

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

TELEPHONIC MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OPEN SESSION

Monday, September 19, 2011

11:03 a.m.

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

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

John G. Levi, Chairman
Martha L. Minor, Vice Chair
Sharon L. Browne
Robert J. Grey, Jr.
Harry J.F. Korrell, III
Charles N.W. Keckler
Victor B. Maddox
Laurie Mikva
Father Pius Pietrzyk, O.P.
Julie Reiskin
Gloria Valencia-Weber

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT AT THE CORPORATION'S OFFICES:

James J. Sandman, President

Victor M. Fortuno, Vice President for Legal Affairs,
General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary

Mark Freedman, Senior Assistant General Counsel, Office
of Legal Affairs

Atitaya Pratoomtong, Staff Attorney, Office of Legal
Affairs

Katherine Ward, Executive Assistant, Office of Legal
Affairs

David L. Richardson, Comptroller and Treasurer, Office
of Financial and Administrative Services

Stephen Barr, Communications Director, Office of
Government Relations and Public Affairs

Treefa Aziz, Government Affairs Representative, Office
of Government Relations and Public Affairs

Jeffrey E. Schanz, Inspector General

Laurie Tarantowicz, Assistant Inspector General and
Legal Counsel, Office of the Inspector General

Joel Gallay, Special Counsel to the Inspector General,
Office of the Inspector General

David Maddox, Assistant Inspector General for
Management and Evaluation, Office of the
Inspector General

John C. Meyer, Director, Office of Information
Management

Charles Greenfield, Program Counsel III, Office of
Program Performance

C O N T E N T S

OPEN SESSION	PAGE
1. Approval of agenda	4
2. Consider and act on the recommendation of the Operations & Regulations Committee regarding specific approach and statutory language change(s) to suggest to the White House and Congress for replacement of decennial census poverty data in distributing LSC field grants	4
3. Consider and act on the Finance Committee's recommendation to the Board as to LSC's appropriations request for FY 2013 (Resolution 2011-012)	12
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Presentation by David Richardson, LSC's Treasurer & Comptroller</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Comments by John Constance, Director of LSC's Office of Government Relations & Public Affairs</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Comments by Jeffrey Schanz, LSC'S Inspector General</p>	
4. Consider and act on renaming the Board's Development Committee (Resolution 2011-013)	24
5. Other business	28
6. Consider and act on adjournment of meeting	28

Motions: 4, 7, 12, 24, 28

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

2 (11:03 a.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I'll call the meeting to order
4 and ask for an approval of the agenda.

5 M O T I O N

6 MS. BROWNE: This is Sharon Browne. I so
7 move.

8 FATHER PIUS: Father Pius. So move.

9 DEAN MINOW: Second. Martha Minow.

10 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And so all in favor?

11 (A chorus of ayes.)

12 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. The agenda is approved.

15 And that brings us to the consider and act on the
16 recommendation of the Ops & Regs Committee regarding
17 the census. And who is going to make that
18 presentation? Charles?19 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Yes, I will. Thank you,
20 John.21 Well, as most of the Board and others here and
22 on the phone know, we have for a long time distributed

1 our money on the basis of a decennial census count of
2 the poverty population. But the 2010 census does not
3 have a count of individuals in poverty, and therefore
4 we need a new set of data in statute for the
5 distribution of the money.

6 And we've considered this for some period of
7 time -- the manner in which this should be done, what
8 language should be presented to the Office of
9 Management and Budget, and ultimately to our
10 congressional committees.

11 On Friday, the Operations & Regulations
12 Committee had a chance to look into this issue
13 following a period of public comment on the main
14 recommendations for our legislative approach. And
15 after some discussion, we voted to adopt the
16 recommendations of management with regard to this,
17 which if the Board were to approve them would then be
18 passed on to the Office of Management and Budget as
19 part of our legislative package to Congress, including
20 our budget.

21 The main recommendations are that we continue
22 to distribute basic field money on the basis of

1 individuals in poverty, and that the number of
2 individuals in poverty in different areas be determined
3 by the Bureau of the Census. We have not specified a
4 particular data set that the Bureau of the Census must
5 use, but we have said that the Bureau of the Census
6 will be the agency determining those numbers.

7 Then the second recommendation is that LSC
8 funding be distributed, redistributed, on the basis of
9 every three years, triennially, rather than -- we no
10 longer have to use the decennial census and no longer
11 can do so, so it now becomes open to us what period of
12 time to use, and three years was recommended; and that
13 because of a considerable shift in the relative poverty
14 populations between our grantee areas, sometimes
15 approaching 30 percent changes in funding, there has
16 been a recommendation that this be phased in over
17 fiscal year 2013 and 2014.

18 The comments that came in from the public
19 were, in the main, supportive of this general approach.

20 With regard to the first recommendation, there was
21 some discussion in public comment that LSC be given
22 more discretion to determine data sets and numbers than

1 management's recommendation. With regard to the second
2 recommendation, no one was in support of a decennial
3 reevaluation, but some thought that five years would be
4 better than three.

5 And there was general support for a phase-in,
6 although there was some discussion in the committee
7 regarding whether it would be better to use the
8 budgetary process and ask for specific money for FY
9 2013 for the programs losing funding to partially
10 offset that rather than to phase in the formula.

11 So after the discussion of those comments and
12 so on, we nevertheless as a committee voted to accept
13 management's recommendations, and are presenting those
14 to you and the rest of the Board this morning.

15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: In the form of a motion?

16 M O T I O N

17 PROFESSOR KECKLER: In the form of a
18 resolution which you should have received. It's
19 titled -- the title of the resolution -- it's a
20 two-page resolution. Does everybody have that?

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: 2011-014. Right?

22 PROFESSOR KECKLER: 2011-014 is the resolution

1 that is presented on the table.

2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And is there a second?

3 MR. MADDOX: Second. Victor Maddox.

4 DEAN MINOW: Coming from the committee, you
5 may not need a second, but I'm glad to second it.

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Martha's right. Maybe that's
7 correct.

8 Is there discussion?

9 MS. BROWNE: This is Sharon Browne. Just a
10 quick question. Have you talked to the U.S. Census to
11 get in a conversation with them regarding LSC's needs?

12 And are they agreeable to working with LSC on
13 developing the number of eligible clients that we
14 serve?

15 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: This is Jim Sandman.
16 Bristow Hardin has been in regular contact with the
17 Bureau of the Census about this issue, and I'll let him
18 respond with the details. We may have to pay the
19 Census Bureau some money to get them to do this, but
20 the amounts that they've talked about are reasonable
21 and relatively modest.

22 This seemed to be the type of request that

1 would be in the ordinary course of the type that they
2 work, of the work that they do for a variety of
3 government agencies. But I'll let Bristow elaborate.

4 MR. HARDIN: Well, I don't know how much is
5 necessary to elaborate except to reiterate that this is
6 something they do in terms of advising agencies about
7 this. They're quite prepared to do so with us.
8 They've agreed that the details and extra data runs
9 that we would need from them would influence the cost,
10 but the type of things we've discussed to this point
11 don't indicate that the costs would be that
12 significant.

13 But again, this is something they do widely
14 with many agencies. But also, the specifics of it
15 would have to be worked out in the process as it went
16 through OMB and the committees and such like that.

17 PROFESSOR KECKLER: This is Charles Keckler.
18 Sharon, you mentioned the term "eligible clients."
19 We've discussed that as an alternative, but right now
20 the resolution is for persons in poverty, which of
21 course is a distinct thing.

22 It was an open question and discussed briefly

1 during the committee session on Friday whether the
2 Census would be approachable or amenable for the
3 Board's purposes, research purposes, making alternate
4 counts unrelated directly to our grant distribution.
5 But I'm not sure whether you wanted to talk about
6 eligible clients versus persons of poverty or what you
7 were asking.

8 MS. BROWNE: Well, I was just wanting to make
9 sure that the Census Bureau has been informed of the
10 needs that we're looking at right now.

11 But that does raise an interesting issue. Are
12 we asking the Census Bureau just to look at the number
13 of people in poverty, or are they going to be specific
14 in looking at the different geographic areas to
15 determine the number of people eligible for LSC
16 services?

17 PROFESSOR KECKLER: The resolution, as I
18 understand it, just involves them calculating persons
19 in poverty to most closely approximate the prior use of
20 the census. Again, it's something that I think is
21 worth thinking about. I'm not sure the exact process
22 that we would go through for the future to think about

1 alternatives and so on.

2 But as it's been discussed, this is narrowly
3 focused on handling the failure of the census to
4 collect poverty data and to cover that legislatively
5 rather than to get into something that I think we ought
6 to discuss going forward, which is things like eligible
7 clients and the need and the relative cost and things
8 like that.

9 MS. BROWNE: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any other questions or
11 comments?

12 MS. REISKIN: Mr. Chairman, this is Julie
13 Reiskin. I apologize I'm late; I just got out of my
14 hearing, but I'm here.

15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. Thank you.

16 Hearing nothing else, can we have a vote? All
17 in favor of adopting the resolution, please say aye.

18 (A chorus of ayes.)

19 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. The resolution is
22 adopted, and we now turn to the Finance Committee's

1 recommendations. And I gather that we're going to have
2 that as a presentation by Dave Richardson. Is that
3 correct? Or, Robert, are you going to run this --

4 MR. GREY: Well, I think that we talked about
5 this on occasion, and I think the resolution accurately
6 reflects those discussions that the Board has had and
7 information which we received from outside interested
8 parties and organizations, and a further reflection of
9 the analysis by the staff based on the Board's
10 recommendation that we consider an appropriation of
11 \$470 million for 2013 with the breakdown as it is
12 reflected on the resolution, Mr. Chairman.

13 And I think that should anybody have any
14 questions, I think David Richardson and John Constance
15 and Jim Sandman are certainly there to answer any
16 questions that members of the Board might have.

17 M O T I O N

18 MR. GREY: And I would, by presentation of the
19 resolution, move the adoption.

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Now, Mr. Fortuno, does that
21 need a second?

22 MR. FORTUNO: No. Technically, since it's a

1 motion of a committee, I think it's considered coming
2 to the Board with a second.

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Martha, when you're dean of a
4 law school, you know these things.

5 Okay. Any questions? Comments?

6 MS. BROWNE: This is Sharon Browne. I do have
7 just one question for Mr. Constance. In light of the
8 2012 appropriation from Congress, which is now at the
9 level of \$396 million, a 2 percent reduction from the
10 fiscal year 2011 level, will the \$470 million be an
11 appropriate amount to get us to the negotiating table?

12 I know that that was one of our considerations
13 earlier, and we didn't have the \$396 million figure
14 before us until just recently. I think it was on last
15 Wednesday. So is that going to make -- are we still in
16 the ballpark to allow us to be at the negotiating
17 table, with the \$470 million request?

18 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: This is Jim Sandman. I'm
19 not sure John is on the line. He's out of the country
20 and emailed shortly ago saying that he was on the
21 subway in London and there had been a problem, and he
22 was not sure he was going to be able to make the call.

1 John, are you on?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Could you answer that, Jim?

4 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. I have not posed
5 that question specifically to John, but I have spoken
6 to him since last week when the Senate Appropriations
7 Committee voted for \$396 million for fiscal year '12,
8 which would be a 2 percent cut over where we are
9 currently.

10 The Senate itself has not taken action, and
11 the House Appropriations Committee came in at a much
12 lower level. So we still don't know what our actual
13 number will be for 2012. But nothing that John has
14 said leads me to believe that he would feel any
15 differently about the reasonableness of this number.

16 One of our reference points was what the
17 President had asked for for fiscal 2012, and that was
18 \$450. And I believe that in light of the increase in
19 the poverty population, particularly as reflected in
20 the numbers that the Census Bureau released last week,
21 that the modest increase that we're asking for over the
22 President's request for 2012 would keep us in

1 reasonable range and in the discussions.

2 MS. BROWNE: Okay. Thank you.

3 PROFESSOR KECKLER: I have a -- sorry. I just
4 have a quick question. This is Charles Keckler. What
5 is the increase number that we're asking for? We're
6 asking for an increase. What sort of percentage
7 increase --

8 CHAIRMAN LEVI: 3.6 percent, I think, was the
9 number.

10 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Pardon me? What was that,
11 John?

12 CHAIRMAN LEVI: 3.6 percent.

13 PROFESSOR KECKLER: 3.6 percent --

14 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: That would be 3.6 percent
15 over the President's request for 2012.

16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's what that was.

17 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Oh, but what percentage
18 over our actual budget or --

19 CHAIRMAN LEVI: We don't know what our actual
20 budget is. You mean over the 404?

21 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Well, I guess it would be
22 over the 404 or -- I guess it would be the most recent

1 enacted budget.

2 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: The most enacted budget is
3 for the current fiscal year of 404.

4 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Right. Right.

5 MR. MADDOX: It's a 16 percent increase,
6 Charles.

7 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Thank you, Vic.

8 MR. MADDOX: 470 is a 16 percent increase over
9 404.

10 I have another question, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Go right ahead.

12 MR. MADDOX: For Jim Sandman, I was thinking
13 back to the Finance Committee meeting, and I was under
14 the impression that John Constance had indicated that
15 there was bipartisan support for 450. So I was
16 surprised to see the press release relating to the
17 subcommittee's recommendation of 396, I believe.

18 And I'm wondering -- I think Senator Mikulski
19 is the chairman of the subcommittee.

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes.

21 MR. MADDOX: And so I was even more surprised
22 to see that that small a number came out. Has

1 something happened that changes John's thinking about
2 the nature of the bipartisan consensus, or is that just
3 the way the negotiation process sets up? I'm just a
4 little confused by the development in the subcommittee,
5 which I gather has now been carried over by the full
6 committee.

7 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: John's previous advice
8 that there was bipartisan support for 450 was based on
9 a letter that a number of members of the Senate had
10 signed onto, what's called a "Dear Colleague" letter,
11 recommending \$450 million.

12 All of the signatories of that letter were
13 Democrats. But he had had conversations with
14 Republican members or their staffs indicating that
15 there were other people who, although they weren't
16 willing to sign onto the letter, also thought that
17 \$450,000 million was a reasonable number.

18 Since then, I think a couple of things have
19 happened. First, the appropriations subcommittee, the
20 Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice & Science, was told
21 how much money they had to work with. And the number
22 that they came out with last week reflects their effort

1 to allocate what they were given to work with among all
2 of the agencies under their jurisdiction.

3 They did propose increases for a couple of
4 agencies, most notably the Bureau of Prisons, to
5 address overcrowding problems, and NOAA, the National
6 Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, for I
7 think it was a satellite project. And the magnitude of
8 the increases that they thought appropriate for those
9 two agencies require that they decrease almost every
10 other agency under their jurisdiction.

11 So I think as a practical matter, that
12 explains what's happened in recent weeks.

13 MR. MADDOX: Jim, it's Vic Maddox again. Who
14 tells the subcommittee how much they have to work with?
15 Is that OMB?

16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: No.

17 MR. MADDOX: I mean, I wouldn't think so.

18 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: No. No, that doesn't come
19 from the Administration. That comes from -- I don't
20 know if Treefa's on the call, but I believe that comes
21 from the parent --

22 MR. MADDOX: From the committee itself?

1 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: -- the parent
2 Appropriations Committee. But you're getting beyond my
3 expertise.

4 MR. MADDOX: So the Appropriations Committee
5 has, I guess, a global number --

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: At a global number.

7 MR. MADDOX: -- with the assumption that
8 there's not going to be a budget and we're going to
9 have some sort of continuing resolution again?

10 MS. AZIZ: If I may, this is Treefa Aziz.

11 MR. MADDOX: Hi, Treefa.

12 MS. AZIZ: Hi, how are you guys? The Budget
13 Act, the debt ceiling agreement that was enacted into
14 law, set a spending cap for FY 2012. That spending cap
15 was then presented to the Appropriations Committee that
16 does what we call a 302(b) allocation, meaning that
17 they allocate that total spending to each of the
18 appropriations subcommittees.

19 CJS received a \$626 million reduction from FY
20 2011, which was what Senators Mikulski and Hutchison
21 then used to set the funding limits and allocations
22 within the agencies and programs under their

1 jurisdiction.

2 MR. MADDOX: I see. So is there any element
3 of the process going forward with the budget deal that
4 apparently supplants our otherwise normal budgeting
5 process -- is there any element of that that would lead
6 to an increase from what the committee has recommended?

7 I'm just trying to understand the process.

8 MS. AZIZ: No. The Appropriations Committee
9 has already recommended a funding level for all of the
10 agencies in their jurisdiction. It is highly unlikely
11 that those numbers will be increased at this point.
12 There is a spending cap that they have all agreed to at
13 \$1.043 trillion, and the allocation that was provided
14 to CJS is within that limitation.

15 It is nearly impossible for that number to
16 change at this point. So I would say that increases to
17 the recommendation by the Appropriations Committee on
18 the Senate side is unlikely at this point.

19 MR. MADDOX: Mr. Chairman, Vic Maddox again.
20 I'm not quite sure I understand our exercise today.
21 We're making a recommendation on the FY 2013 budget.

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Correct.

1 MR. MADDOX: But the budget is essentially
2 already set by Congress, so it's really going to be --

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: No, no. The budget that is
4 already set is 2012.

5 MR. MADDOX: Oh, okay. Well, that --

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. This is a year -- you
7 worked there, Vic.

8 MR. MADDOX: Well, when I worked there, John,
9 we had laws in place that actually outlined the
10 budgeting process and they were typically followed to
11 one degree or another, unlike the current landscape.

12 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes.

13 MR. MADDOX: So whatever Treefa just said has
14 to do with --

15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: 2012.

16 MR. MADDOX: -- with the 2012. But that
17 year-end budget ends in two weeks.

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Exactly. And not only that,
19 if you may have been reading, the House passed a
20 continuing resolution and there is a lot of belief that
21 we're going to be operating under a continuing
22 resolution until after the Debt Commission reports,

1 which won't be until the end of November.

2 MR. MADDOX: Yes. Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: At the same time, we have to
4 submit right now to OMB a number.

5 MR. MADDOX: Okay. Very well. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's what's happening.

7 Now, I should also say I've had conversations
8 on both sides of the aisle myself, and they
9 said -- basically what I'm getting is, you should
10 proceed as you would ordinarily proceed. And that's
11 what we're trying to do under these circumstances. I
12 don't think it's easy for anybody, and particularly
13 for -- Treefa and John are busy these days.

14 Any other questions or comments for Mr. Grey?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Can I ask for approval? All
17 in favor of approving the resolution, signify by saying
18 aye.

19 (A chorus of ayes.)

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

21 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Nay.

22 MR. MADDOX: No.

1 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I'm sorry?

2 MR. MADDOX: No.

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: There was a no?

4 PROFESSOR KECKLER: At least two.

5 MR. FORTUNO: There were at least two nay
6 votes.

7 MR. MADDOX: I voted no, John.

8 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I'm sorry.

9 MR. MADDOX: Victor Maddox. I voted no.

10 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Charles Keckler. I've
11 also voted no.

12 FATHER PIUS: Should we do a roll call vote?

13 CHAIRMAN LEVI: There are two no votes.

14 MS. BROWNE: This is Sharon Browne. There's
15 something on the line.

16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's what I was going to
17 ask.

18 MS. BROWNE: It makes it very difficult to
19 hear.

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Somebody needs to mute their
21 line. All of a sudden, background noise has become
22 very disconcerting.

1 FATHER PIUS: It's not church bells, is it?

2 (Laughter.)

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: No. That would be okay.

4 FATHER PIUS: Well, if you can't hear them,
5 we're okay.

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: No. That would be all right.

7 I had a call last week in which someone put their
8 phone on hold, and the entire group of us was treated
9 to a piano concerto. That would be disconcerting.

10 M O T I O N

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: In any event, the final item
12 is a resolution renaming the Development Committee.
13 And this was a proposal that I wanted to make in light
14 of what I regarded as some confusion that we saw in
15 Washington over just what the committee would be
16 considering.

17 And I think that, these days, institutional
18 advancement, which has to do with establishing such
19 things as auxiliaries or alumni associations or even
20 opportunities to send out newsletters or whatever, that
21 "development" may be too narrow and that this is a
22 better phrasing of what the committee is going to be

1 doing. And that's why the resolution is here.

2 I should say that I probably should have paid
3 a little more attention to the agenda. My own view is
4 the Development Committee hasn't met to make this
5 recommendation, and in terms of appropriate governance,
6 I believe it ought to have come from the Development
7 Committee to the Board as a resolution at the October
8 meeting.

9 And so if there is anybody on the Board that's
10 concerned about that issue, I'm happy to hold it until
11 then.

12 FATHER PIUS: This is Father Pius. I
13 generally agree with you, but I think the issue is
14 small enough that it's not that big of a deal.

15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: All right. So any other
16 comments or questions about that name change?

17 MR. GREY: Yes. This is Robert. I actually
18 recall encouraging us to think about this in a more
19 broadly described way so that we're not pigeonholing
20 ourselves, in the belief that others see this as
21 strictly just a fundraising committee. So I --

22 MS. REISKIN: This is Julie Reiskin, and I

1 didn't see the resolution. I've been in a meeting
2 since about 8:00 my time. But did you say it was going
3 to be called the institutional something committee?

4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Advancement committee.

5 MS. REISKIN: Pardon?

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Advancement.

7 MS. REISKIN: Okay. Is there a reason that
8 you're using the word "institutional" instead of
9 "organizational"?

10 CHAIRMAN LEVI: We could use organizational.

11 MS. REISKIN: It's just the word institution,
12 in my community, is kind of a cultural issue. It
13 really scares people. I know what you mean and you're
14 talking about the institution of LSC and you're not
15 talking about that kind of institution. But that's
16 just a cultural thing. And I know that probably isn't
17 a big deal to the majority of the people, but --

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, in the development
19 arena, "institutional advancement" is a phrase that
20 they all know and use.

21 MS. REISKIN: Oh, okay. All right.

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: But if you think it's going to

1 create some issues elsewhere, we certainly could listen
2 to that. "Organizational advancement" is not a phrase
3 I've heard.

4 MS. REISKIN: Well, I don't know that enough
5 people for whom it would be a problem would even know
6 this or -- I mean, I just know it well enough -- I
7 don't know who would be working on this, so I don't
8 know that it's a huge deal at this point. But maybe if
9 people do get confused, we can revisit. I don't think
10 it's enough of a big deal, though. I was just curious.

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. Any other questions or
12 comments, then?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, then, can we have -- all
15 in favor of the change as it's prepared in the
16 resolution?

17 FATHER PIUS: On this one --

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes?

19 FATHER PIUS: On this one, I do think we need
20 a second, John.

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. Is there a second?

22 FATHER PIUS: Which I happily do.

1 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. All in favor?

2 (A chorus of ayes.)

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposition?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. Anything else to come
6 before us this morning?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any public comment?

9 Questions? Issues?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Mr. Sandman, do you wish to
12 say anything?

13 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I don't, except thank you
14 to everyone.

15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. Can I have a motion to
16 adjourn?

17 M O T I O N

18 MR. GREY: So moved.

19 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Second?

20 DEAN MINOW: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: We've done this in record time
22 here. All in favor?

1 (A chorus of ayes.)

2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thanks so much, everybody.

3 MR. FORTUNO: Have a good day, everyone.

4 (Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the board meeting
5 was adjourned.)

6 * * * * *

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22