

**LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND COMMISSION**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Meeting Summary and Action Items**

Tuesday, February 15, 2022, 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

State Bar of California (Conference Call via Zoom)

---

**Roll Call**

**Members Present**

Co-Chair Richard Reinis  
Co-Chair Kim Savage  
Co-Vice Chair Christian  
Schreiber  
Co-Vice Chair Christina Vanarelli

**Liaisons**

Salena Copeland, LAAC

**Public Members**

Lorin Kline, LAAC  
Sebastian Bendeck, LAFLA

**Staff**

Doan Nguyen  
Erica Carroll  
Brady Dewar  
Chris McConkey  
Kim Warmesley

---

**OPEN SESSION**

Co-Chair Reinis called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. Members of the committee, staff, and liaisons took time at the beginning of the meeting to acknowledge the passing of Legal Services Trust Fund Commission (LSTFC) member Bob Planthold and remember his contributions to the LSTFC and the community.

**I. ROLL CALL**

Roll call was taken, and quorum was established.

**II. CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Co-Chair Reinis invited members of the public to comment on any items on the agenda. No public comment was made.

**III. CONSENT**

**A. Approval of Meeting Summary and Action Items from October 27, 2021 Meeting**

The Committee approved the October 27, 2021 meeting summary and action items by unanimous roll call vote (Schreiber moved, Vanarelli seconded).

**IV. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Update on Loan Repayment Assistance Program (LRAP) Strategy Working Group**

Program Manager Nguyen provided an update on the working group comprised of LSTFC, Council on Access and Fairness, and Access to Justice Commission members and State Bar staff. She provided broad details of a proposed LRAP that the group would like to advance and reported that the proposal is under internal review with the State Bar. An update will be provided to the LSTFC at its March meeting.

Salena Copeland from Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC) also shared details of a

complementary proposal from the Access to Justice Commission and its recent report about LRAP options and tax implications and opportunities.

**B. Discuss Possibility of Continuing Provisionally Licensed Lawyer Voluntary Contributions**

Nguyen introduced the topic before Program Supervisor McConkey presented on the background of the Provisionally Licensed Lawyer (PLL) grants, including the statutory history, funding amounts that have come in from licensing fee donations, and the progress of the grants in the past year. Nguyen reported that the Legislature is interested in maintaining the \$5 recommended contribution as part an ongoing request in annual licensing fee statements but that the current proposal—as the PLL program is sunseting—would be for the funding to go to legal services. This would amount to several hundred thousand dollars anticipated in annual contributions. However, the LSTFC, State Bar staff, LAAC, and the Access to Justice Commission plan to discuss if there are any innovative ideas or high-need areas that would benefit most from this particular funding.

Copeland from LAAC further commented that legal aid organizations would like to pay summer interns and that this is a helpful recruitment and retention tool, indicating that this might be one idea to pursue. Co-Chair Savage also shared some preliminary discussions on supporting rural legal services with technology. The committee recommended that Co-Vice Chair Vanarelli participate in the discussions regarding this topic on behalf of the LSTFC.

**C. Discuss and Approve Recommendation Regarding \$12 Million Funding Opportunity from California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA)**

Nguyen provided an overview of a potential funding opportunity through CalHFA. The agency is proposing three-year grants, a competitive grant process, and up to five percent administrative expenses. CalHFA met with the State Bar to conduct a risk assessment because it is seeking intermediary to complete the administration of the grants focused on foreclosure prevention. The applicant pool is expected to be smaller than other discretionary grants, but the timeline is only a few months: The LSTFC would need to approve the timeline and delegation of authority to staff at its March meeting in order to meet the timeline that CalHFA requested. Nguyen summarized the work State Bar staff has undertaken to prepare to administer the grants if approved. Lorin Kline from LAAC responded to questions regarding the impact of the timeline on grant applicants.

Among other things, discussion ensued about conforming to the short proposed timeline; how to accommodate possible challenges for the LSTFC, State Bar staff, and grant applicants; and what the application review and scoring process would look like.

After discussion, the committee approved the following motion by unanimous roll call vote (Schreiber moved, Reinis seconded):

“RESOLVED, that the Executive Committee recommends the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission approve the timeline for the 2022 foreclosure prevention legal assistance grants, as outlined in this PowerPoint presentation; and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Executive Committee recommends the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission delegate authority to the Executive Committee to approve the Request for Proposals, including scoring rubric, for the 2022 foreclosure prevention legal assistance grants and to staff to score applications in consultation with Co-Chair Kim Savage.”

**D. Review of Legal Services Trust Fund Commission Committee Assignments**

Nguyen provided a brief update regarding committee assignments, specifically the newly formed Nominations Committee. The committee also discussed the application process and merits of rolling applications versus a deadline to apply for the LSTFC each year.

**E. Discuss Recruitment of New Commissioners and Staff**

Nguyen presented on changes to the LSTFC appointments as a result of the passage of SB 211, which will include term limits and shift some responsibility for appointment away from the State Bar to the California Legislature, specifically the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the Assembly. Nguyen shared the current composition of the LSTFC, individual term limits, and the body that appointed current members. The committee then discussed upcoming vacancies and navigating the application process with the various appointing entities. The committee also discussed how to raise awareness of the LSTFC and the application process among members’ networks and more broadly, particularly in the context of improving diversity. There was also brief discussion about the process of appointing the LSTFC co-chairs through the Judicial Council and coordinating regarding that process.

**F. Discuss Protocol for Exit Interviews with Departing Commissioners**

Co-Chair Savage introduced the idea of conducting exit interviews with departing members, and Co-Chairs Savage and Reinis shared the feedback from two recent members, both of whom authorized their thoughts to be shared with the committee after their departures. Some ideas that were shared were improving diversity on the LSTFC and inquiring the same of grantees, encouraging more participation from the Board of Trustees liaisons while considering the influence of other liaisons on LSTFC decisions, and the fact that the LSTFC is a very active and engaged commission.

**G. Discuss Fiduciary Duties of Legal Services Trust Fund Commissioners**

Co-Chair Reinis addressed the overlap of LSTFC members who also participate on the California Access to Justice Commission, as both these groups often collaborate but potentially present conflicts in pursuing certain projects or funding opportunities. Reinis reiterated the importance of recusal in instances of real or perceived conflict.

**H. Discuss Role of Legal Services Trust Fund Commission Liaisons**

Discussion of this topic was tabled.

**I. Preview of March 11, 2022 Legal Services Trust Fund Commission Meeting Agenda**

Nguyen previewed the draft agenda for the next LSTFC meeting in March. She highlighted the main topics for discussion, including IOLTA revenue and all Executive Committee items that

will be addressed. She further indicated which items are more administrative in nature versus those that will require substantive discussion.

**V. ADJOURN**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:44 p.m.

DRAFT