

STATE PLANNING REPORT OREGON

**Contact Person: Ira R. Zarov, Executive Director, Legal Aid Service of Oregon
(503) 224-4094**

A. Briefly describe the state planning process and participants.

The state planning process has gone through two distinct phases. Phase one involved the Oregon State Bar Legal Services Task Force. The Task Force was convened by the President of the OSB in consultation with the Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court.¹

The Task Force divided into four subcommittees. The four committees were Client Need/Priorities: Delivery System; Structure and Organization; Funding; and Ethical Responsibility/Quality Assurance/Transition.² A wide range of legal services providers made presentations to the Task Force. Among the groups making presentations were the Law School Clinics, the state Protection and Advocacy Agency, the Juvenile Rights Project, Pro Bono groups and a variety of other members of the legal community who had an interest in providing services to low income residents of Oregon. Each of the subcommittees then reported to the full committee and a final Task Force Report was issued. (Because the final Report provided the

¹ The Task Force was Chaired by Stephen S. Walters, a partner with Stoel Rives, the largest law firm in Oregon. Other members included the Honorable David V. Brewer, a circuit court judge from Lane County; the Honorable Neil R. Bryant (Republican - Deschutes County), Chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee; Edward L. Clark, partner in Clark and Lindaauer, Salem; Michael E. Haglund, Haglund and Kirtley, Portland, the Honorable Jack L. Landau, Oregon Court of Appeals; Katherine A. McDowell, Partner Stoel Rives; Katherine H. O'Neil, Graff and O'Neil, Portland; Lawrence B. Rew, Corey, Byler, Rew (Mr. Rew is now President Elect of the OSB); and Martha Walters, Walters, Romm Chanti and Dickens, Eugene. Also serving on the committee as OSB Board of Bar Governors liaison were Barrie Herbold of Markowitz and Herbold, Portland; Ira Zarov, Executive Director of Oregon Legal Services; and Ann Bartsch, Staff Liaison, OSB.

² The reference to "transition" in the fourth subcommittee referred to the transfer of previous Legal Services Corporation program work that became restricted.

basis for much of the state planning that followed, a copy of the Report is included with this State Planning Report.³⁾

The second phase of the report has been conducted through a series of meetings between LSC-funded providers and other legal services providers in the state. These meetings have addressed the issues raised by LSC. Programs involved in preparing this report include: Marion-Polk Legal Aid Services, Lane County Legal Aid Services, Legal Aid Services of Oregon, The Center for Nonprofit Legal Services, and the Oregon Law Center. Discussions with the Campaign for Equal Justice, a fundraising organization devoted to raising funds for legal services, the Oregon Advocacy Center (the state Protection and Advocacy Agency), and the Oregon State Bar Legal Services Program, have also been held during the planning process.

B. Address the following areas in the order presented. In addressing each area, please consider the LSC’s *State Planning Considerations* and:

- **assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current approach;**
- **establish goals to strengthen and expand services to eligible clients; and**
- **determine the major steps and timetable necessary to achieve those goals.**

1. Intake, Advice and Referral

The strength of the structure of Oregon legal services programs is the high number of offices, relative to other western states, located in individual communities, and the outreach efforts those offices make to neighboring communities. It is our belief that local physical presence is one of the two key components of an effective legal services program. The second component, and a strength of Oregon’s legal services delivery model, is an actualized program philosophy that employs community-based priority setting to guide case acceptance and a

³The Task Force Report was submitted, as an attachment, with hard copies of the State Planning Report.

commitment once a case is accepted to designing case strategies that both meet the client's objective and affect as large a number of the client community as possible.

Within the overall Oregon framework, intake, advice, and referrals are handled in ways consistent with mainstream legal services practice. Intake is done both by telephone and in person. In some areas fairly complete initial screening is accomplished in the first phone contact and appropriate referrals are made. In other systems, initial screening covers only financial eligibility and paralegals or attorneys perform secondary screening. More in-depth descriptions of the intake procedures of LSC programs are available in the applications of each program, and we direct the Corporation to those applications for that information.

Oregon programs have attempted to maximize client access by adopting policies that expand services through outreach, the use of 800 numbers, and the use of hotlines. Each LSC program does significant outreach within its community, usually to senior centers or places where minority populations congregate, and also circuit-ride to communities within their service area. Each LSC office also utilizes 800 numbers for intake and has adopted policies that provide for home visits in appropriate cases. The 800 numbers are in response to a number of different and difficult service delivery problems. For example, Legal Aid Services of Oregon was forced to close its Klamath Falls office because of federal funding cuts. In response, LASO created an 800 number in its Coos Bay office to provide service to Klamath residents. LASO also created a mechanism to refer Spanish-speaking clients from Klamath to our Ontario office where the staff is bilingual.

Within the state there are a variety of local, regional, and statewide hotlines. The hotlines are employed in specific individual substantive areas rather than as centralized full-service intake

mechanisms. The local and regional hotlines are typical housing and welfare services. The statewide hotline is currently funded by a \$250,000 grant from a number of foundations and has been extremely successful, both in its benefit to clients and its institutional acceptance within the legal services community. The hotline is designed to respond to the problems of individuals who use the IV-D program, the state system for collecting child support. The hotline responds to the problems of both obligors and obligees. It is not structured in a traditional fashion, and because of its success we are examining recreating the model in other areas where statewide policies are in play.

The hotline provides an 800 number advertised at district attorneys' offices, support enforcement offices, legal services offices and other appropriate places. The responsibility for answering the hotline, which is open five half-days a week, revolves between five local legal services offices. The advantages of the rotating hotline to the program and to individual advocates are significant. By rotating the hotline among offices statewide we are able (1) to spread and keep expertise in the subject area, (2) to allow advocates to accept cases and develop advocacy skills beyond those utilized on generalized intake hotlines, (3) to allow advocates to keep contacts within their communities, making it possible for them to more effectively approach local district attorneys or welfare workers than if they were working the case from a centralized location, and (4) to allow advocates to continue to develop their skills in other areas of law.

The weakness of the current system is that there are not enough advocates to serve clients. Compared to this weakness, others that exist, and they do, are secondary. Other weaknesses include the drain on time and resources that circuit riding expends and the corollary drain on time

resources that occurs when cases that are intensely contested are accepted from circuit-riding areas.

We have identified several goals to strengthen services to clients and to make the current delivery system more effective. One goal is to attempt to find a solution to the problems created by circuit riding. LASO is exploring the possibility of developing video-conferencing capacity between offices and more remote communities. This will reduce the need to circuit ride and will potentially save time and other resources. The initial work has been done on researching video-conferencing and a grant has been submitted to the Department of Justice to begin a trial program in two rural areas of the state.⁴ LASO routinely keeps the other legal services programs in the state informed on the success of these alternatives. When pilot programs are successful efforts are then made to obtain funding to expand them statewide.

A second goal is to expand on the effectiveness of the IV-D hotline if possible. This will involve further planning between the programs to identify the other substantive areas where a rotating statewide hotline is feasible and identifying the scope and individual responsibilities of each participating program.

The programs aim to implement a trial video-conferencing program within the first half of 1999, and another statewide substantive hotline, if the planning process determines another hotline would benefit client access, by a similar date. We do not see improving inefficiencies in intake or advice and referral as the key challenge facing legal services programs in Oregon. We have identified increasing resources and staffing as the primary solution to providing access to

⁴ A copy of the grant proposal is available on request.

justice within the state. The steps we hope to take to achieve that goal, and the timetable will be discussed in depth in the appropriate section of this report.

2. Technology

There is no statewide technology plan, but programs have discussed what role they believe technology can play within the system. There have been discussions directed at securing Westlaw availability at a reasonable capped rate for each attorney in the state and discussions about the possibility of joint purchasing arrangements. In general, technological capacities within the state are modest and need improvement. Weaknesses include inadequate to barely adequate hardware, a lack of a person dedicated to MIS issues in the state, and a personality-based resistance to newer technology among staff that I am certain is not unique within the legal services community. Strengths include a commitment to improving our technological capacity, resourceful efforts to secure improved hardware, and an understanding of what capacities are necessary to improve client services and are a high priority, and what capacities are desirable, but not necessities.

However, LASO has embarked on a statewide technology plan for its office that in many respects will be appropriate for other providers. Once the requirements of that plan are fully met, the ongoing discussions about technology between the programs will be expanded to include integrating the LASO system with other programs in the state.

The LASO plan, briefly, includes the upgrade of equipment in order to create a wide-area network between programs, internet access on each employee's desk, program-wide E-mail capability, Westlaw access on each advocate's desk, real-time checking and entering of conflicts

program-wide, and ultimately the ability for advocates to search document banks and useful program-wide information.

Progress has been made on this plan.⁵ The remaining steps include: completing a working prototype to be installed in the Multnomah County, Oregon City, and Hillsboro offices of LASO and identifying and purchasing appropriate hardware to expand the prototype to each LASO office. Currently, LASO has employed two consultant groups with complementary skills to complete the project. LASO hopes to have this project completed by the middle of 1999 and to expand the benefit of the project to other providers by the end of 1999.

We are not looking at technological solutions to hotline-intake issues at this time.

3. Access to Courts, Self-help and Preventive Education

Again, the major barrier facing low income residents of Oregon is that there are not enough legal services lawyers. Other obstacles are comparatively minor. Nonetheless, we believe that the efficient use of current resources is a priority for the purposes of state planning. We believe our primary goal should be to obtain increased funding for staff statewide.

As in other sections of this report, commentary describing the obstacles within the state or a particular service can be found in the funding applications submitted to the Corporation. A short list of obstacles includes: geographic barriers, language barriers, other communications barriers, financial barriers related to travel expenses, and cultural barriers related to preconceptions and understandings of the justice system.

⁵ It would not be valuable to describe the technological aspects of the plan. If the Corporation is interested in technical descriptions we will be happy to put them in touch with the consultant. The consultant has converted Kemp Works to a client server architecture, which may be a valuable development to other programs nationally.

Another obstacle to access to justice is the formality of the justice system itself and the resulting difficulties pro se litigants face when attempting to navigate the procedural complexities involved in even routine matters. In Oregon, between 50% and 70% of domestic relations litigants are pro se. This is creating significant access problems because the pro se litigants frequently are not able to secure relief because of errors in their pleading or for other reasons. Legal services offices are working directly with the State Court Administrator's office, local courts, the Oregon State Bar, and family law practitioners to design solutions to this problem. Legal services staff have, for example, written pro se forms that have been approved by the Supreme Court and put into use on a trial basis in three counties within the state. We are working further on issues related to creating "court house facilitator" positions which are alternative methods to help pro se litigants. The creation of standard forms, coupled with solving the ethical problems related to "unbundling," would substantially increase access to the courts for low income Oregonians. Legal services is directly involved in creating these solutions, both within its own community and through partnerships with other entities capable of improving the system.

Self-help, preventive education, and legal education are long-time strengths of Oregon programs. Five in-depth self-help publications covering domestic relations, landlord and tenant, social security, unemployment compensation, and consumer rights are routinely published and distributed to thousands of clients each year. The books are re-edited after every state legislative session, work that is shared by each of the programs. Spanish translations of the most used books are made as well.

Weaknesses include some duplication of self-help materials on more esoteric issues between programs which develop their own self-help materials and the lack of a dedicated staff position statewide to coordinate the development and distribution of all self-help legal education materials. Perhaps another weakness is the lack of web pages or another technological-based distribution method for self-help materials.

We have established a goal of attempting to develop either a statewide legal services web page or materials to place on local program web pages. Several programs have begun consideration of a web page project and as a result of the state planning process will begin to collaborate on the development of a web page and to determine what information should be placed on the web page. We hope to have this project completed by the third quarter of 1999, but to make substantial progress by the end of the first quarter.

Another goal is to work to increase the use of approved pro se forms throughout the state and over the next two years to develop a courthouse facilitator function either at the courthouse or in some other manner. We believe that this would produce a significant increase in access to courts for individuals involved in domestic relations issues.

4. Coordination of Legal work, Training, Information and Expert Assistance

Oregon legal services programs have a long history of close cooperation. We have routinely pooled resources in order to facilitate training, case management, and cost-sharing in important cases. We have routinely met in task force meetings that included discussions of cases, (consistent with ethical rules), training functions, administrative updates, and issue-spotting.

The programs traditionally have four task forces covering domestic relations, administrative law, housing law, and elder law. The task forces meet four times a year. Participants from each program attend. Programs routinely co-counsel, share expertise, and respond to individual questions.

Cooperation is also evident in training events. Whenever training events organized for LASO are developed, each of the other statewide programs is invited. Regularized training events include a five-day New Lawyer Training event and a Trial Advocacy Skills Training, a trial practice event modeled on the National Institute of Trial Advocacy training.⁶ Other training events occur as needed.

Cooperation among programs, with Oregon Legal Services (the predecessor program to LASO) acting as a de facto state support center, has long been a strength of this region. A second strength, long evident in the region, is the level of experience and expertise throughout the state that resides with legal services staff. The acknowledged state expert in domestic violence and a variety of other domestic relation issues is the support unit coordinator for LASO, as is the acknowledged expert in landlord tenant law. Other programs have experienced staffs with great expertise in administrative law and elder law. The sharing of this expertise is a firm feature of the culture of programs throughout the state.

In the area of pro bono this expertise is also shared. In the Portland metropolitan area there are regular trainings on elder law and social security law attended by both legal services staff and members of the private bar. Legal services programs have worked with the bar to provide discounts to Continuing Legal Education events for pro bono attorneys who work a

⁶ Except for New Lawyer Training, training events have been spaced further apart since the 1995 LSC cuts.

requisite number of hours in approved pro bono programs. The OSB and legal services also regularly work together to make certain that poverty law questions are included in regular CLE's. In addition, as will be discussed in the pro bono section of this report, there a number of general area and problem-specific clinics staffed by private law firms whose members are supervised by legal services lawyers.

The weaknesses in this area stem from the weaknesses that have been described in the technology section of this report. Because all staff members do not have E-mail capability on their desks, there are a number of opportunities that may well be missed. For example, briefs, rules, and strategies cannot be exchanged through E-mail, and it is more difficult to communicate in cases in which programs co-counsel. Another weakness is the lack of available resources to provide backup and support. Although we fully accept the need for LSC to make certain that programs comply with LSC rules and regulations, the process of ensuring the Corporation that we are in compliance is a time-consuming one. It is a process that directly erodes the time available to provide support for those furnishing direct client services. In short, the problem again revolves as much around resources as systems. Whenever client matters are at issue, there is a genuine, long-standing tradition of cooperation in Oregon.

We have identified as a goal in this area to make certain that when upgrades in our technological capability are finished, we will use that capability to increase communication between legal services advocates and members of the pro bono community. We expect to accomplish this goal soon after finishing the technological portion of our state plan.

5. Private Attorney Involvement

One of the significant strengths of the Oregon Bar is its commitment to private attorney involvement. There are numerous pro bono programs operating throughout the state, and each legal services program, LSC and non-LSC, operates individual programs. In addition, the Low Income Legal Services Committee of the OSB has recently recommended to the Board of Governors of the OSB that a full-time position to coordinate pro bono be funded and sited at the Bar. The Bar has not made a final decision on this request. The Bar, however, now runs a Modest Means program and that person also helps to coordinate pro bono activities.⁷

A list of pro bono programs operated by LSC offices within the state includes the following.⁸ There are: A Senior Law Project that operates with over 100 lawyers and that represents over 1,000 clients; the Stoel Rives Night Clinic (Stoel Rives is the largest law firm in Portland) that covers a broad range of problems and is sited in Portland's low-income minority community; a Bankruptcy Clinic that is a joint project of the State Bar Debtor-Creditor Section and Legal Aid Services of Oregon; an Eviction Defense Project staffed by lawyers from Garvey, Schubert & Barer, another project with LASO; an AIDS Legal Project sponsored by the Cascade AIDS Project, LASO and the law firm of Ball, Janik; a Domestic Violence Project that operates in the tri-county area (Multnomah County, and the two contiguous counties, Washington and Clackamas); a Social Security Project established to provide representation for children and alcohol and drug clients and now has been expanded to do other SSI cases; pro se Divorce Clinics that operate in each community in Oregon in which a legal services office is sited and, in

⁷ The Modest Means program is a volunteer program in which lawyers agree to represent indigent residents of Oregon for a modest fee, \$45 per hour. Eligibility for the modest means program is at 200% of poverty. Legal services programs also participate, accepting only otherwise ineligible clients. No eligible clients are ever charged.

⁸ For more information on how the programs operate, please refer to the applications of the state LSC programs.

addition, some communities to which legal services attorneys circuit ride; the ELVIS (Emeritus Lawyers Volunteers In Service) program utilizes retired lawyers to provide services to clients and is operated by each of the legal services programs in the state, each utilizing retired attorneys within their service area; traditional pro bono panels also operate in each of the counties served by legal services programs. In addition, programs make use of pro bono attorneys with special expertise in appropriate circumstances. For example, when land use expertise is a necessity when representing an organization attempting to develop low-income housing, we will seek help from private land use attorneys. The help available from the State Bar, local bar committees, bar sections, and individual firms for pro bono is quite substantial.

Statewide participation in pro bono, and other legal services activities in general, are as much a function of the organized Bar's overall impressions of legal services as of our direct efforts to increase pro bono through recruitment. In recognition of that, legal services programs in the state have jointly engineered two statewide events to bring the importance of legal services to the attention of the Bar, the judiciary and the community at large. On October 13 of this year each legal services program in the state will be holding an open house. The invitation list includes Bar leaders, members of the judiciary, legislators, and others who we believe could benefit programs and clients if they were more aware of legal services availability and capabilities. Speakers at local offices include presidents of local Bar associations, the State Attorney General, the Governor's legal counsel, members of the Board of Bar Governors, and other key supporters of legal services. Each office will have an agenda that will include discussions of pro bono issues. Subsequent to the October 13 meetings, there will be a statewide *Access to Justice Conference* that is jointly sponsored by the OSB, the Oregon Law Foundation

(OLF), and the Campaign for Equal Justice.⁹ Speakers at the two-day conference will include the Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court, other judges, a representative of LSC (John McKay is currently scheduled), key legislators, and legal services program staff. The focus of the conference includes access issues beyond the low income community, and, while legal services is a major topic, other access issues will be discussed. Planners intend to hold conferences on an annual basis.

Each of these activities is intended to garner support for legal services in all areas, funding, pro bono, and other resource development issues. We feel confident that pro bono in Oregon is being approached in an appropriate statewide manner, with the caveat that like politics, all pro bono is local.

6. Resource Development

As a result of an effective long-range funding plan, there are significant non-LSC resources available in Oregon for the provision of legal services to low income residents of Oregon. Along with the basic funding sources that most legal services programs benefit from—IOLTA, AAA funds, and United Way funds—Oregon programs have available to them an impressive array of other funding sources. A non-inclusive list includes: funds from the Campaign for Equal Justice, an annual lawyer-to-lawyer fundraising drive that raises over \$500,000 a year; Violence Against Women Act funds in the amount of \$320,000 per year; and grants from various local and national foundations that have ranged from \$750,000 (over three years) on down. In addition, Oregon was the second state to pass filing fee legislation. In 1998

⁹ The Campaign for Equal Justice is a private non-profit devoted to raising funds for legal services programs in Oregon.

filing fees across the state were increased by 65% and a total of \$2.1 million dollars will be realized by LSC and non-LSC programs. In addition, other sources of funds include contracts with Indian Tribes to serve tribal members, contracts with the state to serve the needs of obligors with child support problems, contracts with the State Court Administrator's office to staff committees devoted to producing a system that will enable pro se litigants to successfully file and complete domestic relations matters, and, finally, contracts with local non-profit entities to provide work that furthers the interests of low income clients.

Initiatives for funding for legal services are discussed jointly, and for statewide grants, such as the Campaign for Equal Justice, funds are distributed between LSC programs on a poverty-population basis. This is true for the CEJ even though the bulk of funds come from the Portland area. VAWA funds are distributed in the same manner. Filing fees are distributed by the newly formed Legal Services Program of the OSB, according to specific criteria. The effort to obtain the filing-fee increase was led by the OSB with help from LASO staff, but at all times the interests of the whole legal services community were paramount.

Preserving the expansive funding base that Oregon enjoys requires that we continue to provide quality legal services to clients and, as importantly, that our funding constituencies know that we do so. It also means recognizing opportunities whenever they arise to secure additional funding. The open-houses and access conference are two of the methods that we are utilizing to meet this goal.

Expanding resources requires an innovative approach that includes a strategy to increase the resources devoted to resource development without decreasing field services, the willingness to design projects that are not viewed as traditionally within the purview of legal services, and

then to convince funders that legal services programs can best provide services. It is essential that such projects are consistent with program priorities and also pay completely for themselves.

We are examining a number of such possible projects and are in discussions with various state agencies about potential public-private partnerships. We believe that the concept of public-private partnerships between legal services and the state is the most viable source of new funding. For example, we will be meeting with the Director of State Corrections to discuss the representation in SSI hearings of disabled individuals who are no longer incarcerated, and with the head of the Senior and Disabled Services Division to discuss representing general assistance recipients who are eligible for SSI. Each of these projects would benefit clients and the state, while increasing the funding and staffing base of legal services.

Foundations are another source of increased funding, although because of the one-time nature of grants, we approach them with more caution than we approach attempts to obtain more secure state funding. However, we are currently examining submitting a large grant to the local Ford Foundation (not *the* Ford Foundation) to provide legal services in rural areas. The foundation has as its focus rural Oregon. There is inter-program discussion when decisions regarding potential grant applications are being considered.

The combined long-term funding goal of legal services and the CEJ is to develop sufficient Bar support to vote an increase in Bar dues of \$100 that would go specifically to providing services to low income residents of Oregon. This would provide over \$1,000,000 in new funding for legal services. We are also working on a planned giving campaign that will be a joint venture with the Oregon Law Foundation (the IOLTA program) and the CEJ. The goal for that campaign is \$10,000,000 over the next twenty years. Finally, we hope to secure State of

Oregon general fund funding, as opposed to the specialized funding we are discussing through agency budgets, for legal services. We believe that this is a possibility within the next five years.

7. System Configuration

As mentioned in other places in this document, we believe regardless of what configuration of legal services programs is chosen, an adequate system for the delivery of legal services within Oregon is not possible at current funding levels. With that said, we believe that there are certain values that should be honored in any configuration. First, the delivery system should emphasize presence in communities. Presence must include the availability of lawyers to represent clients in court, administrative hearings, and other appropriate forums, and a mechanism for advice and referral that is efficient but not bureaucratic. Whatever system is adopted must also ensure that advocates continue to gain skills and expertise throughout their careers.

There are obviously a number of approaches to a comprehensive delivery system. Such a system must have genuine expertise within the entire spectrum of poverty law. To accomplish that there must be an efficient communications network between advocates statewide, regardless of their program affiliation; there must be sufficient back-up resources to advocates, regardless of their program affiliation; and there must be high quality training and an effective skill development program, regardless of program affiliation. In addition, programs must possess sufficient support and technological development to ensure that advocates have adequate resources to meet court requirements and to ensure that recruitment and retention efforts are successful, and there must be intake procedures that identify cases and clients that meet priorities

and for whom a legal solution is appropriate. A service delivery model that neglects these goals is apostasy.

With these axioms stated, the question presented is, Is there a particular configuration that furthers these goals more than another, or is there a configuration that in one manner or another detracts from these goal? In Oregon, where there has been a long history of cooperation and mutual support, and where LASO has acted as a state-support center and is able and willing to continue to do so in the future, we believe that the current configuration is rational and integrates services, community to community, in a reasonable way. The current configuration has, in fact, been designed over a period of two decades, to include mechanisms to make real what we believe constitutes a good legal services program.

We are continuing to study ways to improve the system within our financial limitations. For example, we are experimenting with statewide and local hotlines like those described in the section on service delivery, specifically the IV-D hotline. It is our experience that the IV-D model works well in a state committed to community presence. We also believe that the technological improvements discussed in that section are important to accomplish. Accomplishing both of those goals would improve the overall delivery system and help to integrate services.

We believe that another factor, perhaps the major factor, necessary to ensure that the highest quality legal services are available to clients is the job satisfaction of advocates and staff. Legal training, a sense of community, a shared mission communicated by program leaders, opportunities to increase skills and to work on cases and issues that, in fact, matter to clients, are all conditions that affect whether advocates find satisfaction in positions that, relative to the

private bar, pay little. The technical factors that this State Plan emphasizes are certainly important and cannot be ignored, but when considering configurations that work, these other more abstract but equally important factors should not, cannot, be ignored. While we believe that there may be places where the size of programs and resulting inefficiencies or the inability of neighboring programs to seek common ground and the competition for funding that might result, is cause for concern, and perhaps even a radical reorganization of the delivery system, we do not believe that Oregon is currently such a place.

In Oregon, it is our goal to increase funding for legal services within the next five years by 50 percent, regardless of funding for LSC, although we hope that a significant increase from that source will someday be forthcoming. We hope to increase staff by at least one-third, with the remaining increase to fill voids that were created when federal funding was cut.

At the same time, we hope to configure the state delivery system to be able to respond to client needs statewide in ways that maintain existing cooperation and increase cooperation in other appropriate areas. We must also state that we believe that no configuration of legal services providers that does not provide access to clients who cannot receive representation from an LSC program because of restrictions is adequate, efficient, or comprehensive.