

ATLANTA LEGAL AID SOCIETY, INC.

151 SPRING STREET NW
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-2097
(404) 524-5811

Steven Gottlieb
Executive Director

Cheri Tipton
Deputy Director

Charles R. Bliss
Director of Advocacy

Donald M. Coleman
Jacqueline L. Payne
Margaret Hayman
Susan C. Jamieson
Stephen Krumm
Catherine C.
Vandenberg
Karen E. Brown
Roshonda Davis-Baugh
Anne E. Carder
Deborah A. Johnson
John R. Warchol
Dina Franch
Kristin Nelson Verrill
Jamie Aliperti
C. Talley Wells
Stacy E. Reynolds
Margaret Kinnear
Yazmin Sobh
Hee Ryu
Michelle Jordan
Stacy A. Sax
Anne Marie Lugo
Karen Moskowitz
Lindsay C. Verity
Angela Riccetti
Sarah C. Cipperly
Kimberly P. Charles
Megan L. Miller
Elena M. Mushkin
Martha A. Fineman-
Sowers
Craig L. Goodmark
Elizabeth Ann Guerrant
Rachel M. Lazarus
Andrea Espie Landers
Kevin A. Anderson
Kate M. Gaffney
Hilary Leland
Marsha K. Klevickis
Nancy E. Rhinehart
Erin A. Willoughby
John Bartholomew
Stephanie Jones
Lisa Liang
Sarah Beth Stephens
Rachael Scott
Elaine Poon
Payal Kapoor
Anna-Elisa Mackowiak
J. Erik Heath
Allison Stiles
Saadia A. Memon
Brianna H. Erwin
Lori E. Quesada
Jessica Felfoldi
Ángela Vela Ramirez
Pam Kraidler
Cristina Dumitrescu

Mark Freedman
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Legal Services Corporation
3333 K. Street, NW
Washington DC 20007

Dear Mark:

I wish to participate at the PAI workshops as a panelist—preferably in the first workshop in Denver.

The key points that I would like to make as a panelist involve having the regulation either be interpreted or amended to allow for a less restrictive and longer long term view of what it means to have private attorney involvement and support for the work of LSC recipients.

The appropriate (and I believe original) purposes of the PAI regulation are to insure that private attorneys have a stake and investment in the provision of legal services to low income people while at the same time doing so within a framework which makes it likely that the services they provide are as much as possible in priority areas. An underlying purpose of the regulation is to help develop coordination between local legal services providers and private attorneys, both to better organize the provision of the services and also to build bridges between legal aid programs and the private bar. The present regulation or the way it has been interpreted undercut these purposes in each of areas that LSC wishes addressed.

Topic 1. Presently LSC does not give credit toward the PAI requirement for resources spend supervising law students, law graduates or deferred associates because they are technically not attorneys eligible to practice. This view is shortsighted. Many if not most of these aspiring attorneys will become licensed and training provided to them before they practice gives them a stake and investment in providing legal services to our clients. It also gives them additional ability to do so once they become licensed. And it ties them more closely to our programs and makes it more likely that when they do practice, they will continue to provide services through our programs and will be supportive of our work and of our programs.

Dawn M. Jones
President

Catherine Acree
Vice President

William Stanhope
Treasurer

Chad Allan Shultz
Secretary

Michael W. Rafter
Immediate Past Pres

June 25, 2013

Mark Freedman
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Legal Services Corporation
June 25, 2013
Page 2

Topic 2. While we normally think of private bar involvement as the provision full representation, in fact many private lawyers who want to volunteer want to take on more limited services. They may be hesitant about time commitments or they may be nervous about full representation of clients in areas outside their specialty and often they are reticent to go to court. To make best use of private attorneys to help our clients we need to encourage more limited commitments like screening, advice and referrals. We have also learned that these services have value for our clients, and are a necessity given our limited resources.

Topic 3. While in theory the best use of private attorney resources would be on the cases that programs considered the highest possible priorities--those cases that staff attorneys would take. In fact, it is often not possible to persuade private attorneys to take those cases, and often the cases that they will take are ones that are less complicated and require less urgent action. However, these cases are nonetheless important to our clients even though we do not have the in house resources to handle them. In addition it is not always possible to determine exactly how much of the support provided to private attorneys results in support to eligible clients. And if the provision of the services are in clinics or hotlines, trying to determine eligibility undercuts the purposes of providing quick services.

I understand that giving PAI credit does not determine whether programs will necessarily use private attorneys in a particular way. Our program for instance has many mechanisms for involving the private bar in our work and we well exceed the 12 and 1/2 percent requirement regardless of how LSC interprets 1614. However whether a particular practice is counted undoubtedly does skew what some programs do, and the present limited application of the PAI requirement pushes program not to use the resources of the private bar in a way which bests conforms to the desires of private lawyers or best meets the needs of our clients.

My current resume is attached. I would add that our program has long been in the forefront of private attorney involvement. Our Saturday Attorney program has been in continuous operation for over 40 years. And in addition to traditional pro bono programs, we have had signature projects with various law firms to do eviction protection, unemployment compensation and wills. One law firm actually founded and is still the primary referral source for our grandparent (now relative caregiver) project through which adoptions and guardianships are done for relatives taking care of children. We also have had over 50 associate fellows from law firms, and were the first (and perhaps still the only) legal aid program to get a fellow from the corporate legal department; UPS is

Mark Freedman
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Legal Services Corporation
June 25, 2013
Page 3

now on its third fellow. Finally, we had the honor of have the former governor of Georgia, Roy Barnes, volunteer for 6 months on our staff after he was defeated for reelection.

I have also attached the checklist.

Thank you for considering me as a panelist.

Sincerely,



Steve Gottlieb
Executive Director

STEVEN GOTTLIEB

Professional

- Executive Director, Atlanta Legal Aid Society
July 1980 – Present

Responsible for an organization of about 120 employees at multiple locations, with a budget over \$8.5 million. Atlanta Legal Aid provides civil legal services to low-income persons in the five county metro Atlanta area. In addition to five core legal areas (family law, housing, healthcare, consumer finance and government benefits), Atlanta Legal Aid has ten special practices: Senior Citizens Law Project, Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program, Disability Integration Project, Home Defense Program, AIDS/ALS/Cancer Initiative, Hispanic Outreach Law Project, Grandparent/Relative Caregiver Project, Georgia Senior Legal Hotline, TeamChild Atlanta and the Health Law Partnership.

- Deputy Director, Atlanta Legal Aid Society
January 1977 – July 1980
- Managing Attorney, Savannah Regional Office
Georgia Legal Services Program
July 1974 – December 1976
- Staff Attorney and Managing Attorney
Atlanta Legal Aid Society
July 1969 – June 1974

Education

University of Pennsylvania Law School, LL. B. 1969
Hamilton College, Clinton NY – B.A. 1963

Awards

American Bar Association, 1994 John Minor Wisdom
Public Interest and Professionalism Award
Anti-Defamation League, 1999 Elbert P. Tuttle Jurisprudence Award
Atlanta Bar Association, 2000 Leadership Award
Emory University School of Law, 2007 EPIC Inspiration Award
State Bar of Georgia, 2009 Justice Thomas O. Marshall Professionalism Award
Georgia Bar Foundation, 2009 James M. Collier Award
Georgia State University College of Law, 2009 Ben F. Johnson, Jr.,
Public Service Award
Management Information Exchange, 2010 Lifetime Achievement Award
2012 Turknett Leadership Character Award, 2012

Name	Steve Gottlieb
Topic 1: LSC Pro Bono Task Force Recommendation 2(a) - Resources spent supervising and training law students, law graduates, deferred associates, and others should be counted toward grantees' PAI obligations, especially in "incubator" initiatives.	
x	How are legal service providers engaging new categories of volunteers? What are the needs of these new categories of volunteers?
x	What are the obstacles to LSC grant recipients' full use of these volunteers?
x	Should LSC implement conditions and guidelines to allow LSC recipients to claim PAI credit for the supervision and training of these volunteers?
x	How can LSC ensure against fraud, waste, or abuse related to implementing this recommendation? What caution should LSC exercise to ensure against any unintended consequences?
x	To the extent applicable, discuss how any approaches you recommend might be implemented.
	Other issues related to Topic 1 (please specify in your submitted outline).
Topic 2: LSC Pro Bono Task Force Recommendation 2(b) - Grantees should be allowed to spend PAI resources to enhance their screening, advice, and referral programs that often attract pro bono volunteers while serving the needs of low-income clients.	
x	How are recipients currently using integrated intake and referral systems?
x	Do LSC's current PAI regulations inhibit full use of integrated intake and referral systems?
x	Should LSC implement conditions and guidelines to allow LSC recipients to claim PAI credit for the resources used to create and staff integrated intake and referral systems?
x	How can LSC ensure against fraud, waste or abuse related to implementing this recommendation? What caution should LSC exercise to ensure against any unintended consequences?
x	To the extent applicable, discuss your organization's ability to execute any recommended approaches.
	Other issues related to Topic 2 (please specify in your submitted outline).
Topic 3: LSC Pro Bono Task Force Recommendation 2(c) - LSC should reexamine the rule, as currently interpreted, that mandates adherence to LSC grantee case handling requirements, including that matters be accepted as grantee cases in order for programs to count toward PAI requirements.	
x	How are recipients currently using or supporting pro bono volunteers in brief service clinics?
x	What are the obstacles to recipients' use of pro bono volunteers in brief service clinics?
x	Should LSC implement conditions and guidelines to allow LSC recipients to claim PAI credit for the resources used to support volunteer attorneys staffing brief service clinics?
x	If LSC were to allow recipients to claim PAI credit for the resources used to support volunteer attorneys staffing brief service clinics under circumstances where the users of the clinics are not screened for LSC eligibility or accepted as clients of the recipient, how could that change be implemented in a manner that ensures compliance with legal restrictions on recipients' activities and uses of LSC funds?
x	How can LSC ensure against fraud, waste or abuse related to implementing this recommendation? What caution should LSC exercise to ensure against any unintended consequences?
x	To the extent applicable, discuss your organization's ability to execute any recommended approaches.
	Other issues related to Topic 3 (please specify in your submitted outline).