and I am honored to serve both as Dean of the Harvard Law School and as vice chair of the Legal Services Corporation Board of Directors.

I want to thank you all for the privilege of inviting me to offer testimony here in this gorgeous room today and to be here with you, Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman, with Judge Lawrence Marks, with Presiding Justice Karen Peters, and with Glenn Lau-Kee, President of the New York State Bar Association, as you pursue your superb work. Your leadership gives me real hope about real progress in remedying the crisis in the access to justice. Your work improves the access to lawyers, legal advice, courts and justice and you change lives every day.

2 3

A civilization advances when what was once viewed as a misfortune becomes understood as an injustice. The justice gap is a profound injustice. The way in which we name an injustice actually gives us the chance to begin to remedy it. New York's Judiciary and this Task Force no

doubt are leading the way.

I so admire your efforts, Chief Judge Lippman, and your leadership. This Task Force to expand access to civil justice spotlights facts and generates powerful proposals and initiatives. And as Chief Judge you found the right person in my friend, Helaine Barnett, to chair the Task Force. She is the former president of the Legal Services Corporation. She is a lifelong leader in legal services for low-income people. And she is a force of nature.

You each have heard the call and now powerfully amplify the note sounded so well by Judge Learned Hand in his 1951 address to the Legal Aid Society in New York. He said, "It is the daily; it is the small; it is the cumulative injuries of little people we are here to protect...if we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: thou shalt not ration justice."

Sadly, this challenge is even more severe now than it was in 1951. We hit a historic record number in recent years in the level of people in poverty. Today

nearly 64 million people across this great nation 21% of Americans are eligible for federally-supported civil legal assistance because they have to make ends meet on an income of up to 125% of the poverty level.

The national data confirms the New York findings that fewer than 20% of all civil legal needs of low-income families and individuals are met and has been reported more than 2.3 million individuals have been unrepresented last year in the civil court proceedings here in New York.

Americans who cannot afford legal help routinely forfeit basic rights. Neither the facts of their situations or governing law are to blame. Lack of legal assistance is the problem. When people forfeit their rights simply because they cannot afford legal help everyone suffers. The law does not enforce itself. In civil cases, law requires litigants to proceed. Litigants need advisors and guides to the law and its agencies and courts.

Justice Lewis Powell, Jr., spearheaded the bipartisan commitment that built civil legal assistance for the poor. He said, and I quote, "It is fundamental that justice should be the same in substance and availability without regard to economic status." But we do not live up to that standard.

Eligible clients are turned away daily from

legal services offices. One office we at the Legal Services Corporation visited closes intake every month after only two days. Who's turned away? Victims of the financial crisis, veterans returning from the brutality of armed combat to the cruel indifference of the nation they defended, paying tenants living in buildings subject to foreclosure, domestic violence survivors at risk of new violence which we know increases with each economic downturn. Those turned away include individuals whose race, ethnicity or native language exposes them to the micro-aggression of bias and exclusions.

As a law school dean and Chair of the Steering

Committee of Deans of the American Association of Law

Schools I can report that students today in law school

want to serve. Hundreds of students want to provide legal

services for the poor yet they cannot pick their jobs

doing so even though they would gladly accept a job which

pays much less than what's available to many other

lawyers.

Finding steady and secure funding for legal services for low-income people has been a persistent challenge. The bipartisan commitment that produced the Legal Services Corporation 40 years ago remains an inspiration, but the federal funding for LSC has declined 19% between 2010 and 2013.

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

Another key source of support, Interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts, relies on the interest on funds held by lawyers in trust for clients and strengthens justice by supporting legal services. It's a wonderful program, but the returns have fallen to record lows due to both the low interest rates and the lower deposits.

So unfortunately, at this time of increasing need, 56 legal services programs supported by the federal government have had to close offices since 2009. an office, in a rural area in particular, can mean that the next nearest office is two days away by bus, inaccessible to a person who lacks money for the bus or for child care or for any other way to meet the need. Further reductions in federal support are likely next year and the year after that.

And especially in this climate I honestly know of no better or more inspiring efforts than the work of this Task Force. You have made and studied the problem and you have built remedies that are already making a difference. Over the last five years your comprehensive, creative and fruitful work has included pursuing successfully funding through the judicial budget for civil legal assistance. Your research demonstrates the devastating effects on the most vulnerable people that results from the lack of counsel in eviction, domestic

violence, consumer matters, and other cases involving essential needs for daily life.

You have shown how lack of counsel for low-income people produces delays and inefficiencies for the courts, like a broken down car in the middle of a highway. National evidence shows the same situation. In a recent survey of trial judges from 37 states, Puerto Rico, more than 60% of the responding judges report that unrepresented litigants fail to present necessary evidence, committed procedural errors, performed ineffective cross-examination, and failed to proffer evidence enforceable in the courts. Unequal justice, falling heavily on the most vulnerable, damages justice for the entire society.

Your Task Force has done a superb job making the case for civil legal assistance. What could be better evidence than your success in securing the \$70 million in funding annually for civil legal assistance, a sum higher than the commitments made in any other state in the nation? But I want to say that we at the Legal Services Corporation want to add wind to your sails as you seek your goal of 100 million a year.

The Task Force ensures steady public attention to the basic human needs of low-income clients for housing, safety, stability, access to health care,

education, financial resources. And you know that ensuring civil legal assistance for low-income people is not only the right thing to do, it's the smart and economical thing to do. Your path-breaking study demonstrating that for each \$1 in funding legal aid providers generate \$6 in economic benefits for all New Yorkers demonstrates the power of doing the right thing.

Your study also reveals that \$85 million has been saved through civil legal services for domestic violence survivors, \$116 million in preventing homelessness, and 457 million in securing federal disability, health care and other benefits for which people are qualified.

We all save money when we ensure that people can pay their own bills, avoid foreclosure, avoid eviction, avoid foster care placements, and obtain health care before there is a crisis, keep their children in school with appropriate services. Comporting with your own research a study in Florida estimates savings of a similar order of magnitude due to legal services responding to domestic violence and homelessness risks. A study in Nebraska showed that Legal Aid clients received \$2.5 million in parental support, alimony and unemployment awards in one year because of the help provided by their lawyers. And similar research shows how preventing

homelessness and domestic violence can help kids in school, reduce the risk of foster care, and improve their access to health care, healthier housing, and hence a success in life. Other states look to your leadership, your empirical studies, your unwavering commitment to justice for all, and your success in securing state funding.

Former Chief Judge in my State of Massachusetts,
Chief Justice Margaret Marshall, strikingly observed a few
years ago that no one questioned whether there should be
public funding when our Commonwealth needed to hold a
special election to fill the senate seat that was vacated.
If funding to make elections work is unquestioned as a
public duty, why not funding to keep the courts working?
And the courts cannot work if a whole class of litigants
cannot use them without public assistance.

You demonstrated that there are avenues to meet the justice gap beyond public funding, although that is essential. Those avenues include pro bono services, partnerships with law firms, law schools and companies, innovations that use technology and staffing and private philanthropy. In the work the Legal Services Corporation has pursued on pro bono we have followed closely the work of the New York Task Force and the recommendations are inspiring: Increasing the aspirational pro bono goal for

attorneys from 20 to 50 hours; requiring the 50-hour pro bono service before admission to the bar; and making it possible for retired lawyers to actually contribute service; and the Pro Bono Scholars Programs are all models for us all to follow.

We at the Legal Services Corporation are proud to collaborate. So for example, the Legal Services

Corporation awarded one of our very first pro bono innovation fund grants to the Legal Assistance of Western New York, Inc., which is working alongside with other LSC grantees: The Legal Aid Society of Mid-New York, Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York, Legal Services of the Hudson Valley, Nassau/Suffolk Law Services Committee, and Neighborhood Legal Services of Buffalo.

This effort, combined with the new 50 hours of pro bono work for new applicants to the New York Bar and the Attorney Emeritus Program actually has provided an exciting model I think for us all to study. The six LSC grantees are creating a new pro bono practice group across all of these organizations to coordinate pro bono opportunities among 33 offices and 9 New York law schools, including the Feerick Center for Social Justice at Fordham University School of Law, which staffs the Attorney Emeritus Program for the Office of Court Administration.

The six LSC grantees which provide legal

services to every urban, suburban, rural community outside of New York City will coordinate thousands and thousands of hours of service donated to help low-income New Yorkers. And with our initial grant, the 18-month grant of three hundred and fourteen thousand dollars, I should also say and sixty-eight dollars, this effort is the largest innovation grant that we have given. And it's followed a very competitive process designed, as our President James Sandman explains, to promote innovation. I'm encouraged to hear that the grantees actually are committed to finding funding to continue this initiative after the initial effort.

On behalf of the Legal Services Corporation I say congratulations and good luck to the Legal Assistance of Western New York and partners in this timely and path-breaking project, implementing ideas generated by this Task Force.

Partnerships of this kind can leverage the energy of new lawyers and emeritus lawyers, along with the knowledge of law school faculties and experienced legal services providers joining pro bono work with expertise to meet the needs of low-income clients. Partnerships are also at the heart of your Task Force's Annual Law School Conference which joins together all 15 of the New York law schools, the providers and representatives from the

private bar and the courts to focus on quality supervision of law students engaged in New York's pro bono programs.

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

Access to justice issues can be part of a law school's curriculum. I am here to say this can be done. And not only can it be done, it can be done in a way that is inspiring and meaningful. And as you have shown, it's also worth considering incorporating access to justice issues on bar exams and building summer and postgraduate opportunities for students so they can develop skills as well as serve.

I do believe that there is a new promise in innovative technology to tackle the justice gap. Legal Services Corporation held a summit on the use of technology last year to suggest five ways that technology can help meet the legal needs of low-income individuals: First, create in each state a unified digital legal portal to connect individuals who need legal advice with guides through the legal process and ways to access professional Second, support the creation of legal documents help. through digital document assembly. Third, develop apps -that is a word -- that could be used by mobile technologies to reach more people more effectively. Fourth, apply business process analysis to improve the efficiency of access to justice efforts. And fifth, develop expert systems to give lawyers and other service

providers access to knowledge that's rendered relevant to particularized factual situations.

Your Task Force is pursuing these promising directions for the use of technology. And the inventory that you called for to identify the urgent, medium and long-term technology needs of New York's legal services providers is an excellent step. Another powerful effort will be the first statewide technology summit here in New York. And the Legal Services Corporation's Technology Innovation Grant staff, which we affectionately call the TIG staff, is eager to help with that conference and with your further efforts.

Law schools and engineering and computer schools and corporations and corporate legal departments can also be partners in the use of technology to remedy the justice gap. Many states are finding also that public libraries offer low-income people their most obvious way to gain access to technology. So collaboration with libraries, including training programs for library staff can also be a promising initiative. In these and other ways many people who are not lawyers can play critical roles in addressing the justice gap.

And so we think it's completely important and valuable that your Task Force is boldly considering potential roles for non-lawyers to advance justice for

low-income people. I, and so many other people around the country, are following closely your study of those subjects and your Court Navigator programs in the Bronx and Brooklyn addressing consumer and housing issues. Also the upcoming pilot in online dispute resolution in consumer cases is extremely intriguing. The combination of online tools with pro bono resources can actually meet people where they are. Some teams have found that in California. And also work joining religious and civic organizations to offer legal clinics is something that the Access to Justice Commission in Tennessee is pursuing.

It's a privilege for all of us from the Legal Services Corporation to be here today and to see the works of the Task Force. Our Chair, John Levi, recently said, "The cracks in our civil justice system may not be as visible as those in our bridges and highways, but we all know that they exist. But because they are not as easy to see, we in the profession have a responsibility to speak up and let the country know the risk to one of the fundamental pillars of our great democracy."

The judges and lawyers of New York show us all what it looks like to take up this responsibility. And if the emphasis is not on us, who else will pick it up? And if it's not now, then when? At stake is the rule of law. At stakes is stability and security. At stake is the

climate in which businesses can thrive. At stake is secure employment for workers, families and consumers. At stake actually is the risk of unrest in a society where justice is not done.

My own work experience has taken me to transitional societies emerging from violent conflict, in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. And what I know is that if you do not pay attention to fairness of society there's no fairness for anyone. There's no peace. There's no chance of the kind of life that anyone would want to live. You cannot get or sustain economic investment without courts that operate. You cannot get or sustain economic investment without a rule of law that is enforced. And you cannot get or expect the kind of respect that this nation, this great nation, hopes to earn each year if we don't live up to the values that we say we believe in.

We strengthen our best selves and we avoid the worst when we are committed to justice. My old boss,

Justice Thurgood Marshall, talked of the courts as the protector of the powerless. And he said, "In recognizing the humanity of our fellow beings, we pay ourselves the highest tribute." That is why those here today who provide legal help to those who are poor, that is why they deserve our highest compliment. The rule of law and access to justice is all about that, how to recognize the

humanity of our fellow human beings.

These are challenging times and it's a time to remind us all that any of us could be in need suddenly. It could be our own parents, it could be our siblings, it could be our children. What would we want for them? What would we want for us? Justice, after all, is JUST US. And I think that's a pun, but there you go.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: We like it.

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: You know, we talk about what we teach in law school and that we ought to be teaching about ethics and access to justice, and the fact is we teach it whether we say so or not, but the question is what do we teach? Do we teach that we live up to the highest standards or not? And the legal profession teaches, whether we know it or not. What do we teach? What do we teach the country about what we stand for? I want to say that we stand for justice.

And I, in that spirit, thank you all for the work you do to advance justice every day.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Dean Minow, for that really eloquent statement and for your comprehensive testimony. I can't think of anyone who can lay out this problem as well as you did and the many solutions that you and all of our distinguished visitors from the Legal Services Corporation have done to advance

this issue. Let me ask you just a few questions.

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: Certainly.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: You know we are very proud to get this latest grant, the Innovation Grant by Western New York, and we see how much good your grants do and how important the Legal Services Corporation is today with a budget of \$360 million and something in that range. What should the federal government's role be in promoting the kinds of things the LSC has done? And let's be very frank, over these last years it's been a struggle. It seems to get the funding that is really needed. It seems almost incomprehensible, even with the gridlock in Washington, that we cannot get additional funding for LSC. What should our representatives in Washington be thinking about when they talk about the federal role in providing funding for legal services for the poor?

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: Well, thank you for that question. I do believe that we have a job to do to help educate our own leaders about the multiplier effect of legal services, as the research conducted by your Task Force has demonstrated. If you're not moved by just doing the right thing, doing the smart thing should be pretty good evidence. The return on the investment is better than most other kinds of returns that the federal government makes. If there really were sufficient support

for legal services there would be not only the kind of access to justice that would make us all proud, there would be a strengthening of the economic and stability dimensions of each local community.

I do think that in addition that the federal government could understand I think that its own commitments, its own benefits would be better secured if there's legal services to help people actually make the federal programs work. And the veterans example, I can't imagine a better one, that our returning veterans are entitled, they're entitled to health care, they're entitled to job services, they're entitled to small business association grants, but it's very hard for them to navigate. And the federal government, in order to make its own investments meaningful, should invest in legal services.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I couldn't agree with you more. We talked about it a little bit earlier today this idea that this isn't only the right and ethical thing to do, but there are very good economic issues to make the case for the good of our community, for the good of our society, for the stability, for the fabric of our society. And those arguments are out there, we make them, you make them. Is it that we need more of our constituency to be pounding the door in Washington and making these same

arguments? Why is it that even given everything that we know is going on in Washington today, is that what it is, that we need more soldiers in this fight?

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: I am sure that more constituents talking with their own representatives would help. I also believe that a combination of statistics and stories are the way to communicate. And so it's vital in fact to support the kind of research that this Task Force has undertaken to make available to people who want to make the case the materials that will help them do so.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And I also think, as we were talking about earlier today, there are various parts of our constituency in a broader sense, including the Judiciary, that must be standing up and going to Washington and insisting that this be done.

But let me ask you about another part of our constituency that you are so familiar with, the law schools. What is the role of the law school today? And I know we talked about privately some really wonderful points about we're teaching values, whether we say we're doing it or not, in the broadest sense when we tried to mobilize the 15 New York law schools behind this idea that they are very much a part of this access to justice vision that we're all trying to push. What do you see -- I know that we teach these different disciplines in law school

which lawyers have to know to be capable lawyers. Is it mutually exclusive to teach these disciplines and to let lawyers understand -- the prospective lawyers -- what it means to be a lawyer and they have to give back? How do you take it to the mandate of the law school? What do you do to mandate of the law school?

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: In many ways the legal education is a little different than any other part of higher education. We are a professional school, we're also part of the university. We are the locus of research about law and justice and therefore have to be a place that criticism of the justice system is pursued. And we also of course try to prepare people to have meaningful lives and careers. If we do not address what frankly is the multi-decade-long crisis about whether or not law is a profession or is a business, then we will not have this unique role anymore.

There are many, many businesses, but if we're not also a profession then we're not addressing what is unique about law. I do think that one of the great surprising side benefits of the financial crisis is that we have the rapt attention of law students when we turn to mortgages in the middle of the property class. We have the rapt attention of the law students when we turn to the questions about stay and injunctions in procedure class.

The issues have spilled over into public awareness. So the students are aching for the opportunity to take the learning that they're getting and apply it on behalf of people in need. The law schools have to provide a way to be able to equip them to do so and also to provide the law schools as a meeting ground for the transformation of the profession. That includes the role of technology. That includes assisting the courts in digitizing forms and otherwise helping to modernize. We are the research arm of the legal profession and that is a major role for us. That includes empirical study about the efforts to meet the access to justice problem.

Just one more element. The law schools alone can never remedy the justice gap. We can play a role and we help students play a role. But what we can do is be part of an integrated solution that connects the practicing bar, the Judiciary, the business community and help everything from having a platform, a shared digital platform, for allocating pro bono cases, to actually translating the data into law reform proposals. So I think there's an enormous opportunity for the law schools to play that kind of role today.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I agree. In your law school and your leadership I think that's obvious. And I think around the country it's so important. One more

question before I ask the panel if they have any questions. You talked about awareness in public consciousness. And we know that in the criminal area the public gets it, from the TV alone or from all the things, about your right to an attorney and how critical it is. And obviously since Gideon v. Wainwright and watching Henry Fonda in the movies, we get it, everybody gets an attorney.

Is the public starting to get it that the roof is going to come down over your head that someone is entitled to representation? Do they get the fact that losing your home can be as severe as actually losing your liberty? Is that public consciousness getting there in your mind?

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: I had a student who grew up in Russia and who learned about the Miranda warnings from watching American television growing up in Russia. I don't think we have anything comparable to that level of awareness in this country, much less around the world, about civil justice. So I think we have a long distance to go.

I think that the numbers of representatives in Congress who don't know what civil legal services, what that phrase means, is astounding. So that's our burden. That's our obligation to figure out how to communicate

much better.

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

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I think in some ways the economic crisis maybe has made people a little more aware; particularly, the foreclosure clan, or whatever you want to call it, really did heighten the awareness, but I think we've got a ways to go. Are there other questions?

HONORABLE KAREN PETERS: I have one. fascinated by your suggestion of public libraries playing a role with regard to access to justice for low-income people. And as the Presiding Judge of the Third Department as you are probably aware we have so many clients and potential clients who live in rural areas who don't have access to a law school pro bono program, they don't have a Legal Aid office in their neighborhood or in their community or even within driving distance. live in a rural community in this department and I can tell you that there are libraries everywhere, many of whom have really come so far with regard to technology and availability of technology to local citizens. Would you tell me a little bit more -- and I know we're tight for time -- would it take to refining this type of cooperation successful in rural states?

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: Well, an example is Hawaii.

And Hawaii on its many islands does not have a large
number of lawyers. The lawyers are in Honolulu. So it's

exactly one reason why they've turned to libraries. And it was Andrew Carnegie who developed the idea that every community should have a library. And now in many communities the libraries are the own shared civic space. And as you say the libraries have become at the forefront about technology and how to make technology available. For many poor people the only access they have to online services is through their public library.

So what Hawaii has done and a few other states are exploring is the possibility of not only bringing access to a statewide portal or other kinds of materials that involve access to the court forums and so forth, but also providing training to the librarians in the same way that your Task Force is exploring the possible role as a navigator role or other roles for non-lawyers. Librarians should not pretend to be lawyers, they don't want to be lawyers, but they can provide the kind of access to reference materials as they do in other circumstances right here to advance the access to justice initiative.

HONORABLE KAREN PETERS: Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you for your terrific testimony. And I think everyone here in this room can get an idea of the wonderful work that LSC does through your really very comprehensive terrific testimony.

DEAN MARTHA MINOW: Thank you for the privilege

and inviting me to testify.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Our next witness will be the Honorable Katherine M. Sheehan, the Mayor of the great City of Albany.

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And Mayor Sheehan, we're delighted to see you here. The City of Albany has always been very, very conscious of the need of legal services and we know that you actually, which you don't have to be, are a member of the profession and you are equally aware of the need for legal services in this City. So you're on, Madam Mayor, great to see you.

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: Thank you very much. I want to thank you for this invitation. I want to thank the Administrative Judge Gail Prudenti, Presiding Justice Karen Peters, Justice Marks and Glenn Lau-Kee, President of the New York State Bar Association, for once again holding this Third Department hearing in Albany.

I also want to thank you, Judge Lippman, for your unwavering support for civil services and for securing unprecedented funding for the City of Albany's civil legal services providers and providers throughout the state.

I want to acknowledge with pleasure the President and the Board of Directors of the Legal Services

Corporation. I'm delighted to welcome them to the City of Albany. I'm particularly glad to welcome Jim Sandman, one of our own, back to Albany.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: They all come back to Albany.

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: They do. Thanks to Don Levi, and Dean Martha Minow who we just heard from, and all the members of the Board of Directors for their support in civil legal services.

Albany is a beautiful and historic city. We are proud to be the Capitol of New York. Despite being New York's Capitol we are not without our challenges that many, many cities in our state face today. The City of Albany's population is about 98,000 people and 25.4% of them live in poverty. A staggering 34% of our children are living in poverty. Similarly, our substantial elderly population also has a very high poverty rate. And for all of these people they face many of the burdens of maintaining the essentials of life. They grapple with consumer debt, but they also need shelter, safety, stability and access to education and health care.

And with so many residents in need, I am very pleased that Albany is home to a number of the finest legal service providers, each of whom provides vital services to low-income residents. As an attorney in

private practice and as general counsel of a manufacturing company I was only rarely able to provide direct legal assistance to low-income people in need, but when I did it was the most gratifying work that I ever performed in my career. That is the situation for many local lawyers and that is why ongoing fiscal and programmatic support for these agencies is essential to the residents and to the economic viability of our City.

The Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York provides a full range of civil legal services to protect essential needs. Legal Aid provides general legal services to all low-income people. Their housing attorneys partner with the City through our Emergency Solutions Grant Program and with Albany County to provide comprehensive homelessness prevention services. They also administer several projects which respond to the acute needs in our City. For example, Foreclosure Prevention, Disability Advocacy Project, the Children's Law Project, HIV/AIDS Law Consortium, the Nutrition Outreach & Education Program, Upstate New York Immigration Law Project, Senior Legal Services Program and Low-Income Taxpayer Clinic.

The Legal Project of the Capital District
Women's Bar Association also provides essential legal
services to victims of domestic violence and stalking.

The TLP leverages pro bono volunteers throughout the

Capital Region to provide services to low and moderate

income New Yorkers, including the working poor. They also

provide services to prevent foreclosures, do affordable

home closings, wills and appellate cases. They sponsor a

reduced fee matrimonial program, small business advice

bureau, speakers program, pro bono bankruptcy program, and

also they host an incubator project with the Albany Law

School.

The Albany Law School Clinic and Justice Center provides free legal services through a variety of clinics, including the Health Law Clinic, Tax & Transactions

Clinic, Field Placement Clinic, Civil Rights &

Disabilities Law Clinic, Domestic Violence Prosecution

Hybrid Clinic, Family Violence Litigation Clinic and

Immigration Project and Introduction to Litigation Clinic.

The City of Albany is also home to Empire

Justice Center, a statewide advocacy organization that

provides back-up services for local legal service

providers and direct representation in some appellate and

public benefit cases. Disability Rights New York, also

located in the City of Albany, provides protection and

advocacy services to the developmentally disabled, the

mentally ill and other disabled people.

It is gratifying to see all the local legal

service providers collaborate among themselves to minimize duplication of services and to coordinate for the provision of services to low-income residents in Albany.

I am proud to serve on the board of Albany Law School and note their commitment to community partnership and collaboration with local legal service providers. The benefit of the services delivered by all of these providers is best demonstrated by first-hand accounts from those that they serve. And I understand you are going to be hearing first-hand accounts from individuals today.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: We will absolutely.

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: I want to tell you about one individual the Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York represented, Christine, a disabled woman who was evicted for nonpayment of rent. They appealed the termination of her Section 8 voucher and after an administrative hearing her housing voucher was reinstated after Legal Aid set forth her many attempts to pay her rent. The hearing officer agreed and restored her voucher.

In a city like Albany eviction can uproot an entire family. We are only now beginning to understand that transiency, particularly among students in our schools, is a leading indicator of a challenge and a leading negative indicator around graduation rates.

Having advocacy around keeping people in their homes is critically linked to the education outcomes that we see in our City. And as we begin to understand that, the importance of pro bono services and of advocacy to help keep families rooted in their neighborhoods so that their children can stay in the same schools throughout their school career is critically important. It's just one example of the investment that the Dean talked about, that it pays dividends and why it's so important that we advocate and continue to do this work.

I applaud the Task Force for the long reach of all of its activities. The Task Force's commitment to developing non-economic access to justice initiatives is brilliant. The 50-hour admission requirement was the first in the nation. And I am proud to say in Albany local law students have responded eagerly to the new initiative. I believe that the Task Force's commitment to increasing pro bono and using non-lawyers, online dispute resolution, training and technology to promote access to justice will enure to the benefit not only of residents of the City of Albany today, but in the days to come and the generations to come.

I eagerly await the results of today's hearing and this year's Task Force report. I can provide you with any other additional information, please don't hesitate to

ask. But thank you again for the work that you do.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mayor

Sheehan, for being here today, and we really appreciate

it. Let me just ask you a couple of quick questions. Do

people know where to go in Albany to get legal services?

Even assuming the fact that we know that we can't handle

all the requests that we get now for legal assistance, you

talked about collaboration, do you have the means to see

people in the legal services? Is that clear to the

average person where they go?

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: The navigation of it can be challenging, but I will say in a city like Albany where there are so many advocacy groups that are located here that we are able to direct people to where they need to go in most instances.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: When they come into a governmental office do you send them to legal service?

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: Absolutely. So when they come into City Hall, and people come to City Hall for a whole host of reasons, eviction is a very common one we get, and so we are able to refer them to a provider that can help them.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: One other question. So you get them into legal services and certainly significant numbers of people are helped, not as many as we would

like. Describe, as the Mayor, how this affects the fabric of this city that having the ability to have legal service providers helping people in need, whether it's an eviction or some other crisis in their life, how do you see it from your broad perspective of things?

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: To me, having that access is essential for our city to be able to grow, to be a place where people feel as though they are treated fairly, where they have the ability to get a fair hearing of their challenges and to be able to navigate the system in a way that -- we have so much more work to do. It's not just the legal system, it's all of us, have a lot more work to do to provide that ease of access to people so that they can focus on providing for their family, on making sure that their children are getting a good education, as opposed to having to go from one place to another to another.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: You're evicted, you lose your job, your kids can't go to the same school that they're supposed to be going to.

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: Exactly.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: All these things are not healthy for your community.

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: And if we can get back to that root problem of preventing it from happening in

the first place, prevent that eviction from occurring.

The issue that is causing that can be domestic violence,

it can be unfair treatment in their job. You know, all of

these are challenges that people face that when they have

that advocate, when we're able to connect people with

somebody who becomes their advocate and helps them

navigate through the system we see wonderful outcomes.

But that's the key, is making sure that they have that

person who is helping them to navigate.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Any further questions?

HONORABLE LAWRENCE MARKS: Quick question to

follow up on Judge Lippman's question. So the federal

government is a source of funding for legal services, the

state is a source of funding, increased source of funding,

at least in the State of New York, for legal services. If

local governments, including cities, benefit from

well-financed legal services do the local governments and

cities have any responsibility of their own to fund legal

services?

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: Well, you know, the challenge for a city like Albany where we have high rates of poverty, where we have significant challenges with just being able to fund basic city services as well as our schools it is a challenge. I know from where I speak because I had to issue my budget last Wednesday. And the

City of Albany, notwithstanding making significant cuts to our operations, still has a \$12 million deficit. We are funding that with one-time revenue opportunities, but it is very, very challenging. And that is why I think if we can get advocacy around these issues at the state and the federal level, this is a way that localities can be helped with offsetting the burdens that are created when you have people that fall through the cracks, because that then places a strain on our local resources.

So I think from the standpoint of finding the ways to fund it where -- our tax base is really our residents who are in some cases in the least position to be able to provide funding for those services which is why we look to the federal and state government in order to do that.

question. You mentioned the studies show clearly that if the child has residential stability it's a relevant factor for success in school. And interestingly, in this country in general, if the child gets sick in school and there's a school nurse the child can go to for some assistance, and in most situations if the family is not of money means they will have some assistance getting medical care for that child. But interestingly, if the child's family is being evicted, there's no way that family is going to get

assistance until some program that you have available in the city will provide assistance to them. Do you think that part of the problem is that most people in this state, in this country, who aren't in physical distress don't seem to understand the need for civil legal services is just as serious as the need for medical care?

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

MAYOR KATHERINE SHEEHAN: I think that we're starting to see that, that what is contributing to stability and that we just reported in a story about two different school districts, two high schools one and a half miles apart, with staggeringly different outcomes. But within the school district that was struggling where they had about 60% graduation rate, among students who had been in the district from kindergarten all the way through, 95% are graduating. I mean to me that is an incredibly compelling number that shows the importance, just as you said, that physical stability, that stability in your life and the supports around your life are every bit as important as your health and as other factors that we seem to assume but we don't -- we have not made that connection around these other areas where legal services can play an incredibly important role in providing that stability.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Mayor

Sheehan, it's always a delight to see you at the Court of

Appeals. Thank you for coming in. I now ask the Honorable A. Gail Prudenti, the Chief Administrative Judge of the courts, to come up. And it's a little unusual that Judge Prudenti is testifying, she's usually sitting up here next to me, but we thought it important for the judges to tell us a little bit about what's going on in New York, the success that we've achieved, problems, to document some of the numbers about what the results are here in upstate in regard to civil legal services for the poor. Judge Prudenti.

HONORABLE A. GAIL PRUDENTI: Yes, thank you.

Thank you, Chief Judge. And I would just like to thank
you for the privilege of being the Chief Administrative

Judge and for being here today. And I also would like to
thank my colleagues and friends who are of course sitting
with you: Presiding Justice Peters, Judge Marks,

President Lau-Kee.

I'm not going to be reading from my remarks, but I have some notes that I have taken, so please don't hesitate if you would like to stop me at any point, that's fine. If you would like to wait until the end to ask questions, that's fine, but I would be absolutely delighted to answer any questions.

For those of you who don't know me my name is

Gail Prudenti and I am the Chief Administrative Judge.

Many people have asked me what does the Chief

Administrative Judge do? Well, the Chief Administrative

Judge is appointed and in this case by a brilliant Chief

Judge.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Judge. You see why I have her testifying.

HONORABLE A. GAIL PRUDENTI: And our brilliant Chief Judge is a visionary and he is a visionary of the New York State court system and his reputation is known nationally. But I have to tell you, whether it be in Barcelona or Puerto Rico, he is known internationally as well. And I am a spokesperson who tries to make his initiatives a reality.

But I am here today to talk about an important role that these hearings play in helping us to set and meet the unmet legal needs of so many New Yorkers. My role today is to share the progress of this Chief Judge's initiative to expand access to civil legal services to all New Yorkers. It has always been, and those of us who have known him know it well, always been a top priority of this Chief Judge's administration. It's also a vital importance to all of the Judiciary.

I have to tell you I don't know a judge who has sat in the family court or in the housing court or in the

matrimonial courts or in the medical malpractice courts or at the Appellate Division level that doesn't realize the vital importance of civil legal services for individuals who can't afford those services themselves. So it is important to all New Yorkers.

As I said, our visionary Chief Judge long ago, and I tell you long ago because I've had the privilege of working for this gentleman for about 20 years in different capacities, recognized the situation that we were in is critical. He knew and we talked about how people came to us at some of the most difficult times in their lives and without the benefit of counsel, they were frightened, they were anxiety-ridden, they didn't know which way to turn. So he also decided that as far as his administration was going to be concerned, that providing civil legal services to those who couldn't afford legal services would be at the top of his agenda when he became the Chief Judge.

appearing without lawyers in our courts in New York. They are involved and they remind us, as the Chief Judge said, that there are individuals that sometimes we forget about that do not have the essentials of life. They don't have a roof over their head, they don't know where their children are supposed to go to school, they don't have any health care being provided, nor have they had the

privilege of education. There are women who are victims of domestic violence. So as our Chief Judge said, it was time and it was appropriate to do something to help many, many individuals who are in great need of civil legal services but couldn't afford them.

There were many in our legal community, and I remember it well, that said the Chief Judge had the right idea but that it was not the appropriate time due to the financial crisis that we were in. But as the Chief Judge said, if not then, when?

The current economic climate has lead to an increased number of poor and unrepresented individuals in civil matters, but many of us have realized the Chief Judge was correct, we must give help and hope when it is most needed. Civil legal service money is essential to our Judiciary fulfilling its course mission which is equal justice to all.

Lack of legal representation not only hurts the unrepresented, but as we judges know, and we practiced in the courts in the State of New York know, we saw higher litigation costs, and usually for those people who are represented, leads to less efficient courts, and it's because of constant adjournments and because of judges who want people to have a level playing field. And of course, to the quality of justice suffering. As the Chief Judge

said, this issue is as important as keeping the doors of our courthouse open.

So we are indeed fortunate to have a proactive Chief Judge who leads by example and taught me long ago, longer than either one of us would like to admit, that one person can be a force for positive change in the world today. We are here because of his commitment to help others.

So now I would like to talk to you about the many successes that we have had in the past four years. But although we have many successes, we have very far to go. We have tried in so many innovative ways to bridge the justice gap. We've heard today already and so many of us already know about the 50-hour pro bono requirement for admission to the Bar or increase in aspirational hours of pro bono service for the lawyers in the State of New York, for our Pro Bono Scholars Program which Judge Graffeo and Chief Judge Lippman work so hard on, that not only bridges the justice gap but helps young law students hopefully achieve their own personal and professional goals. And of course pro bono service by in-house counsel.

So in these challenging budget times, and believe me each and every year is a challenging budget process, we have been able to obtain increasing amounts of funding in our Judiciary budget. The first year that

funding was \$27.5 million. In our second year we were able to obtain \$40 million. And in our third year \$55 million. And the current fiscal year ending March 2015 \$70 million. Each year we have passed on to IOLA \$15 million in rescue funding and distributed the rest through our Judicial Civil Legal Services Funding through an Oversight Board that has its RFP process. We request proposals by civil legal service providers and we focus only on the matters involving essentials of life which you have heard so much about today and which we hear so much about at each and every hearing with regard to civil legal services.

We know that the eligibility for services is limited to persons who are living at or below 200% of the federal poverty level. Primarily we focus on direct legal services, that is our funding priority. And collaboration among civil legal services providers is very, very much encouraged.

Grantees also may use a very small portion of their award to give other legal assistance, whether it be hotline, help desk, workshops, referrals to other providers. The Oversight Board allocated the latest Judiciary budget of \$55 million to 75 civil legal services providers serving low-income New Yorkers in every county in the State of New York. Grants range from approximately

\$15,000 to \$6 million.

I would be remiss though if I didn't personally, not only on behalf of the Chief Judge, but on behalf of myself, thank Helaine Barnett, the Chair of the Task Force to Expand Access to Civil Legal Services in New York and the Chair of our Oversight Board. Through her efforts and that of her Task Force they have been able to afford us the ability to assess the need for civil legal services, to give us information in a comprehensive report each and every year. And they have dedicated and studied all of our creative ideas and come up with many creative ideas on their own. They are enabling us to address this critical situation.

I personally owe Helaine Barnett a debt of gratitude. I have learned so much from her about the legal services community not only in the State of New York but throughout the country. She is a true professional with a very kind heart.

The good news is that funding is helping millions and millions of New Yorkers. The physical year ending March 2014 grantees of our Judiciary civil legal service funding handled 385,000 cases involving the essentials of life. We have seen improvement with increased funding. Vast improvement. The number of clients served more than doubled from 2011-2012 to

2012-2013. And many more New Yorkers were helped who were not directly given services but still were the beneficiaries of cases that were brought on behalf of individuals, as well as class action, and as well as family members who are also involved in foreclosure proceedings, as well as one very notable case which involved an individual and her family, her children were suffering from disability. Post-Sandy or Superstorm or hurricane, no matter what you call it it was devastation, this woman and her family were being asked to leave the hotel where they were housed, there would be no more federal funding. A legal services provider brought a case, the matter was resolved. But that case just didn't help that family, it helped 488 other people who were similarly situated. Last year close to 1.4 million individuals were beneficially impacted.

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

With regard to our other legal assistance, whether it be informational, help desk, hotline, educational workshops, the number of individuals using this assistance has grown dramatically. In our first year it was approximately 730,000 individuals, in our second year it was 1.9 million individuals, and in our third year it was 4 million individuals.

As you will see this afternoon from clients who will tell their stories, these stories are heart

wrenching, and believe me they can tell their stories much, much better than I would ever be able to tell their stories. You will hear from them. I have included in my written remarks some of the many stories that touched my heart that make me truly believe that these people and so many others, including so many people that we love and we care about, family members, could be in this situation at any time, and that it is our obligation and our responsibility as lawyers to provide these services.

We have come a long way. We have made great progress. In 2009 we've estimated that 2.3 million individuals were unrepresented litigants in civil cases.

Now, from our 2013 data, it shows a dramatic decline to 1.8 million. There are examples we have seen of many improvements, whether it be tenants in eviction cases, whether it be in family court outside of the City of New York, whether it be inside New York City with regard to child support matters. We still have so far to go. The number of unrepresented litigants in these important cases remains extremely high.

Tenants in eviction cases in New York City remain unrepresented at a high rate of approximately 99%. Defendants in consumer credit cases that were closed last year there were 96% of individuals in those cases that were unrepresented. The current resources are still

insufficient. As always, we must build upon and redouble our efforts. This is fundamental to our core issues.

With that said, I would be remiss if I didn't say a heartfelt thanks to the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation. They are the Chief Judge's kindred spirits and their tireless efforts will help us achieve our goals I hope in our careers and in our lifetime.

With that said, thank you for listening to me and I would be very happy to answer any questions you might have.

Prudenti, for putting some meat on the bones and some numbers before us. Let me ask you a question now. With the money we get from the state, which you work very hard across the street to help to get us, and the money that comes into New York through the Legal Services

Corporation, what about the issues that Judge Marks raised before about our cities and localities? I was very pleased that New York City, under the current administration, is putting money into eviction cases and providing representation and to immigration cases which are so relevant today. Do you think that the cities and municipalities are a part of this puzzle or do we say gee their economic problems at that level of government are so

1 2

difficult that we can't expect to have additional funds

coming in? Do you have any thoughts about that?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

think an educational process is needed.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I affirm what you say.

HONORABLE A. GAIL PRUDENTI: I certainly do. think that we have to be sympathetic to the difficult times that our cities and our counties are facing. are cities and counties around the State of New York who aren't able to provide assistance. Chief Judge, I have seen member items in the City of New York that are as small as \$1-, \$2-, \$3-, \$4-, \$5 million, but each and every one of those dollars adds up. I know that we have some wonderful avenues and I know that there are some counties and some cities around the State of New York who have insufficient funds and realize that by spending those funds they will be able to -- their Social Services budgets will go down and they will have more money to spend because they will gather more federal dollars.

I also would like to say that our partners in the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch are very gracious and kind and listened and heard your message, but I also would like to say that we obtain many grants, many grants nationally that have also helped us with this mission, and I'm sure that we could encourage many cities and counties to help us as well.

The Legislature and Executive have been terrific in New York in providing the funds that they do. I am very pleased by the numbers and we are looking toward what that number will be as to how many people are unrepresented in the State of New York. And you put that number 1.8 now and I think that is progress that we should be proud of. Give people a sense, how many cases come into the New York State courts every year?

HONORABLE A. GAIL PRUDENTI: Chief Judge, millions and millions and millions and millions, that's what I can tell you. If my memory serves me correctly, and please correct me if I'm wrong, but it was like 4- or 5 million cases.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Yes, between 4- and 5-.

Judge Prudenti is a good learner. 4- to 5 million I think is right. So you're talking about 1.8 million people who are unrepresented. Of course that can be more than one person in the same case. But there are certain -- and I think the judge made that clear -- there are certain kinds of cases in which the representation level is so low and virtually no one is represented. And those are the areas we're looking, with President Lau-Kee, we're looking at other methods of delivering legal assistance where there are no lawyers to hear many cases. Even with pro bono efforts we still don't have many lawyers. So that's where

we've gotten into the initiative with non-lawyers maybe being involved in this process, particularly housing and consumer credit.

HONORABLE A. GAIL PRUDENTI: Chief Judge, I just would like to end my testimony and tell you that having been a judge and sat in many courts I can tell you that for the individuals that are involved in each and every case this is no passing matter. And I think this afternoon everyone will see that the individuals who were represented by legal services providers, that these providers changed their lives. And I can say for myself, having attended many of these hearings with you, that what it does for me when I sit in this room or if I sit on this panel, it makes me rededicate my efforts to your efforts. Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Any other questions for Judge Prudenti? Let's have Corinda

Crossdale, the Director for the New York State Office for the Aging. Thank you for coming, it's a pleasure to see you.

CORINDA CROSSDALE: Thank you, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I am the Director of the New York State Office for the Aging and I am here today to speak about New York State's Services Initiative, which is a private/public effort announced in September of 2012 by

Governor Andrew Cuomo. The intent of this initiative is to find new ways to better provide affordable legal services to older New Yorkers, individuals of all ages with all types of disabilities and their caregivers; with the goal of advancing equal access to justice.

The partnership established to implement this initiative includes the New York State Office for the Aging, the New York State Office of Court Administration, and New York State Bar Association, and the New York State Office for People with Developmental Disabilities. effort to achieve greater and more diverse involvement in this statewide effort, our partnership is collaborating with a Think Group of experienced individuals from across the state to define the barriers these populations encounter when they need legal assistance, to identify strategies to address them.

In accordance with the Older Americans Act, the New York State Office for the Aging administers a Legal Assistance Program for older adults who, due to economic or social need, would not likely be able to obtain the assistance of an attorney. At the community level, each area agency on aging is required to dedicate a portion of federal funds to provide legal assistance under this program.

Individuals with disabilities, that's including

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

mental, developmental, intellectual, emotional and physical, account for 2 million of New York State residents. There are currently 3.7 million adults aged 60 and over in New York State; and informal caregivers number over 3 million. It is expected that all of these populations will increase over the next decade. People are living longer and increasing numbers of people are living alone in all stages of life. Health and long-term services and supports have moved away from institutional care to home and community-based care. For some older New Yorkers and individuals with disabilities access to legal services can be a critical factor in their ability to continue to live in the community of their choice.

These shifts in demographic and policy trends provided the impetus for the development of the Legal Services Initiative. Some of the reports received from across the state underlie the importance of working on these initiatives, activities and goals which include lack of awareness regarding the legal framework underlying many of the problems encountered; therefore, legal rights and protections are not considered when addressing these concerns. Many older adults and individuals with disabilities enter the court systems without the benefit of legal representation. Numerous residents cannot afford the costs of legal help, and there is a growing gap in the

ability to afford legal assistance. Many residents do not know where or how to contact legal help that is most appropriate to address their particular needs. Many members of the legal community and of the Judiciary are not knowledgeable about the traits, conditions and circumstances characterizing aging individuals and persons with disabilities and are often unaware of the extent to which these elements have a significant impact on the ability to gain successful access to the legal system or to achieve just outcomes.

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

Based on these reports the legal initiative collaborative looks to a successful partnership that will advance the following goals: Ensure that New York's older adults, individuals with disabilities and caregivers have practical access to sufficient and affordable legal assistance. Increase awareness among these populations and their service providers of legal rights regarding a variety of topic areas. Increase attorneys', Judiciary members' and law students' awareness of the traits, characteristics and circumstances of these populations, as well as increase understanding of how these elements impact the ability of older adults and those with disabilities to successfully engage with the legal community and the court systems. Increase attorneys', Judiciary members' and law students' awareness of the very diverse types of legal concerns impacting the targeted populations on a daily basis. Increase the number of attorneys who will include the needs of this population in their practices. Explore the provision of pro bono legal services, as well as other non-attorney alternatives, as a means of increasing access to affordable legal assistance. And strengthen and better coordinate the aging network's legal assistance program.

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

To date the legal services collaborative has completed six statewide exploratory surveys. The goals of these surveys is to describe the status of legal assistance for these three population groups. information obtained from the six surveys is still being analyzed and will soon be reviewed by a public/private Think Group which will be convening this month. This will be a group of about 120 individuals that will comprise a wide variety of experts from across the state, including representatives from state agencies, community aging and health networks, community disabilities networks, caregiver organizations, members of the legal and Judiciary communities, law schools, and of course The findings from the survey and Think Group consumers. will be used to develop strategies, activities and steps to achieve the Initiative's goals of equal access to justice.

We are anticipating that the next steps for the Legal Services Initiative's partners and Think Group will be to establish voluntary work groups that will take recommended strategies developed and begin implementation. The final goal is to increase availability, affordability and accessibility of legal assistance for older adults and people with disabilities, particularly those with great economic and social need, as well as the informal, unpaid family members and friends who provide the majority of

care for these individuals.

The legal services collaborative will continue to be proactive in working to improve legal services and advocacy for older adults and those with disabilities of any age. By increasing partnerships and integrating the work of the Initiative with other agencies and entities to maximize the utilization of resources, we will continue down this path to create systems that are more seamless for the consumer and their caregivers.

I thank you for the opportunity to share my comments.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you. And I want to thank the Governor and your office for focusing on what is a key population group that so desperately needs legal services, and by focusing on that I think you're really furthering the cause of equal justice in this state that's

often overlooked and their problems not really concentrated on. I think your office is doing a terrific job and a collaborative one, which we applaud.

CORINDA CROSSDALE: Your support is very much appreciated as well.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you. President Lau-Kee.

MR. LAU-KEE: I just wanted to note that the New York State Bar Association will be participating in that think tank. I will be there personally, so I look forward to it.

CORINDA CROSSDALE: Fantastic.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you, I appreciate it. Our next speaker is Chris O'Malley, who is the Executive Director of IOLA, which certainly performs a vital role in our state, and Chris does a terrific job. Today he's going to report on our next cost benefit analysis that is being prepared by the NERA Economic Consulting Group. Chris, great to have you with us and thanks so much for coming.

CHRIS O'MALLEY: Thank you very much, your

Honor, for having me here, and for all of your work. I've

been asked to testify and sum up the testimony of

Dr. Elizabeth Becker. She is an economist who works for

the NERA Economic Group who for the past three years, pro

bono, has been providing detailed economic analysis of the civil legal services provided in New York State.

And I've been asked to focus on three of the highlights of her work this year in summing up her work. First, Dr. Becker looked at the savings associated with the prevention of emergency shelter costs in New York State. And in doing this Dr. Becker was updating a study that had originally been done in 2011 by the Cornerstone Economic Group of Dr. Edith Sing. And Dr. Becker updated in two important and significant ways. First, she was able to do a survey of homelessness shelter costs throughout the state and update those figures. And as you know, those can be quite extensive. For example, in New York City the cost of an individual's homeless shelter cost for one year is \$27,000. For a family it's \$36,000. And the average family stay is amazingly over 460 days.

Pennsylvania study that looked at the efficacy of brief advice and services in civil legal service. And so that way she was able to look at all of the benefits that were derived both from extended representation and brief representation. And what Dr. Becker found was that in the year 2013 the savings realized were over -- and this is a conservative estimate -- over \$150 million which represented an increase of \$30 million in taxpayer savings

from 2011. And you will hear me use that phrase "conservative estimate" quite a bit in my testimony.

And just to give an example to touch upon something that Mayor Sheehan mentioned, the impact that homelessness has on education and graduation rates. For example, the lifetime earnings of somebody who has a high school degree versus a non-high school degree is over a million dollars. So for every student who can maintain a place to live, stay in school and graduate, the economic benefits are substantial over the years and that gets multiplied thousands of times in New York State. But again, conservatively just looking at the savings from the shelter costs, that's \$150 million.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So helping people out of homelessness is a good economic investment for our cities and our state.

CHRIS O'MALLEY: Absolutely. And it helps, as again Mayor Sheehan was mentioning, the difficulties that many of our governments and towns across the state are facing, this saves them money. This saves taxpayer money and it's direct.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I think the documentation of those savings, Chris, is so important in the reports that we give to the Legislature in these cost benefit analyses. Continue.

1 2

4

5

3

6

8

7

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHRIS O'MALLEY: Yes. The second new area that Dr. Becker looked at this year was the economic impact of obtaining permanent legal status for clients, and these are mainly women, who obtain permanent legal status through VAWA, which is the Violence Against Women Act; U Visas, which is for victims of crime; or T Visas, which is for trafficking victims. And as you know, the impact on an individual is transformative, not just in increased earnings, but their change in permanent legal status, and also better housing, and the ability for children to stay in schools. But Dr. Becker again looked at a very kind of narrow slice of that overall economic benefit and looked at the present-day value of obtaining the permanent legal status. And she found that for this group of clients, which represents only 10% of immigration cases closed by legal service providers in New York, the impact was again considerably over \$15 million.

The last area that Dr. Becker looked into this year was she looked at the federal funds brought into New York State in 2013 through the provision of civil legal services, and that figure was \$518 million.

CHRIS O'MALLEY: That's a lot of money.

CHRIS O'MALLEY: That's a lot of money. And that represented a \$60 million increase from 2012. But she also looked at another aspect of those funds coming

into the state. The Department of Commerce estimates that for every \$1 brought into New York it generates \$1.49 of economic activity. That figure represents \$769 million, which is a 13% increase from 2012. And that represents the creation of 7,675 new jobs in New York. And there's a very simple reason for that; these funds are going to the lowest income New Yorkers and these people have to spend money for food, for housing, for the essentials of life, for Medicare, Medicaid. And as your Honor has heard in testimony from leading hospital administrators, that's been very important for hospitals in their ability to provide jobs. And that again is one of the leading economic engines of New York State.

Dr. Becker also looked at the fact that a large percentage of the federal funds that are brought into New York this year will continue to come in. For example, SSI and SSD benefits have an average life span of 9.5 and 10 years respectively. Again, the conservative estimate by Dr. Becker of the present-day value of those funds in New York in 2013 is \$1 billion over the next 10 years.

Thus, Dr. Becker's estimate adding the 150 million in shelter savings, the \$15 million that is realized by people who are establishing permanently from VAWA, U Visa and T Visa, the \$518 million in federal funds brought into the state this past year, the \$769 million in

economic stimulus benefits, and the future value of those awards, Dr. Becker conservatively estimated that the total economic impact was well over \$1 billion.

And she wouldn't put it this way because she's an economist, but I get to say it's not a free ride. For every dollar that New York sends to the federal government New York only receives 79¢ back in benefits and that results in a deficit of this past year of \$104 billion. So that \$518 million that came back to New York State through the provision of legal services represents money that should come back to New York State taxpayers and it reduces that deficit by 2.4%. Overall, Dr. Becker was able to again conservatively estimate that for every dollar spent in New York State in 2013 there was more than six fold return on that investment.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I think that's really helpful, Chris. I think it graphically demonstrates when we talk about \$1 invested makes \$6 back to the state, that's real. We think it's the best argument. We talked to Dean Minow about what's the argument at the federal level, the state level, what can be clearer than the kind of report that again we're going to receive this year in black and white. It demonstrates so convincingly that this goes beyond society's obligation to those people in need, the society and our government's obligation to the

people of our state, and that is investing in civil legal services. There could not be a better investment for our state or our government.

CHRIS O'MALLEY: Exactly.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Any questions? Thank you, Chris, and thank you to Dr. Becker. We're really very, very grateful.

Our last witnesses for today will be three clients of legal service organizations. First, Tajma Motley from the Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York, accompanied by Marlene Morales; Dideolu Olufunke Okediran, a client of The Legal Project, accompanied by Lorraine Silverman; and Cinnamin Schmitz, a client of the Legal Aid Society of Mid-New York, accompanied by Matthew Schreck.

Tajma, do you want to start out and tell us your story?

TAJMA MOTLEY: Good afternoon.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Good afternoon.

TAJMA MOTLEY: My name is Tajma Motley. I am here to tell you how the Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York prevented me from becoming homeless and gave me my dignity back. I am 42 years old and I have fibromyalgia, diabetes and back pain. My back pain prevents me from walking or sitting for long periods of

time without pain. My health limits me in the types of work that I am able to perform. I can only do clerical type jobs.

I used to be a secretary at Hudson Park
Rehabilitation & Nursing Center. I worked there for two
years. I met and greeted the patients, conducted
inventory and kept the medical records and doctors'
schedules up to date. I really liked my job. I worked
with helpful staff that would assist me when I needed to
carry heavy inventory. Without their help I could not
have completed some of my assigned tasks.

After I lost my job at Hudson Park I received unemployment benefits until they ran out. Without any income to support myself and pay my rent I applied for temporary assistance. During my eligibility interview at the Department of Social Services I told the caseworker about my disabilities. I did everything the caseworker at DSS asked. I brought in all the documentation that was requested. I was assigned to the job search program and told to search for 15 jobs and return the completed job search form in a week. The forms say that 10 of the employment applications had to be filed in person. After doing job searches while receiving unemployment benefits, I knew that employers would not let me apply for the types of jobs I could perform. Nevertheless, I tried applying

in person, but was directed to apply online.

I returned the completed form with 17 online job applications. The person who took the job search form did not give me a new job search log or a bus pass to continue my search, I was only told that I would get a response in the mail. Later I received a denial letter from the Department of Social Services for failing to comply with the job search assignment. I felt that I had done everything that I was supposed to do, but I was still denied benefits. Because of my lack of income, I was not able to pay my rent. I received an eviction notice from my landlord. I was afraid of losing my housing and becoming homelessness.

I requested a fair hearing, but had no idea what to do to prepare, so I called the Legal Aid for help.

Mrs. Marlene Morales was my lawyer. She explained the fair hearing process to me. Marlene also explained the rules that apply to my case. She told me that because I told my caseworker about my medical limitations, she should have asked me to submit proof or send me for a medical examination before assigning me to the job search program.

Marlene represented me at the hearing. We won.

My temporary assistant case was opened and I received

retroactive benefits. I was given the opportunity to

submit medical documentation about my disabilities and my work limitations. I also received emergency assistance to prevent my eviction.

Even though I did my best to comply with what was asked of me at the Department of Social Services, they did not follow their own rules. I am grateful that Legal Aid helped me get the benefits that I needed to stay in my home. And thank you for helping to keep funds going to Legal Aid so that they can help others like me.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Your life would have been a lot different without legal services.

TAJMA MOTLEY: Yes, it would have been.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Could you imagine, what would you have done?

TAJMA MOTLEY: I don't know. I mean I really don't know.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you for telling us your story. People can see on a real human level what legal services means to people confronting everyday problems that can so dramatically affect their lives, and the services of a lawyer can be so important. So thank you so much for coming in to tell us, we greatly appreciate it.

We're now going to hear from Ms. Okediran, a client of The Legal Project. Great to see you.

my life.

ma'am, and sirs. I am very happy to be here today to be in your presence, and to The Legal Aid Project,

Ms. Lorraine Silverman. I am here to tell my story, which is a sorry case. My story may not be new in terms of domestic violence experienced by women around the world, but what I went through was the most horrific encounter of

It all started in 2006 when I married a man that I thought would be my partner, friend and husband.

Instead, he turned out to be the devil in human skin. I soon realized that I made the greatest mistake of my life.

This man promised me that if I left my home in Nigeria and moved with him to the United States, that I would find employment using my credentials as a qualified social worker. Trusting the man I loved, I resigned from my job in Nigeria and moved away from everything I knew.

But, as soon as we reached the United States, he immediately broke his promise. He never allowed me to work. I soon realized I was in my own hell. He emotionally and physically abused me. His goal was to belittle me and my capabilities. He called me all sorts of derogatory words almost every day and I was blamed for everything. He would always tell me that here, in the United States, things are done differently. Everything I

did or wanted to do was not right by him. He regularly showed me that my opinions did not count and I soon realized that all of my self-esteem was gone.

This man controlled and monitored my every move. I had no privacy. He would constantly ask me if I called or talked to my family, and if I said yes he wanted to know every detail. If I said no, he would force me to call them so he could pick up the other phone, interfere and take over the whole conversation. His jealousy only worsened as time went on. I was only allowed to call and receive calls on my cell phone from him, all other calls had to wait until I got home.

Things eventually turned physical. He hit me once and demanded sex on a daily basis, whether or not I wanted it, but I was too scared to fight back. Instead, I would get down on my knees and beg him. I always tried to console myself. I'd say, "Dee, things is going to get better, just continue to pray as a child of God." But unknown to me I was only deceiving myself.

In time I grew very wary of him. I grew afraid.

Afraid that while asleep he could hit or even kill me. At times I would relapse and feel horrible, my pride was deeply shaken as was my faith, for which I had to struggle to hold on to it. I was fervent in my prayers to God to release me from the lion's den because I was so scared. I

believed that he could kill me, chop me up and put me in a box and throw me in the Hudson River on his way to work, and then he would lie to people that I walked out of the marriage.

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

But no matter how bad it got, I couldn't leave,
I was financially unable to. Every time I received money
as a gift from people he would cunningly take it from me
by telling me he was broke. I married a controlling
pathological liar.

Then one day I finally found the courage to fight back. In March 2010 he came home from work, and as usual the table was already set for his dinner. While he was eating he demanded sex. After washing the dishes I went to him the way I always did when he demanded sex, but this time he demanded that I caress him before the actual thing and I said, "No! Just have me the way you been doing it." That is when all hell broke loose. He told me to get out of his house. He was literally kicking me out of the door because finally I stood up to him. I told him not to touch me and that I would leave, even though I didn't know where to go. I had no friends or family to He isolated me from day one. I had no one to I had no one to talk to. I had no one to share turn to. what I'm facing there. I was only with him and him alone.

So I picked up my backpack, went out in the

cold, crossed the lawn and went to a neighbor's house who took me in and allowed me to spend the night. She was my Guardian Angel. We both then called the domestic violence hotline that I gave to her which I cut out of the school bulletin and kept in my wallet. The next day I was taken to a domestic violence safe house where I stayed for six months until I got my own apartment.

I finally realized I needed help getting a divorce. First I sought help from the domestic violence agency, and then I went to family court hoping I would get an attorney to help me file for divorce. Instead, I was told to go to the Supreme Court, where I was given a big packet called New York State Unified Court System

Uncontested Divorce Forms and Instructions. When I got home I looked through this packet. I was so overwhelmed.

It was so overwhelming for me to digest and process. I broke down and cried for days.

I knew I needed an attorney desperately if I had any chance of getting divorced, but I had no money. In the course of time I was given the phone number of The Legal Project. I called the number and was immediately set up to meet with Ms. Lorraine Silverman, the managing attorney for the Katheryn D. Katz Fellowship Program. That was the beginning of the end of my sorrow from my estranged husband.

2

4

3

6

5

7

9

8

11

10

1213

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

I went to the office and I met with this beautiful lady who treated me like a queen. She listened to my plight, collected previous court orders from me and told me that she or her law fellows would get back to me. And they did exactly as they promised.

The experience I had with them throughout the divorce process was awesome. They beat my imagination. It was when I went for the second meeting that I met my attorney with her bunch of beautiful, handsome and intelligent fellows who represented me in the divorce They came to my rescue when I least expected it. case. Their straightforward tact and sympathetic understanding approach, which was so calm and clear, eased my scares and concerns. I finally realized that this divorce was actually possible. They provided support and excellent advice throughout the filing of the divorce papers. made the whole process easy by explaining things in a way simple for me to understand. On the day of the divorce I was rallied around by my attorney and her fellows. kept assuring me that there would be no problem and everything would be fine.

In fact, their display of honesty, dignity, humility and compassion during this trial period has left a deep and lasting impression on me. I truly value their guidance and counsel. I thank them all for being my

friend through such a hard and pressing time. I also give 1 2 thanks to God that I finally came out of it alive. 3 would say that I was so lucky to have them as my 4 attorneys, and if ever I need an attorney in the future, I 5 will certainly be going back to them. More powers to your 6 elbows. 7 CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much for 8 your story. It demonstrates again what legal services is 9 all about. With legal services you know you're not alone. 10 You have legal services and sometimes it replaces friends

DIDEOLU OLUFUNKE OKEDIRAN: It is very different.

is very different, right?

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And better, right?
DIDEOLU OLUFUNKE OKEDIRAN: Yes.

and family and is the one thing you can hold on to. Life

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Again, thank you for demonstrating what a legal service provider can do for someone who just needs a helping hand. And in sometimes a very dangerous situation. So thank you so much.

DIDEOLU OLUFUNKE OKEDIRAN: Thank you, sir.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: I'm now going to ask Cinnamin Schmitz, a client of The Legal Aid Society, to speak.

CINNAMIN SCHMITZ: My name is Cinnamin Schmitz

2324

25

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and I am here today to talk about how the Legal Aid Society of Mid-New York helped me to save my home. I live in the home with my husband, four children and my disabled father. I originally bought my house in July 2004 and the only loan type I qualified for was an interest only for the first five years at \$698 per month. When the interest only period ended in September 2009 my payments increased to \$797 a month which we still didn't have a problem with.

About four months after this increase I was informed by my employer that my entire department would be relocating resulting in me losing my job. And when I contacted American Home Mortgage Servicing, Incorporated, who was the mortgage sever at the time, they told me that there wasn't much I could do until I fell behind in my payments. Starting April 1st my mortgage payment was increased to \$1235 a month. This left my family less than 200 a month to live on after the mortgage payment. and desperate, I filled out paper work and tried for a loan modification. Believe it or not, I sent paperwork in to American Home Mortgage Servicing, Incorporated, a total of 22 times over 18 months. Claiming that they never received all the paper work from me, I had to restart the modification process a total of three times, and didn't get any closer to a modification.

In the middle of all this I'm dealing with a bad

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

job market, seven people living in my household, and having no luck attempting to modify my mortgage, my mortgage servicer changed again from American Home Mortgage Servicing, Inc. to Homeward. They said I would need to start the entire modification process again. I had the same struggles with the new servicer. Soon after, I received notice that a foreclosure had been initiated and that the court had scheduled a settlement conference to begin foreclosure proceedings on my house.

Scared to death that I had gotten nowhere, I contacted housing counselor Mary Kilmer of Delaware Opportunities who accompanied us to the first settlement conference. The judge's court attorney told us that we needed to have jobs or no one would be willing to work with us and we would not get a modification.

Mary Kilmer eventually suggested that we contact
Legal Aid before we lost our house. I was getting so
worried and was not sleeping well. I was actually getting
sick and was put on depression medication by my doctor.

At the first conference where Legal Aid assisted me in May of 2013, and after switching mortgage servicing again to Ocwen, Ocwen's attorney asked that the case be removed from conference claiming that I had been evaluated and denied for a modification twice. We already had five conferences with no resolution, and that the foreclosures

should be allowed to proceed. They even brought a deed in lieu of foreclosure paperwork to court, marked with tabs where they wanted us to sign off to agree to hand over our house to them. Legal Aid was not only able to keep the case in conferences, but after about a year of more conferences and discussions with Ocwen, they finally gave us a modification.

My attorney at Legal Aid, Matthew Schreck, made repeated requests for information which Ocwen seemed reluctant to give, and he strongly advocated on my behalf in these conferences, demonstrating to the servicer that the information they were basing their case on was incorrect. I had believed from the start that everyone who had held my mortgage, including and especially Ocwen, was not servicing my loan properly, and with the help of Legal Aid we were able to eventually get Ocwen to acknowledge that their numbers were incorrect and that a modification was in fact affordable for us.

When the modification papers arrived I was very pleased; my monthly payment was reduced by roughly \$400, the interest rate was changed from an adjustable rate to a 4.5% fixed rate, and just under \$34,000 was taken off the principal.

Because of the help I received from my housing counselor at Delaware Opportunities and from my attorney

at Legal Aid I no longer have to worry about losing my home to foreclosure. My health has improved, I'm off my depression medication and my life is back on track. I am so very grateful for the assistance I received and hope that other people who find themselves in positions similar

to mine can also get the same help I did. Thank you.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: Thank you for coming in.

And I think it's a familiar story that when you're dealing with, in this case a big lender or a bank, you don't speak their language, right?

CINNAMIN SCHMITZ: No.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: If you had to do it on your own God knows what you would do, right?

CINNAMIN SCHMITZ: Yes.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: So I think in your case the role of a housing counselor, usually a non-lawyer, and an attorney was able to turn this situation around for you.

CINNAMIN SCHMITZ: Right.

CHIEF JUSTICE LIPPMAN: And we thank you so much. Again, what could be more important I'm sure to you than getting your mortgage taken care of. Having a home for you and your family is so critical. And we're so pleased that this was able to work out for you and so pleased that you came in to tell us about what legal

services means for people who have basic problems in life that need to be dealt with. And I think that your stories help us in demonstrating why funding for legal services is so important. So your testimony was the most instructive.

And we've heard today from so many witnesses who all told a different part of the story. We heard from the Dean of one of our most notable law schools in the United States, who is the vice chair of the Legal Services

Corporation, that provides such critical work in Washington in funding for legal services.

We heard from the mayor of the City of Albany what legal services means to the well-being of this city and the fabric of its communities.

We heard from our great Chief Administrative

Judge talking about how many people this funding serves

and what it does in the documentation of what funding for

legal services can mean in terms of the well-being of our

state.

We heard from the director of the New York State
Office for the Aging which really shows the commitment of
our state government to legal services for the elderly.

And we heard from Chris O'Malley from IOLA demonstrating just a few of the cost benefit analyses that we've done that shows in dollars the difference to the economic well-being of our state by just helping people

who need assistance we help the entire state and all of our citizens.

And of course the last three witnesses really have put the human element to it and it shows what legal services not in the abstract, but in graphically relation to human beings who again need help in all different situations in life.

So this is the fourth and final hearing of this year. The Task Force will take the testimony that is received from each of these hearings, will digest it, put it together and they will inform our recommendations this year to the Legislature as to the financial needs of legal services and also provide recommendations beyond the need for public funding for legal services and where we should be proceeding next in New York in trying to close and eventually eliminate the justice gap.

So I want to thank everybody for being here today, for our witnesses, for our audience. And I particularly again want to thank the Legal Services

Corporation for having their quarterly meeting here in Albany, and President Levi, and really contributing to the rest of the country seeing what we're doing in New York and we seeing what goes on in the rest of the country.

And I can't tell you how much it means to us to have you here. And be assured that we will take your visit and all

of the information that we've gathered from the hearings to again make some recommendations of what we do this year. With our help from the State Bar and from our partners in government we hope to continue our efforts to close the justice gap in New York.

Thank you all. And particularly thank you to our last three witnesses. Thank you so much.

CERTIFICATE I, COLLEEN B. NEAL, Senior Court Reporter in and for the Third Judicial District, State of New York, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my stenographic notes in the above-entitled matter. DATED: October 10, 2014 Colleen B. Neal, Senior Court Reporter Albany County Courthouse Albany, New York 12207