

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MEETING OF THE
FINANCE COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

Monday, April 15, 2013

3:40 p.m.

Legal Services Corporation
McCalpin Conference Center
3333 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robert J. Grey Jr., Chairperson
Sharon L. Browne
Laurie Mikva
Martha L. Minow
Father Pius Pietrzyk, O.P.
Robert E. Henley Jr. (Non-Director member)
Allan J. Tanenbaum (Non-Director member)
John G. Levi, ex officio

OTHER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Charles N.W. Keckler
Victor B. Maddox
Julie L. Reiskin
Gloria Valencia-Weber

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT:

James J. Sandman, President
Rebecca Fertig, Special Assistant to the President
Lynn Jennings, Vice President for Grants Management
Katherine Ward, Executive Assistant, Office of Legal
Affairs
David L. Richardson, Comptroller and Treasurer,
Office of Financial and Administrative Services
Jeffrey E. Schanz, Inspector General
David Maddox, Assistant Inspector General for
Management and Evaluation, Office of the
Inspector General
Carol Bergman, Director, Office of Government
Relations and Public Affairs
LaVon Smith, Office of Information Management
Eric R. Jones, Office of Information Technology
Herbert S. Garten, Non-Director Member, Institutional
Advancement Committee
Frank B. Strickland, Non-Director Member,
Institutional Advancement Committee
David H. Hoffman, Non-Director Member, Audit
Committee (Sidley Austin)(by telephone)
Jeanne Philips-Roth, Associate Director for Client
Services, Legal Services of Eastern Missouri

Don Saunders, National Legal Aid and Defenders
Association (NLADA)
Terry Brooks, American Bar Association
Dominique Martin, Law99.com

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
OPEN SESSION	
1. Approval of agenda	4
2. Approval of minutes from the January 26, 2013 meeting	4
3. Consider and act on the Consolidated Operating Budget for FY 2013 and recommend Resolution 2013-XXX to the full Board	5
David Richardson, Treasurer/Comptroller	
4. Presentation on LSC's Financial Report for the five-month period ending February 28, 2013	15
David Richardson, Treasurer/Comptroller	
5. Report on FY 2013 appropriations	17
Carol Bergman, Director, Office of Government Relations and Public Affairs	
6. Report on FY 2014 appropriations process	24
Carol Bergman, Director, Office of Government Relations and Public Affairs	
7. Discussion with Management regarding process and timetable for FY 2015 budget "mark"	29
8. Public comment	30
9. Consider and act on other business	30
10. Consider and act on motion to adjourn the meeting	31

Motions: 4, 4, 14, 31

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

2 (3:40 p.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN GREY: I'd ask for approval of the
4 agenda, please.

5 M O T I O N

6 FATHER PIUS: So moved.

7 DEAN MINOW: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN GREY: It's been moved and seconded.
9 All in favor say aye.

10 (A chorus of ayes.)

11 CHAIRMAN GREY: Opposed, no.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN GREY: I would also ask for approval
14 of the minutes from the January 26, 2013 meeting. Is
15 there a motion?

16 M O T I O N

17 FATHER PIUS: So moved.

18 DEAN MINOW: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN GREY: All in favor say aye.

20 (A chorus of ayes.)

21 CHAIRMAN GREY: Opposed, no.

22 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN GREY: Thank you.

2 Mr. Treasurer.

3 MR. RICHARDSON: Agenda item 3 is to consider
4 and act on the Consolidated Operating Budget. This
5 material was not originally in your materials because
6 we've been working with OMB and the Treasury on our
7 funding as a result of the Consolidated and Further
8 Continuing Appropriations Act of 2013.

9 And just to provide a little background, we
10 received a CR this year. The CR was last year's
11 funding plus .612 percent. And that ran through March
12 27th.

13 However, because there was not a full year
14 appropriation in place and because of the appropriation
15 process, there was a 5 percent rescission that took
16 effect on March 1st. Later in April, we did get the
17 Appropriation Act, which provided us with a \$365
18 million appropriation.

19 However, it did keep the sequestration in
20 place. But before we applied the sequestration, we had
21 to apply a 1.877 percent rescission. And then on top
22 of that, because they didn't get enough of a cut, they

1 implemented a second rescission of .2 percent.

2 CHAIRMAN GREY: "They" is? "They" being?

3 MR. RICHARDSON: Congress. What I have done
4 with the memo is laid out where we were budgetary-wise
5 in January. At the board meeting, you approved a
6 budget of \$364,790,000. The budget that is now before
7 you, because of the funding, is reduced to
8 \$355,343,000.

9 I have laid that out further in the
10 spreadsheet in the back. And it does show the
11 appropriation that we received, which was 365 million.
12 We added to that a million dollars for the Hurricane
13 Sandy disaster relief funds, and then we also added to
14 that the U.S. Court of Veterans Appeals, which we're a
15 pass-through for.

16 So the first column shows, without any of the
17 cuts, a \$368,726,000 amount. The rescission, the
18 1.877, reduced our spending by \$6.9 million. The 2
19 percent cut reduced it an additional \$721,000, 722
20 rounding.

21 FATHER PIUS: That's .2 percent, not 2
22 percent?

1 MR. RICHARDSON: Point 2 percent. And then
2 the sequestration was based on the CR funding, which
3 was the 350 million. So it goes back to the funding we
4 had through March 27. And that was the \$17,692,800.

5 So the total funding from Congress this year,
6 the pass-through with the U.S. Court of Veterans
7 Appeals, and the hurricane supplemental, is
8 \$343,409,000. We add to that the carryover, which was
9 \$11,900,000. And the budget that's before you is
10 \$355,343,000.

11 In addition to that, coming to you today, each
12 quarter we look at our operating experience. We look
13 at the expenditures for the period so that we have
14 enough time for our directors to do their review and
15 project. We stopped and did it based on January.

16 They then projected their spending for the
17 eight months. As a result of that, we have a couple of
18 small adjustments and one not-so-small in regards to
19 the funding.

20 Page 2 lays out that there was an additional
21 amount needed for a temporary employee pay to basically
22 fund an agency hire that supports the President and the

1 Vice President for Grants Management and the two
2 special assistants. This is needed because the
3 executive assistant for the area did depart from the
4 Corporation, resigned in March.

5 CHAIRMAN GREY: David, let me suggest this to
6 you. I want to make sure we've got time for questions,
7 but also get us out of here in time to do what we need
8 to do for preparation for the next item on our
9 calendar.

10 So on these items, I think we've read these
11 things. I think it would be helpful for us if you
12 pointed out anything that you consider extraordinary,
13 not ordinary, and then allow us to act on this
14 accordingly.

15 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. At the bottom of page
16 2 is the only one that I would really call to your
17 attention, and that is the Office of Program
18 Performance. There's \$50,000 that was moved within the
19 budget to account for some additional temporary
20 employees. And all of this money is covered within the
21 budget.

22 There's additional money needed for visits,

1 and the \$70,000 that was needed there is available from
2 the personnel compensation line because of the open
3 positions that we have. And basically the same thing
4 in the Information Technology, a realigning of the
5 budget with the new director to his priorities to be
6 able to do the spending that he needs for the year.

7 There is no adjustments for the Inspector
8 General. They go through the same process of review
9 and projecting. So what we have before you then is the
10 Consolidated Operating Budget and Special Circumstance
11 Operating Authority.

12 The reason that I have labeled it as such,
13 when we did this there was discussions that there may
14 be a small amount of money that could be added back to
15 our budget. We've certainly gotten information since
16 that time that we're not going to get an add-back.

17 The amount of money that is shown for the U.S.
18 Court of Veterans Appeals, I have based that on what we
19 have done in getting our money together. I have
20 contacted the U.S. Court of Veterans Appeals. They've
21 not responded to what the final funding for the year
22 is, so there may be a small adjustment there.

1 So this just gives us authority to come back
2 to, Mr. Grey, as Chairman of the Committee, and John
3 Levi to approve that within our budget cycle. So I ask
4 that you consider the adoption of this resolution.

5 CHAIRMAN GREY: Any comments? Father Pius?

6 FATHER PIUS: Just a question. Obviously, in
7 terms of our own MG&O account, it looks like what we're
8 doing is we're taking the cut entirely out of the
9 contingency funds. But it's not clear, looking at it
10 immediately, that that's what we're doing.

11 Just the thought behind that, and should we
12 make the accounting a bit clearer that we're taking
13 this hit not from the operating part, essentially, but
14 we're just taking the contingency and replacing
15 anything that was lost in the cutbacks with whatever
16 was in the contingency funds? Because I think that's
17 what we're doing.

18 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, it is. When we look
19 at --

20 FATHER PIUS: And should we account for that
21 much more explicitly?

22 MR. RICHARDSON: Well, when we look at

1 Attachment A, you'll see that the MG&O budget, the 17
2 million in the carryover, was reduced. We have 2.4
3 million.

4 Originally we had carryover or money of 5.8.
5 We still do. But 3.1 of it was from -- we put in the
6 contingency. We've subtracted that, so when you look
7 at 2 through 6, you'll see -- actually, when you look
8 at 5 and then you subtract, we've subtracted \$1.2
9 million from the MG&O contingency line to come up with
10 the new balance for the contingency of \$1.9 million.

11 We've done the same thing in IG. So tried to
12 make that clear, but yes, it is coming completely out
13 of our contingency funds at this point.

14 FATHER PIUS: Because at first I was looking
15 at it thinking, why isn't MG&O being cut? Everything
16 else is. And then it took me a little bit to realize.

17 But we are. We're not putting in that line item;
18 we're taking it out of the contingency line item. So
19 it just struck me as a little odd at first until I
20 figured out what was going on.

21 CHAIRMAN GREY: I think Father Pius raises a
22 good question. Maybe one of the ways, David, that we

1 can do that is in the narrative, to make that
2 explanation clear, as opposed to learning about it by
3 looking at the numbers. That would then support the
4 review of schedule A more clearly, I think.

5 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN GREY: Do you agree?

7 FATHER PIUS: Yes.

8 MR. RICHARDSON: I will do that.

9 CHAIRMAN GREY: Alan?

10 MR. TANENBAUM: Just a question about
11 the -- we took \$50,000 in the Office of Program
12 Performance. We found it because of the delayed hiring
13 and the open positions. And the money was essentially
14 used to hire temporary folks to deal with grant
15 applications and some of the recommendations made by
16 the consulting group.

17 Is it reasonable therefore to believe in that
18 next year's budget, we will have that \$50,000
19 additional cost in next year's budget to review these
20 temporary applications? And if these open positions
21 are filled, we're going to be expecting to see \$50,000
22 more in the budget proposal from Office of Program

1 Performance?

2 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I can answer that
3 question. Yes, assuming that the Office of Program
4 Performance continues to operate in the way it
5 currently does. But we have a reorganization plan in
6 the works. So what the relative staffing is between
7 the Office of Program Performance and the Office of
8 Compliance and Enforcement and the Office of
9 Information Management is all subject to change.

10 But this is additional expense, the \$50,000,
11 compared to the status quo, to implement the
12 recommendation of the consultants that we bring more
13 eyes to bear on the applications, that they not be
14 reviewed simply by the single person in the Office of
15 Program Performance who is also the liaison to the
16 program whose application is under review.

17 MR. TANENBAUM: One other question. Is it
18 reasonable then to presume that this reorganization
19 will result in efficiencies that you won't have that,
20 or that we'll just be doing economic efficiencies so we
21 won't have that extra money? Or is it that it'll
22 become reorganized so that we'll do a better job but

1 still have those expenses?

2 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I think the answer is it's
3 too soon to tell. I do think we need some realignment
4 of responsibilities. I think that we do need to beef
5 up our fiscal capability; what the cost of that will be
6 and what the tradeoffs might be, we haven't finally
7 decided yet.

8 CHAIRMAN GREY: There is a recommendation by
9 the Treasurer for the adoption of the resolution that's
10 contained in your materials by the Committee to the
11 Board. Is there a motion?

12 M O T I O N

13 MR. TANENBAUM: So move.

14 DEAN MINOW: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN GREY: All in favor of recommend the
16 resolution as proposed say aye.

17 (A chorus of ayes.)

18 CHAIRMAN GREY: All opposed say no.

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN GREY: Thank you.

21 Mr. Treasurer.

22 //

1 MR. RICHARDSON: The next item is the report
2 on the February spending that's found on 141 through
3 144 in your book, and actually, the charts that are
4 attached.

5 To be expedient, let me just say that there is
6 nothing out of the ordinary here. Spending is
7 consistent from month to month. What I have seen, and
8 I reported on our telephone call, is the spending has
9 started increasing slightly.

10 In October, we had \$1.28 million in spending.
11 In November, it was 1.29, almost 1.3. December was
12 1.27, down because of light travel during the holiday
13 season. And then January it went to 1.36, and in
14 February it's 1.36. So we do see our spending trending
15 upward a little bit because of the additional hires,
16 being on the road a little more, and being out visiting
17 our grantees.

18 We are well within budget, as the report
19 shows. We currently have variances in each line under
20 budget, which is good for us. And I'll be glad to
21 answer any questions that you may have.

22 CHAIRMAN GREY: Alan?

1 MR. TANENBAUM: Yes. I had one. If all of
2 the open positions were filled, we would then be
3 moderately over budget?

4 MR. RICHARDSON: No. Even with the
5 sequestration and the cuts, we have enough money this
6 year with our carryover that we would not be over
7 budget. The future, though, is where our problem is
8 going to be.

9 Once we start staffing up, if we don't get
10 additional money back, then later I think we have
11 enough money for next year. We should be able to ramp
12 up and do okay. The year after that is when I project
13 we'll have a problem with staffing and the amount of
14 money that we have for MG&O operations and being able
15 to support the full staffing load that is currently
16 proposed.

17 CHAIRMAN GREY: Other questions?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN GREY: David, thank you very much.

20 I'll ask Carol Bergman from the Office of
21 Government Relations and Public Affairs to report on
22 2013 appropriations.

1 MS. BERGMAN: Thank you very much. Hopefully
2 I can provide a little clarity on where things are at
3 between FY '13 and FY '14.

4 So as Dave mentioned, we finally have a final
5 budget for the current fiscal year, 2013. The second
6 CR that was passed on March 26 included, as Dave
7 mentioned, the 365 million for LSC. It would be
8 annualized over the year. That's the number prior to
9 the sequestration and the two rescissions.

10 And the number matters between it's the midway
11 point between the House Appropriations Subcommittee and
12 the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee from last year.

13 So if things had moved in regular order and there had
14 been a bill passed by October 1st, we would have gotten
15 the midway point between those two -- that's the
16 365 -- with the Senate having started with the White
17 House ask last year of 402.

18 So it's a very positive number. It gets
19 reduced to the number we're facing now on the
20 annualized basis, which is 340.8, because of the 5
21 percent sequestration. The two rescissions, the 1.877
22 that Dave referred to, was across the board for the CJS

1 subcommittee under whose jurisdiction LSC falls.

2 The .2 percent rescission was across the board
3 to bring the numbers of the Senate appropriations bill
4 in line with the House appropriations bill. This is
5 the way the House and Senate leadership were trying to
6 move forward on the final CR right before the spring
7 recess.

8 That conversation about a credit or not had to
9 do with whether or not an agency's final number under
10 the second CR after the sequestration and first
11 rescission was higher or lower than the number in the
12 first CR for the first six months.

13 And since our number at the 340.8 was higher
14 than the number in the first CR, that's why we were hit
15 with the .2 percent rescission and didn't get a credit
16 for that. So just to put a little bit of clarity on
17 that.

18 Excuse me?

19 DEAN MINOW: And that's final?

20 MS. BERGMAN: Yes. This is a final number
21 now, okay? And that number does include the funding
22 for Hurricane Sandy.

1 And again, I just want to clarify for the
2 record, the IG spoke earlier about that being a one
3 million dollar amount. That was what was originally
4 appropriated. But of course, the sequestration is
5 applied to that, so there's only 950,000 for the
6 Hurricane Sandy supplemental. So that is now included
7 when we look at the final number of the 340.8.

8 So this ends up being approximately 8 million.
9 It's actually 8.2 million more than was in the
10 original CR for the first half of the year. So that's
11 why we get hit by the .2.

12 So we have been attempting to inform our
13 grantees as this has been progressing, which has been a
14 little bit challenging, as you can imagine. We just
15 sent out a spreadsheet for folks to show them what the
16 May numbers were going to look like, which is obviously
17 different than the April numbers, which were the first
18 ones to show the impact of the March 1 sequestration
19 that went into effect.

20 The other thing to point out that was in the
21 legislation in the final CR was regarding the census
22 data. This CR included language that directs LSC to

1 change the distribution of grants based on the updated
2 census data.

3 You'll recall that the original language
4 refers us to the Census Bureau's decennial collection
5 of data. They no longer collect it decennially. We
6 have been waiting for a congressional authorization to
7 do this differently.

8 This changes now to be phased in over two
9 years, which is the remainder of FY '13 and '14. And
10 it directs us to use the updated census data every
11 three years.

12 So what this means is that the Census Bureau
13 has been asked to provide us new data in an expeditious
14 way. We expect to get that by early May, at which
15 point we will then recalculate what payments look like
16 based on the new data.

17 So we are going to implement 50 percent of
18 that change in 2013 and 100 percent of that change in
19 FY '14. The idea is that there's some level of a
20 phase-in for our grantees.

21 The challenge, as you can imagine, is that
22 this is based on the percentage of the poverty

1 population, not the hard numbers. When you look at it,
2 poverty numbers and eligible population has increased
3 virtually throughout the country.

4 So the reaction from many grantees, of course,
5 is they're seeing an increased number of eligible
6 clients, but now they're in the position that the
7 actual dollars are going to go down. So it's very hard
8 for folks to reconcile what that's going to look like.

9 Of course, the other side of it is that many
10 grantees have been underfunded during this period as
11 their eligible population has grown exponentially. So
12 we are hopeful that we can get this out, with some
13 clarification, by mid-May before the June payments.

14 This will then be the payments that are June
15 through December, remembering that we pay our grantees
16 on an annual basis, not on a fiscal year basis. So it
17 will be phased in over six months of payments for our
18 grantees in this fiscal year, and then the full year in
19 2014. And the analysis we'll make will be, of course,
20 on the assumption that 2014 continues at this same
21 number because we don't know yet, of course, what the
22 2014 numbers are going to look like.

1 So that's it on the --

2 FATHER PIUS: One quick question. I'm sorry.

3 MS. BERGMAN: Yes?

4 FATHER PIUS: Does that mean we'll be updating
5 these numbers every three years then instead of every
6 ten years?

7 MS. BERGMAN: Yes. Yes.

8 FATHER PIUS: And how --

9 MS. BERGMAN: The Census Bureau is going to be
10 updating the numbers.

11 FATHER PIUS: And so we'll just take the
12 Census Bureau numbers?

13 MS. BERGMAN: Yes.

14 FATHER PIUS: Does the Board need to be
15 involved with approving that, or does that just go
16 through --

17 MS. BERGMAN: No. This is statutorily now the
18 Census Bureau is directed to give us those numbers.

19 FATHER PIUS: And when will the first change
20 take place, then?

21 MS. BERGMAN: We are hopeful that we will have
22 all of the data in May so that --

1 FATHER PIUS: I mean after this one. The next
2 one.

3 MS. BERGMAN: June. It will affect the June
4 payments.

5 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: No, no. '16.

6 MS. BERGMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. 2016.

7 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Well, it'll be -- yes.

8 FATHER PIUS: That's when we'll get the
9 numbers?

10 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: What the statute says is
11 triennially. So it'll be three years from now.

12 MS. BERGMAN: Correct.

13 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: But one other points I
14 wanted to make. Once we know what data sets the Census
15 Bureau is using to compute their numbers, we will be
16 able in the intervening three years to notify grantees
17 of the trends so they won't be blindsided three years
18 from now. We'll do our best to give them ongoing
19 notice of where they stand so that they can plan
20 accordingly.

21 CHAIRMAN GREY: Further questions about the
22 2013/2014?

1 MS. BERGMAN: Well, that was just 2013. Now I
2 was going to talk about 2014.

3 (Laughter.)

4 CHAIRMAN GREY: I'm trying to help you, Carol.

5 MS. BERGMAN: I know. I know. You're trying
6 to move ahead. Then Dave's going to start talking
7 about 2015. You know that.

8 CHAIRMAN GREY: No, '16. I'm sorry, go ahead.

9 MS. BERGMAN: Okay. So as you know, the Board
10 voted for the request of 481 million, which was then
11 increased with the 5 million for the 486 that went to
12 Congress. Our budget request -- there should have been
13 a copy for everybody; there are extra hard copies in
14 the back if anybody wants one. Please let me know,
15 obviously, if you need hard copies. We sent out a PDF.

16 So LSC submitted its budget request to
17 Congress concurrently with the Administration's
18 request, which went up on April 10th. Now, the White
19 House number, the White House recommended 430 million
20 in funding for LSC.

21 This is an increase of 90 million over our
22 current funding and 28 million more than the White

1 House recommended in FY 2013. That recommendation
2 includes 400.3 million for basic field grants. So
3 that's 93 percent of what the budget request looks
4 like.

5 We have begun meeting with House and Senate
6 appropriations staff about our budget request and the
7 White House budget request, and we do not anticipate
8 hearings this year. Obviously, Congress is working on
9 a very truncated schedule for appropriations hearings.

10 The challenge with the timing this year, as
11 folks may have noticed, the House and Senate passed
12 budget resolutions before the White House budget was
13 sent up for the next year, so it's really changed the
14 whole dynamic.

15 Appropriations committees were not prepared to
16 do hearings until the White House budget had come up.
17 So we are not expecting it. We're just having meetings
18 at this point.

19 What's interesting is that in our meetings on
20 the Senate side, it's been made very clear to
21 us -- Senator Barbara Mikulski is now Chair of the
22 Senate Appropriations Committee, both the full

1 committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee with
2 jurisdiction over Legal Services. And Senator Shelby
3 is ranking in both the full committee and subcommittee.

4 Staff have made very clear that both Senators
5 Mikulski and Shelby are of the old school. They
6 believe in returning to regular order in the budget
7 process, and they are looking to work very closely with
8 each other.

9 So they are moving forward and intending to do
10 a budget on time and appropriations process on time
11 before the start of the new fiscal year, at least on
12 the Senate side, and they expect that the CJS
13 subcommittee, our appropriations subcommittee, will be
14 the first to probably move forward.

15 What's interesting is that Senator Mikulski
16 has created a budget in the overall budget resolution
17 of \$1.058 trillion. She is ignoring the sequester.
18 She's moving forward with a budget without
19 sequestration, and anticipating that they're going to
20 take the appropriate action with regard to whatever
21 cuts are needed in that process.

22 Needless to say, the House is doing it a

1 little differently, and the number that they are
2 starting with, with the sequester, is 967 billion. So
3 there is quite a gap between the two in terms of how
4 things are going to move forward.

5 So as much as the Senators may want to do
6 regular order, the challenge is going to be what that's
7 going to look like, assuming bills move through the
8 House as well in terms of what the negotiation and the
9 conference process is going to look like. If there's
10 no overall budget agreement that's reached, the lower
11 House numbers would govern under the authority of the
12 Budget Control Act of 2011.

13 So that's the overarching scenario of how it
14 looks right now. Questions?

15 MR. MADDUX: Carol, what were those numbers?
16 The one trillion and the --

17 MS. BERGMAN: Those are for the Senate and
18 House budget resolutions, the overarching budget
19 proposals for the year. So in other words, it's before
20 the appropriations numbers of the Senate and House
21 Appropriations Committees. It's the budget numbers,
22 Budget Committee numbers.

1 FATHER PIUS: Just the Justice numbers,
2 though?

3 MS. BERGMAN: No. No, no, no, no, no. That's
4 the whole thing.

5 MR. MADDOX: But the budget's like 3-1/2
6 trillion.

7 MS. BERGMAN: Trillion. That's what I said.

8 FATHER PIUS: I think that billion --

9 MS. BERGMAN: No, no, no. The House is
10 working with billion. The House has got 967 billion.
11 The Senate is working with 1.058 trillion.

12 MR. MADDOX: That's why I'm confused because
13 that's not even close to the total federal budget.

14 MS. BERGMAN: No. That's just the piece that
15 was under -- yes.

16 MR. MADDOX: Thank you.

17 MS. BERGMAN: No. It's not the overarching.

18 MR. MADDOX: No. I was thinking we'd gone
19 back two decades.

20 MS. BERGMAN: No. No, we would have gone back
21 a couple decades.

22 CHAIRMAN GREY: That was an audit question.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. BERGMAN: Other questions on FY '14?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN GREY: Carol, thank you.

5 It is also about that time when we, as the
6 Finance Committee, recommend to you for consideration a
7 timetable for the 2015 budget request, as we have done
8 in the past. We've sort of worked backwards into a
9 proposed timetable.

10 Committee members have the previous timetable,
11 and with dates that would match up on the calendar
12 dealing with weekends and holidays, we have another
13 timetable set up. And I think what I'd like to do is,
14 if the Committee is comfortable with that, I'd like to
15 just circulate that to the board members to consider,
16 not for action but to review and comment on and give us
17 some guidance as we look forward to this next process.

18 We'll probably work on this at our next
19 meeting, so any thoughts that you have as you look at
20 this tomorrow and in the future will be helpful to us.

21 David?

22 MR. RICHARDSON: That's all I have, sir.

1 CHAIRMAN GREY: Carol, anything else?

2 MS. BERGMAN: No, thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN GREY: Members of the Committee?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN GREY: Sharon?

6 MS. BROWNE: I have no questions. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN GREY: Thank you. Alan and Bob?

8 MR. HENLEY: No.

9 MR. TANENBAUM: No.

10 CHAIRMAN GREY: Mr. President?

11 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: No.

12 CHAIRMAN GREY: I'd like to open the
13 discussion for public comment. Anyone from the public
14 has any comment about any of the discussion so far,
15 please feel free to let us hear from you.

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN GREY: Hearing none, I'd like to
18 consider and act on any other business that might come
19 before the Committee.

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN GREY: Hearing none, I'd like to
22 consider a motion to adjourn.

1 M O T I O N

2 FATHER PIUS: So moved.

3 DEAN MINOW: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN GREY: All in favor say aye.

5 (A chorus of ayes.)

6 DEAN MINOW: But first we congratulate you for
7 an expeditious committee meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN GREY: Madam Chair, with your
9 encouragement, I move to expeditiously --

10 DEAN MINOW: Well done. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN GREY: The meeting is adjourned.

12 (Whereupon, at 4:13 p.m., the Committee was
13 adjourned.)

14 * * * * *

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22