

Office of Inspector General's Report on  
The Evaluation of Legal Services Mapping - Kirt West,  
David Maddox and Edward Jurkevics

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Thank you very much.

Today we have some special presentations and we would like to begin with those. Our first one is on the mapping project, a project that the Office of the Inspector General initiated and has been spending a lot of time on. And so Kirt West, our inspector general, is going to be leading that presentation. So I would like to turn it over to Kirt and we can begin.

PRESENTATION ON MAPPING PROJECT

MR. WEST: Thank you, Chairman Hall, members of the Committee. The Office of Inspector General is completing its three-year project in the evaluation of Legal Services mapping and it will shortly be issuing a final report for the LSC Board of Management with our findings. We are doing this under our, you know, authority to work on effectiveness and efficiency of LSC's programs and operations.

The comments of the eight LSC grantee

participants, many of which were -- have been provided in your board book, clearly indicate that they believe mapping offers significant benefits on the local and state levels. The evaluation participants have told our office that they would like to continue to have access mapping on at least an annual recurring cycle and that they believe the capacity would be useful to other grantees.

I believe there is a good chance at our July meeting that you will be hearing from a number of the executive directors from the California area where -- one of the areas we did our mapping project and you will be able to hear from the grantees directly.

At this point, I would like to turn the floor over to my assistant inspector general for resource management, Dave Maddox, who is the project manager of the evaluation project, and he will provide the informational briefing to the Board.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you, Kirt.

We hope that our presentation here today will prove that mapping is not rocket science, but we also do realize that it is not exactly a commonplace item

within the Legal Service community at this point in time either. So if at any point in time we get technical or we are somewhat unclear, please jump in and ask us questions at any point in time.

Computerized mapping is a tool that is commonly used by government agencies and non-profit organizations to serve widely disbursed social needs. Examples would include U.S. Departments of Justice, Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Fannie Mae, ARC and United Way, all of whom we have spoken with in the process of this presentation.

In an organization, such as LSC, that provides service grants based upon the number of persons in poverty per geographic area, the application of poverty and service mapping as a management tool initially and still does appear a natural fit.

The objective of the fair and balanced evaluation was to determine the utility of mapping to improve program quality as part of the OIG mission to promote efficiency and effectiveness in the activities and operations of LSC and its grantees.

The goals of the project are to prototype methods and then define significant map products, establish the benefits of mapping to all stakeholders, determine if mapping is adaptable in both urban and rural legal services environments, evaluate if mapping could be implemented in a manner that does not pose too high of a technical barrier or cost. We will address the question of cost in our concluding statements, but let me say that there is several reasonable ways to implement mapping in an affordable manner.

If you will allow me to give you a brief overview. In phase one of the project, we produced a wide spectrum of legal services maps, which the Georgia executive directors and their staffs assessed. After several iterations, we learned a number of dos and don'ts about legal services mapping. The conclusion of the first Georgia project was presented to the prior board in January 2003 and the phase one report was released in November of that same year.

The general conclusions, now affirmed in phase two, are, maps provide a detailed picture of the geographic distribution movements of poverty

populations. Maps strengthen planning and resource management by providing a visible tool -- a visible model of the legal services environment.

Maps improve promotion and fund-raising by showing the distribution of need and the contribution of legal services to the low income community. Maps measure the degrees of access to federally funded legal services by income eligible persons.

And phase two, which started in late 2003, was essentially a stress test of legal services mapping in some of the nation's most extreme poverty environment, including both dense urban and sparsely populated rural areas.

In Southern California, the OIG worked closely with five grantees who served five of the Nation's top 15 counties in terms of poverty growth and roughly 4 million income eligible persons. In Georgia, which provides a good cross section of urban and rural poverty areas, we produced updated map books using the 2000 census in the most case data.

In Montana, during the summer of 2004, the OIG completed an accelerated project within five weeks.

Executive director Klaus Sitte, of Montana Legal Services Association, and his staff presented some of that work at the September 2004 Provisions Committee in Helena, Montana to illustrate the extreme rural legal services challenges and the outreach required of their work. They have already used the maps for state planning and currently are using them to support legislation.

New products defined were created in phase two. Using the lessons learned in phase one, we created several new map products, including a core map book with 25 maps useful to any legal services environment, total grantee activities and legal matters maps, neighborhood level maps, standards of accurate mapping of urban and rural areas and a summary of all available census poverty data by LSC defined service area.

In the evaluation project as a whole, we produced over 400 maps for the eight participating grantees. I would now like to introduce Edward Jurkevics, a consultant who has worked with the OIG throughout the mapping effort. Ed will show you some

of the maps we produced.

MR. JURKEVICS: Thank you, David.

Well, I would like to draw your attention to the screen where I thought we would maybe look at some of the maps. You know, first, maps can provide a national perspective and these two maps, you may recall at the last time the phase one was presented to the Board, these were the last maps that were of that presentation. So I thought we would pick up right where we left off at that time.

In the left -- the darker colors on the left-hand side of the map would indicate higher poverty populations and you can see there is some dots. Maybe you can see at the front. I can barely see the grantee offices and regional offices on top. And on the right-hand side, there is a change in poverty between the census, the two census, the 1990 and the 2000.

As you know, the census drive is a funding formula for LSC grantees and what is notable about the map is that the bicoastal effect, the yellows and oranges are growth in poverty populations and the blues are relative declines so that the grantees in the

darker of the blue would have lost a higher percentage of their funding when they went to the new funding formula, whereas the yellows and the oranges would have seen an increase in funding.

What is interesting and what this map has indicated and we have other data you won't be seeing today, but we can show you, is that there is a real differential shift in poverty populations. It doesn't just sort of all rise and fall like the level of the ocean in a tide the same in the nation. There is very differential changes. So as the -- with the decennial census, there is not much change in that. Sometimes things will be out of proportion funding wise.

Now this next map is of the service area of Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles. And here this is again a map of the poverty where the darker reds indicate higher poverty. And some of the highest poverty areas are right here around the office.

And the executive director -- I am going to jump sort of to the conclusion -- we made about 40 maps for -- on Neighborhood Legal Services and their executive director, Neal Dudovitz, had just sort of a



summary comment. In his view, the maps can be used by NLS for management, for fund-raising and ultimately he thinks they could also be used for advocacy, although we didn't develop any of those under this program.

He is favorable to devoting some staff time and some budgets to mapping and he is looking for a way to keep going with it. And I am going to show you some of the maps that maybe you can see what he saw in the program.

First of all, that was the other maps and now the blue dots that I have put over the top show his cases that are closed. And one of the things you will notice is that this is still Los Angeles county and above. There is three grantees in the county. And he closes cases outside of his service area. Those are -- he has a health grant, a county wide health grant. So that is one of the reasons. And even then there is still some cross utilization outside of service area that people call this help line or that help line, sort of the closest facility.

This generally is a map that shows you demand and supply and sort of -- you know, the best sort of

surrogate we have for legal needs is this 125 percent poverty population. You know, that is the nominal eligibility for -- to be eligible for services. There is other measures, but in general, the 125 percent poverty is that cutoff. So underneath, you can see the demand for legal services and the need and on top of that, the supplies that met them in that year.

So what you would not want to see is, you know, very great red uncolored -- spots that aren't covered by blue cases. That would be an area of concern for you. And one of the things that we have seen -- by the way in all of our mapping from program after program, that the dots look a lot like the data underneath in general.

So, you know, it is often -- I will tell you, the executive directors, they wait in trepidation to see these maps. They worry that they are not serving where the poor people are concentrated, but in general, in fact, they are rather admirably. There is often some pockets of problems that need outreach, and so on, that are identified, but in general, we have found the programs to be highly efficient in their work.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Just to stop you for a second so that I am clear. All of the blue dots in the kind of white areas here is areas where there is not heavy poverty.

MR. JURKEVICS: No. We didn't color them because they are outside of NLS' service area. Those are served by the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. So that relates to --

MR. JURKEVICS: Right, but Los Angeles County keeps going all the way down here and they have a statewide health grant so they are covering cases that are outside their LSC service area with another grant.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MR. JURKEVICS: So now we took that -- you know, what we had was cases over persons and poverty and we can compute that ratio to see how many cases are being closed in a census track, let's say, per person in poverty. And the range here is from, like, seven here to down less than one here. And you will be interested to note for about -- there is about -- the national average is something over two cases closed per person of 125 percent poverty. So a hundred people at

the 125 percent poverty level nationwide. So 2 percent.

So one of the things is we recall in the last map the two great concentrations of poverty, there is one in the San Fernando Valley here and one in the San Gabriel Pasadena area. And we know that the colors are a little bit darker here. The service is a little bit higher here and a little bit lower here.

So we zoom in, we get a little bit closer to this so we can see and it is pretty much verified that the service level seems to be higher in the left poverty area as opposed to the right and we talked to Director Douglas about this and he said that in -- I guess in early 2001, they took over the programs. There was a consolidation under the state planning and they took over the programs in Pasadena and the San Diego valley and they knew that there was a -- that they were underperforming and they had worked devilishly hard to repair that, to bring equality of service across the service area.

And in fact, this map sort of indicates what happened is that in the following year, the red

increased in cases closed here. So they were able to raise the cases closed here. But, you know, this is one of the great ironies in this business is that the resources are finite and you can dip out a cup of water from one bucket and put it in another one, but you can't create more water. And here is where the resources came from.

So they lost services in their core service area where NLS was based before and they moved them over here, but there is a winner and a loser. You maybe get better equality, but, you know, it is a finite step. It is an interesting way to demonstrate how resource constrained in fact things are and how inelastic the supply is. They just can't create much more services that easily.

This is one of the maps that he liked, which shows his health case closures and the reason he liked this was he was able to show the funders that, in fact, he wasn't just concentrating services in the core areas, but he was reaching the outlying areas up in the high desert here and closing cases in Lancaster and so on. So it is -- it shows the funder that -- how the

results of their activities.

Now I have moved just east a little bit to the area of Inland Counties' Legal Services by Irene Moralis. And this is the same map, the cases over their income eligibles. They have some different challenges. One is that there is this big inland California of deserts and they still have to serve these areas like Needles and Blythe and Barstow and these high desert areas.

In the meantime, in the west part of their area, this is the L.A. basin, which is -- you know, what is going on there is that people that are economically pressed are fleeing the housing prices in L.A. and they are moving out into these areas. So this is the highest growth area in the country with vast tracts of land. And what is surprising is it is not just middle class growth, it is the growth in poverty there is very high at the same time.

Now this is a map that shows ICLS' intake methods in response to this. And they have -- I think in 2000, they finally set up a telephone hotline and they say that the walk-ins here, in office visits are

going on in the core urban areas, but out here in the outlying areas, they are using outreach methods, clinics and the telephone hotlines are starting to be able to get to those areas and as -- and because circuit riding is fairly expensive and they have been circuit riding out to those areas. So this shows the results of their telephone and they want to continue to measure these methods.

Now I have some comments from ED Morales. And first of all, she feels that this mapping can help her with fund-raising from special grantors and encourage her private bar involvement in outlying areas. She wants to use mapping as an internal management tool in her project planning and with community partners to help identify gaps in programs services and to figure out some strategies to get those gaps. She has -- they are not -- they don't have a lot of great technical people on their staff and she was -- would like some ongoing assistance from LSC so she can get this mapping going in her program.

Now I have moved down to -- the NLS maps were just to the north that we looked at at the beginning

for Neighborhood Legal Services. This is core Los Angeles -- Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles. Bruce Iwasaki is the executive director of this program. And here, these areas, the central and south central L.A. represent some of the most intense poverty in the nation.

And this map was something that Bruce Iwasaki thought was a very useful map because it could be used for -- it shows access, it shows where outreach is necessary, it shows the logic of their object placement and it can be used by staff or to funders in the public. And you can sort of imagine a map like this would show their programs and activities per year hanging in their office and used as a reference point because it shows what their program's contribution to this community has been.

These kind of maps have a lot of detail and you can get really in and drill down and sort of look at these neighborhoods so we can get in and really see what is going on in central L.A. and see the case closures where you can see the city blocks of poverty populations.



These darkest here, they have about 25,000 persons at the 125 percent poverty level per square miles. So here in three square miles of this area here you have as much poverty as states like Alaska or Vermont or others. So it is a really intense level of poverty as you know.

We know that all of the grantees have had a very intense interest in ethnicity and languages. And this map shows language groups and they are listed here. Chinese, Japanese, Kmer, Hindi and Korean. The Asian language groupings. We get this data from the census. And there is some interesting things to note here. One is that there is a Kmer community down here in Long Beach, there is an isolated Korean community right here, the Koreans here, the Chinese here and then some real mixed communities, a Chinese community here and some isolated Japanese communities right here.

These maps are of interest to the program here because they would be useful for potential funders and supporters in the Asian/Pacific Islander community and it shows how coordinated outreach can be done to these isolated communities.

Now if we change this for the Spanish speakers, then of course there is, you know, there is coverage in all Los Angeles, but more interestingly, we can isolate the Hispanic poverty population, those are in color underneath, and the Hispanic cases that were closed by LAFLA to see those comparisons. And one might -- if they were looking at this map, they would say, one of these little spots here. Why is there a little bit of red that is not covered. Can we go and see what is going on there. You know, that would be the type of use for this kind of map.

Executive director Iwasaki is supportive of mapping and, in fact, even before we started the evaluation, he was looking for a way to get started with mapping and intends to make use of mapping in the future. He has pointed out some caveats. He says it takes training to learn how to interpret these maps and he cautions that maps, if not constructed carefully, can sort of misrepresent data, relying with map sort of problem.

However, he believes they can use maps for management first, like priority setting and allocation

resources, they can use them for marketing, you know, to raise money from legislature, foundations, private bar and for -- and ultimately for advocacy also, for redlining priority lending identification. He believes that those will be the future use of those.

Now moving just to the south of that area into Orange County in California, this is the area served by the Legal Aid Society of Orange County and Executive Director of Bob Cohen of LASOC has used maps as a lever to form partnerships with justice organizations. And here what we see are dots. The blue dots on top are low income pro se litigants with the county court right there. And underneath the colors represent the case close density by Orange County.

And what is interesting here is that this might be the first court legal aid partnership map. And it is also important because it demonstrates sort of a big picture on the legal needs and what is supplying those in the entire county. And there is a lot of excitement for the potential of forming these partnerships with the courts and attacking their problems together.

And he has another similar map where the colors underneath the red is the poverty population of the City of Santa Ana and the blue dots are 4,200 -- well, some of the dots are outside this area -- domestic violence incidents from the police department of Santa Ana and the yellow dots are Orange County's LASOC's, our grantees domestic violence cases.

And, you know, I am not going to say that this particular map has tremendous analytical value as it is, it is the very first map that was created; however, this represents an unprecedented willingness for the police to share data that is confidential of domestic violence and they believe that they can look at jointly and that potentially the legal aid can be an enforcement of components of theirs and there is, again, opportunities for partnerships and building stronger relationships.

Okay. Now we went and did an update of Georgia with the new census data. The last time around the census data wasn't available and this is a map of Georgia Legal Services programs in the Dalton area in the northwest part of the Georgia state. And this had

an immediate impact when it was first seen. Executive Director Phyllis Holmen, at that time, was considering closing this office and moving it to Rome because it thought there might be more private bar involvement here.

But when she looked at the map and looked at the changes of the census -- in fact, what it shows is that there was growth in poverty populations in the north part of the state where there hadn't been previously and poverty sort of along the I-75 corridor, which is a great transportation corridor. And based on this map, she decided to leave the office where it was and stop consideration of moving it to Rome. So it is sort of in a negative -- you know, had a null impact. It was an impact map right away.

And then when we were doing this project, Executive Director Holman requested this map. And this is the Hispanic poverty population, that is the color underneath. And you can see a little bit of it coming into northern Georgia. And Georgia you don't think of having this large Hispanic population, but they are growing there very significantly. And on top are some

few scattered case dots. These blue dots, just a few of them, they are where Hispanic cases have been closed. I guess there is a few more up in the Dalton, right around Dalton.

These maps were requested by GLSP because they had just gotten a new grant to do outreach and case closures for Hispanic -- for these two offices, just Gainesville and Dalton. And she wanted to set a baseline to say, okay, what were we doing before so that one, they could see how the poverty population, the Hispanic poverty populations are changing. And then demonstrate to the funder how -- what the results of the money. Look before and here is the case closure afterwards. So it forms a baseline. And I think that they are going to be very useful for that.

Ms. Holmen hopes that both of these two offices, plus the main office down in Atlanta, are going to be able to get started with some mapping this year, particularly to support this one project. And although, you know, their technical capability is again is pretty stretched at GLSP, she feels that maps will be useful for management and potentially for

fund-raising purposes.

This map was at the last Board meeting, I believe an earlier version of it was also shown. So it is a repeat. And here Steve Gottlieb of the Atlanta Legal Aid Society, these five counties are his program.

He saw that between the censuses, the poverty population in Gwinnett County in red there grew from 14 to 33,000 people.

And he showed this map to the county court in Gwinnett as part of its case for more funding and he was -- as a result, and this map wasn't all of it. His personal, you know, representation was part of it, but the map formed an evidence base and he received a grant to help turn that Gwinnett office from a part-time clinic to a full-time staffed office. So it is a map that produced a positive effect for his program, you know, well within in excess of his efforts to participate in this evaluation.

Now you were all, I think, in Montana several months ago and you may have seen this map at that time.

What happened is that the Montana State Bar provided us the number of attorneys per zip code and we mapped

it. So you can see the colors underneath. There is no attorneys out here. There is very few attorneys in these yellow areas and a smattering of these in these orange areas around Missoula and Helena and -- primarily.

And the red dots, which there are a few over land, are the PAI cases that were closed by MLSA in a year. So we are looking where the attorneys are and where they are participating. And they were using this map to go to the bar to seek greater bar involvement. And if you recall, back in the east part of the state there is virtually no attorneys. So it is very difficult to get bar involvement out there.

And then onwards MLSA Director Klaus Sitte used this and three other maps to promote a bill, which is going on right now, sponsored by the Montana Equal Justice Task Force, that will set up an interim commission to study the need for legal services for low income Montanans and to allocate state funding for that. So he has taken those and the state centers are looking at it and it is now up to the Justice Committee for review. So it has been through one subcommittee



and that is proceeding forward. So they are using these tools for advocacy.

That is the end of the map program. I have a couple of other remarks I would like to make. One is that there is other programs that weren't part of our evaluation that have taken up mapping. Eastern Tennessee, we have seen them do some mapping. Washington State, who I think has been a leader in these technology adaptations is doing -- they have a statewide justice community organization effort and they are just getting going with mapping as part of that, as an integral part of that statewide justice community planning process.

And very impressively, we have also -- the Legal Services of Northern California, again, it was not part of this evaluation, we have found that they have been going very strong. They are probably the most accomplished mapping grantee with regard to mapping. They use mapping, they claim -- their claims to us is for internal resource management and greatly for advocacy. They use it for advocacy and they have produced some very interesting advocacy maps and some

good examples of results.

They have trained four -- I am sorry, six staff attorneys to run the software to make maps on their own. They say that they can support something for a presentation. They can whip up a map in a couple of hours, if not days. And six staff attorneys do and make these maps. And I think it is a pretty interesting and impressive result of what can be achieved.

And I am going to conclude in somebody else's voice and that is a participant who hasn't been represented by the maps here and that is Greg Knolls of the grantee from the Legal Aid Society of San Diego. And, you know, I must say, as an aside, that Mr. Knolls was skeptical of this project to start -- when we started. You know, he thought it was an OIG project that was coming and, you know, what good could come out of that in participating with it. But, you know, when he started to see them, the maps for him in the evaluation served to show him the benefits. And he has now stated that in retrospect, before the project, he was unable to identify, analyze or in any meaningful

way communicate the concentrations for potential of actual clients.

He has shown the maps to his board and he plans to use them to target outreach and request additional funding to focus services more intensely in certain geographic areas. He intends to adopt mapping.

And while he does send the message that he would not like to see an unfunded mandate that all programs must find their own resources to make maps, he doesn't want an unfunded mandate, he has expressed the specific requests for continued LSC support for mapping.

One, he would like LSC to provide training to the grantees in making and using maps. Second, he would like LSC to use its scale and clout in getting the costs down for individual programs to use its scale for this mapping. He would like LSC to provide, negotiate and provide linkages to other national data sets from outside service agencies, like Fannie Mae and HUD, that are meaningful indicators for where the needs are and he feels that LSC can facilitate that rather than a hundred and fifty grantees individually running around and doing it.

And he has suggested that LSC provide initial support and continued support for a five-year period so that mapping can become institutionalized with grantees. And with his words, I will end there and I thank you very much.

MR. MADDUX: Thank you, Ed.

Clearly, this was just a small subset of a number of maps we have, but basically the evidence supports the conclusion that mapping technologies can make a significant difference in the quality and effectiveness of access to justice efforts by making them very, very visible and also concentrating on very strategic, oriented information, management information such as the needs -- legal needs in the low income population, legal services provided, the scale and impact of initiatives and programs, the relationships between all three, which ultimately create new management questions, potentially scary at first, but ultimately that provides insights and leads to new strategies.

In making it possible for grantee managers to employ resources better for executive directors and

boards to make a better case for new resources, to provide useful data for advocates work and to leverage national partnerships with courts, the bar and social and justice organizations and it enables the legislatures to see the challenges and contributions fo LSC and grantees in their state or district.

In terms of ways to move forward, the key question facing LSC management is how to assist the grantees in this area. With limited resources in both TIG and M&A funding, we offer a number of observations that could be helpful in developing a strategy and minimizing costs.

From our experience, there is limited field capacity to produce maps on an individual basis. The cost of mapping declines substantially with experience and there is large economies to be gained from a coordinated effort.

There are several cost-effective alternatives in our opinion. For instance, one middle of the road approach that would put Internet tools in place so that willing grantees and LSC could download census data to make quality maps themselves with desktop software.

Such a program would be outlined to include a partnership with an organization already using web mapping to establish a poverty mapping web server where grantees could download census data for their services.

Several of the organizations I mentioned earlier, HHS, HUD all have expressed interest in such a partnership, some of which have even mentioned the word pro bono in the conversation. An expansion of this basic idea would enable grantees to map their client locations using privacy protected online services.

LSC would offer continued support to the evaluations' participants and other interested grantees in the adoption in the use of mapping. LSC could separately develop an in-house mapping capability to support internal planning and performance evaluation. We have good reason to believe this program, as outlined, would provide nationwide legal services mapping capability for just under \$200,000 a year or \$1,400 per grantee. The cost would most likely be somewhat front-loaded in the early year.

Based on this cost estimate, the OIG believes that such an approach would be cost justified based

upon the broad base of benefits that we have documented throughout our project. Of course, the potential return on investment from greater access to mapping to the grantees and LSC must be considered against all other costs associated with other potential investments LSC could make.

But the evidence is very strong supporting further investment in mapping. The consultants used in this evaluation are, of course, available to support LSC in planning, costing and in further implementation efforts. We thank you for your time and would be happy to take any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you both for a very excellent presentation. I do have a list of questions, but I would refer to other committee members who might have some to begin with.

MS. MERCADO: The figure that you just mentioned a minute ago, Mr. Maddox, the \$200,000 a year, is that for a nationwide cost to cover all the grantees?

MR. MADDOX: That is correct. That does not include grantee labor to actually create the maps, but

that would include training, software arrangements that are currently in place. Basically through the TIG program, grantees can get the mapping software at very heavily discounted prices currently.

MS. MERCADO: How much did it cost us to do this mapping for the three-year period of time that we had under the inspector general. And I have that somewhere in one of my budgets, but do you recall that offhand how much that cost?

MR. MADDUX: An off the head estimate -- as with any technology investment, and this is part of the reason this concept evaluation was done with the OIG -- because a lot of the cost to figure out how to do it in a cost effective manner are up-front, but an off the head estimate of consulting money that we have used it is going to range around \$600,000. But that is an off the head estimate.

MS. MERCADO: Well, I mean, I knew it was in the hundreds of thousands. I was just trying to remember if that were the cost for just doing five or six programs that we did, then how does it equate with 200,000 nationwide for all the grantees?



MR. MADDOX: We have learned numerous lessons. Our -- just so you know, from what we spent with the initial Georgia project when we spent roughly \$200,000 there and then when you go to Montana, we have cut those costs -- that cost 25,000. So in terms of lessons learned, how you make those investments, that is why when we through out this dollar of \$1,400 per grantee, that is the kind of lessons learned.

For instance, one of the costs associated with mapping is a process by which case addresses become mappable. They get assigned latitudes and longitudes. Throughout our projects, we have scaled it down from 20 cents an address to 10 cents an address and only recently have we found about new breakthroughs and partnerships where it could be basically a penny per address.

Extrapolate that over the million cases LSC grantees provide annually, that is \$10,000. But in terms of the incremental reductions in investments, you know, I think that is where our project has led to substantial cost savings nationwide from any kind of mapping effort.

MS. MERCADO: I mean, you said that \$1,400 would be for, I guess, the actual technical cost, but the labor to input the information and to get the mapping that is required, I mean what would that cost average because that means you are pulling people away from doing actual client delivery of services by doing this mapping. What is the labor amount that you would use allocated to each of those programs?

MR. JURKEVICS: You know, this is an important point. The way that we envision this going forward is to provide some infrastructure support, but the grantees would map for themselves. In this evaluation, that didn't occur. There was a contractor down in Georgia that made all these maps. The maps were made by an outside professional organization. That is why they are so beautiful and, you know, so highly finished. We would see going forward, they would be much more utilitarian in nature as the grantees made their own.

We find that the grantees we talked to, they believe that there may be -- the first time the person makes the first map might take a few days for them to

learn the software. They have to take a training course. There is online training as part of the TIG program. You have to sit down for several hours to learn that and get going, but after that, they think that making a map is a few hours, that it is not something that takes days and days. And it may -- not every organization may use attorneys to make those. That was the advocacy cases.

In other cases, we would see the mapping being done by the person that runs the case management system, sort of the IT person, may be the person that adopts the mapping. And so it may not represent an extra staff load in any way whatsoever in those types of cases.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Is it your sense that mapping is providing the grantees with some information that they really did not have at their disposal in the past or is it just taking that existing data and putting it together in a more succinct and certainly eye appealing way because there is a difference between --

MR. JURKEVICS: You know, there is two sides to that. One is that we did find the executive

directors in general had a great intuitive sense of their service area. They know their patch of dirt pretty well intuitively; however, it is surprising that they have never seen detailed census data to find out where the poverty populations actually are and then when you get into language and ethnic communications, they have notions that they have heard that there might be a community over there, but they certainly don't know those demarcations, they have never seen it.

And in general, they are not -- do not know very well where their cases lay. So that is usually a surprise to them because they don't have a real sense of how the cases distribute geographically because the case management system -- they can tell them how many were brief service and extended service and how many were done in housing and so on. They can find that out at the end of the year through a statistical report, but they have no sense of where they are.

So and, you know, a lot of this when you distribute social services, a core denominator is the geography, is the awareness of things and they don't really have that at all. No. So I would say that they

are -- the programs largely, this whole field, unlike other social service organizations -- HUD does not do this, but this field here at LSC is driving blind. It drives by looking in the rearview mirror. You know, there is no sense of planning strategically on how this is going using this geographic stuff.

MR. MADDOX: Well, I think that brings up a point that mapping would be an excellent tool for state planning. It is, you know, kind of sets of the road map is what does the local poverty distribution look like and in many cases in Georgia where there is 159 counties, they have county wide poverty population numbers. That is it.

When we were able to bring that down to a census group level, this is complete new information that they have never seen before and as we saw even on a county perspective, they were able to use that quite a bit for fund raising to actually be able to display that to others and say, "This is the challenges that we are facing."

One of the maps we did not show, but we also did some maps where we computed a number of income

eligible persons per attorney in a service area and just some of the sheer numbers you see there, in Georgia, there were a couple of service areas that one attorney for fifteen thousand income eligible persons.

In Montana, there was an area where you had one attorney per 26,000 income eligible persons. Just the ability to kind of display that information of the size of the challenge and in many cases, the ratios that we computed of persons served, cases closed for income eligible when we talk about ratios of 1 percent, 2 1/2 percent on a national basis, 7 percent in certain neighborhoods, it gives you a size of the scope of the challenge.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Both of you have given some examples of how programs have been able to use it for fund-raising at the local level, i.e., going to, I guess, a donor or to the state legislature. Should we extrapolate from those examples that if we were to do this in a system wide basis, that it would be a tool for helping LSC and its requests to Congress and being able to make a more powerful or informed case at that level or is this something that only as a tool at the

local level for that goal of fund-raising?

MR. MADDUX: The feeling within the OIG, and we can talk to the congressional relations people who would know the Hill relations much more, but in terms of presenting a persuasive case for the size of the challenge, maps, you know, are one page marketing device in the right hands of showing what is going on in someone's state or congressional district -- and in many cases, you are, you know, showing even not your biggest fans sides of the contribution of what you do in their area can only be a positive in congressional relations work I believe.

CHAIRMAN HALL: The 200,000 a year, was that on the assumption that LSC would be absorbing all of that cost or would some of these partners that you named who are also interested in doing some of this would -- is this after they have contributed whatever they might or is this saying that is what the figure is. If we could get HUD or somebody else to go in with us on this, that would drop?

MR. JURKEVICS: You know what? I can answer that. We have assumed that there would be some cost

recovery for those organizations. You find a partner that may not -- you may not bear the full freight, but you have to pay some money. You may. However, it is very interesting.

Some of these organizations are very politically oriented of themselves and HUD, for instance, money wasn't their primary importance. What was a justification of the other good that they were serving that justified their own programs and their own budget. So you don't know how -- you know, depending on the organization that you partner up with, there could be -- it could be much more favorable for the Corporation than what we outlined as the \$200,000.

CHAIRMAN HALL: And I guess David and Kirt would be here would probably the best person to answer this, but does the OIG see itself or that office having a continuing role in this, the expertise that you have developed, the time that you have committed to this? Is this a project that you now see handing off or is this another way in which you can provide quality enhancement to the effort?

MR. WEST: I think at this point, it is really



something we have to hand off. This is really a programmatic responsibility. I think it is something for management and the Board to decide, you know, if they are interested in this, when they might be interested. I mean, that is really your call. We did this to show here is a tool.

I think the expertise really lies in Ed and the other consultants as opposed to internally with our office. So I would -- I think we are pretty much at the end of the road and now it is, you know, what is the next step if there are any. And understanding, as Dave said, the tremendous cost constraints that Helaine has and the challenge in her budget and, you know, where you spend your money and what you do and that.

But I also wanted to say I think that your question about the political, you know, ramifications -- and this is just sort of speaking personally, maybe not as the IG, I think it would be tremendous. I think it would show some people what they really have in their communities, their legislatures, that this is what you have got.

And I think it could be probably not only on

the national level, but obviously on the state level for state politicians in terms of funding and for bar associations. This is what it really is. This isn't somebody's guess, this isn't somebody's intuition, but here are some hard numbers.

CHAIRMAN HALL: You've certainly provided us with some other testimonies from executive directors of people in the field about how favorable they were to that. Would you, again, extrapolate from your experience with them that most grantees in the field, assuming it is not an unfunded mandate, would feel that this was a tool that they would be given that would help them do their work better? And I don't know how large your survey of grantees is, but what would you conclude as to their reaction if LSC was to say yes, this is something we are going to try to institutionalize?

MR. MADDUX: They would be very excited. I mean, they are at the point of asking LSC for resources and help, but they are also scratching their own heads, looking at their own dollars and saying how much of my own money would I be willing to pony up to this. And

as such, I think they are very serious about adoption.

So they are looking at all strategies that are open to them at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MR. WEST: But I would suspect, like any other issue, there is some people who are a little more savvy to technology than others and there is some that would probably be very resistant and it would be like anything else. Kind of like 20, 25 years ago when computers first came around.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Sure.

MR. WEST: Some of us didn't embrace it as fast as others.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes. Okay. Any other questions from committee members?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, thank you very much. Very informative presentation.

\* \* \* \* \*