December 21, 2006

Thomas Meites, Esq.
Chairman, LSC Operations and Regulations Committee
Legal Services Corporation
3333 K Street, NW, 3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20007-3522

Dear Chairman Meites:

As the Chairperson of the Client Policy Group of the National Legal Aid & Defender Association, I am writing to address the proposed changes to Part 1621 of the Legal Services Corporation Regulations dealing with Client Grievance Procedures. I am specifically requesting that the Legal Services Corporation retain the current language in Section 1621.1 the Purpose Statement.

Client grievance procedures play a vital function in the delivery system of legal services for low income people and clients. Clients and applicants for services need to be afforded an opportunity to bring their concerns and complaints to the program leadership including the boards of directors of grantee programs. Client feedback from complaints, client letters, and client satisfaction surveys provide a check on the quality of representation and services provided by programs. Complaints and concerns about the denial of services and the quality of legal assistance should be welcomed, addressed and resolved in a timely and effective manner. It is my belief that the Legal Services Corporation, other funders, Executive Directors of LSC grantee programs, and boards of directors of LSC grantee programs should welcome client feedback.

The client grievance procedure insures that programs are accountable to the clients they represent and serve. Congress recognized this idea as being fundamentally important to the effectiveness of legal services programs. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Part 1621 states in the Supplementary Information: Background that the regulation is intended to help, "insure that legal services programs are accountable to those whom they are expected to serve."

I am concerned that the proposed changes to Section 1621.1 will water down and weaken the intent of Congress and the purpose of having client grievance procedures. I have read and reviewed the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. This notice proposes to remove language that says:
By providing an effective remedy for a person who believes that legal assistance has been denied improperly, or who is dissatisfied with the assistance provided, this part seeks to insure that every recipient will be [accountable to] those it is expected to serve, and will provide the legal assistance required by the Act.

I believe that the removal of the words “providing an effective remedy” will greatly weaken this regulation governing client grievance procedures. Clients who submit a grievance in the form of a complaint about the denial of services and or the quality of services received should expect that their complaint will be effectively resolved. Eliminating reference to an effective remedy will allow programs to create and enforce client grievance procedures that do not address the concerns of the client. Leadership of grantee programs could implement procedures that create a process that doesn’t resolve the problem and provides clients with a process that sends them in circles without a resolution of their complaint. This is not acceptable. It clearly undermines the intent of Congress to every program is “accountable to those it is expected to serve.”

Many times the problem that brings clients to legal services program is based on the denial of due process rights from a public agency. I find it troubling that the proposed revision for a client grievance procedure is one that lessens the rights clients have when seeking assistance from a legal services program. Legal services programs represent clients every day in actions against other agencies because the due process rights of the agency are inadequate and fail to resolve or remedy the complaint or situation.

It is disappointing and unbelievable that the Legal Services Corporation might adopt a regulation that will lessen the legal rights of clients by eliminating their right to a resolution or remedy of their complaint against the program. I urge the Legal Services Corporation to keep the current language and refuse to adopt the proposed change that calls for deleting the language, “By providing an effective remedy...those it is expected to serve, and will provide the legal assistance required by the Act.”

I am also troubled by the recommendation of the LSC staff to add language that says, “This Part is not intended to and does not create any entitlement to legal assistance.” It is my firm belief that this language does not belong in a client grievance procedure that is intended to hold programs accountable. The LSC regulations speak to issues of eligibility and spells out grounds for denying services in other places. It is not necessary to place this additional language into the regulation. It is not appropriate to add this language in the client grievance procedure. It adds insult to injury for a complaining and disappointed client to be told that they are not entitled to assistance. Placing this language in the purpose section of the regulation covering client grievance procedures undermines the purpose of this important regulation.

I am well aware of the movement to create a Civil Gideon. While I know that the establishment of a defined right to counsel in civil matters is a state matter, I believe the ABA resolution passed in August 2006 that calls for a defined right to counsel is a significant development for low income people. It will assist us in our efforts to close the justice gap and address the increasing unmet need.
As an advocate, ambassador and gatekeeper for equal justice, I believe that clients must work as partners with program staff, program leadership, boards of directors, funders, and community partners to meet the legal needs of low income people. It is my firm belief that we cannot afford to water down our efforts toward building a network of well funded quality programs that meet client needs in all fifty states.

Approving the proposed changes to Section 1621.1 will cause damage to the credibility of legal services programs and the legal services community with low income people. Denying clients a resolution or remedy to their grievance about the denial of services or the quality of representation is fundamentally unjust and unfair. Enclosed you will find petitions and letters received by the Client Policy Group and Client Section of the National Legal Aid & Defender Association. These letters and petition signatures represent the concerns and opinions of clients of programs located around the country. I urge the Legal Services Corporation to keep the original language of Section 1621.1 and disapprove the adoption of the proposed changes.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosita Stanley
Chairperson
Client Policy Group

cc: Helaine Barnett
    Frank Strickland
    Karen Sarjeant
    Jo-Ann Wallace
Charles A. Wynder Jr.
Vice President for Program Leadership and Support
National Legal Aid & Defender Association
1140 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20036

December 11, 2006

RE: Petition regarding proposed changes to LSC Regulation Part 1621.1

Dear Mr. Wynder:

On Friday, December 8, 2006 and Saturday, December 9, the Indiana Legal Services Board met and hosted a client training event. During the meeting and training, the enclosed petition was circulated to clients and client-eligible board members. Fourteen (14) individuals signed the petition regarding LSC Regulation Part 1621.1. Please use this petition as the expression of the clients’ interests in disapproving the proposed change to the purpose section of the regulation. Thank you for your kind attention to this matter and the enclosed, signed petition.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Norman P. Metzger
Executive Director

C.C. Harry Johnson

Enclosure/eb
PETITION
REGARDING
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
CLIENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE
LSC REGULATION PART 1621.1

BE IT KNOWN, that the undersigned individuals agree that the purpose section of the regulation covering client grievance procedures for federally funded legal services programs should remain unchanged and remain as originally drafted; and

BE IT ALSO KNOWN that we disagree with the proposed changes in the purpose section of this regulation referred to as Part 1621.1. We do not believe that the remedy language should be removed from this regulation. We also disagree with the recommendation that the regulation should include language that receiving legal assistance through legal services programs is not an entitlement.

THEREFORE, we call upon the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation to disapprove any recommendation to change the purpose section of LSC Regulation 1621.

[Signatures]

[Signatures]
PETITION
REGARDING
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
CLIENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE
LSC REGULATION PART 1621.1

BE IT KNOWN, that the undersigned individuals agree that the purpose section of the regulation covering client grievance procedures for federally funded legal services programs should remain unchanged and remain as originally drafted; and

BE IT ALSO KNOWN that we disagree with the proposed changes in the purpose section of this regulation referred to as Part 1621.1. We do not believe that the remedy language should be removed from this regulation. We also disagree with the recommendation that the regulation should include language that receiving legal assistance through legal services programs is not an entitlement.

THEREFORE, we call upon the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation to disapprove any recommendation to change the purpose section of LSC Regulation 1621.

[Signatures]
PETITION
REGARDING
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
CLIENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE
LSC REGULATION PART 1621.1

BE IT KNOWN, that the undersigned individuals agree that the purpose section of the regulation covering client grievance procedures for federally funded legal services programs should remain unchanged and remain as originally drafted; and

BE IT ALSO KNOWN that we disagree with the proposed changes in the purpose section of this regulation referred to as Part 1621.1. We do not believe that the remedy language should be removed from this regulation. We also disagree with the recommendation that the regulation should include language that receiving legal assistance through legal services programs is not an entitlement.

THEREFORE, we call upon the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation to disapprove any recommendation to change the purpose section of LSC Regulation 1621.

Signature

Signature

Signature

Signature

Signature

Signature

Signature

Signature
Dear [Name],

I am writing to confirm your reservation at The Westin. We are excited to have you with us!

Here are the details:

- Check-in: [Check-in Date]
- Check-out: [Check-out Date]
- Room Type: [Room Type]
- Rate: [Rate]
- Deposit: [Deposit Amount]
- Payment Method: [Payment Method]

If you have any questions or need further assistance, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Thank you for choosing The Westin.

Best regards,

[Manager's Name]

The Westin
PETITION
REGARDING
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
CLIENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE
LSC REGULATION PART 1621.1

BE IT KNOWN, that the undersigned individuals agree that the purpose section of the regulation covering client grievance procedures for federally funded legal services programs should remain unchanged and remain as originally drafted; and

BE IT ALSO KNOWN that we disagree with the proposed changes in the purpose section of this regulation referred to as Part 1621.1. We do not believe that the remedy language should be removed from this regulation. We also disagree with the recommendation that the regulation should include language that receiving legal assistance through legal services programs is not an entitlement.

THEREFORE, we call upon the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation to disapprove any recommendation to change the purpose section of LSC Regulation 1621.

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

[Signatures]
Dear member of the legal services corporation Board of Directors, I am a client and I would like to thank you for all your support and help you have given to poor people across the states.

As a client I feel that the statement 16:21. I protect, care, is safety met for clients & myself.

Sincerely,

Gloria Perez
Dear Members of The Legal Service Corporations Board of Directors,

I would like to take this time to thank you for all the services you have provided me with as a client of legal services.

I am writing you in reference to the changes of 10.21.1 purpose. I am asking that you do not change this purpose due to I feel that this is an injustice to me and that there is no due process to protect me for the services that I am to have as a legal service client.

Thank you for your consideration.

Linda J. McRae
Penn. Legal Aid Network
Nov 10, 2006

Dear Member of Legal Service Corporation,

I am asking you please don't change 1621. I purpose. It really help us to stay focus and protect us. We know that you care about clients because of what you do.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

1231 N. Franklin St
Phila. 19122
WellPride@.aol.com
November 16, 2004

Dear Members, Iowa Service Corporation Board of Directors:

Please do change 2004 Purpose Statement
It help us in many ways
Please do not change!!

Thank you,
[Signature]
November 9, 2006

Dear LSE Board Members,

Please do not change 1621.1. Clients need a process by which they can challenge the services if they are not properly delivered.

Sincerely,

Lucille Logan
534 N. Reid
Oklahoma City, OK 73104
November 10, 2006

To: Legal Service Corporation Board of Directors

I want to first thank you for all your support and help you have given to poor people across the States.

I am requesting that the Legal Service Corporation Board of Director's please do not change or add to regulation 1621.1 Purpose Statement. I am a client and can speak for myself. I feel that 1621.1 Statement protects many clients like myself. It is a safety-net. It speaks very clearly and give guidance for clients.

Again, I want to thank you for all that you do.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Theda, 10/10/2006
Nov. 10th 2006

Dear Member of the Legal Services Corporation
Board of Directors:

Thank you for years of support.
I would like to request as we move forward focus on the future that you
Reconsider, and Not change the Language
in 1621.1 which insite every Recipient
has a Right.

LSC was design to Provide service to
Protect the Process if we need each other.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Grace Harley-Temple
Client Council Member
Legal Aid Inc. San Diego, Ca.
Dear Members of the Legal Services Corporation
Board of Directors:

Thank you for the services you have provided. The purpose of this letter is to ask that you make no changes to the languages of (16:14115) as told at the NLRB in Conference, Nov 9, 2006.

That you all are considering making changes. We the clients feel that we need a protection process now and in the future, therefore I feel the language we already have is good enough.

I look forward in hearing from you on our behalf.

Thank you
La Dena Robbins
5850 Reo Service #C
San Diego, Ca. 92139
Dear Members of the Legal Services Corporation Board of Directors. My name is Gary Johnson, I am a client board member, I am taking this time to urge you to reconsider your decision in changing 1631.

1631.1 Purpose
The original language is very simple, in which all clients can understand. In your change document, the wording is in very legal terms which most clients would need an attorney to explain.

1631.2 Committee
You did not change, you kept it very simply.

1631.3 Complaints
In the original language is pretty straightforward, your change document the wording once again the very legal terms.
1621.4 Complaints

In the original language is pretty straightforward. Yet again the year change document is one again is in very legal terms.

I have been involved in my community long enough to know that change can be good as long as change does not hurt the people we serve in our low income community. In your change document seems to appear that this change will be taking away the due process from all of our clients. Whether we serve on the board or not.

I thank you for all you have done on behalf of our low income clients. For what you are about to do.

Thank you and may god bless all of you in Jesus name.

Sincerely yours.

Gary A. Johnson.
Nov 9, 2004

To the member of the Legal service of The Corporation Board of Directors

Please do not change 16:21:1

The purpose it was put there was to help poor people who don’t have the means or money to Pay a lawyer. I am glad that some one came up with 16:21:1 So that every poor person can have legal assistance. Even with all that we do there are still a lot of people out there, that don’t know to go or how to receive legal assistance. I am a Client member from Houston Texas. I am a disable person who was wronged, and the Legal aid that helped. So I became a Client member and I could go out and help others.

I think we all should be held accountable to applicant for legal assistance. I feel like you are changing the 5th amendment. So will you reconsider what the change could do to people like my self.

Thank you

Pearly M. Blunt
Client Council member
Houston Tex 7722
Dear Members of the Legal Services Corporation Board of Directors,

The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention the recent modification of changes being made to regulation 1621.1, which is the purpose under the Client Grievance Procedure.

I am a Client Board Member who has the clients welfare at heart. To take away or add the language that I have read takes away the justification of even providing legal assistance to the poor; the present language at gives a clients that they have hope that something will come to them needing assistance and can rely on a mechanism that they have recourse if they are refuse assistance or not handle professionally. I am asking you to think about what the legal service to the poor stands for.

There should be a trust between the clients and the Service organizations that is supplying the assistance.

Sincerely,

Robert Blunt Jr.
7750 Bellaire Ave #11
Houston, TX 77061
November 10, 2006

Dear Members of the Legal Services Corporation Board of Directors,

I was at the National Legal Aid and Defender Association Conference in Charlotte, North Carolina. I was informed that you are in process of changing the Purpose of 1621, Client Grievance Procedure.

I have reviewed part 1621 and feel that this change will greatly impact many clients and client board members all over the United States of America. In changing the purpose of section 1621, clients will no longer have a voice about the legal system; it will take away the accountability of the Legal Assistance agencies, and most importantly - clients' last of fair justice.

As a client board member of the Mid Minnesota Legal Assistance in Minneapolis, Minnesota - I ask the board to reconsider this change and think about its original purpose and mission when 1621 was first
originated and why it was originated. Thank you for taking your time and patience in reading my letter and my concerns with this change to 10-21.

Sincerely,

Mendes Young