## LAWYERS PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY BOARD

SUITE 300

372 ST. PETER STREET ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102

GERALD E. MAGNUSON CHAIRMAN

CHAIRMAN

MARY H. DAVIES
KELTON GAGE
JEANNE GIVENS
ARTHUR N. GOODMAN
JAMES T. HALE
ROBERT F. HENSON
JARED HOW
CHARLES T. HVASS
KENNETH F. KIRWIN
HERBERT P. LEFLER
GREER E. LOCKHART
WILLIAM I. NOVAK
WILLIAM I. NOVAK
WILLIAM T. O'CONNOR
RICHARD L. PEMBERTON
CLARENCE W. PETERSON
STEPHEN C. RATHKE
ALAN K. RUVELSON
RONALD P. SMITH
WILLIAM P. VAN EVERA
SHERMAN WINTHROP
MARTHA ZACHARY

MICHAEL J. HOOVER ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

BRUCE E. MARTIN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

> RICHARD C. BAKER STAFF ATTORNEY 612 - 296-3952

February 11, 1981

Honorable James C. Otis Associate Justice Office of the Chief Justice Minnesota Supreme Court State Capitol Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

ABA Evaluation of the Lawyers

Professional Responsibility Board

Dear Judge Otis:

As you have requested, I am enclosing a proposed Order which will permit us to give access to files, records and proceedings in connection with the American Bar Association evaluation of the Minnesota Lawyer Disciplinary System.

You may recall that the Court last year at a Court meeting authorized me to make arrangements for the evaluation, subject to Board approval and subject to a reasonable limitation on The Board last year gave its approval and the cost of the evaluation will be between \$1250 and \$1500, which will approximately cover 50% of the actual cost of transportation, lodging and meal expenses of the evaluation team members. balance of team expenses and the costs associated with the production of the report will be contributed by the American Bar Association.

The proposed Order is substantially similar to a proposed Order submitted in 1978 in connection with the proposed William Mitchell Study. Unlike the William Mitchell proposed Order, the enclosed proposed Order does not prohibit contact with respondents and complainants. In order to evaluate properly our operation the evaluation team may desire to talk with some respondents and complainants and with their attorneys to consider their perceptions of the operation of this system. upon my discussions with other jurisdictions which have been evaluated, I am convinced that such contacts may be appropriate

during this limited study and can be done sensitively and without an invasion of privacy.

Since the Committee has tentatively proposed conducting the study during mid-March, the Court's early approval of this proposed Order would be appreciated. If there are any questions or problems, please let me know.

Very truly yours

Michael J. Hoever

Administrative Director

MJH:rk