1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
2	- FOURTH DEPARTMENT-
3	X
4	THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARINGS
5	ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES
6	
7	X
8	Appellate Division 50 East Avenue
9	Rochester, New York September 29, 2010
10	copecimoer 15, 2010
11	BEFORE:
12	
13	HONORABLE JONATHAN LIPPMAN, CHIEF JUDGE
14	HONORABLE ANN PFAU,
15	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
16	HONORABLE HENRY J. SCUDDER,
17	PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE FOURTH DEPARTMENT
18	VINCENT DOYLE, JR., ESQ. PRESIDENT ELECT - NY STATE BAR ASSOCIATION
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	JANINE J. VASCUKYNAS, RPR, CSR. OFFICIAL SENIOR COURT REPORTER
25	

1	THE CHIEF JUDGE'S HEARING ON CIVIL LEGAL SERVIC	ES
2	THE FOURTH DEPARTMENT, SEPTEMBER 29, 2010	
3		
4	<u>I</u> <u>N</u> <u>D</u> <u>E</u> <u>X</u>	
5		PAGE
6	CLIENT PANEL	
7		
8	JANE KRESSMANN-KEHOE, CLIENT OF EMPIRE JUSTICE CENTER	13
9		
10	LAURA HART, CLIENT OF LEGAL AID BUREAU OF BUFFALO	21
11	иналинг олио	
12	HEATHER OAKS, CLIENT OF LEGAL SERVICES OF CENTRAL NEW YORK	28
13		
14	EDUCATORS PANEL	
15		PAGE
16	RACHAEL ANN GAZDICK,	
17	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF "SAY YES TO EDUCATION," SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY 35	35
18	JEAN CLAUDE BRIZARD, SUPERINTENDENT OF ROCHESTER	
19	CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	42
20	DR. ANNE M. KRESS,	
21	PRESIDENT OF MONROE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	50
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	HEALTHCARE PANEL	
2		PAGE
3	FRAN WEISBERG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE FINGER LAKES HEALTH	
4	SYSTEMS AGENCY.	58
5	STEVEN D. BLATT, M.D.,	
6	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PEDIATRICS/DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF GENERAL PEDIATRICS AT UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL OF SUNY UPSTATE MEDICAL UNIVERSITY	
		66
7		
8	CATHERINE CERULLI, J.D., Ph.D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR OF LABORATORY OF INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE AND VICTIMIZATION, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY, UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER	
9		76
10		
11	TUDCEC DANIEL	
12	JUDGES PANEL	
13	HON. HENRY J. NOWAK,	
14	BUFFALO CITY, HOUSING COURT	86
15	HON. LANGSTON C. MCKINNEY, SYRACUSE CITY COURT	
16		93
17	HON. JOSEPH G. NESSER,	
18	MONROE COUNTY FAMILY COURT	99
	HON TOLVING WELLOW	
19	HON. JOANNE M. WINSLOW, SUPREME COURT, MONROE COUNTY	105
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	BUSINESS LEADERS PANEL	
2		PAGE
3	THOMAS S. RICHARDS, ESQ., CORPORATION COUNSEL, CITY OF ROCHESTER,	
4	FORMER PARTNER NIXON PEABODY LLP, AND FORMER CEO OF ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC	113
5		
6	PROJECT DIRECTORS PANEL	
7	KENNERII DEDDI. 1900	
8	KENNETH PERRI, ESQ., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, LEGAL ASSISTANCE OF WESTERN NEW YORK	123
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Good morning. 2 AUDIENCE: Good morning. 3 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Everyone should definitely sit down, we're going to be here for a 4 5 while. 6 I want to welcome you to the second of 7 four hearings on expanding access to civil legal services in New York. I think it's fair to say that 8 9 no issue is more fundamental to the courts and our 10 constitutional mission than ensuring equal justice 11 for all. The availability of affordable legal 12 13 representation for low income New Yorkers is indispensable to our ability to carry out our 14 mission. 15 16 This hearing -- yesterday there was a 17 hearing in Manhattan in the First Department at the Appellate Division building on 25th Street in 18 Manhattan. Today is the second hearing. Next week 19 20 there's a hearing at the Third Department at the 21 Court of Appeals in Albany on October 5th. And on 22 October 7th, there is the fourth hearing in the 23 Second Department on Monroe Street in Downtown 24 Brooklyn.

And the reason why we're here is to focus

for the benefit of the judiciary and the task force
that I have appointed to expand civil legal services
on where are the gaps in civil legal services in New
York State. In this local area, local areas around
the state and the particular kind of cases that come
before the Court.

I want to introduce to you the panel that's here with us. First on my right, and you all know, is Presiding Justice Henry Scudder, who I want to thank for being such a wonderful host in having us here at this beautiful Fourth Department building. And thank you, Judge Scudder.

And to my left is Judge, Chief

Administrative Judge Ann Pfau, who as you know runs
the day-to-day operations of the Office of Court

Administration.

And to our far right is the terrific

President Elect of the State Bar Association, who I

have had the pleasure of working with his father for

many years, Vince Doyle, Sr., and this is Vince

Doyle, Jr., who is, will be a great President of the

State Bar.

And I think that it should be obvious to all, that what you have here is the leadership of the Judicial Branch of government and the legal

profession in the state holding really unprecedented hearings on a particular subject that is of such importance that we thought that it was essential for us to hold these hearings so that we can recommend to the legislature the monies that are needed to close the gap in civil legal services.

We, again, there's a 28-person committee. The chair of that task force is Helaine Barnett, who's here today. Somewhere -- Helaine, right here. Who's handling this task force that is doing a number of surveys around the state, a lot of research on civil legal services, and has helped us to prepare for these hearings and will be helping us to do a report to the legislature on what monies are needed for civil legal services.

What is clear to us already is that the economic collapse that we've had in our country, again in our state, and in local areas like this here in the Fourth Department and in Rochester, have had a dramatic effect on the people who appear in our courts, and most particularly on those most vulnerable in society; the poor, the elderly, struggling families, disabled, the victims of domestic violence.

There's been a sharp rise in the courts

of cases particularly related to the economy.

Evictions, foreclosures, debt cases, family

offenses, matrimonial conflict. Really, cases

dealing with the necessities of life, the

fundamentals of life, the very roof over people's

heads, their livelihoods, their well-being of

themselves and their families.

We have had a terrific outpouring of probono work in this state by the legal profession, including here in Rochester for the Monroe County Bar Association. And around the state there have been over two million hours of pro bono work given for free to people who can't afford legal representation. But that doesn't begin to be even the tip of the iceberg in relation to the need for additional funding for legal services.

For every person who is accepted by a legal service provider for representation, there are another eight to ten that are turned away. That people we know, that people are dealing again with the very basics of their life, lives, and are unable to have a representation in court.

And we in the judiciary recognize that it is our constitutional mission to provide equal justice for all. That's what we're here for. And

it is also our ethical obligation as a profession to
foster access to the courts and equal justice for
all.

So from our perspective we believe that if we're not going to stand up for those most vulnerable in our society, who is? Other than the people who care. And certainly from our perspective, it is our mission to care. It is very much a part of the fiber of who we are.

And the information that we gather at these hearings plus the additional information that the task force is able to get together from around the state, will result in a report, I think it will be the most comprehensive of its kind in the country, to the legislature, laying out the need and the amount of monies that are needed to fill those needs.

And what's clear to me is that this is every bit as important as the other priorities we have in life when this -- and in our society, whether it's schools or hospitals, legal representation for the poor is every bit as important, and we cannot leave it to the vagaries of the economy or unstable funding streams.

Like, as you know, the beginning of this

crisis started with IOLA and the drying up of the monies that came from the interest accounts that lawyers have because interest rates are way, way down. As a result, the monies available to IOLA, which is one of the key funders of legal services in this state, went from about 35 million to 8 million this year. And that's really what we're up against.

So we were able to put our fingers in the dike for IOLA this year, but again, it's just the beginning of this effort. We need a permanent funding stream for civil legal services, and it has to come out of the public fisc. This is not one of those things we say, gee, we can't afford it, or let's put all kinds of fees or taxes to do it. This is — goes with the very basics. Again, schools, hospitals, representation for the poor, all the things that are important.

v. Wainwright, the Supreme Court said that it is an obvious truth to us, meaning the Supreme Court, that people who are hauled into court as a defendant in a criminal case cannot get a fair shake, cannot get their day in court without being represented by a lawyer. And I think it's fair to say that it's an equally obvious truth today, particularly in these

difficult times that people who come into court and are dealing with the very necessities of life cannot get a fair shake, cannot get their day in court without a lawyer. To me again, to all of us, an equally obvious truth.

want to learn from all of you exactly what the problem is, where the funding is needed. We're going to try and keep to a schedule. You'll forgive me if I try and move you along. We have a full day of testimony. We're allowing, and I'm sure you have each been told that, roughly five minutes for each person who testifies. You don't have to read your statement. You know, that will be in the record and will be digested by the task force, but we want you to tell us what your viewpoint is. And then we're going to ask you some questions to try and draw out a little further where we, you know, what we can, the information that we need to do what we have to do to get our message through to the legislature.

The legislature has passed a joint resolution that says that they fully support this process that we are putting into place. They want us to give them a report, and they want us to tell them how much money we need. This is a far cry from

the past where basically civil legal services was funded kind of in a hodgepodge way. The IOLA Fund, some member items, a little Federal money, a little private money. We need a systemic approach to all of this. We need to build the plumbing so that this kind of funding comes through a regular part of the legislative process rather than being something going around with our hands out saying, gee, what can we do? Because people are going without that very fundamental need of being represented in court on things that are vital to them and critical to themselves and their families.

So, we're going to begin. I thank the task force members who are in attendance today. I'd like to also introduce, I think from the task force Steve Banks is here from the Legal Aid Society.

Judge Fern Fisher, who is the Statewide Director of Access to Justice. Fern, where are you? You're right there. Judge Fern Fisher. Sheila Gaddis is here. Sheila? George Lowe, Judge George Lowe is here. Deborah Wright. And Bob Convissar, the President of the Buffalo Bar Association is here. All members of the task force, and we're so grateful for their assistance.

The lights that are in front of you, for

1	those non-lawyers or people who haven't argued here
2	at the Fourth Department, when the white light goes
3	on, that means that you have one minute more to your
4	presentation. But don't get nervous, the red light
5	will go on which says you're out of time.
6	We will try and move the hearing along,
7	but yet be gentle and, you know, not be too brusk.
8	And Judge Scudder is an expert in keeping this
9	courtroom in shape, on schedule, and moving along.
10	So, so blame it on Judge Scudder if you have to be
11	cut off by the lights.
12	So okay, let's start. Our first panel
13	really, and a lot of these are in groupings, is the
14	Client Panel. And I'd ask Jane X, Laura Hart, and
15	Heather Oaks to come forward and sit at these, at
16	the table right here, at the witness table.
17	Okay. Let's see. Jane? Okay. And
18	you're a client of the Empire Justice Center.
19	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: That's right.
20	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And why don't you begin.
21	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: Okay.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Like I said, don't feel
23	rushed, but just try and tell us your
24	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: Okay.
25	JUDGE LIPPMAN: your story rather than

holding these hearings.

necessarily reading it, but read as much as you
want.

MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: Okay. First of all,
thank you for letting me speak and thank you for

My name is Kate Kressmann-Kehoe, and my story is about how having legal services helped me break down bureaucracy that I could not have done on my own. Because we had access to legal services, my daughter is learning to work to her educational potential.

When my daughter started 2nd grade last year, we thought it might be a little bumpy. She had not had an easy time in the first two years, but it wasn't terrible. There was also not a lot of writing in kindergarten or 1st grade.

But 2nd grade, with much more writing,
was a whole different story. Within a few weeks the
teachers were calling us in because my daughter was
refusing to do any writing. We all agreed that
there was a possible learning disability. We
requested a formal evaluation.

As the evaluations began, it was really obvious that she couldn't write. She could explain how the solar system worked, she could explain why

we have seasons, she could not write. And if she had to write, it could take days, hours, screams, tantrums. Clearly there was something wrong, and an evaluator really helped out on finding what the problems were.

So we met with the teachers. It all looked good. We went to a CSE meeting at the end of March. We all thought there was a good plan, and we expected to be working on how to help my daughter. Instead, it was a nightmare.

The CSE representatives, who had never met my daughter and who never referred to the relevant reports, seemed to be trying to find ways not to help her. They ran the meeting very unprofessionally. My daughter's teachers, who had attended many CSE meetings, had never seen anything like it. They ruled that -- the CSE representatives ruled that my daughter did not have a disability. So, she was denied services that she needed and was legally entitled to.

Now, my husband and I had to decide what to do. We really did not think of a lawyer at first. We thought we could navigate the bureaucracy ourselves. We'd be fine. The ruling was an obvious error, and we're very used to advocating for

ourselves.

The school staff strongly encouraged us to talk to Empire Justice. We would not be able to do it on our own, they told us. The mere presence of a lawyer would change and accelerate the process.

Because it had already been seven months since we had first noticed that there were some major problems and because every day she was getting more and more discouraged, we decided that we did need help.

We contacted Jonathan Feldman at Empire

Justice, and when he reviewed our file, he felt that

we had a strong case. Empire Justice agreed to

represent us, and to our surprise, they told us that

there would be no charge for this service. This was

a great relief to us.

As soon as we began the process of appealing the CSE ruling, we started to understand how much it mattered to have a lawyer. The process was complex and confusing, and Jonathan knew which step really mattered.

Early on in the appeal we received a discouraging letter from the district reiterating the CSE ruling. Therapies, they said, were not necessary for our daughter to receive an appropriate

public education. If we had been alone, we probably would have given up then. But, thanks to the advice of our lawyer, we didn't. Jonathan responded to that letter with a renewal of our appeal.

After that, we attended a resolution session with lawyers for both sides present and Jonathan was able to negotiate a settlement.

another CSE meeting, but this time we had our lawyer there. It was as if the first CSE meeting had been from an alternate universe. At this meeting people were actually trying to help our daughter. They had actually read the reports. They were using their expertise to think about what would help her learn. The fact that we had a written settlement in hand meant that they had to truly respond to her needs.

So listening to the teachers and the CSE staff worked. It really reinforced how much it mattered that we could work within the school system and get the services in the school. And there's just no way if we had all the resources in the world that we could have reconstructed that ourselves without having a lawyer and going through the district.

It really mattered that we could, the

teachers could integrate the support with the curriculum, with the daily schedule when and where our daughter was struggling, and they could rearrange things so it could mesh the schedules.

And having our lawyer in the room with us, even when most of the time he didn't say anything, just having him being there made a huge and visible difference.

The services have only just begun, but it is already, it is really, it is quite different.

Writing is still a struggle, but we don't have the tantrums, we don't have the fear. She's got some hope. She says, I like school. And they can rearrange the schedules so they can put math first if the therapist isn't available until later so that the therapist could be there when she's doing the work or she needs help. They are actually doing the exercises and the therapies based on the actual curriculum as opposed to some generic workbook that's unrelated to what she's trying to do. If there's multiple people working on her case, they can coordinate amongst themselves without having to bring us into the loop.

It really makes a difference that we were able to get it through the system. And we're, I would say, people who could advocate for ourselves

1	most of the time.
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Let me ask you a
3	question.
4	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: Sure.
5	JUDGE LIPPMAN: How did you find out
6	about Empire Justice Center?
7	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: The school staff.
8	They had actually been to another CSE meeting that
9	Jonathan had attended and they had said that, again,
10	they had seen the same thing that when the lawyer
11	was there, it was a completely different experience.
12	JUDGE LIPPMAN: What happened when you
13	went into Empire Justice, they immediately assigned
14	you a lawyer?
15	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: Well, they had given
16	us Jonathan's name, so we called and he looked at
17	our materials and said this is a strong case and
18	it's emblematic of some systematic problems and we
19	would like to take it on.
20	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And what would you do
21	today with your daughter if you weren't able to
22	have, have this help navigating the system?
23	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: I don't know. I
24	think it would have been it would have been
25	really hard for us to try and get legal services on

our own. I don't know if we would have tried to cobble together something outside of school. I'm not sure what we would have done.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay.

MR. DOYLE: Can I ask a question?

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Sure.

MR. DOYLE: And Kate, let me explain why I'm asking. I'm a lawyer, my wife is a Special Education teacher. We went through a CSE thing with our own child, and I was completely confused. I didn't understand what was happening. I couldn't figure out the bureaucracy, couldn't figure out the procedure, and we ended up having to hire a lawyer who specialized in that.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: This is the President of the State Bar Association.

MR. DOYLE: So I knew the right people to call. But that's my question. It wasn't just that you got a lawyer, it was that you got someone who was an expert in that particular field and someone who knew how to navigate such that when that person showed up, the doors opened, people became friendlier, the procedures suddenly fell away, and everything was worked out for the best. Is that right?

1	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: I think that's true.
2	I think it mattered that we were working not just
3	with we were working with somebody who knew the
4	routine and knew how it worked.
5	MR. DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.
6	JUDGE PFAU: And what's so interesting is
7	this isn't a series of things you wanted that were
8	extra for your daughter. This is something that you
9	were entitled to, had a legal entitlement to get,
10	and you couldn't get it without a lawyer. Even
11	though you are used to advocating for yourselves,
12	something as basic as the education she is entitled
13	to.
14	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: Mm-hmm.
15	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Anything else?
16	Okay. Thank you.
17	MS. KRESSMAN-KEHOE: Thank you.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Laura Hart, you're a
19	client of the Legal Aid Bureau of Buffalo.
20	MS. HART: Yes. Good afternoon. Thank
21	you for having me. I'm 27-years-old. I got married
22	very young, when I was 19, in 2003. My now
23	ex-husband is ten years older than me. We have
24	three young children. We have now seven-year-old
25	twin girls and a five-year-old little boy.

There were a series of events that were intolerable for the four of us, me and my children. I decided to leave the marriage. We all suffered from severe emotional abuse, not only from him but from his parents, who resided with us. The emotional and mental abuse was intolerable. It started changing the people my children were becoming and we had to leave.

I had no established work history because I was a stay-at-home mom for about four years before I decided to leave. I had no money saved up. I had nowhere to go. I had to live with my parents and with my three children.

I was initially represented pro bono by a private attorney. After I left my husband and was staying with my parents, I began a relationship with a person who ultimately became abusive to me in all the ways my ex-husband was but also physically. The relationship took me to a level I have never been in my life. I was depressed, I was withdrawing, I was financially strained. I had three small children, all stay at home, which ultimately led to a suicide attempt in, on Christmas of 2007.

My attorney at the time decided to cease representation because after my suicide attempt my

children were taken from me and given to my ex-husband. I was not able to see them. And when I did, it was only for an hour at McDonald's at the corner of the street in the playground, and that wasn't good enough for me.

I had to find representation through the Legal Aid Bureau. Not only through their legal services but through their emotional support, I was able to find the strength to stand up to the person that I was being abused by. I left him, ultimately pressed charges, and he was convicted in July of all four counts, and he's in jail now serving four and a half years.

I have my children back three to four days every week. I have reestablished trust with them. I have reestablished my role as mom with them.

The divorce was actually final in 2009.

As a result of that, my ex-husband kept all of the marital debt and for a while I wasn't paying any child support. And the child support I'm obligated to pay now is very minimal, which is helping to regain financial independence.

I'm involved with activities at school.

My kids are in dancing, yoga, football,

extra-curricular activities. I'm involved in all the doctors' appointments. I am more of a parent 2 3 now than I was before this whole ordeal happened. 4 I am now under the assistance of Assigned 5 Counsel in Buffalo. I have a petition to regain 6 residential custody of my children. And I 7 wholeheartedly feel that I would not be in the position that I am today if not for the emotional 8 9 and legal support of the Legal Aid Counsel and 10 Assigned Counsel in Buffalo. 11 JUDGE LIPPMAN: How did you come to the 12 Legal Aid counsel? 13 MS. HART: Well, I was being represented 14 pro bono by a private attorney. Through the court 15 process, the judge suggested after I was 16 representing myself --17 JUDGE LIPPMAN: That you go to legal --18 MS. HART: -- that I would qualify. And 19 she gave me a referral and immediately was accepted. 20 MR. DOYLE: So there was an attorney who 21 was representing you pro bono for free? 22 MS. HART: Yes. 23 MR. DOYLE: But your needs just became 24 too great, you said? 25 MS. HART: I was making my own situation

worse. I kept going back to an abusive man. My
ex-husband found out about this, didn't want the
kids around him, rightfully so. And that kind of
led to the, you know, downfall.

MR. DOYLE: Legal Aid was able to step

MR. DOYLE: Legal Aid was able to step in where the pro bono efforts of an attorney weren't sufficient to help you?

MS. HART: Absolutely, yes. And helped me understand that I wasn't doomed forever. That it was a situation that I was in, that I was -- I wasn't made to feel that I could be honest and say that I have these problems and I'm being abused and I need to get out without fear of losing my children, which ultimately what I tried to do made me lose them anyways. But there was a lot of emotional support as well.

MR. DOYLE: Let me ask you about that because you said it was not only legal services but emotional support. How was that provided to you by the clinic?

MS. HART: Well, ironically the lawyer I was appointed, Nadine Patterson, one of her co-workers Melissa Hervotis, I went to school with her and so there was age similarity, and we went to the same school, we grew up in the same town and

just kind of befriended her. And she understood my 2 situation, both Nadine and Melissa understood that I 3 wanted to get back where I was with my kids. My 4 kids were my number one priority. And they helped 5 me understand that in order to get to where I want 6 to be, there are certain things I have to stop 7 doing, which would be going back to an abusive 8 relationship and keep making negative choices. 9 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Was there any way that 10 you could have afforded to pay a lawyer to represent 11 you? 12 MS. HART: Absolutely not, no. 13 JUDGE SCUDDER: Was the process to 14 qualify difficult at all? 15 MS. HART: No. I also am on Medicaid and 16 so the process of getting assigned with an attorney 17 I think was lessened because I had Medicaid, which 18 automatically made me qualify. It was very quick, 19 within days. 20 JUDGE LIPPMAN: So there were criteria by 21 which you -- that they looked at and knew that you 22 would be someone that they could take? 23 Right, right. But I MS. HART: 24 absolutely would not be able to get what I have

today, which is my children back, without them.

JUDGE PFAU: Was there any point which 2 you were representing yourself? 3 MS. HART: For a day. And that didn't go 4 very well. 5 JUDGE PFAU: Right. The Law Guardian kind of 6 MS. HART: 7 helped me with the legal terminology that I kind of deer in the headlights looked at the judge. 8 9 yeah, that stopped, and she politely said that I 10 would very much qualify to have an attorney if I 11 wanted one. And so we adjourned and I went down the 12 street to get an attorney. 13 JUDGE LIPPMAN: I guess the bottom line is that courts are foreign places and when you come 14 in --15 16 MS. HART: Intimidating. 17 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know, it is all like 18 a different world to you. 19 MS. HART: Very. 20 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Even though you bring a 21 lawyer today and your red light is on, you still, 22 it's still, but it's a different world when you got 23 in there. 24 MS. HART: It's totally foreign. 25 knew was diapers and bottles, and I got in there and

there were suits and sheriff's and everything and it's very intimidating. And then they speak in 2 3 terminology that you don't know understand, and you 4 don't know what your rights are. And I waived away 5 a lot of things that I probably shouldn't have, 6 but --7 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Like I said, you didn't 8 know what your rights were. 9 MS. HART: Right. 10 JUDGE LIPPMAN: And how to uphold those 11 rights. 12 MS. HART: Or how what I did in my 13 personal life would greatly effect what happened in 14 the courts. So I'm thoroughly thankful and would not have my kids today without that. 15 16 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you, Laura. 17 Heather Oaks, and you're represented by 18 Legal Services of Central New York. 19 MS. OAKS: Good morning. My name is 20 Heather Oaks. I am a member of the 865th Combat 21 Support Hospital in Utica, New York. My fiance', 22 Jason Lewis, served with the United States Marine Corps at Henderson Hall down in Washington, D.C. 23 24 Together we're 27. We have three children, two of

which are from a previous marriage, and he has a

daughter who's seven named Angela, and a five-year-old son named Aiden, and then together we have our 16-month-old baby boy Braydon.

When I learned I was pregnant in
September of 2008, we began looking for a house as
we would outgrow our apartment. Jay and I spent
each night looking through books of houses,
newspaper ads, Internet sites. Throughout the
months of December, January and February, we looked
at dozens of houses.

Towards the end of February we came across an ad in a weekly paper: "Bad Credit, No Credit, No Problem. No closing costs." They work with all, all types of credit. They can get us our own home.

I left a message at the listed phone number and several days later I got a phone call back from Paul with Best House. He asked us a couple of questions about where we wanted to live, how many bedrooms we needed, driveway, garage. All the basics that a real estate agent would ask you.

Paul gave us the Best House website and asked us to review the site to pick out houses that we would want to see. So we did. We looked at it, we called him back. We found a house that we wanted

to see because it was very close to both of our parents' home and made a day to view it.

We met Paul at the house. As we walked into the home there was a family living there. We went throughout the house. I fell in love with it. This house was absolutely beautiful. It had everything that we needed and wanted. It had enough rooms for all of our children, plus us, and then room to grow. It was our American dream, ultimately. It was almost too good to be true. And you know what happens when things are too good to be true.

Jay and I went back and signed the papers to buy the house. Paul ensured us that the house would be ready for us to be moved in before my due date. Towards the end of March I drove by the house and it still looked the same as when we were there in February. The family was still living there. I was starting to worry and had sent several e-mails to Paul and left phone messages that were unreturned. I had almost finished packing our house and all of our possessions, and we were ready to go.

The days were flying by and my due date was rapidly approaching. I still heard nothing back from Paul. Finally, about a week into April, Paul

called and told us they are having problems getting the people out of the house but that he had another house for us available immediately. We agreed to look at the house with him.

The first time I walked in, I cried.

This house was a wreck. It was trash. There was so much damage. The people that lived there before had their possessions in the house still. It needed a lot of work.

So I was supposed to be in our new home relaxing to prepare for the birth of our child when we had nowhere to go, so we had to take the house. Paul promised to repair the foundation crack, to get rid of the black mold throughout the house, to fix the bathroom plumbing, put new carpeting in rooms, replace the back door, install basement windows, and do other repairs to the home to make it liveable. Our American dream was slowly turning into a nightmare.

We moved in soon after, and I don't have to tell you that Paul's promises were nothing but broken words. After being in the house for a couple of weeks we had an inch of sewage in our basement that just so happened to happen on my son's fourth birthday.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Paul would make dates to come and fix things that were wrong with the house and then never show up. Needless to say, all of the work to make this house a home was done by Jay and I, our parents, my brother, and our family and friends. We have spent hundreds of hours and more than \$4,000 to make this house livable for ourselves and our children.

A few months later I read in the newspaper a lawsuit filed by Legal Services of Central, New York against Best House, Paul, and several other individuals including two Syracuse-area lawyers. One of the lawyers at the center of the scam defrauded first time home buyers like us. They were operating, which I later learned, was a property flipping scam. I cried harder than I cried when we had to move into this rundown house. I called Legal Services and they have represented us since. They also represent about 25 other families in the situation to ours. The scammers buy depleted HUD homes and advertise them for sale, making all kinds of promises to fix things and add things to the house. They'll do anything, they'll say anything to you to get you to sign that piece of paper. We also learned that for

families who did get a mortgage, it was obtained fraudulently.

We had put money and much effort into our home to make it livable for us and our kids. We've done significant improvements. We want to own and eventually live there for good.

When we fell behind on monthly payments, the scammers tried to evict us. After we fixed up the house, the scammers wanted it back.

eviction. The lawyers at Legal Services have worked with us for long hours to sort out all of our problems. With help from Legal Services we would not have a roof over our head. They have been working to make sure that we can buy our house for a fair market value. And our story is far from over. It's going to require more hours, more time, more money, more research.

I took an oath to defend our country against enemies foreign and domestic, but where are the people to help me and my family in our time of need? We found those people with Legal Services of CNY. Mr. Kaufmann and Mr. Young have helped us through a lot.

I would just like to make sure that Legal

Services has the resources to defend other people in 2 our situation. I thank you for the opportunity to 3 tell my family's story here today. 4 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. You know that 5 the story that you tell, particularly in these 6 economic times, is not unusual. And evictions and 7 forecloses are through the roof literally in the 8 state, and I'm sure, you know, here in the Rochester 9 area and in the Syracuse area where, you know, 10 you're from. And so this is a common thing and yet 11 there are people who aren't able to get the help 12 that you received, and it's frightening. It is. It's very frightening, 13 MS. OAKS: 14 but you have a self-confidence that's built up with 15 a reassurance from Legal Services. They tell you 16 what's going on, they keep you informed. anything new comes up, you're always first to know. 17 18 It's not like you're the back of the line. And, 19 okay, everybody else knows and now we'll go and tell 20 them. As soon as something happens between 21 Mr. Kaufmann and Mr. Young, we know right away. 22 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Any other questions? 23 Thank you all. We greatly appreciate it. Okay. 24 MS. OAKS: Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And I think graphically,

your stories graphically illustrate the need for 2 publically funded civil legal services. Thank you. 3 MS. OAKS: Thank you. 4 JUDGE LIPPMAN: We now have a Panel of 5 Educators, who I would ask to come forward. Rachael 6 Ann Gazdick, Jean Claude Brizard, and Dr. Anne M. 7 Kress. And they will each introduce themselves to 8 you, and, you know, what role they have. And let's 9 start with Rachael Ann Gazdick from Syracuse 10 University. 11 MS. GAZDICK: Good afternoon. And thank 12 you for the opportunity to testify on this very 13 important issue. 14 My name is Rachael Gazdick, and I'm the Executive Director of "Say Yes to Education" at 15 16 Syracuse University. I'm from the City of Syracuse. 17 Say yes Syracuse is the Syracuse chapter of the National Not for Profit Foundation "Say Yes 18 19 to Education" committed to dramatically increasing 20 high school and college graduation rates for urban 21 youth. What separates the Syracuse chapter from 22 active chapters in Harlem, Philadelphia, Hartford, 23 and Cambridge, Massachusetts is the implementation 24 across the entire Syracuse City School District,

serving well over 20,000 students.

By strengthening the model across the entire district, Say Yes demonstrates that with appropriate engagement, monitoring, support and coordination, schools and communities they serve can significantly alter the course of urban education.

The long-term success of Say Yes rests largely on specifically designed supports that are introduced early in a student's educational career.

Say Yes and Syracuse University have designed two components to Say Yes Syracuse that address these needs. Comprehensive student support and enrichment beginning in kindergarten to help students reach their academic and social potential, and free college tuition for up to over one hundred universities and participating colleges and universities for all Syracuse city graduates who meet residency, admission and financial aid requirements.

Syracuse was chosen as a pilot program for a district-wide implementation under Say Yes because of substantial challenges that the school district was facing, that affected children's success in school. These challenges are set forth in my written submission, and I will not repeat them here. But they were daunting, and I'm pleased to

report that under Say Yes substantial changes have been made.

Say Yes begins in kindergarten offering high quality and sustained academic, social, emotional, health and family supports. These supports include universal after-school programming, summer camps, tutoring, mentoring, family outreach engagement, additional social workers, and counseling services, financial aid counseling and referrals for high quality healthcare and pro bono legal clinics.

The law clinics are an invaluable component to our support services because they provide many of our families with access to the legal system who would otherwise fail to obtain legal assistance of any kind or encounter many obstacles to accessing the limited free legal services available in the community.

In my role with Say Yes, I have the ability to interact with many young students and their families on a daily basis. I've learned firsthand of the many obstacles that students face and ultimately must overcome to be able to perform in school.

Many of the students who struggle in

school come from families with very low incomes.

Their economic status is further encumbered by their housing conditions and family problems that often have a legal matter at the root cause.

Parents and students have shared their stories with me, and I have learned that many of them face legal problems that interfere with the child's ability to concentrate and learn while in school, complete homework assignments outside of the classroom. Some examples are set forth in my written submission.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So let me understand. So legal services doesn't exist in a vacuum, it allows -- in different areas of people's lives very, again basics of their lives -- it allows them to get things accomplished that they couldn't do, interface with different kinds of disciplines, including in this case education and getting the benefits of education and being a part of your program and facing the challenges that they face legally.

You know, is that a natural kind of dynamic that in order to do what you have to do, you really need legal services even though you think what does one world have to do with the other?

MS. GAZDICK: Yes. We believe fully that

to remove students out of poverty, that we have to 2 remove the barriers that impact their academic 3 successes. 4 JUDGE LIPPMAN: To allow them --5 MS. GAZDICK: To allow them to move. 6 that's also connecting the legal community also with 7 our health community where we have organized our 8 entire health system. 9 Just to give you an example, 60 percent 10 of our students at Dr. King Elementary School have 11 asthma. And a lot of these health conditions are 12 related to housing conditions, which ultimately are 13 handled by our attorneys, and we're opening legal clinics throughout the entire school district --14 JUDGE LIPPMAN: So how did this 15 16 connection come about? The program with Legal 17 Services? 18 MS. GAZDICK: The program with Legal 19 Services is we have private law firms and Not for 20 Profit legal services throughout our entire city 21 offering pro bono. And it was through the Say Yes 22 Foundation as well as Syracuse University's Law 23 Clinic at the university to coordinate all of these 24 services. And we do that in all of the public

schools as we roll out the Say Yes Program across

the entire city. So currently we have six legal 2 clinics available for families, to reach 20,000 3 families. 4 JUDGE PFAU: Did you start out with this 5 comprehensive model, or did you identify as you were 6 kind of developing it that legal services was such 7 an integral part of how you could achieve success? MS. GAZDICK: We started with a 8 9 comprehensive model knowing that Say Yes did this in 10 cohort models with 100 students in their other 11 chapters, where there were 100 kids that they 12 supported with high-quality academic, legal, health 13 and so forth. And then we took that model district-wide to the entire City of Syracuse. 14 15 JUDGE SCUDDER: What's the scope of the 16 need, you know what I'm saying? 17 MS. GAZDICK: Yep. 18 JUDGE SCUDDER: -- of the need for legal 19 services? In other words, how much more would, 20 would you need to have to do an adequate job? 21 MS. GAZDICK: I think we're going to, we 22 are going to need to probably double the number of 23 legal clinics that we offer. What we're saying is 24 as the legal clinics pick up and people are 25 utilizing them and knowing that they're there, we're seeing a lot of flow in each of those dep -- you know, programs.

MR. DOYLE: Is it your impression, I know you mentioned that some of this began with the generosity of law firms and lawyers doing pro bono work. Is it your impression that the need is greater than can be met by pro bono efforts? That it has to be met through legal services funded by the public?

MS. GAZDICK: Yeah. I think that as this grows, we'll get a better sense of -- but what we're understanding from the pro bono field right now is that there's not enough resources to meet the need and how are we going to bring this to scale. So that's a great concern to this. We have a legal task force that meets with all of the legal services in the city, and that is one of the major issues that they raise as we begin to bring all our programatic efforts to scale.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What we're finding there are lawyers in this state contribute more than two million hours of pro bono service, and it's the tip of the iceberg. You know, there's so much need out there.

MS. GAZDICK: Yeah, I would agree.

23

24

25

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And it is so commendable 2 and so wonderful and we couldn't do what we have to 3 do without it, but it's all part of a puzzle, you 4 know, that fits together. 5 And I think what seems evident from your 6 testimony, what it tells me is that in communities 7 around this state, there are lots of pieces to the 8 puzzle. You know? That have to fit together to 9 have stable, thriving communities. 10 MS. GAZDICK: Yeah. And for the City of 11 Syracuse to offer free college tuition to all of our 12 graduating seniors, it's critical that our children 13 are prepared to take advantage. It's not enough to 14 just offer the free college tuition. We have to 15 remove all of the barriers, both academic, social, 16 emotional, legal and health, so that the kids can 17 take advantage of the college scholarships and be more productive citizens and make contributions. 18 And it all is interconnected. We can't do one 19 20 without the other. 21 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great. Okay.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great. Okay. Jean Claude Brizard?

MR. BRIZARD: Good morning, Chief Judge and Judge Pfau, Scudder and Mr. Doyle. Thank you so much for this opportunity.

Try that.

My name is Jean Claude Brizard, I'm the 2 Superintendent of schools here in the Rochester City 3 School District. We have got 32,000 students, and we serve 10,000 adult students. So again, thank you 4 5 for doing this for our kids. 6 Let me just start by saying that we don't 7 believe that poverty is an excuse for inadequate or ineffective education. And we know of no other 8 9 effective path out of poverty other than delivery of 10 a quality education to our students. 11 We know, nonetheless, that social capital 12 correlates well to how effectively we can deliver 13 the educational services to our students. I want to begin by sharing with you 14 census data reflecting the economic conditions under 15 16 which most of our students live. 17 According to the most recent census data 18 available, the City of Rochester ranks 12th in the 19 nation in per capita child poverty. 20 While Monroe County ranks 11th in New 21 York State in per capita wealth --22 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Superintendent, I think 23 if you maybe move the mike a little bit further away 24 from you, you won't have that static you're getting.

MR. BRIZARD: Sure, I'll try this. The Rochester City School District has a 2 3 second highest per capita poverty rate among all 700 school districts in New York State. 4 5 Eighty-eight percent of our students are 6 eligible for free or reduced lunches. 7 Nearly 20 percent of our pre-K and kindergarten students were recipients of neonatal 8 9 intensive care. This number has increased by 10 one-third in the past decade. 11 We are beginning to mirror third world 12 countries here in the city. 13 Twenty percent of our parents report that their pre-K and kindergarten students have witnessed 14 violence in their neighborhoods. 15 16 Eighteen percent of our students have been classified to receive special education 17 18 services. 19 One of the strengths in our community is 20 our cultural diversity, when compared to the City 20 21 or 30 years ago. Over the past five years, the 22 number of English language learners in our district 23 has grown from approximately 2,000 to 3,000, over 27 24 percent increase.

The number of languages spoken by

25

students here has grown dramatically from 2 approximately 20 to 72 over the past decade. 3 English language learners represent our fastest 4 growing population. 5 Given the economic and language barriers 6 facing City families, the need for civil legal 7 services is profound. Our families face much greater risks of foreclosure, eviction, mental and 8 9 physical abuse, and unmet health and special 10 education needs when compared to their suburban 11 counterparts. 12 The Legal Aid Society and other legal 13 services agencies do their best to address the following family needs in order that children arrive 14 15 at the school house doors ready to learn. 16 For example, assistance with applications 17 for Social Security Disability, Unemployment, 18 Worker's Compensation, aid to homeless and abandoned 19 children that are not living with a biological 20 parent due to economic circumstances, abuse or 21 incarceration. 22 Legal representation at meetings, as you 23 said earlier, of Committees of Special Education

with students with disabilities.

Assistance with matters of custody,

guardianship and foster care. Under the Federal

Fostering Connections Act of 2008, state and local
social service agencies and school districts are
expected to work together in order to minimize the
disruption in academic settings. But these
agencies, despite their best efforts, do not meet
the need. I can't quantify the unmet needs, but it
is so substantial.

Legal rights are empty promises unless citizens have the ability to enforce those rights. Children displaced from their homes due to foreclosure, eviction or abuse, face enormous barriers to educational and workplace successes.

So we support your initiative, Chief

Judge, and ask the State of New York to identify

permanent civil legal service funding streams,

improve the delivery of those services, and thus

remove the obstacles that stand in the way of

protecting the legal rights of the families of

students here in the City of Rochester. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you, Superintendent.

What happens to these kids if they don't get the -- you know, we're focusing on the legal services part of this equation. What are the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

consequences when they can't access the different kinds of services or benefits that they need to have? What's the result from an educational perspective in not getting the legal help that gets them these other forms of help?

MR. BRIZARD: Well, you take a look at the achievement rate of students here in the City of Rochester. Until very recently we had the lowest four-year graduation rate in New York State. When you look at it again, the best example was early on when students who have disabilities who are not represented well. Imagine having a parent who knows how to advocate for a child still having great difficulty at CSE meetings and imagine one that is not as educated, who doesn't have the resources to seek and find those services and, therefore, not represented and face this real intimidating process, this cumbersome process. So kids don't get services, they falter, they drop out of school.

And our mayor is very good at pointing out that the crime rate is directly correlated to the dropout rate in the City of Rochester. So if you look at the kids --

> JUDGE LIPPMAN: A direct relationship? MR. BRIZARD: Absolutely. It is an

24

economic issue that you have as well because you're 2 losing monies from people that could be productive 3 citizens and contribute to our society. 4 JUDGE LIPPMAN: And instead they are a 5 drain on the society. 6 MR. BRIZARD: Absolutely. 7 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know, and I think 8 that's one of the things that we find certainly in 9 the hearing yesterday and the one today that legal 10 services is not only the right thing to do, that 11 people should have, as you say --12 MR. BRIZARD: Yes. 13 JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- be able to uphold 14 their rights. But that the bottom line is served by 15 getting those people legal help. That that money is 16 leverage a hundred times over. MR. BRIZARD: Absolutely. 17 18 JUDGE LIPPMAN: In terms of having people 19 live productive life that benefits society rather 20 than again being a drain on society. 21 MR. BRIZARD: Absolutely. It also 22 provides a level of accountability for school 23 districts and systems should to do the right thing 24 for people perhaps who don't know how to

self-advocate. So when you have a child who needs

something and you have perhaps sometimes adults who may not have the best interest of people in mind, having an attorney sitting in your room suddenly makes everyone pay attention.

JUDGE PFAU: Is Rochester different from other parts of the state, or do you think the scenario is laying out throughout the state?

MR. BRIZARD: I think it is throughout the state. I worked in New York City for about 22 years, much of Brooklyn was part of my region. The issues are very, very similar, the scales are a bit different. But I bet if you were to walk into East Flatbush, different parts of Brooklyn, you would find the exact same story repeating throughout the state.

JUDGE PFAU: And the ripple effect felt in every school.

MR. BRIZARD: Absolutely. And you can see the correlation. You have people that do not advocate who have the resources to seek and find the services, the achievement is much better than places where you have adults who are struggling to support the kids and parents that don't need to advocate for their children.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great. Okay. Thank you

us.

so much. Greatly appreciate it.

Dr. Kress?

DR. KRESS: Good morning. Thank you so much, Chief Judge, for this opportunity to offer testimony on this very important issue for all of

Across our state -- I am President of
Monroe Community College in Rochester, New York.

Our college serves about 37,000 students over a

year, a little over 19,000 students in the fall so a

considerable number of students. And across our

state, across our nation, students come to community

colleges seeking a high quality education, higher

education that's also affordable.

Our students frequently come from families where their goals and aspirations are not matched by financial means. The cost to attend Monroe Community College as a full-time student for a year, our tuition is \$3,000 a year, which may sound low, but then consider that over 70 percent of our students receive some form of assistance to pay for their college education, and 45 percent of them access federal financial aid grants indicating that they come from the lowest economic rungs in our society.

They come to MCC, they come to community colleges seeking a better life, but the reality is many of them come from current lives that are filled with strife that washes over into their academic life, as we have already heard today.

I'm going to share some representative and real stories that were shared with me from our Equal Opportunity Program, which is a program at MCC, like at many community colleges, that serves students who are at the greatest risk for dropping out, who come with the least degree of preparation to our community colleges.

As their personal narratives will reveal, their lack of access to consistent and quality legal services has dramatically impacted their ability to continue in college. And as a framer on that, I want to share that we are in the midst of a national discussion about college degree completion, our lack of global competitiveness, and the fact that we have fallen to 12th among developed countries in college degree completions. So this is an issue that is not just regional or statewide, it's a national issue at this moment.

As might be expected, students needs to access legal services in connection with housing

issues, as we have already heard here today, is a recurrent one. For example, one student's mother took a home equity loan that she, like many others, did not completely understand. The mother of the student had a limited education herself, and, in fact, I think did not even complete high school. The rate on the equity loan escalated rapidly, and without recourse to assistance in understanding her options, the mother lost the family home.

Because of the results of stress on the mother, she lost her ability to handle many situations, and the responsibility for finding a new home for the family fell to the student. The impact of this responsibility as well as her lack of transportation to campus caused her to withdraw from school for that term.

Another student and her mother lost their apartment, and, for a while, they became homeless. They were able to find temporary housing, which initially seemed like it could become a permanent option for the family. However, after they moved in, they learned of significant issues with the home, including a rodent infestation. They complained repeatedly to the landlord, who, of course, made promises to fix the property. Those

were never forthcoming. The home itself was condemned. The family moved again. The repeated moves and interim homelessness led the student to miss classes and finally withdraw from courses. Her failure to attend led to her failure to meet academic progress.

And I just want to underscore this because her failure to meet standards of academic progress then compromised her ability to access federal financial aid, essentially foreclosing her opportunity to continue in school.

Other stories provide insight into the struggles our many student-parents face in their dealings with the legal system. For example, as a result of an ongoing personal dispute, the father of one student's son falsely reported the young woman to Child Protective Services. Although she was eventually cleared of any wrong-doing, she repeatedly missed classes to attend court and she subsequently again lost her financial aid because of failure to make standards of academic progress.

I should also mention that other students, typically mothers, are consistently in arrears in their financial obligations to the college because of their inability to collect child

support that has been awarded them rightfully. They are forced to make decisions no one should make, between buying a textbook and feeding their family, between paying for a bus to come to school and feeding their family.

Female students are also, unfortunately, the majority of those on the receiving end of abusive relationships. One student reported that her ex-boyfriend broke her car windows, destroyed the inside of her car, stole her school work and textbooks. She withdrew from school for a period of time because she was left with no transportation, no books, and no recourse to replace either.

The fact is, too often, the students whose futures can be most improved by access to higher education at Monroe Community College and community colleges across this state, lose this opportunity because they cannot access consistent and quality legal services. Many of them, and let me add this, many of them, and you have heard this, simply do not understand how to navigate the systems that are even set up to assist them.

This is a loss for all of us: Rochester,
Monroe County, New York, the Nation. And for this
reason, Monroe Community College supports the

initiative of the Chief Judge in this task force.

We join you in asking the State of New York to

provide permanent and sufficient funding for low

income civil legal services. Thank you.

ask you in relation to the community college, you said that your kids are really the most vulnerable in that they can go either way. They are not people who are paying \$30,000 a year for tuition and the families have the wherewithal to make sure that they get through and have a decent job. That these kids are either going to be productive, they are going to get through and really be able to earn a living and support themselves and support their families, or if they can't navigate these different problems, that legal services can help them out of, they fail, and God knows what happens to them. They go in the totally opposite direction.

DR. KRESS: And I would also underscore that we're not just talking about kids, we're not always talking about traditional college-age students.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes.

DR. KRESS: We're talking about people who are 34, 35-years-old for whom --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It's their last chance. 2 DR. KRESS: This next chance may be the 3 last chance that they have. 4 JUDGE SCUDDER: As you're aware here in 5 Rochester we have the Telesca Center For Justice? 6 DR. KRESS: Yes. 7 JUDGE SCUDDER: Which is a tremendous 8 project and does so much good, but they have limited 9 resources. 10 DR. KRESS: Mm-hmm. 11 JUDGE SCUDDER: Is it, when somebody 12 comes to your attention, do you ever send them 13 there? Or how's that work? MS. KRESS: We definitely refer students. 14 We have entire counseling procedures, advising 15 16 procedures, to help students understand their 17 options outside of MCC. 18 But, you know, again, I'll just 19 underscore the figures. If we have 19,000 students 20 in the fall and 45 percent of them are accessing 21 grants to attend a college where the tuition is 22 \$3,000 a year, you know, that goes back to the 23 superintendent's point about the level of poverty 24 you find in Rochester and in so many communities. 25 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know, I want to thank

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the panel. I think it is instructive that even at and all the different parts of it.

this point where we have only had, you know, some of our witnesses, we see how legal services impacts so many parts of life. Whether it be housing and the roof over somebody's head, the well-being of families, domestic abuse, success in education at the grade-school level, you know, at the college level, at the university level. Future jobs and employment, you know, again, I think that there's a, there's a tendency to think of legal representation in a very narrow way. You know, a particular case that, gee, you have representation or you don't. But it's so almost seamless in a way it cuts over all the lines of life and the way people, again, become productive and, you know, lead meaningful lives, and they're not a burden to society but rather, you know, enhance a richness of our society So it's very helpful to hear from people from disciplines that you might not think at first glance are really what this is all about. And it sort of, again, cuts across so much of our life here in the western part of the state and in the entire state, and it makes the case again quite graphically for the need for funding for legal services.

thank you so much. Appreciate it.

The next panel, and again another area which I think is so vital, which is our Health Care Panel. And we're going to have Fran Weisberg, Dr. Blatt, and Catherine Cerulli -- Dr. Cerulli. Thank you.

Okay. We're going to start with Fran Weisberg. And I'd ask you to introduce yourself and tell everyone what you do and why you're here today.

DR. WEISBERG: Great. Thank you so much, Judge Lippman. My name is Fran Weisberg, and I am the Executive Director of the Finger Lakes Health Systems Agency, which is the only fully functioning independent community-based health planning organization left in New York State. We hope that changes sometime soon.

We serve the Finger Lakes region, which is, as you know, a nine county area within the Fourth Department. Our mission is to improve healthcare in Rochester and the Finger Lakes region by analyzing the needs of the community, bringing together stake holders and organizations to solve health problems and measure its results.

And I have to say what you were just saying, it could be whether it's education, housing

or healthcare, it's the same issues for everybody. 2 And I have to say our job is to bring multi-state 3 cultures together to drive improvement in the 4 community. We could not do this. Every one of our 5 commissions, task forces, and work groups have very, 6 very many, many people from the legal services 7 community that are critical to the workers. JUDGE LIPPMAN: So it's about 8 9 partnership. 10 DR. WEISBERG: It's completely about 11 partnership. 12 JUDGE LIPPMAN: And the legal services 13 community is so much a part of that. 14 DR. WEISBERG: And we leverage the work that legal services folks do with the work that we 15 16 do. We just offer the community table. 17 Our health planning work is made real 18 through the many initiatives that we have, which is 19 to ensure the right care at the right time at the right place to everybody in the community. 20 21 convene what we called the 20/20 performance 22 commission right now, which has legal services 23 representation on it. A diverse group of community 24 leaders who meet very often and convene workshops

to -- our greatest goals is to right size the whole

healthcare system, reduce preventable
hospitalization, reduce suboptimal Emergency
department visits and strengthen the whole rural and
regional healthcare system.

We also have another very excited commission called the Sage commission, which is developing a person center integrated healthcare system for older adults and allow them to enjoy care in the least restrictive setting and help shift investment to community resources.

Lastly, we convene and support this community's African American health and Latino health coalitions. These group of community leaders support and inform our planning work to eliminate disparities by helping our community build non-medical approaches to reducing health disparities. These coalitions supported the work to document and report pressing health issues that confront local communities of color with regard to expanding access to needed services, empowering people to navigate the complex system and help healthcare providers to meet the unique needs of Latino and African American.

I will say again, civil legal service providers are vital to the work that we do in

1	improving health status and ensuring health access
2	and advocating for improvement to the healthcare
3	system. Whether it's work at the individual level,
4	like representing clients who are denied needed
5	benefits, or helping people navigate the Medicare
6	system and secure quality care they deserve.
7	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Won't that become even
8	more vital when you have the new legislation?
9	DR. WEISBERG: Exactly.
10	JUDGE LIPPMAN: The federal legislation
11	that are now coming into play.
12	DR. WEISBERG: And actually if the
13	Medicaid and Medicare system isn't confusing enough
14	now, it will be. I'm on the Governor's Advisory
15	Task Force of how our state actually is prepared as
16	is Empire Justice with getting ready for healthcare
17	reform. That was what the whole meeting was about
18	last week. It is complex, but it's so critical that
19	we get it right because it's about access for
20	everybody. But
21	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Even the healthcare
22	professionals, I would guess, don't understand it.
23	DR. WEISBERG: Nobody understands it.
24	Right.
25	JUDGE LIPPMAN: But the legal services

people can explain it?

DR. WEISBERG: But I'm still one of these people that are optimistic that it will do more good than harm, and we need to get ready for it.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: No, no but whenever you think about it, it is complicated.

DR. WEISBERG: It is very complicated as is, and what I would say not only do we, our legal services attorneys critical to the one on one work of accessing care, Medicaid/Medicaid care, other disability kind of payments that are needed, these legal services folks are in every one of our more public policy agenda issues to really ensure some of the broadest issues.

We have great needs in this community. I won't go through all of them. I have the testimony, but I will give you -- the data speaks for itself about the Latino and African American disparities and unfortunately the poverty. None of the facts that you have been hearing are startling in and of itself. What is under-appreciated is the extent to which poverty, race, ethnicity, geography, interact and intersect with health status. When our planning staff maps out the socioeconomic status, there are clear patterns of economic segregation emerge and

how poverty relates on what that impact is on 2 health. I'll give you an example. 3 JUDGE LIPPMAN: When you have an economy like we have today, those who suffer most are the 4 5 ones at the bottom of the ladder who are already 6 suffering. 7 DR. WEISBERG: Yes, exactly. JUDGE LIPPMAN: And the lack of legal 8 9 representation impacts the very people you're 10 talking about. 11 DR. WEISBERG: And impacts their ability 12 to access care at the right place at the right time. 13 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right. 14 DR. WEISBERG: And thus they are sicker. 15 And I will give you an example and of the 16 disparity of the lowest income. There is no 17 difference in diabetes prevalence in Latinos, between Latinos and the general population. Yet 18 19 they are twice as luckily as non-Latinos to wind up 20 being hospitalized. With a two to one disparity in 21 diabetes, diabetic African Americans in our 22 community are hospitalized at a rate that is almost 23 four times greater than whites. And in Monroe 24 County, the Emergency department visitation rates

for African Americans were more than twice that of

whites. And when we also look at the disparities, there is a sad disparity in who dies from disease and at what age.

The work that legal service attorneys do with our task forces are there to breakdown the barriers and come up with solutions, whether it's in cancer, heart disease, diabetes or AIDS, people of color are sicker and die younger than the rest of our community, and there is tremendous impact on that, that we need legal help to really breakdown the barrier.

In aging and long-term care it is the same issues, and a perfect storm of challenges that really threaten the viability of health service for older adults. We all know the aging of the population. The problem is if we don't get help that navigates the Medicare and the Medicaid and the Disability system, you will see tremendous more problems that exist.

We have something called AL -- Alternate Care Status, that people who are fair older adults that are left in hospitals way later than they should be, and the reasons why they have that is because of Medicaid issues, Medicare issues. And what I also want to say, and there's other people

here that know this better than I, that we do not have an effective person-centered guardianship system that allows these folks who have lost in diminished capacity, person centered, that can really have somebody else that can speak for them but understand the system.

The Kaiser Family Foundation recently found that people under 65 who have Medicare as a result of a disability are more likely to experience difficulty in accessing and paying for care. We know that although healthcare reform will fix some of that, there are so many issues still not addressed. Hospital and healthcare providers did not single handedly create these problems, nor can they fix these problems at all. We need activities that are like Legal Services. Healthcare improvement cannot happen without civil legal services in a very incredibly complex system so that we have help in accessing the system.

And I can keep talking about churning and Medicaid churning and so many other kinds of issues that exist. As you've been saying before, whether it's education, housing or healthcare, legal services is intertwined into our ability what we call and it is a critical tool in our tool box.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: It is almost the glue. 2 DR. WEISBERG: It really is the glue. 3 have the Lead Coalition that works with us, we have 4 the obesity work, we have the Ryan White Network. 5 And every one of us plus the 20/20 Commission, and 6 we're trying really to decrease disparities. 7 lawyers in Empire Justice, Legal Services, Legal Aid 8 are all intertwined in every part of what we do. 9 JUDGE PFAU: So the uncertainty in 10 funding of the state of civil legal services has a 11 very direct impact on your organization's ability to 12 plan and move forward? 13 DR. WEISBERG: On both levels. Both on the individual level of that individual who is 14 15 uninsured because they can't get their Medicaid in a 16 timely fashion, to the broader public policy work of 17 preventing lead, preventing obesity kinds of work 18 from the policy to the individual. Thank you. 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. 20 Okay. Dr. Blatt? 21 DR. BLATT: Good morning, distinguished 22 members of the task force. It is really my distinct 23 honor to appear here to provide testimony about 24 important issues facing my patients, their families,

and people in need in my community.

I am a pediatrician on the faculty at

Upstate Medical University in Syracuse. And I have
been working in our Outpatient Pediatric Department
for the past 20 years. I also am the Director of a

clinic which provides healthcare to every child in
foster care in Onondaga County. And I am the

Medical Director of the Syracuse Medical-Legal

Partnership, a partner-site of the National Center
for Medical-Legal Partnerships.

As a pediatrician providing care to an underserved population, I really congratulate you and your colleagues for looking at ways to improve access to civil legal services for my patients and their families. And I want to share with you some of the characteristics of my patients, some of the obstacles that they face, and some of the efforts currently underway to help them.

You've asked some of the other panelists, and I know patients and families seen in my office and Syracuse are very similar to the ones seen in Rochester and Buffalo, the North Country, the Southern Tier, Harlem, Bronx. Patients are patients, they really are, and the data does bear that out.

I don't want to spend a lot of -- any

time talking about statistics, but I do want to give you a clear idea about what these people actually look like. The typical mother that walks into my office became pregnant for the first time when she was a teenager. The typical mother became pregnant when she was a teenager. Less likely to graduate from high school or to hold a full-time job than women who delay child birth until they are in their 20's.

The father is unlikely to live in the same home as the mother and the child. Is unlikely to provide financial or other assistance. They are poor. They receive public assistance funds.

Healthcare is paid by Medicaid. But even though that's all true, it really doesn't begin to capture what, who they are.

And one thing that I would like everyone to consider is really what poverty is. And all of the other panelists have mentioned poverty. And poverty, it's not the absence of money. My medical students are poor. When you were in law school you were probably poor. College students are poor. In fact, after I take my four children shopping, I feel poor.

But we are not in poverty. If everyone

in this room left your wallets behind and moved to the Midwest with only \$50 in your pocket and the clothes on your back, within a short period of time you would have a job, a place to live, and something to eat. And that's because we have an education.

We know how to find a job, we know how to work, and we know how to manage our money.

People in poverty do not have those skills. It's more than the absence of money.

Poverty means a lack of education, living a disordered, chaotic life. It's not knowing how to manage the few dollars that you have. You're spending more than half of your monthly income on housing, and not uncommonly, as people that have mentioned already, on an apartment that may be without heat or full of mold or otherwise unfit to live in.

Ever wonder why obesity, which now affects more than 30 percent of the pediatric population, is so much more common in poor people? It's because people in poverty do not have good access to healthy food. And healthy food costs more money. For \$5, you can easily get 2,500 calories at a fast food place, but in a supermarket it will buy you half a head of lettuce, a cucumber and a tomato.

People in poverty do not receive

appropriate healthcare. At least most of the

children in New York do have access to medical

insurance, but that doesn't mean they actually make

it to the doctor. No matter where one goes in this

country, the no show rate at clinics that care for

children on Medicaid have about a 30 to 50 percent

no show rate.

There are multiple reasons why kids don't make it to the doctor. Certainly part of it is people don't recognize the importance of healthcare. But most parents understand about physicals and shots. I think the bigger issue is it takes a lot of work to make it to the doctor. One needs to schedule an appointment, have a calendar to know when to show up, arrange for transportation, battle inclement weather, arrange for Medicaid coverage, wait in offices. Make sure you don't have to go to another appointment at the Civic Center at the same time for your Medicaid or housing benefits, and so forth. And it's almost amazing that anybody makes it into the office.

Similarly people in poverty have in the rest of their life, have the same challenges. My office has 25,000 visits annually. A few years ago

1	we surveyed our families and found that 60 percent
2	of them had at least one unmet legal need. This
3	included economic issues such as public benefits or
4	entitlement programs, housing issues, education,
5	special education, custody and guardianship,
6	immigration, domestic violence, divorce and elder
7	law.
8	JUDGE LIPPMAN: So, Doctor, because of
9	all of those issues, if you don't have legal
10	services, they don't get to your office.
11	DR. BLATT: They may well, here's the
12	interesting thing. They find it to my office, and
13	we want to help them get legal services because
14	they
15	JUDGE LIPPMAN: If they get to your
16	office, you help them get legal services.
17	DR. BLATT: Correct. But we at least get
18	to start with them in the hospital when the baby's
19	born. So we do get a crack at em'.
20	So why do I care about these legal
21	issues? Most doctors do not routinely ask their
22	patients about them and most of us don't enjoy
23	dealing with them.
24	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you actually do that?
	II

You ask your patients about legal --

1	DR. BLATT: Absolutely.
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Problems.
3	DR. BLATT: Absolutely.
4	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And you try and funnel
5	them towards legal services?
6	DR. BLATT: Yes, we do. And the way we
7	do that is we have this medical legal partnership.
8	And I want to explain that to you.
9	JUDGE LIPPMAN: I thought the medical and
10	legal communities are not necessarily always on the
11	same page?
12	DR. BLATT: You know, that is that's
13	old thinking already. And this program started
14	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, you're well beyond
15	that. You're well beyond that. Go ahead.
16	DR. BLATT: Okay. So in the 90's this
17	came out of a model at Boston University, and it's
18	really spreading throughout the state. And we
19	partner with Syracuse University College of Law, and
20	what we do is we actually have law students and law
21	faculty come to our offices, and when we go see a
22	patient, the law student comes in with us. And if
23	they need a lawyer, they are right there. If the
24	law student or law faculty are not onsite, we refer
25	them to you.

examples. A mother came to our office in September. She said she moved from the City of Syracuse to a suburb to live with her mother. She went to enroll the kids in a school in the suburb. They said, you don't live here, your driver's license says you live in Syracuse, you got to go there. They said go to Syracuse. She says, no, I live here. Two weeks into the school year, the kids were still not in school. She came to my office, I don't even think she knew why she came to my office, but she came to my office, told us the story. Within two days she had a lawyer. They went to the school, the kids were enrolled in school.

But we don't always know as doctors or healthcare professionals what a legal issue is. A resident came to me in our conference room and told me about a nine-year-old who was here for a well-child visit. Said, by the way, the child's in special education. By the way, he got in a fight, they're going to suspend him. Luckily, the law faculty was standing next to me, and she pointed out that if this is part of the child's individual education plan, you cannot suspend him, you have to remediate him. We got them a lawyer, went back to

25

school, and the child was never suspended. 2 JUDGE PFAU: So the visits are really you 3 get two for one? 4 DR. BLATT: Correct. 5 JUDGE PFAU: You see the doctor and you 6 see the lawyer. 7 DR. BLATT: Absolutely, absolutely. You know, it used to be I would go into the room and I 8 9 would say to the lady, are you the mother or the 10 grandmother? And I'd move on. Now, when I find out 11 she's not the mother, I say, do you have custody? 12 And if she says no, I say, well, do you want to know 13 about custody? And a lot of times they don't, but sometimes they do, or they may not today but a month 14 later when the mother comes back and starts 15 16 threatening, they want custody, and then they get 17 the lawyer. And this comes up with everything, with 18 housing, immigration. 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: So, again, this is what 20 we say, it all fits together. 21 DR. BLATT: It all fits together. And 22 one of the reasons why it fits together is because 23 people still trust doctors. They know when they

have a problem, and certainly pediatricians with

their child, they show up at our door. And even

when they don't have a problem, it's our job to ask.

And this is a model that is spreading across the state. There's some legislation proposed both statewide and federal to try to support these services.

The thing is, as a doctor I love it,
because, I mean, I really do enjoy the law, I love
Law & Order, but, but this, I don't take care of
this, I want to be a doctor, and it is just so much
easier for me to say, okay, you have this problem,
go to the lawyer, you're going to get better medical
care for it.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What we need to do is to get you the funding so that you have lawyers to send these people, too.

DR. BLATT: That's right. Right now.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's what we're trying to do.

DR. BLATT: That's why we need this. We need the funding. And that the other thing I just want to point out is that we need more than just lawyers. We need to get lawyers to where the people are. You know that my patients, they may not know that they have a legal problem. They may have a legal problem — they may know they have a legal

problem, but they have had bad experiences in the past, either they lost or they were arrested or it's too confusing. And so lawyers are not sufficient.

We need to get the lawyers to where the people are, and we need to get people like doctors and schools, you know, the folks from Say Yes doing it in the schools. And we do work with them. We share a lawyer who helps oversee both programs, but it's more than just bodies, we need to get the bodies to the people who need them.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Great. Thank you so much. Any other questions? No? Okay.

Dr. Cerulli, who I know of your good work. Do you want to introduce yourself?

DR. CERULLI: Yes, I would. My name is
Kate Cerulli. And I'm with the laboratory of
Interpersonal Violence and Victimization at the
University of Rochester Department of Psychiatry. I
have been working in the field of intimate partner
violence since 1983. And I can tell you over my 27
years being an advocate, a shelter worker, taking
911 calls before they were routed to the centers,
and being a prosecutor, that civil legal services is
imperative in addressing the social problem.

I can also tell you as the Director of

the laboratory, that our past, present and current research projects including randomized control trials to help the court systems respond differently to social issues, that counsel is imperative for every one of the projects that we have been engaged with.

I'm going to focus for just a moment on intimate partner violence, which affects 23 percent of women nationally and seven percent of men. If you think about that in terms of having a house party, one in four people walking in the door is likely to be suffering such a situation.

Intimate partner violence lasts long beyond the physical abuse. It can result in sleep issues, depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, increased use of pain medications, long lasting physical, mental health consequences, which in the end cost our counties and communities money because that results in lost wages, lost work days, lost productivity, incarceration, and other, other situations that I will discuss momentarily.

In addition to the people I have just told you, one in four walking in the door, uncounted numbers of children also are involved in this issue. We can put someone on the moon, we can have space

labs where people live forever, but we cannot get a count of how many children are living in this country exposed to this issue. Children not only see the violence, they also are at higher risk experiencing the violence, having medical consequences themselves, and also have to watch the aftermath of the violence.

How this results in costs to our communities, these children end up having difficulties in school. They have health and mental health consequences, behavioral issues, and they are at risk for future victimization and potentially perpetration, which again is continuing the cycle which we know is intergenerational.

The healthcare system and legal system have become the frontline providers for this issue. For the legal system, we're still in the infant stage of our response only having started the past two or three decades.

We have no way of knowing what this issue is costing our communities. While the Center for Disease Control has promulgated certain figures, I believe they are a gross underestimation of the problem. The reason is because the Center For Disease Control forgot to look at our side of the

fence. They forgot to account for what it costs the community in terms of legal responses to this issue.

But it's important that we have legal responses to this issue because of the long-lasting consequences, not only to individuals but also to our communities. Domestic violence has documented connections with poverty, which has been talked about at great length. We have a connection to homelessness. Many of those people homeless are women and children. It raises landlord tenant issues, immigration issues. People who are fearful to come forward with their violence victimization experiences because they are afraid of deportation. Every single one of those issues in addition to accessing benefits, disability, and anything that they are entitled to, they will need legal counsel to help navigate these systems.

We recently, I will bring two cases to your attention. One, in which the victim had 12

Emergency Department visits in a very brief period of time, and a homicide in Monroe County in which the victim had 17 trips to the Emergency department before killing her abusive partner. While the Emergency departments can place band-aids on wounds, offer pain medication, treat em' and street em', the

Emergency departments are not able to offer the long-term curative effects to rid the family of this issue. Those things include custodial agreements, support, maintenance, divorces, protection order acquisition.

And why do I think protection order acquisition is so important? Because we know from the social science field, it is evidence based that correctly drafted protection orders can reduce injury in the future up to 70 percent. If we can reduce injury up to 70 percent, we will eradicate the need for multiple Emergency department visits, draw downs on Medicaid/Medicare costs, and we can actually have people most importantly lead healthier and better lives.

Our research in Monroe County documents that attorneys who are trained especially in intimate partner violence are likely to have better outcomes, however that is testimony for another day.

If we can provide these trained civil attorneys to provide services to these families across a host of their social issues, we can ameliorate the health consequences, the mental health consequences, reduce children exposed to violence and just provide better health.

In addition to accessing protection orders across the spectrum of courts that we currently offer, divorce is also an important remedy in many of these cases. We know again from social science research, which unfortunately at the time could not include New York, that easy access divorces reduced not only famacide and assault but also suicidal ideating for victims who are experiencing violence. Given the dramatic changes in divorce laws in New York in the recent past few months, we are offering people an empty envelope if we do not offer them civil legal services to help them with these new improved divorce laws.

Why is that important? A client I've been working with experienced 20 years of violence, had over 12 calls for police service to her house. She paid for her attorney, up to \$20,000, another attorney bill up to \$6,000, still no divorce papers filed, no custody agreement signed in her hand. It was not until VLSP took that woman's case that she finally had what I would consider access to quality care. Within a brief time with VLSP's attorney she is now in the process of filing papers which should have been filed almost two years. It is imperative that we continue to offer people these resources.

The cost of a civil legal attorney seems a low cost to bear for a healthier community both for victims, their children and the perpetrators as well. Short-term solutions using civil legal remedies can have big payoffs. It can help us keep people off of public assistance, keep their housing. In turn be able to keep, maintain stable employment. These are simply the first steps to the hierarchy of needs that we know everybody is entitled to.

I support your mission wholeheartedly that we provide access and funding for civil legal services. They play a critical role in the healthcare issue and have amazing opportunities to be collaborative partners in healthcare treatment plans.

We've already heard a little bit about the health education law partnerships, but I will tell you that we just started the first clinical service in a court that we know of offering onsite treatment and assistance for victims of violence suffering trauma. Again, we can do little to help their trauma if we can't help them secure adequate legal remedies as medical providers. Only through breaking the cycle of violence will we improve our community's health.

At some point if we don't offer civil legal services, we will pay one way or another. The way that we will pay will be increased homicides, increased healthcare costs, increased incarceration for perpetrators, if left for the violence to escalate, and the impact on children will be immeasurable in terms of dollars. It will only be measurable in terms of lost opportunities. It is important that we invest now or we will pay later. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. You know, one point that you raised, I think that's so important in talking about may in talking at a different times, it's not only civil legal services that give more lawyers, and more funding, it is that they really have to be trained in some of these areas that are very specialized. And you know, it's not as simple as just saying, gee, if we got a little more money we will be all right. We need money to put the right person in the right spot, whether it is in the doctor's office or in the domestic violence clinic. I mean, there are just so many issues that affect directly people's lives that even, even, you know, a competent lawyer isn't necessary equipped to deal with, and I think some

the issues you see are very much along those lines. 2 You know, state of the art kind of training. 3 MR. DOYLE: And the other thing we have 4 seen, Doctor, is from numbers of witnesses now is 5 that though the desire and the capacity for the 6 legal community to provide pro bono services is 7 really unmatched and is quite commendable. It's not sufficient. It's no way can be sufficient to 8 9 deal with these issues in terms of volume, or as the 10 Chief Judge suggests, in terms of specialized 11 training. We heard from some of the first witnesses 12 13 who had specialized problems with the CSE and 14 domestic violence, that, you know, even if they had 15 access to attorneys, that they didn't have the 16 concentration, the specialization in particular 17 areas such as you're talking about and such as the 18 doctor was talking about. 19 JUDGE LIPPMAN: And to have legal service 20 providers who have people in these different 21 specialties costs money. 22 DR. CERULLI: Yes. 23 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know, to get people to be able to allow them to have a specialty to 24

understand it, to really help people, you know, is a

whole organizational and educational, a challenge 2 for the providers. 3 MR. DOYLE: Doctor, the demographics of the people you're talking about who need these 4 5 services, they can't afford private attorneys. I 6 mean, if a law firm wanted to go out and create 7 itself as a law firm for domestic violence victims, they wouldn't be able to sustain itself 8 9 economically. 10 DR. CERULLI: Likely not. The issue with 11 the domestic violence affects all 12 socio-demographics, but I think that for people that 13 have resources, they can move out quicker, they can 14 secure housing quicker, in some way circumvent the problem, and they can afford the attorneys. 15 16 The individuals that I work with even if 17 they come from a middle class family, if they are 18 leaving in the middle of the night with the shirts 19 on their back, they have no access to their assets. 20 They can't even release enough of their funds to put 21 down a retainer. So even for those who have the 22 resources, it's different to have them and to have 23 access to them. 24 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Anything else?

Thank you so much. Again, I think that shows a wide impact that Legal Services has on so many different parts of our society.

Okay. The next panel will be a Judge's Panel. You'll get a firsthand view of the need for civil legal services. And so I would ask Judge Nowak, Judge McKinney, Judge Nesser, and Judge Winslow to come up to the witness table.

Your Honors, it is a pleasure to see you all, and I think you have a unique perspective to offer, as we saw yesterday in Manhattan, where we had a number of judges who came up and testified about civil legal services and how it impacts some what you all supposed to be doing. I know it is a little strange for you on the other side of the fence here, with the red lights and the white lights, usually go the other way, but you'll do the best that you can. So let's start out with Judge Nowak.

JUDGE NOWAK: Thank you, Judge Lippman.

It is a pleasure to be here. I am a housing Court

Judge in the City of Buffalo. I served in that

capacity for eight years now. And I preside over

all of the code violation cases in the city. But

more importantly to this panel since 2007 I presided

over approximately 7,700 evictions per year in the City of Buffalo.

In general, litigants in evictions have negative and often volatile relationships. By the time they come to court tenants and the landlords hate each other. They want to tell me the whole story. Or the court referee that's assigned to help me. The entire history of their relationship, which is now fractured to the point where they are at each others throats.

Ninety-five percent of the information they wish to share is irrelevant to the proceeding. Much of the information that they wish to share is against the interest of the individual who's speaking, especially if that's the tenant.

I have been fortunate since 2007 to have two programs that provide free legal services to tenants, and in fact, they represent over 90 percent of the tenants that are facing eviction in the City of Buffalo in my courtroom through two programs.

One through what is known as the Attorney of the Morning Program, that's funded by the Volunteer Lawyers Project, that's three days a week, and the other two days a week through Neighborhood Legal Services.

The attorney's ability to calm the clients down, narrow the issues, make appropriate motions, and most significantly negotiate settlements greatly reduces court time and achieves better results in the neighborhoods often saving the tenancies and saving the homes of the tenants with appropriate payment plans.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: When the lawyers not there, what does that do to you in the role that you're supposed to play in the courtroom.

JUDGE NOWAK: Well, the 95 percent of the story that's irrelevant comes out. And sometimes I end up ruling against someone because of what they said in court when they couldn't control themselves. It's not uncommon if I have a case, you know, one of those 10 percent of the cases where neither side is represented by an attorney, I often very quickly explain what happens at the end depending on who wins or loses ahead of time. And I do that in my own self-interest because I want to warn the parties ahead of time that you know, I know that you are angry with each other, I know that you're hating each other, I know that you're screaming at each other, I heard you in the hallway, but if you win landlord, and you're successful in getting your

judgment of possession of a warrant of eviction,

your tenant will be escorted out ten days from now

by city marshals. And what I of course am trying to

imply is if the tenant decides to put his current

hatred that he's clearly demonstrating for you into

your house that the tenant is currently residing in,

that takes ten minutes not ten days.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you feel your role as a judge is compromised when you have one side that does have an attorney and the other doesn't in terms of how you maintain neutrality when you have one side that's very vulnerable and the other side well represented by an attorney?

JUDGE NOWAK: Yes. Especially in a case where a landlord who has means to understand, owns property, they may own a number of properties, has an attorney and the a tenant has no attorney, there's certainly more of an equal playing field if the landlord is pro se and the tenant has counsel.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We had some of that yesterday where the judges were telling us that, you know, they are caught in the situation that challenges their role as an neutral arbiter and makes it very difficult so they can't be an advocate, you know, and yet you have this unequal

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

playing field so it's not productive in terms of, as 2 you say, the efficiency and the end result of what 3 the justice system must be there for. 4 JUDGE PFAU: And we heard particularly 5 with regard to Housing Corp., we're talking about if 6 the judge sees defenses that may be available to the 7 tenant that the tenant doesn't see, and where is the 8 judge's role in that, and how do you do justice? 9 JUDGE NOWAK: Yes. 10

JUDGE PFAU: Very challenging.

JUDGE NOWAK: That happens all the time. Especially in regards to warrant of habitability and totality of eviction. That happens all the time with pro se litigants where attorneys would pick those up and present them.

Just two other points I want to make very quickly. The Volunteer Lawyers Project has an operating budget of \$40,000 and they have a staff with that relatively meager of budget that recruits and trains pro bono attorneys that represent tenants about five hundred hours per year in my court. so the funds that they do receive are leveraged to the greatest extent that they possibly can.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: But think about what lawyers in the private sector earn and the amount of

money that's available for a program like this which is so vital. The \$40,000 doesn't necessarily go as far as we would like it.

JUDGE NOWAK: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: For the chairman.

JUDGE NOWAK: Absolutely. I think the time that the court would need to spend without those attorneys would greatly exceed \$40,000 in terms of judge time and court reporter time and all that.

The last point I would mention is we had a study in any courtroom in 2007 that was done by the University of Buffalo SUNY System Department of Family Medicine came into court. They operate a program known as Gold Choice, which is an arm of Medicaid in Erie County that serves mental illness. And it provides that. And the problem they presented me with in 2007 is that in order to stay on the Gold Choice Program, an individual receives a document in the mail. They need to fill it out and send it back. If that individual is evicted and if the mail is not forwarded properly, they lose their — they lose their benefit, their Gold Choice benefit to deal with their mental health issue.

Which then creates a myriad of other problems. So

24

25

they asked if they could just compare the docket sheets, track the system and everything else, see if they can catch anybody that may have been evicted so that they can try to find a better address, track them down, make sure they keep their benefits. said sure, you can watch the dockets, monitor the program. I thought they'd catch three or four people, help them out and that was it. They came to me February 2008 after conducting their sample and their survey and said, Judge, we looked at several hundred, took a sample of several hundreds individuals that were evicted in your court. have an estimate as to how many are part of the Gold Choice Program? And I said four or five? They said 27 percent that have documented mental illness as part of Gold Choice Program. Now, that's including anyone who may have fallen through the cracks, are not part of the Gold Choice Program and qualified for benefits. That's just the ones that they know 27 percent of the people evicted in the City of Buffalo based on the sample of 2007 have a documented mental illness.

So you look at that in terms of the attorneys ability to step in, help them, calm them down, and try to save their home, it shows it's even

more critical.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: With the idea that there are reasons why people come to the court.

JUDGE NOWAK: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: And to get to those underlying reasons is not quite as simple as one might seem. And, you know, the lawyers, certainly legal services can play a tremendous role but getting, you know, in peeling the layers and getting to what this is really all about and getting people the help that they need.

Okay. Judge McKinney? Delight to see you.

JUDGE MCKINNEY: It is a pleasure to be here. I'm Langston McKinney. I'm a sitting judge in Syracuse City Court. I've been doing it for the last 24 years.

I just want to just briefly state the following: I think there's a need for lawyers to be representing unrepresented individuals in the civil side, especially in the housing area.

One of the things that's overlooked by
like the volunteer lawyer program is the follow thru
that occurs after court. And a real significant
lacking point is that our volunteer lawyer program

does no trials. That's a little problem. Short term is a problem because if a case goes down for trial, the defendant's put at the mercy of having to secure the services of a lawyer, perhaps from Legal Services, in the neighborhood legal services in our community. And they don't have the full-time to prepare a defense and present a defense as a lawyer who had been on board originally.

That other area where follow thru is absolutely necessary is once a warrant of eviction issues or a stipulation occurs in court, there's very little supervision over the effectuation of the agreement as is made in court by someone who is of equal stature with the landlord.

There's a world of difference between a landlord who's appearing pro se and a tenant who's appearing pro se. A landlord is normally versed in all the practical and beneficial aspects of the RPAPL whereas most tenants aren't. And even, so the playing field is not even level there.

We have to intervene. We, being the judge who's presiding, just to try to ensure that the letter and spirit of the law is fulfilled without necessarily appearing overly or partial to the tenant.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right. And isn't that s difficult. In terms of the role we're supposed to have? You know.

JUDGE MCKINNEY: Not taking over the past few years just in general the landlord that I have, the origin of the landlord tenant law is principally and primarily to protect property and property owners. It's only been in the last hundred years or so that we have seen any kind of significant change, 50 years, more significant change that tip the law in favor of the tenant. I use that as a rationalization for saying the trend is to push the law more in the direction of the tenant so there's some liberty for me to not necessarily advocate, but to not be so willing to grant every single demand or request that the landlord makes.

And that's a segue into the last part of my little presentation here is I just think it is very, very important for you all to know that where we place judges in situations where people possibly and probably will not be represented by lawyers, it is absolutely imperative that the judge who presides have a full and sound working knowledge of the law. What it does, what it purports to do, what it was designed to do. Letter and spirit. And there's

some possibilities to intensify the level of 2 training or, in the words of your predecessor, 3 perhaps create a problem-solving court that 4 addresses that as being perhaps a community problem. 5 When we don't have the advocates for the 6 tenant on a wholesale basis, very little, if any, 7 law reform occurs. 8 I can tell you, I see people in my court 9 that I represented 30 years ago that work for Legal 10 Services, tenants and landlords, all right? And 11 it's just the housing stock in the community is not 12 enhanced at all unless there's a major force that 13 says there's little or no value in renting bad 14 property. And I think the pro bono sources, the 15 Legal Aid and legal services organizations have 16 little or insufficient resources to manage --17 JUDGE LIPPMAN: There's no question about 18 it. 19 JUDGE MCKINNEY: A mounting campaign that says let's try to improve the housing stock by 20 21 taking some of the worst offenders out of the 22 business, making it more difficult for them to 23 prevail in the landlord/tenant relationship in 24 court.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay. Thank you, Judge.

MR. DOYLE: Judge, I think that's an 1 2 important point you make. We have been focused so 3 far on the role of lawyers in these various settings 4 to help people enforce existing rights, so to speak, 5 that exist, but the people may not know how to 6 enforce them themselves. You're talking about the 7 lawyers role in terms of improving, pushing the 8 bounds of the law, helping perhaps even helping to 9 reform things. That's an important point. And 10 where those lawyers are there when the people can't 11 afford to have them or where there's a 12 well-intentioned, you know, pro bono voluntary 13 effort but perhaps there's inadequate training, 14 certainly inadequate man/woman power for the law, 15 it's not going to achieve those purposes. 16 JUDGE MCKINNEY: I think it is the 17 Court's responsibility in some way to not ignore 18 that, is a pivotal thing of what occurs. 19 JUDGE SCUDDER: Would the element being 20 like the criminal system essentially the housing 21 court where a tenant comes in and says here's my 22 situation and you'd say, okay, and we're going to 23 adjourn this and you go over and see X, Y and Z,

would that be the element or?

JUDGE MCKINNEY: Perhaps. But just from

24

25

the criminal side in a domestic violence situation, the arresting officer is responsible for advising the victim. Here's some advice that you have, here's the organization that you can contact to do something about effectuating your rights. There's no parallel on the civil side. Perhaps something just as simple as perhaps the legislature requiring that when you serve a summons or petition in a landlord/tenant proceeding, the petitioner has as advanced notice that says you got to get this thing in the lawyer's hands because you're going to be in court. And here yet the legal services that are available. If not, at least contact this person, perhaps at some other organization in town bear the responsibility for at least screening those.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I think one of the things that we're trying to do is to fashion a parallel to the criminal side. And we talked about Gideon on the criminal side and the spirit --

JUDGE MCKINNEY: Spirit.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: -- of Gideon on the civil side. So I think this is all something that we are, as Presiding Justice Scudder indicates, it would be the optimal if we can go in that direction.

So, Judge Nesser?

My name is Joe Nesser, and I've been on the bench,
the Monroe County Family Court bench for almost
three years. Prior to that I practiced in Family
Court for 21 straight years. I represented parents,
grandparents, aunts, uncles, and I handled almost
every type of case in Monroe County Family Court.
And I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak
here today.

Can you manage an indigent litigant who is usually from a low socioeconomic class, probably without a high school diploma and unable to articulate their position. Imagine further that they are in a custody trial and they are the better parent. The standard in Family Court is the best interests of the child. The child's best interests are not going to be served by having a litigant represent themselves since they cannot properly prepare and try a case.

While in private practice I represented many litigants pro bono in Family Court through the Volunteer Legal Services Program, VLSP. They were non-parents attempting to gain custody of children who were not adequately cared for by their parents. Histories were obtained, disclosure was prepared and

exchanged. There were many court appearances, and you never just get in and out of Family Court. It's always a long wait. Settlement negotiations were engaged in and sometimes you had to engage in an emotional trial, a battle, if you will. Presenting evidence and challenging evidence during trial requires legal and practical knowledge, experience and trial preparation and trial skills that pro se --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Particularly in Family Court. Isn't it a world into itself, it is a very different place than some of our other courts.

JUDGE NESSER: Yes. By emotion, when you're talking about children and who gets custody, it is high emotion.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Isn't it funny that, not funny, but ironic that the part of our court system that so affects the most critical things in our lives, our families, our children, is so often so prevalent that there aren't lawyers representing people. It seems odd.

JUDGE NESSER: Right. But the non-parent litigants are at a disadvantage because they have to prove extraordinary circumstances as well as best interests. These are difficult hurdles.

There's a presumption that parents should take care of their own children. The majority of the litigants I represent were successful and these happy endings would not have come to fruition without an attorney.

I want to mention one attorney in particular, his name is Steve Levitsky. He just finished the case not too long ago. He was pro bono through VLSP. He represented a maternal grandmother trying to get custody of her three grandchildren who had different fathers. The fathers were all out-of-state. And he just did a, just did an unbelievable job in locating them and then getting them served. And there's no way this lady would have had a shot if he wasn't representing her. And fortunately she got custody of all three children.

Just a couple other points. The Court must take extra measures to explain procedures and what is happening to pro se litigants without any guarantee that the litigants even understand what the court is talking about. This extra time created by unrepresented litigants adds to the already unduly burdensome dockets that Family Court judges have.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You know, we ask the same

1	to the judges that talk about housing issues. Does
2	it compromise your position? You're trying to be
3	the neutral arbiter and you have people without
4	attorneys, and basics, the basics of their life are
5	going to be so impacted, and yet, you know, who are
6	you? The judge, the advocate, the educator, you
7	know?
8	JUDGE NESSER: I would agree with that.
9	I mean, I think there's a tendency for people to
10	want to represent the underdog, and the people who
11	are pro se are underdogs. So I, you try to keep
12	JUDGE LIPPMAN: But that makes it very,
13	very
14	JUDGE NESSER: It is difficult.
15	JUDGE LIPPMAN: strained.
16	JUDGE NESSER: You want to be fair.
17	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly. You want to be
18	the neutral arbiter.
19	JUDGE NESSER: You know, you're supposed
20	to, if somebody's representing themselves, they are
21	supposed to be held to that same standard as an
22	attorney, but it is very difficult.
23	JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's not the way that
24	our system serves.
25	JUDGE SCUDDER: To say that you bend over

1	backwards, I have been in Family Court a lot, I
2	think you do flips for them. Wouldn't you agree
3	with that? In order to try to make it fair. I
4	mean
5	JUDGE NESSER: I try to be fair. How's
6	that?
7	And as a result of the economic
8	recession, there has been a significant increase in
9	the number of custody, family offenses, and child
10	court petitions. There were 1,600 filing increase
11	in the past two years alone in Monroe County Family
12	Court. Volunteer Legal Services Project clients
13	increased 35 percent from 2005 to 2009, from 1,640
14	cases to 2,220. 48 percent were in Family Court.
15	And of the parties that come before me, 90 percent
16	qualify for full representation.
17	Not to belabor the point, I think it's
18	just imperative that the best interests of the
19	children are protected and that New York State
20	maintains strong public financial support for these
21	programs.
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: It goes to the fabric of
23	our society.
24	JUDGE NESSER: Absolutely.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That you see every day.

JUDGE NESSER: Absolutely. So I want to thank you for this opportunity.

JUDGE PFAU: Just from kind of an efficiency point of view, Family Court is before the cases are growing, we know that you are seeing more and more cases added to the extent that you have people that have to represent themselves, does it prolong the case? Do you have more appearances? Each appearance takes longer because you're trying to --

JUDGE NESSER: Many of these pro se litigants don't even know how to get the petition served. And often, yeah, I served them. Well, you can't serve them, you have to have someone who's not a party at least 18 years of age serve them, and you have to provide me with an Affidavit of Service just to get out of the house.

JUDGE NESSER: Yeah. From start to finish, it takes a lot of extra time, and it is really they are at a disadvantage and that's very unfortunate.

JUDGE PFAU: From the very beginning.

MR. DOYLE: Judge, Judge Nowak had mentioned in his housing court, landlord/tenant particularly that the representation of a lawyer can

1	often sort of calm things a little bit in that
2	there's a high level of emotion in those cases. I
3	know there is in Family Court as well. Do you
4	witness the same thing?
5	JUDGE NESSER: Most of the attorneys are
6	very good in trying to just be professional about it
7	and just stick to the facts and try to keeping the
8	emotion out and not going down to the level of the
9	emotion that their clients have. So I would
10	definitely agree with that.
11	MR. DOYLE: And it's really a security
12	issue worst case scenario.
13	JUDGE NESSER: It's a security issue and
14	it helps to set up cases where people are thinking
15	reasonably and calmly and rationally.
16	MR. DOYLE: As lawyers are supposed to do
17	at least?
18	JUDGE NESSER: Yes, most of the lawyers.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Okay.
20	Judge Winslow?
21	JUDGE WINSLOW: I'm Joanne Winslow. I'm
22	a Supreme Court Justice serving here in Rochester.
23	Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you about
24	this all-important issue.
25	In particular I wanted to talk to you

3 4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about how our current economy and this issue colliding, how it effects the everyday workings in our courtrooms, particularly our courtroom.

Currently, I have men and woman coming through the doors of the courtroom and they carry with them a wide range of emotions. Sometimes they are worried, sometimes they are frustrated, sometimes they are even fearful. They are scared and they are worried because they come to the courthouse not knowing things like whether or not they'll lose their children, whether they'll be able too put the food on the table for themselves and for their children, and whether they'll be able to keep a roof over their head and clothes on their backs. The litigants who come to my courtroom, for those who have been married a long time, their issues are slightly different. Their children are now grown and they are on their own, and instead they are worried about if they'll be able to retire or afford sufficient healthcare coverage at a time when they will likely to need it the most. These are the fears and emotions of litigants who come into my courtroom who have lawyers.

Add to that for the pro se litigants those same fears, but also not knowing where to sit

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

once they walk in the courtroom door. Not knowing what's important to say. Not knowing how to say it. Not knowing what is relevant. Not being able to know how they can explain to the judge what they are most concerned about. Not knowing how to properly present what relief it is they are looking for, or how to oppose what relief their opponent is looking for.

A pro se litigant who has to face an opponent who is represented by counsel, as Judge Nesser said, is at a distinct disadvantage in a forum where important issues such as I've mentioned are decided on a daily basis. Issues to be decided like where are the children going to be living? How much time will each parent get to spend with the children. How much money will each parent have to spend on housing, food, car, clothing, monthly expenses for themselves and the children. Healthcare coverage. What happens if a Court orders the following? How does the pro se litigant handle that? How do they know what to do about it. What if someone falls behind in the payments that they so desperately need in order to make their obligations, in order to put clothes on the kid's back and food on the table.

In many ways a person who represents

themselves pro se against a litigant with counsel is

like speaking a foreign language and not having the

benefit of an interpreter. The pro se litigant

doesn't know where to begin and they simply don't

have the ability to do so.

Now, imagine both litigants, and this is happening more and more, appearing pro se in my courtroom. The process becomes much more onerous and inherently unfair. And, Chief Administrative Judge Pfau, just as you mentioned, it becomes much lengthier, requires much more patience, requires many more adjournments, and lengthens the process. It is fraught with potential for error.

And as you have stated, Chief Judge

Lippman, remaining in the position of the neutral

arbiter becomes much, much more difficult. It's not
impossible, but it is very difficult and very time
consuming.

In a case without an attorney there is neither any knowledge or ability, and as the doctor from Syracuse mentioned, when you come to poverty, it is not just the issue of not having money, it is the lack of education, and that lack of education is what really trips us up.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you think people have a right to an attorney? What's the answer here? We know that we need to fund Legal Services much more than we have. You know as a society, as a government, what's the answer in the long run?

I think Judge Scudder asked a little bit of the context before. Do people have to have an attorney in these cases?

JUDGE WINSLOW: Well, certainly as you mention in comparison, in the criminal realm I have a great deal of past experience in, in the criminal realm, absolutely. In the civil realm, they should.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: What we're trying to do, one of the things that we've been talking about is where do you draw the line? And one of the things that the task force is going to be dealing with is in what cases must you have an attorney?

We've used the buzz words or framed it as when you're dealing with the necessities of life or the fundamentals of life, you must have an attorney. Do you think it would be hard to draw? What does that mean? How do you draw the line because, you know, there isn't enough money in the world to provide representation on every case to everybody no matter what it is. But yet we know right from

1	wrong, and we know that there are certain kinds of
2	cases that you must have an attorney.
3	Or as it was said, getting in on the
4	criminal side, it is an obvious truth that you can't
5	get your day in court. When you're dealing with the
6	kinds of issues that you're dealing with, these
7	critical issues, you're looking and say, boy, they
8	really have to have an attorney, right?
9	JUDGE WINSLOW: Certainly.
10	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Is that your experience?
11	JUDGE WINSLOW: If I had to draw that
12	line?
13	JUDGE LIPPMAN: If you had to draw that
14	line in the kind of cases you're talking about.
15	JUDGE WINSLOW: If I could draw that
16	line, I certainly would say in all contested cases,
17	but if you ask me to also write the check, that
18	would be tougher.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yeah. And that's one of
20	the things that the task force is going to grapple
21	with is that what are the cases that you have to
22	have an attorney.
23	JUDGE WINSLOW: Well, I certainly think
24	where there are children involved. Already we're
25	doing out best to do that. Legal Aid oftentimes

becomes available because of children being involved
and the cases amount VLSP rise to the top of the
list because there are children involved.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: I mean, we've made a little bit of progress on the family and matrimonial side in this area. Not all the time, but a good, you know, amount of progress. But as we have seen today civil legal services cuts over so many lines in society with almost every issue one could possibly think of is affected and has the need for representation by trained lawyers.

Dr. Cerulli indicated in her comments in her testimony about how you can reduce the cost, by spending the money now, you reduce the cost later. The same is true here. If you had someone who was going through a divorce and who didn't have children and there were financial issues which now are critical in our divorce cases, the amount of debt is unmanageable. But if the money doesn't get spent now to protect that person's rights, they are going to become a public charge down the road.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, that's the common theme that we have heard in two days of testimony now. It's not only because this is right or this is

today. Thank you.

a moral obligation or an ethical obligation, it goes 2 to the bottom line. 3 JUDGE SCUDDER: It is interesting as a 4 society, we seem to draw that line somewhat with the 5 interplay between Family Court and then other civil 6 courts. I mean, we recognize that need in family, I 7 remember in the olden days we used to assign counsel 8 in Family Court, they go to matrimonial, no longer 9 could have the counsel, so we'd send back that part 10 to Family Court so they'd have an attorney. 11 been remedied somewhat, I realize. But at least 12 that's the start, wouldn't you say? That we have 13 already have that block there of when you have to 14 have an attorney, now we can build on that block? 15 JUDGE WINSLOW: True. 16 JUDGE SCUDDER: Would you agree with 17 that? 18 JUDGE WINSLOW: I would agree but I think 19 that those building blocks need to keep growing. 20 JUDGE SCUDDER: That's what I'm saying. 21 Yeah, okay. 22 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Anything else? I want to 23 thank you all. You're terrific. We appreciate what 24 you do every day, and we appreciate you coming in

1	JUDGE WINSLOW: Thank you.
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Now we are going to have
3	one of the local business leaders, who is a panel of
4	one.
5	Yes? Oh, paper change.
6	Come on up, Mr. Richards.
7	We have an equipment change over here.
8	The Court needs money to replace antiquated
9	equipment, you know.
10	COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
11	JUDGE LIPPMAN: You're welcome.
12	Okay. Come on up, Mr. Richards. So now
13	it is my pleasure to introduce Thomas Richards,
14	Esquire, he's currently the Corporation Counsel for
15	the City of Rochester, a former partner at Nixon
16	Peabody, and a former CEO of Rochester Gas &
17	Electric. Pleasure to see you and thank you.
18	MR. RICHARDS: I am a panel of one. I
19	feel like the fortunate litigant whose case was
20	called by Justice Scudder and the opposition didn't
21	show. It's never happened to me before. It's just
22	my luck when there's no case here. I draw this
23	luck. I will do the best that I can.
24	JUDGE LIPPMAN: You have free reign.
25	MR. RICHARDS: Yes, thank you. Maybe the

reason I am a panel of one here is that I think that I have the opportunity to approach this from three different perspectives in my life. Almost 38 years ago I started Nixon Hargrave and now Nixon Peabody, and in my 20 years there I was an appointed Law Guardian for a while. I served on the Volunteer Legal Services Project panel, and on whose board I still serve. Eventually I became a managing partner of that firm and I had some responsibility for setting up the policy and practice with respect to pro bono legal services that that firm provided.

I left that firm in the 1990's to join RG&E, which is the utility for this region, and eventually became a CEO. RG&E is the supplier of essential services with a mandated obligation to serve, and so as a result, it is constantly dealing with people who not only have difficulty understanding the rules and regulations that entitle them to utility service, but also whose interaction with the legal system itself in a myriad of ways often incapacitates them with dealing with the everyday obligations of their life.

For the past four and a half years I have served as the Corporation Counsel for the City of Rochester. It's a city with a substantial number of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

people who do not have the financial means to engage in legal profession in a conventional manner. This position has given me yet another perspective on the difficulties that people experience when they try to deal with the laws and regulations that govern all of our lives.

So as a result of my experience in each of those positions and sort of the combined perspective it's given me or I hope it's given me, I would like to suggest the following to the panel:

The need and importance of competent civil legal assistance is not proportionate to a person's ability to afford it. However, that is the basic mechanism by which we allocate such service This applies not only to the quantity of today. service but to the sophistication of it as well. The inability to deal with the civil, legal and regulatory problems can be every bit as difficult and devastating to a family, as you heard from people who are more qualified than I, in many criminal problems. For criminal problems, we recognize that people can't be left on their own. However, for civil problems, but for an often poorly funded and largely volunteer effort, people are often on their own with unfortunate and sometimes

unfair consequences.

Now, the consequences of inadequate access to civil legal service is not just borne by the individual who needs it. It is a burden on the legal system, on civil society, and very often on the very entity or individual, no matter how well represented, who's on the other side of that issue.

Individuals wandering around the legal or regulatory system without proper guidance make it difficult for everybody. Relatively simple aspects of the process take more time and are more likely to be adjourned or repeated. The outcome is less likely to be understood and accepted by the unrepresented party, even if there's a resolution that's been offered. All of this adds time and frustration and expense that's borne by everyone and ultimately by society with a less effective legal system.

I have also concluded that access to civil legal service will not result from the present system. That depends on a various underfunded and inconsistently funded agencies and the volunteer efforts of attorneys.

There were two words there. One that you have heard a lot about here, that is "unfunded," but

1	the other one is "consistent."
2	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Consistent is very
3	important.
4	MR. RICHARDS: In many respects I think
5	it is almost as important. As I have been involved
6	in this through my career and particularly on the
7	boards of VLSP, I see this system staggering from
8	year to year without any consistency and so the
9	ability to plan, the ability to provide some
10	effective system is hampered by that.
11	And, you know, the State of New York has
12	accepted, to its credit, some level for
13	responsibility for this periodically.
14	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Here and there.
15	MR. RICHARDS: Here and there. It has
16	not been a very reliable partner. I mean, this
17	isn't the only place that's true, but it is
18	certainly true here.
19	JUDGE LIPPMAN: But let's cut
20	MR. RICHARDS: We're not here for that
21	hearing, though, are we?
22	JUDGE LIPPMAN: They have their own
23	problems. Let's cut to the chase.
24	MR. RICHARDS: Yeah.
25	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Why shouldn't civil legal

services be funded out of the public fisc, out of
the general fund of this state, the same way so many
other critical functions in society are funded? Why
not? Why doesn't that make total sense?

MR. RICHARDS: Well, I think it does make

MR. RICHARDS: Well, I think it does make sense. I think that it is very hard to measure the other consequence. The other consequence has money attached to it, too. The inefficiency of the system, the time and effort it takes, the inadequacy of the process, and the result, which often has to get repeated. Those are all -- all have monetary consequence because they are not added up anyplace. We don't know where they are.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: We had yesterday we had people similar to you spend much of their lives in the business world, from the real estate to the landlord side, from the banks, the big banks, Citibank testified yesterday. The big hospitals, they are all saying not only should it be, but it affects our bottom line.

MR. RICHARDS: Oh, yeah, it clearly does.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Economically.

MR. RICHARDS: It clearly does. And you're going to have to make some choices because if we attack this as from only a principle, they are

reciprocal process. 2 JUDGE LIPPMAN: I agree with you. 3 MR. RICHARDS: You're not going to get 4 this done. 5 JUDGE LIPPMAN: I agree with you. 6 MR. RICHARDS: And what you're trying to 7 do very nice to your credit is to get something We have been talking about this for a long 8 9 time. 10 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Forever. 11 MR. RICHARDS: Ever since I got admitted 12 to the bar, we've been talking about this. So I 13 think we're going to have to make some choices. And I don't know any better than you how to make those 14 choices, but I think there are certain elements of 15 16 the process that affect the capacity of an 17 individual or a family to go about their ordinary lives that we need to provide lawyers for. 18 Family Court is the obvious example. 19 20 Housing court is another example. But there are 21 others, there are others. We don't have to provide 22 lawyers for negligence cases in the beginning. I 23 mean, I'm trying to make a simple example. 24 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Exactly right, try to

draw lines, that's what we were talking about

before. 2 MR. RICHARDS: Right. But using that 3 then we need to get a consistent funding stream. 4 needs to get into the state budgeting process in a 5 way that these agencies can count on it. 6 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Not dependent on the 7 interest rate today or tomorrow. MR. RICHARDS: Right, right. Which is a 8 9 very nice thing while it worked, you know. 10 JUDGE PFAU: And that needs the support 11 of the business community. MR. RICHARDS: It does. It does. 12 This 13 is a tough time to start talking about adding expense for anything. It's not very popular right 14 15 now, to talk about increasing the cost of anything. 16 Increasing the cost of government is being rejected 17 all over the place. 18 JUDGE LIPPMAN: But no one would suggest 19 let's not fund the schools anymore. 20 MR. RICHARDS: No, no. But, you know, I 21 think we have an obligation, therefore, to explain 22 why this makes sense, not only from a theoretical fairness of justice obligation. 23 JUDGE LIPPMAN: You're right. 24

MR. RICHARDS: But why it makes sense

1	from the point of view of the administration of
2	justice and that fact that you're going to pay for
3	it anyway in the process.
4	JUDGE LIPPMAN: One way or the other,
5	yep.
6	MR. RICHARDS: And most people who are
7	responsible in this system will accept that. There
8	are those who won't. You know, that's always the
9	case. But I think most people who are responsible
10	in the system will accept that.
11	But it's also why the initial proposal, I
12	think, is very important to make sure the initial
13	proposal as concrete and as reasonable as possible.
14	JUDGE LIPPMAN: The task force is
15	designed to do just that.
16	MR. RICHARDS: It's tough to do.
17	JUDGE LIPPMAN: To realize, which we do,
18	that we don't live in a vacuum.
19	MR. RICHARDS: Right.
20	JUDGE LIPPMAN: And we understand the
21	world around us. But we also understand, and these
22	hearings are all about that, heightening the
23	sensitivity level in this state of the why this is
24	so important, why this needs to be done, and why you
25	need public monies to do it.

23

24

25

MR. RICHARDS: There is one other aspect 1 2 of this that I think would help in that regard. If 3 we're going to fund these things, then and it is 4 going to be public money, then it is perfectly 5 reasonable to hold those people who receive that 6 money accountable for their performance. And that's 7 very much in vogue today as well. 8 In our particular community, a good 9 example of that exists with a combination of the 10 various assorted legal assistance programs who exist 11 today largely because they are connected to an 12 income stream someplace, revenue stream someplace, 13 who now are all in one building, who share a lot of 14 resources. 15 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes, it is a great 16 example. 17 MR. RICHARDS: Somebody comes in the 18 front door, they don't have to wander around town as 19 they did, you know, not long ago trying to find the 20 right place and who can help them, and over time 21 these agencies in Rochester have developed different

JUDGE LIPPMAN: That's what we've been talking about, yeah.

expertise, so they have a reason --

MR. RICHARDS: I think the part that will

1	help, quite frankly, sell it, and I also think it is
2	a reasonable expectation. And we're not, we can't
3	just plow more money into a fractured system and
4	expect to get the return for that. That's
5	reasonable in today's world.
6	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Accountability is an
7	appropriate word and very much a part of this, this
8	puzzle. What those funds are needed for, where they
9	are needed, how they are going to be spent, and I
10	think the whole package needs to be together.
11	MR. RICHARDS: Right, right. Yes, sir.
12	Thank you.
13	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. Appreciate
14	it.
15	The last witness for today will be also a
16	panel of one. C. Kenneth Perri, Esq., who's the
17	Executive Director of Legal Assistance of Western
18	New York.
19	Mr. Perri, it's a delight to see you.
20	MR. PERRI: Thank you, Judge. And thank
21	you panelists, and I thank you for having me at this
22	hearing and more importantly for having the hearing.
22 23	hearing and more importantly for having the hearing. It is very, very important for the low income people

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Tell us the area that you

cover? 2 MR. PERRI: Okay. My program is Legal 3 Assistance of Western, New York. We have a 14 4 county service area. And it's seven staffed offices 5 provides services to low income people in 14 6 counties. And I will tell you where they are 7 located. They are in Bath, Elmira, Geneva, Ithaca, Jamestown, Olean, and Rochester. 8 JUDGE LIPPMAN: So much of it rural. 9 10 MR. PERRI: Thirteen of the counties are 11 rural. We have the urban center here in Rochester. 12 JUDGE LIPPMAN: One of them the County of 13 Presiding Justice Scudder, very important. MR. PERRI: That's correct. 14 15 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Garden spot of America. 16 MR. PERRI: And the 13 rural counties are 17 an incredibly large geographic expanse. They are a little over 9,070 square miles, bigger than five 18 19 states, including the states of Connecticut and New 20 Jersey. 21 A little bit about what is going on in 22 those 13 rural counties right now. 23 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Yes, tell us. 24 MR. PERRI: The poverty population as of

2008, in 2008 the poverty population in New York

State, the rate was 13.7 percent. In those 13 counties we have 129,000 people living below the poverty level, largely rural counties with the poverty population in some of the counties and one county nearly 18 percent, so that's one out of every five people. In two counties it was 17 percent, and in three others we were over the state rate 13.7 percent. You know that the Census Bureau released new poverty figures earlier this month and the rate in New York State has gone up from 13.7 to 15.3.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: So how do you deliver civil legal services in a rural environment? And where are you getting the money for them? And what is the gap in that funding? I don't mean in a monetary way.

MR. PERRI: Okay. We deliver civil legal services through a staff attorney model. We have seven staff offices, attorneys and paralegals.

Their efforts are supplemented by some pro bono work, but it's very difficult to recruit pro bono attorneys in rural counties.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: You probably don't have a large number of attorneys.

MR. PERRI: There is not a large number.

And the attorneys who are in private practice in the

rural counties are in very, very small firms, two to five is the average size of the firm. Many are sole practitioners, and among the sole practitioners many don't have support staff and, you know, answer their own phones.

So it is very, very difficult to, although some do, it is very, very difficult for them to accept extended service cases where they have to provide representation on something contested.

We have found it to be very effective to use pro bono attorneys to staff clinics. And a good example is in our Geneva office, which serves five counties. We have matrimonial clinics in four counties. So attorneys meet one-on-one with people who will wind up in court pro se, that they meet one-on-one with the Petitioner in a matrimonial action to prepare the pleadings to commence the action. Then the papers are filed, the defendant gets served, and then they meet again one-on-one to prepare the papers necessary to get the Judgment Roll. And the Clerk's know about our program and know who the pro se people who are coming from our program.

But the screening or the triaging to get

those people, our client into the clinic is -- it has to be an uncontested matter as far as we could tell or it won't work on a pro se basis. And child support and child custody issues already have had to have been resolved in Family Court. And so there's the whole world of the contested matrimonial for low income people that we just can't even touch, either with our staff or with pro bono attorneys.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Now, when we were talking about drawing a line as to what is, what are the necessities of life, what kind of cases are they going to require an attorney, you may not be able to draw the line, but I bet you know you that you're not covering a lot of cases that are involved in necessities.

MR. PERRI: Correct. I believe that included on the correct side of that line should be any cases, of course, involving children but also cases involving housing. And let me tell you --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Well, focus on one side.

MR. PERRI: Let me tell you how we have to triage on housing. If it is a private landlord/tenant case on a month to month basis, the chances of them getting extended representation from our program are minimal. We screen to and we court

priority to people who live in public or subsidized the housing because their rents are affordable and often that housing stock is considerably better than the private stock. And if they lose their subsidy, then they are in the private market and will find themselves in situations where they can't pay rent because they can't afford it and will wind up homeless.

There's some statistics in my testimony about the number of mobile home parks and mobile home lots, manufactured homes, I'm sorry, in our 13-county service area. And when a mobile home owner rents a lot and can't pay the lot rent and gets evicted, they often are unable to move the mobile home. And so they lose all of their investment in their home.

MR. PERRI: We had a grant which is phasing out from the Division of Housing and Community Renewal to provide representation. My light already? In cases --

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Keep going.

MR. PERRI: In cases involving foreclosures, but the limitation on the funding was that they had to be sub prime mortgages. So our

1	rural offices are now providing representation to
2	low income homeowners who have sub prime mortgages.
3	That funding ends in November. We are going to have
4	to have a serious discussion, actually next
5	Wednesday when we are meeting to talk about what we
6	will do in that area without funding.
7	JUDGE LIPPMAN: How do you know how much
8	money you have in any given year? Do you have an
9	expectation?
10	MR. PERRI: It's very erratic.
11	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Do you live hand to
12	mouth, or do you have an expectation, I'm going to
13	get X amount of dollars this year.
14	MR. PERRI: We do budget for those
15	funding streams that have been reasonably secure and
16	we did that this year.
17	JUDGE LIPPMAN: Like what?
18	MR. PERRI: We are a legal services
19	corporation grantee, we are an IOLA grantee so we
20	have an estimate of what we will get from IOLA. I
21	would be remiss if we did not thank you as a
22	community for the one time IOLA rescue funds this
23	year.
24	We have five. There are different
25	programs at different funding streams from the

state. My program has about five or six that were 2 severely cut from this year's budget. I will just 3 rattle off. The Department of State cut 72 percent. 4 Legal Services Assistance Fund, 10 percent. Others: 5 Homelessness prevention, supplemental homelessness 6 prevention, state and federally-funded cut 26 and 78 7 percent. And there was extended discretionary money 8 that we got last year which was also cut 72 percent. 9 We budgeted that as revenue we were not 10 expecting. We were hoping for static funding, and 11 the history has been that we have gotten static 12 funding. So we budgeted that, and those cuts from my program totalled a little more than a half 13 million dollars, \$505,000 to be exact on an 14 annualized basis. 15 16 JUDGE LIPPMAN: How does that translate 17 impact on what you can do for these people in these cases in the broader sense that affect the 18 fundamentals of their lives? 19 20 MR. PERRI: That translates into about 21 eight full-time attorney positions in my program 22 concerning salary and benefits. 23 JUDGE LIPPMAN: How many do you have 24 total?

MR. PERRI: We have 49 attorneys,

25

including in Rochester.

JUDGE LIPPMAN: Right.

MR. PERRI: And that's about at least 1,200 to 1,500 fewer families that will be served because of those cuts.

MR. DOYLE: Ken, how disruptive is it to you running the program to worry each year and not just worry but to have to plan, to have to spend your own and other people's resources, whether it be lobbying, begging, pleading, worrying about whether a grant is going to be coming from this entity, that entity, the state, the federal, how much of your time, worry, attention, does it take away from what you could be doing?

MR. PERRI: Significant amounts. And I can speak for all of the project directors.

Significant amounts of every project director's time. If we could devote the time that we have to spend just shoring up our state funding year after year after year to doing fundraising in other venues, foundations, other federal grants, we would be richer, we would be richer if there was consistency with what New York State does. And more clients would be served.

JUDGE SCUDDER: Does it affect your

ability to hire?

MR. PERRI: It's difficult to recruit attorneys for a number of reasons. One is, and this is another infrastructure problem that's going to have to be dealt with, is our starting salaries. We offer an entry level attorney starting salary of \$38,500.

And although we get those entry level attorneys two or three years out when they are trained and when they are buying their first home and starting a family, they can't afford to work for us.

And now the National Association of Law Placement issued a report earlier this month that shows to me that my program is in serious trouble because the national entry level attorneys' salaries is \$42,000 a year on average in civil legal services programs. And the legal services corporation grantees are on 43,000 on average. So we're going to need funding to abate that. And 42 and \$43,000 really is not adequate either.

MR. DOYLE: The ABA is that the average law student comes out and has to earn \$66,000 a year just to be able to pay off their student loans and to live.

1	MR. PERRI: Right. But that wasn't your
2	question.
3	JUDGE SCUDDER: What my question really
4	was, why would I go to work for a place that didn't
5	know if it was going to have any money to pay me?
6	MR. PERRI: The people that we're
7	recruiting actually do. We have been very fortunate
8	to find attorneys who really do have a deep level of
9	commitment to abating poverty to the clients that we
10	serve and doing this kind of work.
11	JUDGE SCUDDER: It certainly would make
12	it easier to know if you knew you had a constant
13	stream and could graduate up the number of years be
14	paid X amount, that type of thing.
15	MR. PERRI: We do have a salary scale
16	that is structured in steps, but the increments are
17	\$1,200 a year. So add \$1,200 a year to \$38,500, and
18	it is ten or twelve years out until you earn 50 or
19	55,000.
20	JUDGE PFAU: You also have to address
21	growing areas of expertise that you are going to
22	MR. PERRI: Correct.
23	JUDGE PFAU: I mean, a few years ago
24	there was some foreclosure issues, now there are
25	significant

MR. PERRI: Correct. My program did 1 2 minimal foreclosure work four years ago, and now we 3 have people that if I were foreclosed on. I would 4 want them representing me. They have become quite 5 experts. Mark Wanenberg in Bath handles quite a 6 number of a significant amount of those cases. 7 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you. 8 MR. PERRI: Thank you, Judge. 9 JUDGE LIPPMAN: Thank you so much. I 10 think that it brings it down to the grass roots 11 level to hear your testimony. 12 I just want to end this hearing by -- I 13 think we all should be thinking about looking at the many different areas, the breadth of what civil 14 15 Legal Services does in this, this particular area in 16 the state. I mean, just to touch on it, and I don't 17 18 pretend to say that civil legal services is going to 19 cure all the ills of the world. I'm not sure any of 20 us are going to do that. But the problems of 21 disabled, of immigrants, of minorities, poverty, the 22 elderly, rural New York, incarceration rates, health 23 benefits, the well-being of our businesses, future 24 jobs and employment, debt collection, the 25 foreclosures, evictions, education at the grade

school level, at the college and university level, the well-being of our families, domestic violence, domestic abuse, custody cases, a divorce, homelessness, all of just so many of the very essence of what was supposed to be as a society is fostered by our legal service providers and having the monies to support legal services in this state, the provision of civil legal services again in issues that cover this, this, our lives. That cover what we're all about, what our society is supposed to be about. So I found these, this hearing particularly elucidating in that regard.

We know that there are so many reasons to support a stable, and the word consistent that was used, stream of funding that should come up out of the public pocket because this is all about the public, and this is about the public's well-being, our societies well-being. All of the different entities within that society. And I think we have to, I think these hearings are the kind of testimony that we had today, will so much help us to make the case to again what I believe to put together what will be the most comprehensive report of its kind in the country, justify why this issue should be prioritized and say, look, this is, in these

difficult times, a question of prioritizing what is 2 important to our state, to our society. 3 And I don't think -- I think there are 4 things maybe that we can say are equally important, 5 but I don't think that there's anything more important than the provision of civil legal services 6 7 when our citizens are confronted with issues and cases and legal problems that affect the very basics 8 9 of their lives. 10 So I thank you all for being here. 11 terrific panel that really does represent the 12 leadership of the court system and the legal 13 profession in this state. I want to thank all of the witnesses who 14 15 I think was really, again the light goes on when you 16 hear some of their stories and why this is 17 important. And I thank all of you for coming. And I 18 19 welcome you if you want to go around the state with 20 us to our next hearings, but we are very much 21 appreciative of your being here. And the next stop 22 will be in Albany next week. So thank you all. 23 Appreciate it. 24 (The hearing adjourned at 1:38 p.m.)

1	137
2	CERTIFICATION
3	
4	I, JANINE J. VASCUKYNAS, do hereby
5	certify that I am an Official Senior Court Reporter of the
6	Seventh Judicial District, at Rochester, County of Monroe,
7	State of New York, duly appointed;
8	That I reported in stenotype shorthand
9	the proceedings had on the 28th day of September, 2010.
10	In the matter of the Task Force to Expand Access to Civil
11	Legal Services in New York;
12	And that the transcript, herewith
13	numbered pages 5 through 136, is a true, accurate, correct
14	and complete record of those machine shorthand notes.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	JANINE J. VASCUKYNAS, RPR, CSR
22	
23	Dated this 6th day of
24	October 2010, at
25	Rochester, New York.