WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Board of Governors Meeting Late Meeting Materials

January 14-15, 2021 Webcast and Teleconference

WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Board of Governors

BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING Late Materials January 14-15, 2021 Webcast and Teleconference	
Description	Page Number
Executive Director's Report – Supplemental	LM-3
Executive Summary – Membership Survey on COVID-19 Impact	LM-80

WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

TO:	WSBA Board of Governors
FROM:	Interim Executive Director Terra Nevitt
DATE:	January 11, 2021
RE:	Executive Director's Report - Supplemental

2022 License & Client Protection Fees

At its last meeting in November, the Board of Governors acted to maintain the active attorney license fee at \$458 and the active Limited Practice Officer (LPO) license fee at \$200 for 2022. The Board also acted to increase the active Limited License Legal Technician (LLLT) license fee from \$229 to \$240 and to lower the Client Protection Fund assessment for active attorneys and LLLTs from \$25 to \$20. Under General Rule 12.2(b)(22) license fees established by WSBA are subject to review by the Supreme Court of Washington for reasonableness, while the Client Protection Fund assessment is set by the Court under APR 15. By order dated January 8, 2021, the Supreme Court of Washington determined that the active lawyer and active LPO license fees are reasonable, but that increasing the license fee for active LLLTs is not reasonable. The order notes that maintaining the current LLLT license fee of \$229 would be reasonable. The Court also set the Client Protection Fund assessment at \$20 as recommended by the Board.

RPC and LLLT RPC Title 7 Amendments Adopted

In June 2015, the Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers (APRL) issued a groundbreaking report following a two-year study of the regulation of lawyer advertising in the United States. Taking into account constitutional and antitrust concerns, technology change, globalization, and the impact of overregulation, the report concluded that the rules of professional conduct governing lawyer advertising are outdated and unworkable in the current legal environment. The report recommended substantial reform of the American Bar Association's Model Rules of Professional Conduct (ABA Model Rules) relating to lawyer communications and advertising. In the wake of this initiative, the ABA Model Rules were amended in 2018. See the attached order no. 25700-B-655.

In early 2016, the Board of Governors convened a work group to evaluate the APRL report and report to the Board regarding possible amendments to the rules governing lawyer advertising and communications in Title 7 of Washington's Rules of Professional Conduct (RPC). After considering the work group's analysis and recommendation, the Board referred the issue to the WSBA Committee on Professional Ethics (CPE) to develop amendments to Washington's ethics rules governing lawyer advertising and communications. The CPE's draft amendments—designed to simplify the regulation of lawyer advertising, promote innovation in legal marketing, and improve access to legal services—were considered and approved by the Board in March 2018. The LLLT Board also submitted to the Court counterpart amendments to the LLLT RPC. Following a public comment period, including publication of a proposed alternative to RPC 7.3, the Court adopted the RPC and the LLLT amendments as originally proposed on January 6, 2021. The amendments will be effective on publication. See attached orders no. 25700-A-1333 and 25700-A-1334 for more information.

Suggested Amendment to APR 26 and RPC 1.4 Regarding Malpractice Insurance

There is currently a proposed amendment to APR 26 before the Supreme Court of Washington to require that active lawyer members of the Bar engaged in the private practice of law (with some exceptions) be covered by professional liability insurance. The Board has submitted a public comment opposing this proposed amendment and submitted

– as an alternative – a proposed amendment to RPC 1.4 to require affirmative disclosure and informed consent regarding professional liability insurance. On December 23, 2020, Pres. Sciuchetti wrote a letter to the Court requesting that both proposals be considered in tandem.

The Court, through then Chief Justice Stephens confirmed that the matter of APR 26 has been referred back to the Rules Committee, with the intent of considering both that rule and the proposal of the Board of Governors at the same time. The Board of Governors' proposal is currently published for comments, which are due by April 30, 2021.

Suggested Amendment to APR 11 to Mandatory Continuing Legal Education Published for Comment

The Mandatory Continuing Legal Education Board, with support from the Board of Governors, suggested an amendment to the Admission to Practice Rule 11 to require that one of the required ethics credits be in the category of equity, inclusion and the mitigation of bias._Comments are due no later than April 30, 2021. See the attached order no. 25700-A-1336 for more information.

Limited License Legal Technician Proposed Amended Admission to Practice Rules Published for Comment The Rules Committee of the Supreme Court of Washington has published suggested amendments to the Admission to Practice Rules relating to Limited License Legal Technicians to implement the Court's action on July 8, 2020 to sunset the LLLT program. Comments are due no later than April 30, 2021. See the attached order no. 25700-A-1335 for more information.

Board Meeting Notice List

In order to streamline our process of notifying interested stakeholders about Board meetings we have created a Board Meeting Notice list serve. Any person who would like to receive notice of upcoming Board meetings can use this online form found <u>here</u> and elsewhere on our website to add themselves to the list serve, which we have prepopulated with the approximately 90 stakeholders that were already on our list to receive meeting notices.

FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON JANUARY 8, 2021 BY SUSAN L. CARLSON CLERK

THE SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

)

))

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE 2022 WSBA LICENSE FEES AND CLIENT PROTECTION FUND ASSESSMENT ORDER

NO. 25700-B-655

General Rule 12.2(b)(22) provides that the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) may establish the amount of all license fees, subject to review by the Supreme Court for reasonableness. The rule also provides that the license fees established by the WSBA may be modified by order of the Court if the Court determines that a fee is not reasonable.

APR 15 provides that the Washington Supreme Court may establish the amount of the annual assessment for the Client Protection Fund upon the recommendation of the Board of Governors.

In a letter dated December 29, 2020, from the Interim Executive Director of the WSBA, the Court was informed that at its November 13-14, 2020 meeting, the WSBA Board of Governors approved the following license fees and Client Protection Fund assessment:

- 1. maintaining the 2022 active lawyer license fee at \$458.00;
- 2. maintaining the 2022 active LPO license fee at \$200.00;
- 3. increasing the active LLLT license fee for 2022 from \$229.00 to \$240.00;
- 4. recommending that the Court enter an order reducing the CPF assessment for active lawyers and LLLTs from \$25.00 to \$20.00 effective January 1, 2022.

The Court at its January 6, 2020 En Banc Conference considered the license fees as established by the Board of Governors and determined that maintaining the active lawyer license fee at \$458.00 and active LPO license fee at \$200.00 is reasonable, but that increasing the license fee for active LLLTs from \$229.00 to \$240.00 is not reasonable, though maintaining the LLLT license fee of \$229.00 would be reasonable.

The Court further determined, pursuant to APR 15(c) that the recommended Client Protection Fund assessment reduction from \$25.00 to \$20.00 should be approved.

Now, therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED:

- The WSBA's active lawyer license fee of \$458.00 and active LPO license fee of \$200.00 for 2022 are approved.
- 2. The WSBA's active LLLT license fee of \$240.00 for 2022 is disapproved as unreasonable, though a fee of \$229.00 is reasonable.

Beginning with the 2022 calendar year, the Client Protection Fund assessment shall be reduced to \$20.00.

DATED at Olympia, Washington this 8th day of January, 2021.

Sterre, C. J. CHIEF JUSTICE

FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON JANUARY 8, 2021 BY SUSAN L. CARLSON CLERK

THE SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (RPC) 5.5—UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW; MULTIJURISDICTIONAL PRACTICE OF LAW; RPC 7.1— COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING A LAWYER'S SERVICES; RPC 7.2—ADVERTISING <u>RESERVED</u>; RPC 7.3—SOLICITATION OF CLIENTS; RPC 7.4—COMMUNICATION OF FIELDS OF PRACTICE AND SPECIALIZATIONRESERVED; RPC 7.5—FIRM NAME AND LETTERHEADS <u>RESERVED</u>

O R D E R

NO. 25700-A-1333

The Washington State Bar Association, having recommended the adoption of the proposed amendments to Rules of Professional Conduct (RPC) 5.5—Unauthorized Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice of Law; RPC 7.1—Communications Concerning a Lawyer's Services; RPC 7.2—Advertising Reserved; RPC 7.3—Solicitation of Clients; RPC 7.4— Communication of Fields of Practice and Specialization Reserved; RPC 7.5—Firm Name and Letterheads Reserved, and the Court having considered the proposed amendments, and having determined that the proposed amendments will aid in the prompt and orderly administration of justice;

Now, therefore, it is hereby

Page 2 ORDER IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (RPC) 5.5—UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW; MULTIJURISDICTIONAL PRACTICE OF LAW; RPC 7.1—COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING A LAWYER'S SERVICES; RPC 7.2—ADVERTISING <u>RESERVED</u>; RPC 7.3—SOLICITATION OF CLIENTS; RPC 7.4—COMMUNICATION OF FIELDS OF PRACTICE AND SPECIALIZATION <u>RESERVED</u>; RPC 7.5—FIRM NAME AND LETTERHEADS RESERVED

ORDERED:

- (a) That the proposed amendments as attached hereto are adopted.
- (b) That pursuant to the emergency provisions of GR 9(j)(1), the proposed

amendments will be expeditiously published in the Washington Reports and will become

effective upon publication.

DATED at Olympia, Washington this 8th day of January, 2021.

nadsen (oonzález

1	RPC 7.1 COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING A LAWYER'S SERVICES
2	
3	A lawyer shall not make a false or misleading communication about the lawyer or the
4	lawyer's services. A communication is false or misleading if it contains a material
5	misrepresentation of fact or law, or omits a fact necessary to make the statement considered
6	as a whole not materially misleading.
7	
8	Comment
9	[1] [Washington revision] This Rule governs all communications about a lawyer's services,
10	including advertising permitted by Rule 7.2. Whatever means are used to make known a
11	lawyer's services, statements about them must be truthful.
12	
13	[2] – [3] [Unchanged.]
14	
15	[4] [Washington revision] It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct
16	involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation. RPC 8.4(c). See also Rule 8.4(e)
17	for the prohibition against stating or implying an ability to influence improperly a
18	government agency or official or to achieve results by means that violate the Rules of
19	Professional Conduct or other law.
20	
21	Additional Washington Comments (5-14)
22	
23	[5] To assist the public in learning about and obtaining legal services, lawyers should be
24	allowed to make known their services not only through reputation but also through organized
25	information campaigns in the form of advertising. Advertising involves an active quest for
26	clients, contrary to the tradition that a lawyer should not seek clientele. However, the public's

1 need to know about legal services can be fulfilled in part through advertising. This need is 2 particularly acute in the case of persons of moderate means who have not made extensive 3 use of legal services. The interest in expanding public information about legal services ought 4 to prevail over considerations of tradition. Nevertheless, advertising by lawyers entails the 5 risk of practices that are misleading or overreaching. 6 7 [6] This rule permits public dissemination of information concerning a lawyer's name or firm 8 name, address, e-mail address, website, and telephone number; the kinds of services the 9 lawyer will undertake; the basis on which the lawyer's fees are determined, including prices 10 for specific services and payment and credit arrangements; a lawyer's foreign language ability; names of references and, with their consent, names of clients regularly represented; 11 12 and other information that might invite the attention of those seeking legal assistance. 13 14 [7] Questions of effectiveness and taste in advertising are matters of speculation and 15 subjective judgment. Some jurisdictions have had extensive prohibitions against television 16 and other forms of advertising, against advertising going beyond specified facts about a 17 lawyer, or against "undignified" advertising. Television, the Internet, and other forms of 18 electronic communication are now among the most powerful media for getting information 19 to the public, particularly persons of low and moderate income; prohibiting television, 20 Internet, and other forms of electronic advertising, therefore, would impede the flow of 21 information about legal services to many sectors of the public. Limiting the information that 22 may be advertised has a similar effect and assumes that the bar can accurately forecast the 23 kind of information that the public would regard as relevant. 24 25 Areas of Expertise/Specialization

1 [8] A lawyer may indicate areas of practice in communications about the lawyer's services. 2 If a lawyer practices only in certain fields, or will not accept matters except in a specified 3 field or fields, the lawyer is permitted to so indicate. A lawyer is generally permitted to state 4 that the lawyer is a "specialist," practices a "specialty," or "specializes in" particular fields, 5 but such communications are subject to the "false and misleading" standard applied in RPC 6 7.1 to communications concerning a lawyer's services. A lawyer may state that the lawyer is 7 certified as a specialist in a field of law if such certification is granted by an organization 8 approved by an appropriate state authority or accredited by the American Bar Association or 9 another organization, such as a state bar association, that has been approved by the state 10 authority to accredit organizations that certify lawyers as specialists. Certification signifies 11 that an objective entity has recognized an advanced degree of knowledge and experience in 12 the specialty area greater than is suggested by general licensure to practice law. Certifying 13 organizations may be expected to apply standards of experience, knowledge and proficiency 14 to insure that a lawyer's recognition as a specialist is meaningful and reliable. In order to 15 insure that consumers can obtain access to useful information about an organization granting 16 certification, the name of the certifying organization must be included in any communication 17 regarding the certification. 18

[9] In advertising concerning an LLLT's services, an LLLT is required to communicate the
fact that the LLLT has a limited license in the particular fields of law for which the LLLT is
licensed and must not state or imply that the LLLT has broader authority to practice than is
in fact the case. See LLLT RPC 7.1(b). When lawyers and LLLTs are associated in a firm,
lawyers with managerial or pertinent supervisory authority must take measures to assure that
the firm's communications conform with these obligations. See Rule 5.10.

26 || Firm Names

1	[10] A firm may be designated by the names of all or some of its members, by the names of
2	deceased members where there has been a continuing succession in the firm's identity or by
3	a trade name such as the "ABC Legal Clinic." A lawyer or law firm may also be designated
4	by a distinctive website address or comparable professional designation. Although the United
5	States Supreme Court has held that legislation may prohibit the use of trade names in
6	professional practice, use of such names in law practice is acceptable so long as it is not
7	misleading. If a private firm uses a trade name that includes a geographical name such as
8	"Springfield Legal Clinic," an express disclaimer that it is a public legal aid agency may be
9	required to avoid a misleading implication. It may be observed that any firm name including
10	the name of a deceased partner is, strictly speaking, a trade name. The use of such names to
11	designate law firms has proven a useful means of identification. However, it is misleading to
12	use the name of a lawyer or LLLT not associated with the firm or a predecessor of the firm,
13	or the name of an individual who is neither a lawyer nor an LLLT.
14	
15	[11] Lawyers or LLLTs sharing office facilities, but who are not in fact associated with each
16	other in a law firm, may not denominate themselves as, for example, "Smith and Jones," for
17	that title suggests that they are practicing law together in a firm.
18	
19	[12] When lawyers and LLLTs are associated with each other in a law firm, the firm may be
20	designated using the name of a member LLLT if the name is not otherwise in violation of
21	<u>this rule.</u>
22	
23	[13] Lawyers or LLLTs practicing out of the same office who are not partners, shareholders
24	of a professional corporation, or members of a professional limited liability company or
25	partnership may not join their names together. Lawyers or LLLTs who are not (1) partners,
26	shareholders of a professional corporation, or members of a professional limited liability

1	company or partnership, or (2) employees of a sole proprietorship, partnership, professional
2	corporation, or members of a professional limited liability company or partnership or other
3	organization, or (3) in the relationship of being "Of Counsel" to a sole proprietorship,
4	partnership, professional corporation, or members of a professional limited liability company
5	or partnership or other organization, must have separate letterheads, cards, and pleading
6	paper, and must sign their names individually at the end of all pleadings and correspondence
7	and not in conjunction with the names of other lawyers or LLLTs.
8	
9	[14] A law firm with offices in more than one jurisdiction may use the same name or other
10	professional designation in each jurisdiction. See RPC 5.5(f) & cmt. [22]. In order to avoid
11	misleading the public, when lawyers or LLLTs are identified as practicing in a particular
12	office, the firm should indicate the jurisdictional limitations on those not licensed to practice
13	in the jurisdiction where the office is located.
14	
14 15	RPC 7.2 ADVERTISING[Reserved.]
	RPC 7.2 ADVERTISING[Reserved.] ———(a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services
15	
15 16	(a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services
15 16 17 18	(a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services through written, recorded or electronic communication, including public media.
15 16 17	 (a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services through written, recorded or electronic communication, including public media. (b) A lawyer shall not give anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's
15 16 17 18 19	 (a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services through written, recorded or electronic communication, including public media. (b) A lawyer shall not give anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's services, except that a lawyer may
15 16 17 18 19 20	 (a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services through written, recorded or electronic communication, including public media. (b) A lawyer shall not give anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's services, except that a lawyer may (1) pay the reasonable costs of advertisements or communications permitted by this
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 	 (a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services through written, recorded or electronic communication, including public media. (b) A lawyer shall not give anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's services, except that a lawyer may (1) pay the reasonable costs of advertisements or communications permitted by this Rule;
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	 (a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services through written, recorded or electronic communication, including public media. (b) A lawyer shall not give anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's services, except that a lawyer may (1) pay the reasonable costs of advertisements or communications permitted by this Rule; (2) pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not for profit lawyer referral
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	 (a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a lawyer may advertise services through written, recorded or electronic communication, including public media. (b) A lawyer shall not give anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's services, except that a lawyer may (1) pay the reasonable costs of advertisements or communications permitted by this Rule; (2) pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not for profit lawyer referral service;

1	(4) refer clients to another lawyer or LLLT pursuant to an agreement not otherwise
2	prohibited under these Rules that provides for the other person to refer clients or customers
3	to the lawyer, if
4	(i) the reciprocal referral agreement is not exclusive, and
5	(ii) the client is informed of the existence and nature of the agreement.
6	
7	address of at least one lawyer or law firm responsible for its content.
8	
9	Comment
10	[1] To assist the public in learning about and obtaining legal services, lawyers should be
11	allowed to make known their services not only through reputation but also through organized
12	information campaigns in the form of advertising. Advertising involves an active quest for
13	clients, contrary to the tradition that a lawyer should not seek clientele. However, the public's
14	need to know about legal services can be fulfilled in part through advertising. This need is
15	particularly acute in the case of persons of moderate means who have not made extensive
16	use of legal services. The interest in expanding public information about legal services ought
17	to prevail over considerations of tradition. Nevertheless, advertising by lawyers entails the
18	risk of practices that are misleading or overreaching.
19	
20	[2] This Rule permits public dissemination of information concerning a lawyer's name or
21	firm name, address, e-mail address, website, and telephone number; the kinds of services the
22	lawyer will undertake; the basis on which the lawyer's fees are determined, including prices
23	for specific services and payment and credit arrangements; a lawyer's foreign language
24	ability; names of references and, with their consent, names of clients regularly represented;
25	and other information that might invite the attention of those seeking legal assistance.
26	

1	[3] Questions of effectiveness and taste in advertising are matters of speculation and
2	subjective judgment. Some jurisdictions have had extensive prohibitions against television
3	and other forms of advertising, against advertising going beyond specified facts about a
4	lawyer, or against "undignified" advertising. Television, the Internet, and other forms of
5	electronic communication are now among the most powerful media for getting information
6	to the public, particularly persons of low and moderate income; prohibiting television,
7	Internet, and other forms of electronic advertising, therefore, would impede the flow of
8	information about legal services to many sectors of the public. Limiting the information that
9	may be advertised has a similar effect and assumes that the bar can accurately forecast the
10	kind of information that the public would regard as relevant. But see Rule 7.3(a) for the
11	prohibition against a solicitation of a possible client through a real-time electronic exchange
12	initiated by the lawyer.
13	
13	
13 14	[4] Neither this Rule nor Rule 7.3 prohibits communications authorized by law, such as
	[4] Neither this Rule nor Rule 7.3 prohibits communications authorized by law, such as notice to members of a class in class action litigation.
14	
14 15	
14 15 16	notice to members of a class in class action litigation.
14 15 16 17	notice to members of a class in class action litigation. Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer
14 15 16 17 18	notice to members of a class in class action litigation. <i>Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer</i> [5] [Washington revision] Except as permitted under paragraphs (b)(1) (b)(4), lawyers are
14 15 16 17 18 19	notice to members of a class in class action litigation. <i>Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer</i> [5] [Washington revision] Except as permitted under paragraphs (b)(1) (b)(4), lawyers are not permitted to pay others for recommending the lawyer's services or for channeling
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	notice to members of a class in class action litigation. <i>Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer</i> [5] [Washington revision] Except as permitted under paragraphs (b)(1) (b)(4), lawyers are not permitted to pay others for recommending the lawyer's services or for channeling professional work in a manner that violates Rule 7.3. A communication contains a
 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 	notice to members of a class in class action litigation. <i>Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer</i> [5] [Washington revision] Except as permitted under paragraphs (b)(1) (b)(4), lawyers are not permitted to pay others for recommending the lawyer's services or for channeling professional work in a manner that violates Rule 7.3. A communication contains a recommendation if it endorses or vouches for a lawyer's credentials, abilities, competence,
 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	notice to members of a class in class action litigation. <i>Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer</i> [5] [Washington revision] Except as permitted under paragraphs (b)(1) (b)(4), lawyers are not permitted to pay others for recommending the lawyer's services or for channeling professional work in a manner that violates Rule 7.3. A communication contains a recommendation if it endorses or vouches for a lawyer's credentials, abilities, competence, character, or other professional qualities. Paragraph (b)(1), however, allows a lawyer to pay

26 advertising. A lawyer may compensate employees, agents and vendors who are engaged to

1	provide marketing or client-development services, such as publicists, public-relations
2	personnel, business-development staff and website designers. Moreover, a lawyer may pay
3	others for generating client leads, such as Internet-based client leads, as long as the lead
4	generator does not recommend the lawyer, any payment to the lead generator is consistent
5	with Rules 1.5(e) (division of fees) and 5.4 (professional independence of the lawyer), and
6	the lead generator's communications are consistent with Rule 7.1 (communications
7	concerning a lawyer's services). To comply with Rule 7.1, a lawyer must not pay a lead
8	generator that states, implies, or creates a reasonable impression that it is recommending the
9	lawyer, is making the referral without payment from the lawyer, or has analyzed a person's
10	legal problems when determining which lawyer should receive the referral. See also Rule 5.3
11	(duties of lawyers and law firms with respect to the conduct of nonlawyers); RPC 8.4(a)
12	(duty to avoid violating the rules through the acts of another). For the definition of nonlawyer
13	for the purposes of Rule 5.3, see Washington Comment [5] to Rule 5.3.
14	
15	[6] [Washington revision] A lawyer may pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a

16 not-for-profit lawyer referral service. A legal service plan is a prepaid or group legal service 17 plan or a similar delivery system that assists people who seek to secure legal representation. 18 A lawyer referral service, on the other hand, is any organization that holds itself out to the 19 public as a lawyer referral service. Such referral services are understood by the public to be 20 consumer-oriented organizations that provide unbiased referrals to lawyers with appropriate 21 experience in the subject matter of the representation and afford other client protections, such 22 as complaint procedures or malpractice insurance requirements. Consequently, this Rule 23 only permits a lawyer to pay the usual charges of a not-for-profit lawyer referral service.

24

[7] A lawyer who accepts assignments or referrals from a legal service plan or referrals from
a lawyer referral service must act reasonably to assure that the activities of the plan or service

are compatible with the lawyer's professional obligations. See Rule 5.3. Legal service plans
and lawyer referral services may communicate with the public, but such communication must
be in conformity with these Rules. Thus, advertising must not be false or misleading, as
would be the case if the communications of a group advertising program or a group legal
services plan would mislead the public to think that it was a lawyer referral service sponsored
by a state agency or bar association. Nor could the lawyer allow in-person, telephonic, or
real-time contacts that would violate Rule 7.3.

9 [8] [Washington revision] A lawyer also may agree to refer clients to another lawyer in 10 return for the undertaking of that person to refer clients or customers to the lawyer. Such 11 reciprocal referral arrangements must not interfere with the lawyer's professional judgment as to making referrals or as to providing substantive legal services. See Rules 2.1 and 5.4(c). 12 13 Except as provided in Rule 1.5(e), a lawyer who receives referrals from a lawyer must not 14 pay anything solely for the referral, but the lawyer does not violate paragraph (b) of this Rule 15 by agreeing to refer clients to the other lawyer, so long as the reciprocal referral agreement 16 is not exclusive and the client is informed of the referral agreement. Conflicts of interest 17 created by such arrangements are governed by Rule 1.7. Reciprocal referral agreements 18 should not be of indefinite duration and should be reviewed periodically to determine 19 whether they comply with these Rules. This Rule does not restrict referrals or divisions of 20 revenues or net income among lawyers within firms comprised of multiple entities.

21

22

8

Additional Washington Comment (9)

[9] That portion of Model Rule 7.2(b)(4) that allows lawyers to enter into reciprocal referral
agreements with nonlawyer professionals was not adopted. A lawyer may agree to refer
clients to an LLLT in return for the undertaking of that person to refer clients to the lawyer.
The guidance provided in Comment [8] to this Rule is also applicable to reciprocal referral

1	arrangements between lawyers and LLLTs. Under LLLT RPC 1.5(e), however, an LLLT
2	may not enter into an arrangement for the division of a fee with a lawyer who is not in the
3	same firm as the LLLT.
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

RPC 7.3 SOLICITATION OF CLIENTS

(a) A lawyer shall not directly or through a third person, by in-person, live telephone, or realtime electronic contact <u>may</u> solicit professional employment from a possible client when a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's pecuniary gain, unless the person contacted:

(1) is a lawyer or an LLLT or the solicitation is false or misleading;

(2) has a family, close personal, or prior professional relationship with the lawyer; or
 the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the physical, emotional, or mental state of
 the subject of the solicitation is such that the person could not exercise reasonable judgment
 in employing a lawyer;

(3) has consented to the contact by requesting a referral from a not-for-profit lawyer
referral service. the subject of the solicitation has made known to the lawyer a desire not to
be solicited by the lawyer; or

(4) the solicitation involves coercion, duress, or harassment.

(b) A lawyer shall not-solicit professional employment from a client by written, recorded or
electronic communication or by in-person, telephone or real-time electronic contact even
when not otherwise prohibited by paragraph (a), if compensate, or give or promise anything
of value to, a person who is not an employee or lawyer in the same law firm for the purpose
of recommending or securing the services of the lawyer or law firm, except that a lawyer
may;:

(1) the target of the solicitation has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be
 solicited by the lawyer; or pay the reasonable cost of advertisements or communications
 permitted by RPC 7.1, including online group advertising;

25 (2) the solicitation involves coercion, duress or harassment. pay the usual charges of a
26 legal service plan or a not-for-profit lawyer referral service;

1	(3) pay for a law practice in accordance with RPC 1.17;
2	(4) refer clients to another lawyer or LLLT or other nonlawyer professional pursuant
3	to an agreement not otherwise prohibited under these Rules that provides for the other person
4	to refer clients or customers to the lawyer, if:
5	(i) the reciprocal referral agreement is not exclusive, and
6	(ii) the client is informed of the existence and nature of the agreement;
7	(5) give nominal gifts that are neither intended nor reasonably expected to be a form of
8	compensation for recommending a lawyer's services.
9	(c) [Reserved.]
10	(d) Notwithstanding the prohibitions in paragraph (a), a lawyer may participate with a
11	prepaid or group legal service plan operated by an organization not owned or directed by the
12	lawyer that uses in-person or telephone contact to solicit memberships or subscriptions for
13	the plan from persons who are not known to need legal services in a particular matter covered
14	by the plan.[Reserved.]
15	
16	Comment
17	[1] [Washington revision] A solicitation is a targeted communication initiated by the or on
18	behalf of a lawyer that is directed to a specific person and that offers to provide, or can
19	reasonably be understood as offering to provide, legal services. Solicitations can include in-
20	person, written, telephonic, and electronic communications. In contrast, a lawyer's
21	communication typically does not constitute a solicitation if it is directed to the general
22	public, such as through a billboard, an Internet banner advertisement, a website, or a
23	television commercial, or if it is in response to a request for information or is automatically
24	generated in response to Internet searches.
25	
26	

[2] [Reserved.] There is a potential for abuse when a solicitation involves direct in-person, 1 2 live telephone or real-time electronic contact by a lawyer with someone known to need legal 3 services. These forms of contact subject a person to the private importuning of the trained 4 advocate in a direct interpersonal encounter. The person, who may already feel overwhelmed 5 by the circumstances giving rise to the need for legal services, may find it difficult fully to 6 evaluate all available alternatives with reasoned judgment and appropriate self-interest in the 7 face of the lawyer's presence and insistence upon being retained immediately. The situation 8 is fraught with the possibility of undue influence, intimidation, and over-reaching.

10 [3] [Reserved.] This potential for abuse inherent in direct in-person, live telephone or real-11 time electronic solicitation justifies its prohibition, particularly since lawyers have alternative 12 means of conveying necessary information to those who may be in need of legal services. In 13 particular, communications can be mailed or transmitted by email or other electronic means 14 that do not involve real-time contact and do not violate other laws governing solicitations. 15 These forms of communications and solicitations make it possible for the public to be 16 informed about the need for legal services, and about the qualifications of available lawyers 17 and law firms, without subjecting the public to direct in person, telephone or real-time 18 electronic persuasion that may overwhelm a person's judgment.

19

9

[4] [Reserved.]The use of general advertising and written, recorded or electronic
communications to transmit information from lawyer to the public, rather than direct inperson, live telephone or real-time electronic contact, will help to assure that the information
flows cleanly as well as freely. The contents of advertisements and communications
permitted under Rule 7.2 can be permanently recorded so that they cannot be disputed and
may be shared with others who know the lawyer. This potential for informal review is itself
likely to help guard against statements and claims that might constitute false and misleading

1 communications, in violation of Rule 7.1. The contents of direct in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact can be disputed and may not be subject to third-party scrutiny. Consequently, they are much more likely to approach (and occasionally cross) the dividing line between accurate representations and those that are false and misleading.

6 [5] [Reserved. Washington revision] There is far less likelihood that a lawyer would engage 7 in abusive practices against a former client, or a person with whom the lawyer has close 8 personal or family relationship, or in situations in which the lawyer is motivated by 9 considerations other than the lawyer's pecuniary gain. Nor is there a serious potential for 10 abuse when the person contacted is a lawyer or an LLLT. Consequently, the general 11 prohibition in Rule 7.3(a) is not applicable in those situations. Also, paragraph (a) is not 12 intended to prohibit a lawyer from participating in constitutionally protected activities of 13 public or charitable legal-service organizations or bona fide political, social, civic, fraternal, 14 employee or trade organizations whose purposes include providing or recommending legal 15 services to its members or beneficiaries.

16

25

26

2

3

4

5

17 [6] [Reserved.] But even permitted forms of solicitation can be abused. Thus, any solicitation 18 which contains information which is false or misleading within the meaning of Rule 7.1, 19 which involves coercion, duress or harassment within the meaning of Rule 7.3(b)(2), or 20 which involves contact with someone who has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be 21 solicited by the lawyer within the meaning of Rule 7.3(b)(1) is prohibited. Moreover, if after 22 sending a letter or other communication as permitted by Rule 7.2 the lawyer receives no 23 response, any further effort to communicate with the recipient of the communication may 24 violate the provisions of Rule 7.3(b).

1 [7] [Reserved] This Rule is not intended to prohibit a lawyer from contacting representatives 2 of organizations or groups that may be interested in establishing a group or prepaid legal plan 3 for their members, insureds, beneficiaries, or other third parties for the purpose of informing 4 such entities of the availability of and details concerning the plan or arrangement which the 5 lawyer or lawyer's firm is willing to offer. This form of communication is not directed to 6 people who are seeking legal services for themselves. Rather, it is usually addressed to an 7 individual acting in a fiduciary capacity seeking a supplier of legal services for others who 8 may, if they choose, become prospective clients of the lawyer. Under these circumstances, 9 the activity which the lawyer undertakes in communicating with such representatives and the 10 type of information transmitted to the individual are functionally similar to and serve the 11 same purpose as advertising permitted under Rule 7.2.

12 13 14

[8] [Reserved.]

15 [9] [Reserved.] Paragraph (d) of this Rule permits a lawyer to participate with an organization 16 which uses personal contact to solicit members for its group or prepaid legal service plan, 17 provided that the personal contact is not undertaken by any lawyer who would be a provider 18 of legal services through the plan. The organization must not be owned by or directed 19 (whether as manager or otherwise) by any lawyer or law firm that participates in the plan. 20 For example, paragraph (d) would not permit a lawyer to create an organization controlled 21 directly or indirectly by the lawyer and use the organization for the in-person or telephone 22 solicitation of legal employment of the lawyer through memberships in the plan or otherwise. 23 The communication permitted by these organizations also must not be directed to a person 24 known to need legal services in a particular matter, but is to be designed to inform potential 25 plan members generally of another means of affordable legal services. Lawyers who 26

participate in a legal service plan must reasonably assure that the plan sponsors are in
compliance with Rules 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3(b). See 8.4(a).

3 4

Additional Washington Comments (10 - 1416)

5 [10] A lawyer who receives a referral from a third party should exercise caution in contacting 6 the prospective client directly by in-person, live telephone, or real-time electronic contact. 7 Such contact is generally prohibited by this Rule unless the prospective client has asked to 8 be contacted by the lawyer. A prospective client may request such contact through a third party. Prior to initiating contact with the prospective client, however, the lawyer should 9 10 confirm with the source of the referral that the prospective client has indeed made such a 11 request. Similarly, when making referrals to other lawyers, the referring lawyer should discuss with the prospective client whether he or she wishes to be contacted directly. While 12 13 all communications about a lawyer's services are subject to the general prohibition against 14 false or misleading communication in RPC 7.1, in-person solicitation can create problems 15 because of the particular circumstances in which the solicitation takes place, and those 16 circumstances are, therefore, appropriately regulated. subsection (a) of this rule prohibits 17 solicitation in circumstances or through means that are not conducive to intelligent, rational 18 decisions. Unwanted solicitations (after the subject has informed the lawyer not to make 19 contact) or solicitations involving coercion, duress, or harassment are specifically prohibited. 20 Such circumstances and means could be the harassment of early morning or late-night 21 telephone calls to a potential client to solicit legal work, repeated calls at any time of day, 22 solicitation of an accident victim or the victim's family shortly after the accident or while the 23 victim is still in medical distress (particularly where a lawyer seeks professional employment 24 by in-person or other real-time contact in such circumstances), or solicitation of vulnerable 25 subjects, such as persons facing incarceration, or their family members, in or near a 26 courthouse. The prohibition on solicitation of a subject who cannot "exercise reasonable

1 judgment in employing a lawyer" extends to an individual with diminished capacity who cannot adequately act in the individual's own interest, and the provisions of RPC 1.14 may 2 3 provide guidance in evaluating "the physical, emotional, or mental" state of the subject. 4 5 [11] Those in need of legal representation often seek assistance in finding a lawyer through 6 a lawyer referral service. Washington adopted paragraph (a)(3) in order to facilitate 7 communication between lawyers and potential clients who have specifically requested a 8 referral from a not-for-profit lawyer referral service. Under this paragraph, a lawyer receiving 9 such a referral may contact the potential client directly by in-person, live telephone, or real-10 time electronic contact to discuss possible representation. Under RPC 5.1, RPC 5.3, and RPC 11 8.4(a), the solicitation restrictions that apply to the lawyer's own acts or conduct also extend 12 to acts or conduct by employees, agents, or any third persons acting on the lawyer's behalf. 13 14 [12] Washington did not adopt paragraph (c) of the Model Rule relating to labeling of 15 communications with prospective clients. A specific labeling requirement is unnecessary in 16 light of the prohibitions in Rule 7.1 against false or misleading communications. Washington 17 has not adopted subsection (e) of the Model Rule creating a safe harbor for in-person and 18 telephonic solicitations in the context of a prepaid or group legal services plan because 19 solicitations of professional employment by any means and in all contexts are permitted 20 subject to the exceptions contained in subsection (a)(1) - (4). In addition, prior provisions and comments under RPC 7.3 in Washington relating to in-person, telephonic, or real-time 21 22 electronic solicitations in the context of referrals from a third party or a lawyer referral 23 service have been removed because solicitations by any means in this context are permitted 24 subject to the exceptions contained in paragraphs (a)(1)-(4) of this RPC. 25 Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer 26

1 [13] The phrase "directly or through a third person" in paragraph (a) was retained from former Washington RPC 7.3(a). Subsection (b) of this rule was derived from former Washington RPC 7.2(b).

2

3

4

5 [14] The phrase "prospective client" in Rule 7.3(a) has been replaced with the phrase 6 "possible client" because the phrase "prospective client" has become a defined phrase under 7 RPC 1.18 with a different meaning. This is a departure from the ABA Model Rule which 8 has dispensed altogether with the phrase "from a prospective client" in this rule. The rule is 9 not intended to preclude lawyers from in-person conversations with friends, relatives or other 10 professionals (i.e. intermediaries) about other friends, relatives, clients, or patients who may need or benefit from the lawyer's services, so long as the lawyer is not asking or expecting 11 12 the intermediary to engage in improper solicitation. See RPC 8.4(a) which prohibits 13 improper solicitation "through the acts of another." Absent limitation of prohibited in-person 14 communications to "possible clients" there is danger that lawyers might mistakenly infer that 15 the kind of benign conversations with non-client intermediaries described above are 16 precluded by this rule. Except as permitted under subsections (b)(1)-(b)(5), lawyers are not 17 permitted to pay others for recommending the lawyer's services or for channeling 18 professional work in a manner that violates RPC 7.1 or RPC 7.3. A communication contains 19 a recommendation if it endorses or vouches for a lawyer's credentials, abilities, competence, 20 character, or other professional qualities. Subsection (b)(1), however, allows a lawyer to pay 21 for advertising and solicitations permitted by RPC 7.1 and this rule, including the costs of 22 print directory listings, online directory listings, newspaper ads, television and radio airtime, 23 domain-name registrations, sponsorship fees, Internet-based advertisements, and group 24 advertising. A lawyer may compensate employees, agents, and vendors who are engaged to 25 provide marketing or client-development services, such as publicists, public-relations 26 personnel, business-development staff, and website designers, as long as the employees,

1	agents, and vendors do not direct or regulate the lawyer's professional judgment (see RPC
2	5.4(c)). Moreover, a lawyer may pay others for generating client leads, such as Internet-based
3	client leads, as long as the lead generator does not recommend the lawyer, any payment to
4	the lead generator is consistent with RPC 1.5(e) (division of fees) and 5.4 (professional
5	independence of the lawyer), and the lead generator's communications are consistent with
6	RPC 7.1 (communications concerning a lawyer's services). To comply with RPC 7.1, a
7	lawyer must not pay a lead generator that states, implies, or creates a reasonable impression
8	that it is recommending the lawyer, is making the referral without payment from the lawyer,
9	or has analyzed a person's legal problems when determining which lawyer should receive
10	the referral. See also RPC 5.3 (duties of lawyers and law firms with respect to the conduct
11	of nonlawyers); RPC 8.4(a) (duty to avoid violating the rules through the acts of another).
12	For the definition of nonlawyer for the purposes of RPC 5.3, see Washington cmt. 5 to Rule
13	<u>5.3.</u>
14	
15	[15] A lawyer may pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not-for-profit lawyer
16	referral service. A "legal service plan" is a prepaid or group legal service plan or a similar
17	delivery system that assists people who seek to secure legal representation. A "lawyer referral
18	service," on the other hand, is any individual or entity that operates for the direct or indirect
19	purpose of referring potential clients to lawyers, regardless of whether the term "referral
20	service" is used. The "usual charges" of a legal service plan or not-for-profit lawyer referral
21	service are fees that are openly promulgated and uniformly applied. Not-for-profit lawyer
22	referral services are understood by the public to be consumer-oriented organizations that
23	provide unbiased referrals to lawyers with appropriate experience in the subject matter of the
24	representation and afford other client protections, such as complaint procedures or
25	malpractice insurance requirements.
26	

1	[16] A lawyer also may agree to refer clients to another lawyer or LLLT or other nonlawyer
2	professional in return for the undertaking of that person to refer clients or customers to the
3	lawyer. Such reciprocal referral arrangements must not interfere with the lawyer's
4	professional judgment as to making referrals or as to providing substantive legal services.
5	See RPC 2.1 and 5.4(c). Except as provided in RPC 1.5(e), a lawyer who receives referrals
6	from a lawyer or LLLT or other nonlawyer professional must not pay anything solely for the
7	referral, but the lawyer does not violate this Rule by agreeing to refer clients to the other
8	lawyer or LLLT or other nonlawyer professional, so long as the reciprocal referral agreement
9	is not exclusive and the client is informed of the referral agreement. Conflicts of interest
10	created by such arrangements are governed by RPC 1.7. Reciprocal referral agreements
11	should not be of indefinite duration and should be reviewed periodically to determine
12	whether they comply with these rules. This rule does not restrict referrals or divisions of
13	revenues or net income among lawyers within firms comprised of multiple entities. Under
14	LLLT RPC 1.5(e), however, an LLLT may not enter into an arrangement for the division of
15	a fee with a lawyer who is not in the same firm as the LLLT.
16	
17	
18	RPC 7.4 COMMUNICATION OF FIELDS OF PRACTICE AND
19	SPECIALIZATION[Reserved.]
20	(a) A lawyer may communicate the fact that the lawyer does or does not practice in
21	particular fields of law.
22	(b) A lawyer admitted to engage in patent practice before the United States Patent and
23	Trademark Office may use the designation "Patent Attorney" or a substantially similar
24	designation.
25	(c) A lawyer engaged in Admiralty practice may use the designation "Admiralty,"
26	"Proctor in Admiralty" or substantially similar designation.

1	(d) A lawyer shall not state or imply that a lawyer is a specialist in a particular field of
2	law, except upon issuance of an identifying certificate, award, or recognition by a group,
3	organization, or association, a lawyer may use the terms "certified", "specialist", "expert", or
4	any other similar term to describe his or her qualifications as a lawyer or his or her
5	qualifications in any subspecialty of the law. If the terms are used to identify any certificate,
6	award, or recognition by any group, organization, or association, the reference must:
7	(1) be truthful and verifiable and otherwise comply with Rule 7.1;
8	(2) identify the certifying group, organization, or association; and
9	(3) the reference must state that the Supreme Court of Washington does not recognize
10	certification of specialties in the practice of law and that the certificate, award, or recognition
11	is not a requirement to practice law in the state of Washington.
12	
13	Comment
14	[1] [Washington revision] Paragraph (a) of this Rule permits a lawyer to indicate areas of
15	practice in communications about the lawyer's services. If a lawyer practices only in certain
16	fields, or will not accept matters except in a specified field or fields, the lawyer is permitted
17	to so indicate.
18	
19	[2] Paragraph (b) recognizes the long-established policy of the Patent and Trademark Office
20	for the designation of lawyers practicing before the Office. Paragraph (c) recognizes that
21	designation of Admiralty practice has a long historical tradition associated with maritime
22	commerce and the federal courts.
23	
24	[3] [Reserved.]
25	
26	Additional Washington Comment (4 -5)

[4] Statements indicating that the lawyer is a "specialist," practices a "specialty," "specializes in" particular fields, and the like, are subject to the limitations set forth in paragraph (d). The provisions of paragraph (d) were taken from former Washington RPC 7.4(b).

- 5 [5] In advertising concerning an LLLT's services, an LLLT is required to communicate the 6 fact that the LLLT has a limited license in the particular fields of law for which the LLLT is 7 licensed and must not state or imply that the LLLT has broader authority to practice than is 8 in fact the case. See LLLT RPC 7.4(a); see also LLLT RPC 7.2(c) (advertisements must 9 include the name and office address of at least one responsible LLLT or law firm). When 10 lawyers and LLLTs are associated in a firm, lawyers with managerial or pertinent supervisory 11 authority must take measures to assure that the firm's communications conform with these 12 obligations. See Rule 5.10.
- 13

1

2

3

4

14

RPC 7.5 FIRM NAMES AND LETTERHEADS [Reserved.]

(a) A lawyer shall not use a firm name, letterhead or other professional designation that
 violates Rule 7.1. A trade name may be used by a lawyer in private practice if it does not
 imply a connection with a government agency or with a public or charitable legal services
 organization and is not otherwise in violation of Rule 7.1.

(b) A law firm with offices in more than one jurisdiction may use the same name or
 other professional designation in each jurisdiction, but identification of the lawyers or LLLTs
 in an office of the firm shall indicate the jurisdictional limitations on those not licensed to
 practice in the jurisdiction where the office is located.

- (c) The name of a lawyer or LLLT holding a public office shall not be used in the name
 of a law firm, or in communications on its behalf, during any substantial period in which the
 lawyer or LLLT is not actively and regularly practicing with the firm.
- 26

(d) Lawyers may state or imply that they practice in a partnership or other organization only when that is a fact.

Comment

1

2

3

4

5 [1] [Washington revision] A firm may be designated by the names of all or some of its 6 members, by the names of deceased members where there has been a continuing succession 7 in the firm's identity or by a trade name such as the "ABC Legal Clinic." A lawyer or law 8 firm may also be designated by a distinctive website address or comparable professional 9 designation. Although the United States Supreme Court has held that legislation may prohibit 10 the use of trade names in professional practice, use of such names in law practice is 11 acceptable so long as it is not misleading. If a private firm uses a trade name that includes a 12 geographical name such as "Springfield Legal Clinic," an express disclaimer that it is a public 13 legal aid agency may be required to avoid a misleading implication. It may be observed that 14 any firm name including the name of a deceased partner is, strictly speaking, a trade name. 15 The use of such names to designate law firms has proven a useful means of identification. 16 However, it is misleading to use the name of a lawyer or LLLT not associated with the firm 17 or a predecessor of the firm, or the name of an individual who is neither a lawyer nor an 18 LLLT.

19 20

[2] [Washington revision] With regard to paragraph (d), lawyers or LLLTs sharing office
facilities, but who are not in fact associated with each other in a law firm, may not denominate
themselves as, for example, "Smith and Jones," for that title suggests that they are practicing
law together in a firm.

25 Additional Washington Comments (3 -4)

26

[3] When lawyers and LLLTs are associated with each other in a law firm, the firm may be designated using the name of a member LLLT if the name is not otherwise in violation of Rule 7.1, this Rule, or LLLT RPC 7.5. See also Washington Comment [4] to this Rule.

[4] Lawyers or LLLTs practicing out of the same office who are not partners, shareholders of a professional corporation, or members of a professional limited liability company or partnership may not join their names together. Lawyers or LLLTs who are not (1) partners, shareholders of a professional corporation, or members of a professional limited liability company or partnership, or (2) employees of a sole proprietorship, partnership, professional corporation, or members of a professional limited liability company or partnership or other organization, or (3) in the relationship of being "Of Counsel" to a sole proprietorship, partnership, professional corporation, or members of a professional limited liability company or partnership or other organization, must have separate letterheads, cards and pleading paper, and must sign their names individually at the end of all pleadings and correspondence and not in conjunction with the names of other lawyers or LLLTs. (The provisions of this Comment were taken from former Washington RPC 7.5(d).)

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT TITLE 5 – LAW FIRMS AND ASSOCIATIONS

1 **RPC 5.5 UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW; MULTIJURISDICTIONAL** 2 **PRACTICE OF LAW** 3 4 (a) - (e) Unchanged. 5 6 (f) Subsection (b)(1) of this rule does not prohibit a law firm with offices in multiple 7 jurisdictions from establishing and maintaining an office in this jurisdiction even if some of 8 the lawyers who are members of the firm or are otherwise employed or retained by or 9 associated with the law firm are not authorized to practice law in this jurisdiction. 10 11 Comment 12 [1] – [3] Unchanged. 13 14 [4] [Washington revision] Other than as authorized by law or this Rule, a lawyer who is not 15 admitted to practice generally in this jurisdiction violates paragraph (b) if the lawyer 16 establishes an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the 17 practice of law. Presence may be systematic and continuous even if the lawyer is not 18 physically present here. Such a lawyer must not hold out to the public or otherwise represent 19 that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction. See also RPC 7.1 and 7.5(b) 20 Washington cmt. 14. 21 22 [5] [Washington revision] There are occasions in which a lawyer admitted to practice in 23 another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any 24 jurisdiction, may provide legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction under 25 circumstances that do not create an unreasonable risk to the interests of their clients, the

public or the courts. Paragraph (c) identifies four such circumstances. The fact that conduct

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT **TITLE 5 – LAW FIRMS AND ASSOCIATIONS**

1 is not so identified does not imply that the conduct is or is not authorized. With the exception 2 of paragraph (d)(2), this Rule does not authorize a United States. or foreign lawyer to establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction without being admitted to practice generally or as housel counsel under APR 8(f) here.

[6] – [13] Unchanged.

[14] [Washington revision] Paragraphs (c)(3) and (c)(4) require that the services arise out of or be reasonably related to the lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted. A variety of factors evidence such a relationship. The lawyer's client may have been previously represented by the lawyer, or may be resident in or have substantial contacts with the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted. The matter, although involving other jurisdictions, may have a significant connection with that jurisdiction. In other cases, significant aspects of the lawyer's work might be conducted in that jurisdiction or a significant aspect of the matter may involve the law of that jurisdiction. The necessary relationship might arise when the client's activities or the legal issues involve multiple jurisdictions, such as when the officers of a multinational corporation survey potential business sites and seek the services of their lawyer in assessing the relative merits of each. In addition, the services may draw on the lawyer's recognized expertise developed through the regular practice of law on behalf of clients in matters involving a particular body of federal, nationally-uniform, foreign, or international law. Lawyers desiring to provide pro bono legal services on a temporary basis in Washington following determination by the Supreme Court that an emergency affecting the justice system, as a result of a natural or other major disaster, has occurred, who are not otherwise authorized to practice law in Washington, as well as lawyers from another affected jurisdiction who seek to practice law temporarily in 26 Washington, but who are not otherwise authorized to practice law in Washington, should

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT TITLE 5 – LAW FIRMS AND ASSOCIATIONS

1	consult Admission to Practice Rule 27 on Provision of Legal Services Following
2	Determination of Major Disaster.
3	
4	[15] – [20] Unchanged.
5	
6	[21] [Washington revision] Paragraphs (c) and (d) do not authorize communications
7	advertising legal services to prospective clients in this jurisdiction by lawyers who are
8	admitted to practice in other jurisdictions. Whether and how lawyers may communicate the
9	availability of their services to prospective clients in this jurisdiction is governed by Rules
10	7.1 to 7.5 .
11	
12	Additional Washington Comment (22)
13	[22] Subsection (f) is derived from former RPC 7.5(b), which permitted law firms with
14	offices in more than one jurisdiction to use the same name or other professional designation
15	in each jurisdiction, and is intended to maintain authorization in the Rules of Professional
16	Conduct for the presence of multijurisdictional law firms in Washington for purposes of
17	<u>RCW 2.48.180(7).</u>
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON JANUARY 8, 2021 BY SUSAN L. CARLSON CLERK

THE SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO LIMITED LICENSE LEGAL TECHNICIAN RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (LLLT RPC) 1.0B—ADDITIONAL TERMINOLOGY; LLLT RPC 1.5—FEES; LLLT RPC 7.1—COMMUNICATION CONCERNING AN LLLT'S SERVICES; LLLT RPC 7.2— ADVERTISING <u>RESERVED</u>; LLLT RPC 7.3— DIRECT CONTACT WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS SOLICITATION OF CLIENTS; LLLT RPC 7.4—COMMUNICATION OF FIELDS OF PRACTICE AND SPECIALIZATION <u>RESERVED</u>; LLLT RPC 7.5—FIRM NAME AND LETTERHEADS <u>RESERVED</u>

O R D E R

NO. 25700-A-1334

The Limited License Legal Technician Board, having recommended the expeditious adoption of the suggested amendments to Limited License Legal Technician Rules of Professional Conduct (LLLT RPC) 1.0B—Additional Terminology; LLLT RPC 1.5—Fees; LLLT RPC 7.1—Communication Concerning an LLLT's Services; LLLT RPC 7.2— Advertising Reserved; LLLT RPC 7.3—Direct Contact With Prospective Clients Solicitation of Clients; LLLT RPC 7.4—Communication of Fields of Practice and Specialization Reserved; LLLT RPC 7.5—Firm Name and Letterheads Reserved, and the Court having considered the suggested amendments, and having determined that the suggested amendments will aid in the prompt and orderly administration of justice;
Page 2 ORDER IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO LIMITED LICENSE LEGAL TECHNICIAN RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (LLLT RPC) 1.0B—ADDITIONAL TERMINOLOGY; LLLT RPC 1.5—FEES; LLLT RPC 7.1—COMMUNICATION CONCERNING AN LLLT'S SERVICES; LLLT RPC 7.2—ADVERTISING-RESERVED; LLLT RPC 7.3—DIRECT CONTACT WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS SOLICITATION OF CLIENTS; LLLT RPC 7.4—COMMUNICATION OF FIELDS OF PRACTICE AND SPECIALIZATION RESERVED; LLLT RPC 7.5—FIRM NAME AND LETTERHEADS RESERVED

Now, therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED:

- (a) That the suggested amendments as attached hereto are adopted.
- (b) That pursuant to the emergency provisions of GR 9(j)(1), the suggested

amendments will be expeditiously published in the Washington Reports and will become effective upon publication.

DATED at Olympia, Washington this 8th day of January, 2021.

nadsen (conzále,

LLLT RPC 1.0B

I

1	TITLE
2	Limited License Legal Technician Rules of Professional Conduct
3	RULE 1.0B. ADDITIONAL TERMINOLOGY
4	
5	(a)-(h) Unchanged.
6	
7	Comment
8	[1]-[2] Unchanged.
9	
10	[3] The terms "firm" and "law firm" are used interchangeably in the Lawyer RPC and also
11	in these Rules. An LLLT should be cautious, however, in using the words "law firm" to
12	describe a law practice that includes only LLLTs. The name and description of an LLLT's
13	practice should not imply that a lawyer is associated with the firm unless that is the case.
14	Rule 7.5(a) requires that any firm name used for an LLLT practice that does not include a
15	lawyer include the words "Legal Technician." Any firm name used for an LLLT practice that
16	does not include a lawyer must include the words "Legal Technician." See LLLT RPC cmt.
17	<u>2.</u>
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

LLLT RPC 1.5

l

1	TITLE
2	Limited License Legal Technician Rules of Professional Conduct
3	RULE 1.5. FEES
4	
5	(a)-(f) Unchanged.
6	
7	Comment
8	[1]-[2] Unchanged.
9	
10	[3] Under the circumstances specified in Lawyer RPC 1.5(e), a lawyer may agree to a
11	division of a fee either with another lawyer who is not in the same firm or with an authorized
12	lawyer referral service. By contrast, paragraph (e) of this Rule categorically prohibits an
13	LLLT from dividing a fee. An LLLT may pay the usual charges of an LLLT referral service.
14	<i>See</i> Rule 7.2 <u>3(eb</u>).
15	[4] - [5] [Unchanged.]
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

1	TITLE
2	Limited License Legal Technician Rules of Professional Conduct
3	RULE 7.1. COMMUNICATION CONCERNING AN LLLT'S SERVICES
4	
5	(a) An LLLT shall not make a false or misleading communication about the LLLT or the
6	LLLT's services. A communication is false or misleading if it contains a material
7	misrepresentation of fact or law, or omits a fact necessary to make the statement considered
8	as a whole not materially misleading.
9	
10	(b) In all communications about the LLLT or the LLLT's services, an LLLT shall
11	communicate the fact that the LLLT has a limited license to practice in the particular fields
12	of law for which the LLLT is licensed, and shall not state or imply that an LLLT is licensed
13	to practice in any other areas of law, or has an unlimited license to practice law in any area
14	<u>of law.</u>
15	
16	Comment
17	[1] This RuleSubsection (a) was adapted from is based on Lawyer RPC 7.1 with no
18	substantive changes and the comments to Lawyer RPC 7.1 applyies to LLLTs analogously.
19	See also APR 28(H)(1) (prohibiting an LLLT from making any statement that the LLLT can
20	or will obtain special favors from or has special influence with any court or governmental
21	agency).
22	
23	[2] If there are no lawyers in the firm, any firm name used by an LLLT in private practice
24	shall include the words "Legal Technician."
25	
26	



Comment

[1] This Rule was adapted from Lawyer RPC 7.2 with no substantive changes except to reflect that client referrals may occur reciprocally between lawyers and LLLTs. It applies to LLLTs analogously.

[2] This Rule prohibits LLLTs from paying others for referrals. See also Rule 1.5(e)
 (prohibiting the division of fees with another LLLT or lawyer who is not in the same firm as
 the LLLT); Rule 5.4 (subject to Rule 5.9, prohibiting the sharing of fees with anyone who is
 not an LLLT).

[3] In advertising, an LLLT also has an affirmative obligation to communicate the fact that the LLLT has a limited license to practice in the particular fields of law for which the LLLT is licensed and is prohibited from stating or implying that the LLLT is licensed to practice in any other areas of law, or has an unlimited license to practice law in any area of law. *See* Rule 7.4(a).

RULE 7.3. DIRECT CONTACT WITH PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS OF CLIENTS

(a) An LLLT shall not directly or through a third person, by in-person, live telephone, or
 real-time electronic contactmay solicit professional employment from a prospective client
 when a significant motive for the LLLT's doing so is the LLLT's pecuniary gain, unless the
 person contacted:

(1) is a lawyer or an LLLTthe solicitation is false or misleading;

(2) has a family, close personal, or prior professional relationship with the LLLT; or the LLLT knows or reasonably should know that the physical, emotional, or mental state of the subject of the solicitation is such that the person could not exercise reasonable judgment in employing an LLLT;

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1

2

3

4

5

(3) has consented to the contact by requesting a referral from a not-for-profit LLLT referral service. the subject of the solicitation has made known to the LLLT a desire not to be solicited by the LLLT; or

(4) the solicitation involves coercion, duress, or harassment.

(b) An LLLT shall not solicit professional employment from a prospective client by
written, recorded, or electronic communication or by in person, telephone, or real-time
electronic contact even when not otherwise prohibited by paragraph (a), if;compensate, or
give or promise anything of value to, a person who is not an employee or LLLT in the same
firm for the purpose of recommending or securing the services of the LLLT or law firm,
except that an LLLT may:

(1) the prospective client has made known to the LLLT a desire not to be solicited by the
 LLLT; orpay the reasonable cost of advertisements or communications permitted by LLLT
 <u>RPC 7.1, including online group advertising;</u>

23

24

25

19

 (2) the solicitation involves coercion, duress or harassment.pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not-for-profit LLLT referral service;

1	(3) pay for a law practice in accordance with LLLT RPC 1.17;
2	
3	(4) refer clients to a lawyer or to another LLLT or other nonlawyer professional pursuant
4	to an agreement not otherwise prohibited under these rules that provides for the other person
5	to refer clients or customers to the LLLT, if:
6	
7	(i) the reciprocal referral agreement is not exclusive, and
8	
9	(ii) the client is informed of the existence and nature of the agreement;
10	
11	(5) give nominal gifts that are neither intended nor reasonably expected to be a form of
12	compensation for recommending an LLLT's services.
13	
14	(c) [Reserved.]
15	
16	(d) Notwithstanding the prohibitions in paragraph (a), an LLLT may participate with a
17	prepaid or group legal service plan operated by an organization not owned or directed by the
18	LLLT that uses in-person or telephone contact to solicit memberships or subscriptions for
19	the plan from persons who are not known to need legal services in a particular matter covered
20	by the plan.[Reserved.]
21	
22	Comment
23	[1] This Rule was adapted from is based on Lawyer RPC 7.3 with no substantive changes
24	except to reflect that LLLTs may solicit employment from lawyers as well as other LLLTs,
25	and that referral services may refer to both lawyers and LLLTs. This Rule The comments to
26	Lawyer RPC 7.3 applyies to LLLTs analogously.

1 [2] This Rule prohibits LLLTs from paying others for referrals. See also Rule 1.5(e) 2 3 (prohibiting the division of fees with another LLLT or lawyer who is not in the same firm as 4 the LLLT); Rule 5.4 (subject to Rule 5.9, prohibiting the sharing of fees with anyone who is 5 not an LLLT). 6 7 8 RULE 7.4 **COMMUNICATION OF FIELDS OF** PRACTICE AND 9 **SPECIALIZATION**[RESERVED.] 10 11 (a) In all advertising, an LLLT shall communicate the fact that the LLLT has a limited 12 license practice in the particular fields of law for which the LLLT is licensed, and shall not 13 state or imply that an LLLT is licensed to practice in any other areas of law, or has an 14 unlimited license to practice law in any area of law. 15 16 (b) [Reserved.] 17 18 (c) [Reserved.] 19 20 (d) An LLLT shall not state or imply that an LLLT is "certified," a "specialist," or an 21 "expert," or use any other similar term to describe his or her qualifications as an LLLT, but 22 may identify any award or recognition that the LLLT has received from a group, 23 organization, or association. If an LLLT has received any other legal title, credential, or 24 certificate from any group, organization, or association, then the LLLT may identify the legal 25 title, credential, or certificate provided that the reference must: 26

(1) be truthful and verifiable and otherwise comply with Rule 7.1;

(2) identify the group, organization, or association that issued the legal title, credential, or certificate; and

(3) state that the Supreme Court of Washington does not recognize certification of specialties in the practice of law and that the legal title, credential, or certificate is not a requirement of the LLLT's limited license to practice in the particular fields of law for which the LLLT is licensed.

11 Comment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

[1] An LLLT's license to provide legal services is unique and may not be understood by 12 13 persons who are not familiar with the limited scope of practice of an LLLT and with the 14 differences between an LLLT and a lawyer. Advertising is designed to help educate the 15 public on the availability of legal services, but advertising by an LLLT may not be false or 16 misleading. See Rule 7.1. In order to avoid confusion about the scope of services that an 17 LLLT can provide as distinct from the broader scope of services that a lawyer is authorized 18 to provide, advertising by an LLLT must communicate that an LLLT may deliver legal 19 services only within a limited scope. Accordingly, Rule 7.4(a) differs from Lawyer RPC 20 7.4(a) in that it requires that all advertising by an LLLT communicate relevant facts 21 concerning the scope of the LLLT's license and expressly prohibits communications that 22 state or imply that the LLLT's license exceeds that scope.

23

[2] Lawyer RPC 7.4(b) pertains to a patent practice before the United States Patent and
 Trademark Office, a practice that exceeds the authorized scope of APR 28. Accordingly,
 Rule 7.4(b) is reserved.

1 2 [3] Lawyer RPC 7.4(c) pertains to an admiralty practice, a practice that exceeds the 3 authorized scope of APR 28. Accordingly, Rule 7.4(c) is reserved. 4 5 [4] In order to avoid confusion about the scope of services that an LLLT can provide, APR 6 28(H)(4) prohibits an LLLT from representing or advertising, in connection with the 7 provision of legal services, other legal titles or credentials that could cause a client to believe 8 that the LLLT possesses professional legal skills beyond those authorized by the license held 9 by the LLLT. The terms "certified," "specialist," "expert," and similar terms suggest 10 achievement of skills beyond those that are authorized by the LLLT's license, and may not 11 be used when describing an LLLT's credentials. Other titles and recognitions, however, may 12 provide useful information that is not likely to mislead clients or potential clients concerning 13 the skills and authorized scope of an LLLT's practice. Accordingly, if an LLLT has received 14 a legal title, credential, or certificate from a group, organization, or association, the LLLT 15 may identify that title, credential, or certificate so long as communications about it meet the 16 requirements enumerated in Rule 7.4(d)(1)-(3). Those requirements are substantially similar 17 to Lawyer Rule 7.4(d)(1)-(3). An LLLT may also identify awards and recognitions that the 18 LLLT has received from a group, organization, or association. 19 20 RULE 7.5 FIRM NAMES AND LETTERHEADS [RESERVED.] 21 22 (a) An LLLT shall not use a firm name, letterhead, or other professional designation that 23 violates Rule 7.1. A trade name may be used by an LLLT in private practice if the trade 24 name does not imply that lawyers are members or employees of the firm unless that is the 25 case, and if it does not imply a connection with a government agency or with a public or 26 charitable legal services organization and is not otherwise in violation of Rule 7.1. If there

1	are no lawyers in the firm, any firm name used by an LLLT in private practice shall include
2	the words "Legal Technician."
3	
4	(b) A law firm with offices in more than one jurisdiction may use the same name or other
5	professional designation in each jurisdiction, but identification of the lawyers or LLLTs in
6	an office of the firm shall indicate the jurisdictional limitations on those not licensed to
7	practice in the jurisdiction where the office is located.
8	
9	(c) The name of an LLLT or lawyer holding a public office shall not be used in the name
10	of a law firm, or in communications on its behalf, during any substantial period in which the
11	LLLT or lawyer is not actively and regularly practicing with the firm.
12	
13	(d) LLLTs may state or imply that they practice in a partnership or other organization only
14	when that is a fact.
15	
16	Comment
17	[1] This Rule was adapted from Lawyer RPC 7.5 with no substantive changes except that
18	provisions have been added to subpart (a) to require that any trade name not imply that
19	lawyers are members or employees of the firm unless that is the case, and that, if there are
20	
	no lawyers in the firm, any trade name include the words "Legal Technician." Otherwise,
21	no lawyers in the firm, any trade name include the words "Legal Technician." Otherwise, this Rule applies to LLLTs analogously.
21 22	
22	this Rule applies to LLLTs analogously.
22 23	this Rule applies to LLLTs analogously. [2] An LLLT's license to provide legal services is unique and may not be understood by

1	misleading. See Rules 7.1 and 7.4. In order to avoid confusion, trade names should
2	communicate the nature of the legal services that a licensed practitioner or firm can deliver.
3	Rule 7.5(a) requires that any trade name communicate relevant facts concerning the scope of
4	the legal services that can be delivered by the legal professional or firm.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON JANUARY 8, 2021 BY SUSAN L. CARLSON CLERK

THE SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO APR 4—EXAMINATIONS FOR ADMISSION; NOTIFICATION OF RESULTS; APR 5—RECOMMENDATION FOR ADMISSION; ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE; PAYMENT OF MEMBERSHIP FEE; OATH OF ATTORNEY; RESIDENT AGENT; APR 25.1—RESTRICTIONS ON REINSTATEMENT; APR 25.2—REVERSAL OF CONVICTION; APR 25.3—ACTION ON SUPREME COURT DETERMINATION; APR 28 APPENDIX APR 28—REGULATIONS OF THE APR 28 LIMITED LICENSE LEGAL TECHNICIAN BOARD

O R D E R

NO. 25700-A-1336

The Washington State Supreme Court, having recommended the adoption of the proposed amendments to APR 4—Examinations for Admission; Notification of Results; APR 5—Recommendation for Admission; Order Admitting to Practice; Payment of Membership Fee; Oath of Attorney; Resident Agent; APR 25.1—Restrictions on Reinstatement; APR 25.2— Reversal of Conviction; APR 25.3—Action on Supreme Court Determination; APR 28 Appendix APR 28—Regulations of the APR 28 Limited License Legal Technician Board, and the Court having considered the proposed amendments, and having determined that the proposed amendments will aid in the prompt and orderly administration of justice;

Now, therefore, it is hereby

Page 2 ORDER

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO APR 4—EXAMINATIONS FOR ADMISSION; NOTIFICATION OF RESULTS; APR 5—RECOMMENDATION FOR ADMISSION; ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE; PAYMENT OF MEMBERSHIP FEE; OATH OF ATTORNEY; RESIDENT AGENT; APR 25.1—RESTRICTIONS ON REINSTATEMENT; APR 25.2—REVERSAL OF CONVICTION; APR 25.3—ACTION ON SUPREME COURT DETERMINATION; APR 28 APPENDIX APR 28—REGULATIONS OF THE APR 28 LIMITED LICENSE LEGAL TECHNICIAN BOARD

ORDERED:

(a) That pursuant to the provisions of GR 9(g), the suggested amendments as attached hereto are to be published for comment in the Washington Reports, Washington Register,

Washington State Bar Association and Administrative Office of the Court's websites in January

2021.

(b) The purpose statement as required by GR 9(e), is published solely for the

information of the Bench, Bar and other interested parties.

(c) Comments are to be submitted to the Clerk of the Supreme Court by either U.S.

Mail or Internet E-Mail by no later than April 30, 2021. Comments may be sent to the following

addresses: P.O. Box 40929, Olympia, Washington 98504-0929, or supreme@courts.wa.gov.

Comments submitted by e-mail message must be limited to 1500 words.

DATED at Olympia, Washington this 8th day of January, 2021.

For the Court

Sterre, C. J. CHIEF JUSTICE

GR 9 COVER SHEET

Suggested Amendments to

ADMISSION TO PRACTICE RULES (APRs)

APR 4, APR 5, APR 25.1, APR 25.2, APR 25.3, APR 28 Appendix 28

A. <u>Name of Proponent</u>: Washington State Supreme Court

B. <u>Spokesperson</u>: Justice Charles W. Johnson, Supreme Court Rules Committee Chair on behalf of the court

C. <u>**Purpose</u>:** The Washington State Supreme Court voted by majority on July 8, 2020, to sunset the Limited License Legal Technician (LLLT) program. Specifically, the court authorized: (1) an immediate reduction in the experience hours required of LLLT candidates from 3,000 hours to 1,500 hours; (2) allowance of LLLT candidates until July 31, 2022 to complete the experience hours requirement as long as the candidates have completed all other licensure requirements. The suggested amendments implement the majority vote of the court.</u>

D. <u>Suggested Amendments:</u>

<u>APR 4</u>—Clarifies the LLLT applicant's ability to repeat examinations until the final LLLT examination.

<u>APR 5</u>—Replaces the expiration of preadmission requirements to the July 31, 2022 end date.

APR 25.1 — Restricts disbarred LLLTs from seeking reinstatement to practice.

<u>APR 25.2</u>—Restricts disbarred LLLTs who have their conviction reversed, when it was the LLLT's sole basis of disbarment, from being able to have direct application for reinstatement as a LLLT.

<u>APR 25.3</u>—Removes LLLTs from the petition for reinstatement process after disbarment.

<u>APR 28 Appendix 28 Regulation 3</u>—Removes the requirement to complete the core courses prior to enrolling in the Domestic Relations practice area in accordance with Supreme Court Order 25700-A-1304 issued on August 6, 2020.

<u>APR 28 Appendix 28 Regulation 4</u>—Changes the definition of a "Limited Time Waiver" to remove the finite date, which exceeds the court's vote to end LLLT candidate licensure. Changes the expiration of the waiver approval to incorporate the July 31, 2022 end date.

<u>APR 28 Appendix 28 Regulation 10</u>—Removes the ability for existing LLLTs to add additional practice areas.

- E. <u>Hearing</u>: A hearing is not requested.
- F. <u>Expedited Consideration</u>: Expedited consideration is requested.

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO	
7		
8	APR 4	
9	EXAMINATIONS FOR ADMISSION; NOTIFICATION OF RESULTS	
10	EXAMINATIONS FOR ADMISSION, NOTIFICATION OF RESULTS	
11	(a) - (b) [Unchanged.]	
12	(a) - (b) [Onenangeu.]	
12	(a) Demosting Examinations. There is no limitation on the number of times on	
	(c) Repeating Examinations. There is no limitation on the number of times an	
14	unsuccessful <u>lawyer or LPO</u> applicant may apply for and take subsequent administrations of an	
15	examination for admission. <u>An LLLT applicant may repeat the examination for admission</u>	
16	without limitation on the number of times until the final administration of the LLLT examination	
17	after which no examination will be administered.	
18		
19	(d) [Unchanged.]	
20		
21	(e) LLLT Examination. Unless otherwise stated in these rules, all applicants for	
22	admission to practice law in Washington as an LLLT must take and pass an LLLT practice area	
23	examination and the LLLT professional responsibility examination.	
24		
25	(1) The practice area examination will test applicants on one specific practice area and	
26	knowledge of LLLT scope of practice specific to that practice area.	
27		
28	(A) Each practice area examination shall be comprised of three parts: a multiple choice	
29	section, an essay section, and a performance section.	
30		
31	(B) The duration, form, and manner of the exam shall be as prescribed by the LLLT Board.	
32		
33	(C) The minimum passing standard for the practice area examination is a score of 75	
34	percent for each section of the examination. A failing grade in one section shall result in failure	
35	of the examination, in which case grading of any remaining sections shall not be required.	
36		
37	(D) An applicant who fails the practice area examination may request a copy of their essay	
38	and performance sections if graded. An applicant who passes the practice area examination will	
39	not receive a copy of the examination.	
40		
41	(2) The LLLT professional responsibility examination will test applicants on their	
42	knowledge of the LLLT Rules of Professional Conduct.	
43		
44	(A) The professional responsibility examination shall be comprised of one multiple choice	
45	section.	
46		
47	(B) The minimum passing standard for the professional responsibility examination is a	
48	score of 75 percent.	
49		
50	(C) The professional responsibility examination must be passed no earlier than 18 months	
51	and no later than 40 months from the date of the administration of the practice area examination	
52	in which the applicant receives a passing score.	
53		
54	(f) [Unchanged.]	LM-54
55		
56		

2	
3	
4	
5	PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
6	
7	APR 5
8	PREADMISSION REQUIREMENTS; OATH; RECOMMENDATION FOR
9	ADMISSION; ORDER ADMITTING TO PRACTICE LAW
10	
11	(a) - (b) [Unchanged.]
12	
13	(c) LLLT Applicants. In addition to the requirements in subsection (a) above, LLLT
14	applicants must:
15	(1) domenstrate financial responsibility appropriates ADD 28(I), and
16	(1) demonstrate financial responsibility pursuant to APR 28(I); and
17	(2) demonstrate completion of 3,000-1,500 hours of substantive law-related work
18 19	experience pursuant to APR 28 Regulation 9; and
20	experience pursuant to AT K 28 Kegulation 3, and
20	(3) present proof of passing a LLLT Board approved paralegal examination.
22	(5) present proof of passing a EEET bound approved paralegar examination.
23	(d) [Unchanged.]
24	(u) [Chenangeal]
25	(e) Expiration of Preadmission Requirements. The preadmission requirements must be
26	completed within:
27	
28	(1) within 40 months from the date of the administration of the examination for lawyer
29	applicants;
30	
31	(2) 40 months from the date of the administration of the examination by July 31, 2022, for
32	LLLT applicants;
33	
34	(3) within 12 months from the date of the administration of the examination for LPO
35	applicants;
36	
37	(4) <u>within</u> 12 months from the date of filing the application for lawyer applicants who
38	apply by motion or Uniform Bar Examination (UBE) score transfer, except for good cause
39	shown.
40	
41	(f) – (m) [Unchanged.]
42	
43	

1	
2	
3	
4	PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
5	
6	APR 25.1
7	RESTRICTIONS ON REINSTATEMENT
8	
9	(a) [Unchanged.]
10	
11	(b) When Petition May Be Filed. No disbarred LLLT shall be permitted to seek
12	reinstatement to practice as an LLLT. No petition for reinstatement by a disbarred lawyer or LPO
13	shall be filed within a period of five years after disbarment or within a period of two years after
14	an adverse decision of the Supreme Court upon a former petition, or after an adverse
15	recommendation of the Character and Fitness Board or the Disciplinary Board on a former
16	petition when that recommendation is not submitted to the Supreme Court. If prior to disbarment
17	the lawyer, LLLT , or LPO was suspended from the practice of law pursuant to the provisions of
18	Title 7 of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct, or any comparable rule, the period of
19	such suspension shall be credited toward the five years referred to above.
20	
21	(c) When Reinstatement May Occur. No disbarred lawyer, LLLT, or LPO may be
22	reinstated sooner than six years following disbarment. If prior to disbarment the lawyer, LLLT,
23	or LPO was suspended from the practice of law pursuant to the provisions of Title 7 of the Rules
24	for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct, or any comparable rule, the period of such suspension shall
25	be credited toward the six years referred to above.
26	
27	(d) Payment of Obligations. No disbarred lawyer, LLLT , or LPO may file a petition for
28	reinstatement until costs and expenses and restitution ordered by the Disciplinary Board or the
29	Supreme Court have been paid and until amounts paid out of the Client Protection Fund for
30	losses caused by the conduct of the Petitioner have been repaid to the client protection fund, or
31	until periodic payment plans for costs and expenses, restitution and repayment to the client
32	protection fund have been entered into by agreement between the Petitioner and disciplinary
33	counsel. A Petitioner may seek review by the Chair of the Disciplinary Board of an adverse
34	determination by disciplinary counsel regarding the reasonableness of any such proposed
35	periodic payment plan. Such review will proceed as directed by the Chair of the Disciplinary
36	Board and the decision of the Chair of the Disciplinary Board is final unless the Chair of the
37	Disciplinary Board determines that the matter should be reviewed by the Disciplinary Board, in
38	which case the Disciplinary Board review will proceed as directed by the Chair and the decision
39	of the Board will be final.
40	

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
7	
8	APR 25.2
9	REVERSAL OF CONVICTION
10	
11	If a lawyer , LLLT, or LPO has been disbarred solely because of his or her conviction of a
12	crime and the conviction is later reversed and the charges dismissed on their merits, the Supreme
13	Court may in its discretion, upon direct application by the lawyer, <u>LLLT</u> , or LPO enter an order
14	reinstating the lawyer, LLLT, or LPO upon such conditions as determined by the Supreme Court.
15	At the time such direct application is filed with the court a copy shall be filed with the Bar. The
16	Supreme Court may request a response to the application from the Bar.
17	
18	

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
7	
8	APR 25.3
9	PETITIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS
10	
11	(a) Form of Petition. A petition for reinstatement after disbarment shall be in writing and
12	filed with the Bar. The petition shall set forth the residence and address of the Petitioner, the date
13	of disbarment, and a concise statement of facts claimed to justify reinstatement. The petition
14	shall be accompanied by the total fees required of a lawyer, LLLT, or LPO Applicant for
15	admission under these rules, and by a completed application for admission.
16	
17	(b) - (e) [Unchanged.]

2	
3	
4	
5	PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
6	
7	APR 28
8	LIMITED PRACTICE RULE FOR LIMITED LICENSE LEGAL TECHNICIANS
9	
10	A O. [Unchanged.]
11	
12 13	APPENDIX APR 28. REGULATIONS OF THE APR 28 LIMITED LICENSE LEGAL TECHNICIAN BOARD
14 15	REGULATION 1 - REGULATION 2. [Unchanged.]
16 17 18 19	REGULATION 3. EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR LLLT APPLICANTS AND APPROVAL OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
20 21	An applicant for admission as an LLLT shall satisfy the following education requirements:
21 22 23	A. Core Curriculum.
23 24 25 26	1. <i>Credit Requirements</i> . An applicant for licensure shall have earned 45 credit hours as required by APR 3. The core curriculum must include the following required subject matters with minimum credit hours earned as indicated:
27 28 29	1. Civil Procedure, minimum 8 credit hours;
29 30 31	2. Contracts, minimum 3 credit hours;
32 33	3. Interviewing and Investigation Techniques, minimum 3 credit hours;
34 35	4. Introduction to Law and Legal Process, minimum 3 credit hours;
36 37	5. Law Office Procedures and Technology, minimum 3 credit hours;
38 39	6. Legal Research, Writing and Analysis, minimum 8 credit hours; and
40 41	7. Professional Responsibility, minimum 3 credit hours.
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50	The core curriculum courses in which credit for the foregoing subject matters is earned shall satisfy the curricular requirements approved by the LLLT Board and published by the Bar. If the required courses completed by the applicant do not total 45 credit hours, then the applicant may earn the remaining credit hours by taking legal or paralegal elective courses. All core curriculum course credit hours must be earned at an ABA approved law school, an educational institution with an ABA approved paralegal program, or at an educational institution with an LLLT core curriculum program approved by the LLLT Board under the Washington State LLLT Educational Program Approval Standards. For purposes of satisfying APR 3(e)(2), one credit hour shall be equivalent to 450 minutes
51 52 53 54 55 56 57	2. LLLT Educational Program Approval Requirements for Programs Not Approved by the ABA. The LLLT Board shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards, to be published by the Association, for approving LLLT educational programs that are not otherwise approved by the ABA. Educational programs complying with the LLLT Board's standards shall

LM-59

be approved by the LLLT Board and qualified to teach the LLLT core curriculum.

B. Practice Area Curriculum. An applicant for licensure in a defined practice area shall have completed the prescribed curriculum and earned course credits for that defined practice area, as set forth below and in APR 3(e). Each practice area curriculum course shall satisfy the curricular requirements approved by the LLLT Board and published by the Bar.

1. Domestic Relations.

a. Prerequisites: Prior to enrolling in the domestic relations practice area courses, applicants
 shall complete the following core courses: Civil Procedure; Interviewing and Investigation
 Techniques; Introduction to Law and Legal Process; Legal Research, Writing, and Analysis; and
 Professional Responsibility [RESERVED].

b. Credit Requirements: Applicants shall complete 5 credit hours in basic domestic
relations subjects and 10 credit hours in advanced and Washington specific domestic relations
subjects.

19 **C. Required Supplemental Education.** The LLLT Board has discretion to require all 20 LLLTs to complete supplemental education in order to maintain their licenses due to changes in 21 the permitted scope of practice for LLLTs. The LLLT Board shall provide notice to LLLTs of 22 the supplemental education requirement and the deadline for completion of the requirement, 23 allowing at least 12 months to complete the required supplemental education. LLLTs may be 24 administratively suspended pursuant to the procedures set forth in APR 17 if they fail to comply 25 with the supplemental education requirements by the stated deadline.

26 27

1

2 3

4

5

6

7 8

9

14

REGULATION 4. LIMITED TIME WAIVERS

REGULATION 5. - REGULATION 8 [Unchanged.]

28

29 A. Limited Time Waiver, Defined. For the limited time between the date the Board 30 begins to accept applications and December 31, 2023, tThe LLLT Board shall grant a waiver of 31 the minimum associate-level degree requirement and/or the core curriculum education 32 requirement set forth in APR 3 if an applicant meets the requirements set forth in Regulation 33 4(B). The LLLT Board shall not grant waivers for applications filed after December 31, 2023. 34 The LLLT Board shall not waive the practice area curriculum requirement. The limited time 35 waiver application will be separate from the application process for admission-set forth in these 36 regulations. 37

B. – D. [Unchanged.]

Expiration of Limited Time Waiver Approval. Approval of the limited time waiver
 application shall expire December 31, 2025 July 31, 2022. After expiration of the approval, any
 subsequent application for licensure by the applicant shall meet all of the standard requirements
 for admission without waiver.

44 45

38

- 46
- 47 48
- 49
- 50
- 51

52 REGULATION 9. SUBSTANTIVE LAW-RELATED WORK EXPERIENCE

53 **REQUIREMENT**

1	
2	Each applicant for licensure as a limited license legal technician shall show proof of having
3	completed 3,0001,500 hours of substantive law-related work experience supervised by a licensed
4	lawyer as required by APR 5(c). The experience requirement shall be completed no more than
5	three years before and 40 months after the date of the LLLT practice area examination that the
6	applicant passed, and must be completed by July 31, 2022. The proof shall be provided in such
7	form as the Bar requires, but shall include at a minimum:
8	
9	1. the name and bar number of the supervising lawyer;
10	
11	2. certification that the work experience meets the definition of substantive law-related
12	work experience as defined in APR 28;
13	
14	3. the total number of hours of substantive law-related work experience performed under
15	the supervising lawyer; and
16	
17	4. certification that the requisite work experience was acquired within the time period
18	required by this regulation.
19	
20	REGULATION 10. ADDITIONAL PRACTICE AREAS
21	A Application for Additional Duration Area. An LILT probing admission in an
22 23	A. Application for Additional Practice Area. An LLLT seeking admission in an additional practice area must complete and file with the Bar:
23 24	additional practice area must complete and the with the Dar.
24 25	1. a completed practice area application in a form and manner prescribed by the Bar;
23 26	The completed practice area application in a form and manner presented by the bar,
20 27	2. evidence in a form and manner prescribed by the Bar demonstrating completion of the
28	practice area curriculum required under Regulation 3(B); and
29	practice area carried and regulation 5(D), and
30	3. a signed and notarized Authorization, Release, and Affidavit of Applicant.
31	
32	B. Additional Practice Area Prelicensure Requirements. An LLLT who is seeking
33	licensure in an additional practice area shall:
34	
35	1. take and pass the additional practice area examination;
36	
37	2. pay the annual license fee as stated in the fee schedule; and
38	
39	3. file any and all licensing forms required for active LLLTs.
40	
41	The requirements above shall be completed within one year of the date the applicant is
42	notified of the practice area examination results. If an LLLT fails to satisfy all the requirements
43	for licensure in an additional practice area within this period, the LLLT shall not be eligible for
44	licensure in the additional practice area without submitting a new application and retaking the
45	practice area examination.
46	
47	C. Order Admitting LLLT to Limited Practice in Additional Practice Area. After
48	examining the recommendation and accompanying documents transmitted by the Bar, the
49	Supreme Court may enter such order in each case as it deems advisable. For those LLLTs it
50	deems qualified, the Supreme Court shall enter an order admitting them to limited practice in the
51	additional practice area.
52 52	D. Voluntomy Tommination of Single Duration And License Art LLT license the term
53	D. Voluntary Termination of Single Practice Area License. An LLLT licensed in two

1	or more practice areas may request to voluntarily terminate a single practice area by notifying the
2	Bar in writing. After terminating the practice area license, the LLLT shall not accept any new
3	clients or engage in work as an LLLT in any matter in the terminated practice area. The Bar will
4	notify the LLLT of the effective date of the termination.[Reserved.]
5	
6	REGULATION 11. [Reserved.]
7	
8	REGULATION 12. [Reserved.]
9	
10	REGULATION 13. [Reserved.]
11	
12	REGULATION 14. [Reserved.]
13	
14	REGULATION 15. [Reserved.]
15	
16	REGULATION 16. [Reserved.]
17	
18	REGULATION 17. [Reserved.]
19	
20	REGULATION 18. [Reserved.]
21	
22	REGULATION 19. [Reserved.]
23	
24	REGULATION 20. AMENDMENT AND BOARD POLICIES
25	
26	These Regulations may be altered, amended, or repealed by vote of the LLLT Board on
27	approval of the Supreme Court. The LLLT Board has ongoing authority to adopt policies for the
28	administration of the LLLT program consistent with APR 28 and these Regulations.

FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON JANUARY 8, 2021 BY SUSAN L. CARLSON CLERK

THE SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

)

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO APR 11—MANDATORY CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION

ORDERNO.

25700-A-1335

The Mandatory Continuing Legal Education Board, having recommended the suggested amendment to APR 11—Mandatory Continuing Legal Education, and the Court having approved the suggested amendment for publication;

Now, therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED:

(a) That pursuant to the provisions of GR 9(g), the suggested amendment as attached

hereto is to be published for comment in the Washington Reports, Washington Register,

Washington State Bar Association and Administrative Office of the Court's websites in January 2021.

(b) The purpose statement as required by GR 9(e), is published solely for the information of the Bench, Bar and other interested parties.

(c) Comments are to be submitted to the Clerk of the Supreme Court by either U.S.
Mail or Internet E-Mail by no later than April 30, 2021. Comments may be sent to the following addresses: P.O. Box 40929, Olympia, Washington 98504-0929, or supreme@courts.wa.gov.
Comments submitted by e-mail message must be limited to 1500 words.

DATED at Olympia, Washington this 8th day of January, 2021.

Page 2 ORDER IN THE MATTER OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO APR 11—MANDATORY CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION

For the Court

chief justice

GR 9 COVER SHEET

Suggested Amendments ADMISSION AND PRACTICE RULE (APR) 11 Mandatory Continuing Legal Education

Submitted by the Mandatory Continuing Legal Education Board

A. <u>Name of Proponent</u>:

Mandatory Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) Board

Staff Liaison/Contact: Adelaine Shay, MCLE Manager Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98101-2539 (Phone: 206-727-8249)

B. <u>Spokesperson</u>:

Ayanna Colman Chair of MCLE Board PO Box 9046 Olympia, WA 98507 (Phone: 360-688-8689)

C. <u>Purpose</u>:

This suggested amendment is to ensure that licensed legal professionals in Washington State are adequately educated in order to protect the public and improve each licensed legal professional's ability to render competent and effective legal services to clients.

This suggested amendment will enable licensed legal professionals to better serve their clients by requiring that one of the required ethics credits be in the category of equity, inclusion and the mitigation of bias. The MCLE Board has identified this category as necessary to the practice of law that all lawyers, LLLTs, and LPOs should be required to be educated in this area in order to protect the public and work with clients in an ethical manner. The suggested amendment has been discussed and reviewed at length by the MCLE Board and is designed to enhance the existing ethics requirements of legal practitioners in Washington State.

Background

Pursuant to Washington Supreme Court Admission and Practice Rule (APR) "The MCLE Board shall review and suggest 11(d)(2)(i), Rules and Regulations, amendments or make regulations to APR 11 as necessary to fulfill the purpose of MCLE Suggested amendments are subject to review by the Board of Governors and approval by the Supreme Court." The purpose of MCLE is "to enhance lawyers', LLLTs', and LPOs' legal services to their clients and protect the public by assisting lawyers, LLLTs, and LPOs in maintaining and developing their competence . . . " (APR 11(a)). Therefore, the MCLE Board is continuing its work to address systemic inequities, by suggesting a single, narrow amendment of the APR 11 ethics and professional responsibility requirement focused on equity, inclusion, and mitigation of bias. The need for this requirement is highlighted by increased demand for the legal profession to refresh its commitment to address systemic inequities, as recently noted by statements made by the WSBA President and the Washington Supreme Court.¹ The MCLE Board believes that this suggested amendment is a valuable step toward realizing the necessary change called for by our profession's leaders.

The MCLE Board previously submitted a suggested amendment of the ethics requirement to the Washington Supreme Court in 2019 that would have required additional ethics credits in three specific topics. The Supreme Court rejected that suggested amendment. This year, the MCLE Board began seeking a narrower amendment to the ethics requirement, addressing one topic and specifying one credit of the existing ethics requirement. The MCLE Board created an MCLE Board Rules Subcommittee, tasked with drafting a suggested amendment focused solely on the topic of diversity. This suggested amendment more closely aligns with the original proposal heard by the MCLE Board in October 2018, as presented by the WSBA Diversity Committee and Washington Women Lawyers, with the support of eight minority bar associations: the Asian Bar Association of Washington, the Cardozo Society of Washington State, Filipino Lawyers of Washington, the Pierce County Minority Bar Association, the Loren Miller Bar Association, the Latina/o Bar Association of Washington, the South Asian Bar Association of Washington, and QLaw. That proposal was to require that at least one of the six ethics credits licensed legal professionals are required to earn each reporting period be on the topic of "equity, inclusion and the mitigation of bias in the legal profession."

Based on an initial draft from the subcommittee, the MCLE Board sought feedback from the WSBA Diversity Committee, the Washington Women Lawyers and other stakeholders including Court-appointed boards, WSBA committees, local and minority bar associations, and CLE sponsors. Based on stakeholder feedback, the MCLE Board again refined the suggested amendment, and posted it for public comment.

As of October 5, 2020, the MCLE Board have received 937 written comments, and four in-person comments during a public comment session held at the MCLE Board meeting on August 7, 2020. Out of the written comments, respondents were near equally split as 'in favor' and 'not in favor', with a slight lean towards 'in favor' of the suggested amendment. Of these 937 comments, 45 identified as members of the public (non-WSBA

members); 41 of the 45 responded as 'in favor'. Last year, the compiled feedback for the previous suggested amendment resulted in a large majority opposed. See the attached compiled feedback regarding the current suggested amendment.

The MCLE Board reviewed and considered all written and oral feedback at its August 7, 2020 meeting. After discussing the feedback and hearing public comment, the MCLE Board voted unanimously to continue to move forward with the suggested amendment by sending it to the Board of Governors for review.

On September 18, 2020, MCLE Board member Asia Wright presented the suggested amendment to the WSBA Board of Governors for review. The Board of Governors voted to support the MCLE Board's suggested amendment.² Subsequently, at a special meeting held on September 22, 2020, the MCLE Board voted unanimously to suggest the amendment to the Court.

Suggested Amendment

The role of the MCLE Board is to suggest amendments to APR 11 that support the purpose of mandatory continuing legal education. The MCLE Board believes that the suggested amendment will not only educate Washington licensed legal professionals on the state of the law on various subjects, but also improve inter-cultural communication, improve equitable outcomes, and reduce the risk of potential liability. Further, the MCLE Board has a duty to ensure that Washington licensed legal professionals have the skills and knowledge base to effectively serve their clients, the legal system, and society as a whole. For these reasons, the MCLE Board recommends adopting the suggested amendment.

Many opponents of the suggested amendment are not in favor of mandatory

requirements; however, the practice of law is not a right, but a privilege. It is a natural tendency to choose CLEs that seem directly relevant to one's practice or that sound interesting. However, a person who lacks understanding of a topic covered by the suggested amendment might be more likely to discount the value of the topic, and therefore not choose to participate in a given CLE. Accordingly, if this suggested ethics topic is not mandatory, the licensed legal professionals who might benefit most from the training may not receive it.

The suggested requirement is neither burdensome nor onerous. There are currently hundreds of both live and recorded CLE courses from around the world that cover equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of bias; nearly 200 such courses have been approved for credit in Washington in the past year alone. With the recent commitment by the WSBA Board of Governors, free ethics CLEs on the topic of equity, inclusion and the mitigation of bias in the legal profession will be made accessible both in-person and ondemand.³ This eliminates any barriers to accessing the CLE, as this topic will be provided at no cost and offered in multiple formats. On September 15, 2020, the WSBA offered a free CLE, titled "Beyond the Dialogue: From Transphobia to Gender Inclusion in the Practice of Law". This CLE covered equity, inclusion and the mitigation of bias, and was attended by 1,031 licensed legal professionals.

Throughout the amendment process, the MCLE Board was guided by APR 11, which states that the purpose of MCLE is "to enhance lawyers', LLLTs', and LPOs' legal services to their clients and protect the public by assisting lawyers, LLLTs, and LPOs in maintaining and developing their competence as defined in RPC 1.1 or equivalent rule

for LLLTs and LPOs, fitness to practice as defined in APR 20, and character as defined in APR 20."

APR 20:

(c) Good Moral Character.

Good moral character is a record of conduct manifesting the qualities of honesty, fairness, candor trustworthiness, observance of fiduciary responsibilities, adherence to the law, and a respect for the rights of other persons and the judicial process.

(d) Fitness to Practice Law. Fitness to practice law is a record of conduct that establishes that the applicant meets the essential eligibility requirements for the practice of law.

The following describes each suggested amendment and the amendment's purpose and intended effect:

APR 11(c)(1)(ii)

APR 11(c)(1)(ii) states "at least six credits must be in ethics and professional responsibility, as defined in subsection (f)(2)." The Board suggests an amendment that adds "with at least one credit in equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and explicit bias in the legal profession and the practice of law." The amendment would require one credit per three-year reporting period in the subject of equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and explicit bias in the legal profession and the practice of law." The amendment would require one credit per three-year reporting period in the subject of equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and explicit bias in the legal profession and the practice of law.

This amendment would simply require that one credit of the required six ethics hours be devoted to the subject identified in the suggested amendment. The ethics requirements are a required minimum, and any credits earned above the required minimum of six ethics credits and fifteen law and legal credits can be counted towards the overall 45 credit requirement regardless of the credit category. The MCLE Board notes that the subject - diversity, equity and inclusion, and implicit/explicit bias⁴ – is a core area in which modern licensed legal professionals must be fluent in order to provide legal services and representation. Furthermore, the bar has an important role to play in addressing systemic inequities in our society.

APR 11(f)(2)

The Board's suggested amendment to APR 11(f)(2)(i) strikes a phrase "including diversity and anti-bias with respect to the practice of law or the legal system, and;" this phrase would be reworded to "equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and explicit bias in the legal profession and the practice of law." This wording replaces the wording "diversity" with "equity, inclusion, and mitigation of implicit and explicit bias" at the suggestion of the Washington Attorneys with Disabilities Association. This wording suggestion was originally made when soliciting stakeholder feedback for the previous rejected suggested amendment in 2019, which held similar language and included the term "diversity". The suggestion was supported by the Korean American Bar Association and the South Asian Bar Association of Washington. Similarly, the Middle Eastern Legal Association of Washington and the Loren Miller Bar Association advised changing the language to incorporate "unconscious bias". The MCLE Board believes the intent of that language is captured by adding "implicit" and "explicit" to the proposed amendment.

Objective data demonstrates that the population of Washington State is rapidly becoming more racially diverse.⁵ Increasing the cultural competencies of our legal professionals will equip each of its members to better serve the public today and in the future.

Given the diversity of our community, it is important to understand the different lived experiences of others. Certain assumptions, attitudes, words, phrases and behaviors can harm others, negatively impact their mental and social well-being, and deny them their due economic wellness. Words can be confusing and change interactions if misused; they can also help persuade a judge or jury, sway negotiations, and determine how we meet our clients' needs. An individual's tone of voice, and nonverbal cues also impact how we interact with others. By understanding and identifying biases and interrupting their adverse impacts on others, the Washington licensed legal professionals can better understand their clients' needs and other points of view. It is a business imperative to understand bias. Being aware of our own bias and being sensitive to different perspectives can establish communication bridges. Through this communication, a licensed legal professional can become a credible source, build client relationships, and gain others' trust or convince another to see the other side of an argument.

No one is without some sort of bias. Recognizing our own biases, whether they be positive or negative, implicit or explicit, is a continual process. Opponents' claims that such courses would shame or target a particular group are erroneous. The equity requirement is not about shaming a particular group; any attempts to shame are counterproductive and a detour from achieving equitable outcomes. It is about understanding how one's bias can have adverse impact on the equitable practice of law.

Additionally, knowing that a significant segment of our colleagues and clients face unfair treatment in the legal community, including by legal professionals, requires purposeful action. Both racial discrimination and gender bias remain prevalent issues in
the legal community. According to the National Association for Law Placement's 2018 Diversity Report, women make up nearly 42% of the profession, but only about 23% are represented at the level of partner. A similar disparity is evident with racial minorities, which comprise nearly 17% of the profession, but only 9% are represented at partner level⁶. Mandatory training in this area is both proper and necessary.

The original report and recommendation of the WSBA Diversity Committee and Washington Women Lawyers (with the support of multiple minority bar associations) demonstrates the need for education within the profession across all categories of Washington licensed legal professionals (private practitioners, government lawyers, professors and instructors, judges, regulators, in house counsel, LLLTs, LPOs etc.), to raise the awareness and sensitivity of Washington lawyers to diversity issues, and particularly with respect to equity, inclusion, and both implicit and explicit biases.² Our role as licensed legal professionals should be to work to eliminate our own biases, and to have a positive effect on both the profession and Washington generally. Intuitively, this is an idea whose time has more than come.

Promoting equity and inclusion drives better business outcomes. Having individuals that think differently, by virtue of their distinct backgrounds and experiences, encourages creative thinking and innovation. This is particularly important amongst decision-makers. Conversely, failing to include diverse perspectives can result in a failure to take useful risks and ultimately lead to stagnation. The business sector as a whole has recognized this reality, with many major employers in this state and elsewhere investing in diversity even when not required by law. The legal profession needs to catch up in this regard.

Addressing issues of equity and inclusion is not political move, but a practical one. It is an undeniable fact that certain communities – such as people of color, those with disabilities, and those with non-majority religions, to name just a few – do not have and have not had the same opportunities as others who have not been marginalized.

Members of the MCLE Board talked to citizens of Washington State, who are not licensed to practice law, about this proposal. Board members heard consistently that this proposal is necessary to ensure appropriate treatment and consideration of the various issues and concerns the general public faces, no matter who is in office, or running local, state, and national government.

Promoting equity and inclusion is appropriate for the Bar. The regulatory objectives outlined in General Rule 12.1 specifically address the topic of diversity and inclusion.

• **GR 12.1:**

Legal services providers must be regulated in the public interest. In regulating the practice of law in Washington, the Washington Supreme Court's objectives include:

(j) diversity and inclusion among legal services providers and freedom from discrimination for those receiving legal services and in the justice system.

In addition, the authorized activities of the Washington State Bar Association found in General Rule 12.2(a)(6) further emphasize this objective:

• **GR 12.2(a)**:

(a) **Purposes: In General.** In general, the Washington State Bar Association strives to:

(6) Promote diversity and equality in the courts and the legal profession.

It is therefore both appropriate and beneficial for the Washington Supreme Court to mandate training to help licensed legal professionals gain awareness and understanding of these issues. While it is true that training does not guarantee equitable and inclusive outcomes, training does result in an increased understanding of various topics, especially in a legal context where rules and regulations change constantly. For example, discussion around visible and invisible disabilities allows us, as legal professionals, to better identify legal concerns facing these communities. If we fail to take action while the rest of society engages in this conversation, we risk providing inadequate counsel to our clients as well as the community at large. Given our position in society as rule makers and legal deciders, we cannot afford to sit back and react only when a lawsuit or other grievance takes place.

Conclusion

Washington has an opportunity to take the lead by adopting a requirement that training in all the category of equity, inclusion, and the elimination of bias become mandatory. Education in equity and inclusion is already required in multiple states (eight in total), with more states following their lead. To recognize the importance in this category of continuing legal education and to require it is to identify Washington as a leader in its approach to MCLE.

The MCLE Board recommends that this suggested amendment become effective on September 1, 2022, and that the first group of licensed legal professionals who will be required to report this one ethics credit on this subject be those who are in the 2023-2025 MCLE reporting period. This will allow time for WSBA staff to develop tracking mechanisms in the MCLE database and to notify both licensed legal professionals and CLE sponsors of the new requirement. In addition, an effective date of September prior to the start of the 2023-2025 reporting period allows the Bar's MCLE staff to accredit courses taking place in 2023 according to the new requirements.

D. <u>Hearing</u>: Because of the outreach conducted and input previously received by the

MCLE Board, a hearing is not requested.

E. <u>Expedited Consideration</u>: Expedited consideration is not requested.

F. <u>Supporting Material</u>: In addition to the submission of the suggested amendment

to APR 11, attached is a letter of support from the WSBA Board of Governors, and the

collected public comments on the suggested amendment. The initial MCLE Board report

and recommendation may be viewed online.⁸

¹ The June 3rd, 2020 statement from the WSBA President may be viewed here:

https://www.wsba.org/docs/default-source/about-wsba/governance/civil-unrest.pdf?sfvrsn=1b7809f1_6; the June 4th 2020 open letter from the Washington Supreme Court may be viewed here: http://www.courts.wa.gov/content/publicUpload/Supreme%20Court%20News/Judiciary%20Legal%20Co mmunity%20SIGNED%20060420.pdf

² WSBA Board of Governors Meeting on September 2020. Video of Review and Comments Re Mandatory Continuing Legal Education (MCLE Board) Suggested Amendment to APR 11 Ethics Requirement: <u>http://link.videoplatform.limelight.com/media/?channelListId=34d9718a114a453fa4067f9dad13df94&width</u> <u>=960&height=360&playerForm=WidescreenTabbedPlayer</u>

³ On September 27, 2019, the WSBA Board of Governors passed a motion (7-5 vote) directing WSBA CLE to offer free CLEs one credit in each of the following subjects each year: 1) equity, inclusion and the mitigation of bias, 2) mental health, addiction, and stress, and 3) technology education focusing on digital security The CLEs will be offered in-person and on-demand for free. The Board of Governors confirmed their commitment to offer the equity, inclusion, and mitigation of bias training for free at their September 2020 meeting. The first of the free WSBA CLEs, titled "Ethics Booster", took place on July 21, 2020. This CLE covered the topics of mental health, addiction and stress, and digital security. It was attended by 2,379 licensed legal professionals.

⁴ The MCLE Board references the glossary (provided by the WSBA Equity and Justice team) in Just Lead Washington's REJI Equity Organizational Toolkit: 'Diversity', 'Equity', 'Inclusion' and 'Bias'. The glossary is found on pages 107-113 of the toolkit, and may be accessed here: <u>https://justleadwa.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/REJI-Organizational-Toolkit_Full-1.pdf</u>

⁵ Projections of the state population by age, sex, race and Hispanic origin: <u>https://ofm.wa.gov/washington-data-research/population-demographics/population-forecasts-and-projections/projections-state-population-age-sex-race-and-hispanic-origin</u>

⁶ Nat'l Ass'n for Law Placement, 2018 Report on Diversity in U.S. Law Firms 9 (Jan. 2019) <u>https://www.nalp.org/uploads/2018NALPReportonDiversityinUSLawFirms_FINAL.pdf</u> the

⁷State of Science "Implicit Bias Review" from The Ohio State University Kirwan Institute for Study of Race and Ethnicity: <u>http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/2017-SOTS-final-draft-02.pdf</u>

⁸ The MCLE Board report and recommendation may be viewed here: <u>https://www.wsba.org/docs/default-</u>

source/legal-community/committees/mcle-board/mcle-board-report-and-recommendation.pdf?sfvrsn=52e008f1_4

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO APR 11 (Redline)

ľ	1		
1	TITLE		
2	ADMISSION	N AND PRACTICE RULES (APR)
3	RULE 11. M	IANDATORY CONTINUING L	EGAL EDUCATION (MCLE)
4	Sections (a) -	– (b) No Changes.	
5	(c) Education	n Requirements.	
6	(1) Minimum	Requirement. Each lawyer must of	complete 45 credits and each LLLT and LPO
7	must complete	e 30 credits of approved continuing	g legal education by December 31 of the last year
8	of the reportir	ng period with the following requir	cements:
9	(i)	at least 15 credits must be from a	attending approved courses in the subject of law
10		and legal procedure, as defined in	n subsection (f)(1); and
11	(ii)	at least six credits must be in eth	ics and professional responsibility, as defined in
12		subsection $(f)(2)$ -, with at least or	ne credit in equity, inclusion, and the mitigation
13		of both implicit and explicit bias	in the legal profession and the practice of law.
14	Sections (c)((2) – (e) No Changes.	
15	(f) Approved	Course Subjects. Only the follow	wing subjects for courses will be approved:
16	(1)	Law and legal procedure, define	ed as legal education relating to substantive law,
17		legal procedure, process, researc	h, writing, analysis, or related skills and
18	technology;		
19	(2)	Ethics and professional respons	ibility, defined as topics relating to the general
20		subject of professional responsib	ility and conduct standards for lawyers, LLLTs,
21		LPOs, and judges, including dive	ersity and antibias with respect to the practice of
22		law or the legal system, equity, i	nclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and
23		explicit bias in the legal profession	on and the practice of law, and the risks to ethical
24		practice associated with diagnosa	able mental health conditions, addictive behavior,
25		and stress;	
26	Sections (f)(?	3)-(k) No Changes.	
	Suggested An	mendments to APR 11 - Redline	Washington State Bar Association

	SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO APR 11 (Redline)
1	Sections (f)(3) – (k).
2	No Changes.
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	Suggested Amendments to APR 11 - Redline Washington State Bar Association 1325 Fourth Ave - Suite 600
	Page 2 – July 20, 2020 Seattle, WA 98101-2539

I

WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

TO:	Kyle Sciuchetti, President, Washington State Bar Association (WSBA), WSBA Board of Governors
FROM:	Kevin Plachy, Chair, Michael Cherry, Co-Chair, and members of the WSBA COVID-19 External Task Force
DATE:	January 14, 2021
RE:	Executive Summary—Membership Survey on COVID-19 Impact
Cc:	Terra Nevitt, Executive Director, WSBA

We have attached an executive summary of the initial analysis of survey data collected from the WSBA membership on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, conducted in Nov. 2020.

The COVID-19 Internal and External Task Forces want to thank the BOG for their support in allowing us to conduct this survey, and to Margeaux Green, the WSBA practice manager, and Sara Niegowski, and the communications team for their assistance in preparing, formatting, and analyzing the results of the survey.

Still more analysis can be performed on this data to extract insights, and we will be doing that analysis over the next few weeks. We would be happy to answer questions or provide any additional information to the BOG about this survey and or work supporting members and the public during the pandemic.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Plachy, Chair

Michael Cherry, Co-Chair

1.0 About the Survey

1.1 Why the Survey Was Conducted

After taking initial actions to support both WSBA members and the public during the COVID-19 pandemic, including offering free live and on-demand Continuing Education Programs, resolving issues with remote and online notarization, and creating a workplace reopening brochure, the COVID-19 Internal task force (CITF) and External task force (CETF) asked how best to continue supporting members during the pandemic. In September 2020, the CITF and CETF realized that the pandemic was not winding down, and therefore, thought about better ways to determine what additional actions and possibly long-term support members of the bar and the public might need to continue to provide legal services during and after the pandemic.

1.2 How the Survey Was Conducted

The CITF and CETF designed a survey consisting of nine questions with pre-populated answers, and two open-ended questions to collect data on the impact of the pandemic on survey respondents. The questions collected data about both business operations, and interactions with clients and the courts during the pandemic. In addition, 10 questions collected demographic data about the survey respondents.

1.3 Potential Survey Participants and Respondents

The survey was sent to all active members of the WSBA. The CITF and CETF worked with the WSBA Communication's Staff and the WSBA Sections to get word out to WSBA members to encourage their participation.

The survey was sent out at the beginning of November, and people took the survey throughout the month of November. 616 people responded, which represents approximately 1.5% of the total membership.

Preliminary review of the survey responses shows that even with this response rate, the respondents appear to represent the WSBA membership, in there were responses from most counties, member types, firm sizes, and minority bar membership. Again, more analysis of the data will provide better insights.

2.0 Initial Findings

A quick review of the main questions of the survey are below (please note rounding errors may create totals of more or less than 100% in this summary).

2.1 Effect on Business Volume

Approximately 45% of respondents have seen a decrease in their business volume, while almost an equal number have seen business stay the same (22%) or increase (23%). Approximately 11% said the question did not apply to their situation.

Some data from other sources, shows evidence that the pandemic has a disparate impact on traditionally under represented communities.¹ This is a data area where drilling down by race and ethnicity may provide additional insights.

2.2 Effect on Income

Approximately 48% of respondents have seen a decrease in income, 41% have seen income remain the same, and 12% have seen an increase in income.

As with 2.1, this is a data area where drilling down by race and ethnicity may provide additional insights.

2.3 Ease of Getting Information About Courts

Generally, 36% of respondents are finding it easy to find information about the hearings, trials, or court operations where they regularly practice, while 31% have found it difficult. This is a data area where drilling down by county may provide additional insights.

2.4 Considering Professional Changes

Generally, the largest number of respondents are not planning to change their practice because of the pandemic (44%), while 16% of respondents are planning to leave the profession and 15% are planning to reduce workload or number of clients.

This is a data area where drilling down to determine if this data is affected by the overall age of the membership.

2.5 Changes Caused by Pandemic That Should Continue (Post-pandemic)

Online CLEs were popular (76% of respondents want to see them continue post pandemic), while 73% want to continue to work from home. Using electronic signatures on documents, was equally popular (71%).

2.6 Most Frequently Used Remote or Online Communication Solutions

Telephone was the most popular remote or online communication solution, followed by Zoom, although many respondents suggested a solution not included in the pre-populated answers.

Drilling down to determine if this data is affected by county would be beneficial. For example, is telephone popular in rural counties (due to lack of broadband or investment in technology).

¹ By Lena H. Sun and Isaac Stanley-Becker, "Covid-19 is devastating communities of color. Can vaccines counter racial inequity?", Washington Post, Dec. 18, 2020, available at https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/covid-19-is-devastating-communities-of-color-can-vaccines-counter-racial-inequity/.

2.7 Preferred Remote or Online Communication Solutions

Most respondents preferred remote or online communication solution was Zoom (47%), telephone (27%), and Teams (9%).

2.8 Ways WSBA Could Support Members During Pandemic

Strong responses for WSBA support include job search support, mental health and wellbeing resources, and best practices for working with clients in a pandemic. All prepopulated answers were selected among all of the respondents, and as this was a ranking question, more analysis will provide additional insights.

2.9 Highest Impact Factors on Ability to Provide Legal Services

The survey results show respondents are feeling isolated staying and working from home and are concerned about the lack of good and secure technology to support working from home, and having a private workspace to work remotely.

Some data from other sources, shows evidence that the pandemic has a disparate impact on the family member who traditionally is the caregiver in the relationship. ² The data may allow analysis of the responses to determine if some respondents (for example by gender or sexual identity) are more affected by caring for children, providing home schooling, or caring for a parent or other family member.

2.10 Biggest Challenges Faced During Pandemic

The open-ended questions, including 2.11 (infra), resulted in significant responses, which are taking longer to examine and determine impacts.

2.11 Biggest Advantage Because of Pandemic Changes

See 2.10 (supra).

3.0 How Task Forces Are Using the Recommendations

Both the CITF and CETF are continuing to review the data, but continuing the actions already taken, such as continuing to provide CLEs, in particular CLEs that guide operating during a pandemic will be appreciated and valued by the membership. In addition, it may be necessary to think about how to keep members connected with each other and the courts as the pandemic continues, and address mental health and well-being of the members and their families.

² Avie Schneider, Andrea Hsu, Scott Horsley, "Multiple Demands Causing Women To Abandon Workforce," NPR.ORG, October 2, 2020, available at https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2020/10/02/919517914/enough-already-multiple-demands-causing-women-to-abandon-workforce.

Q1 Since Governor Inslee's first 'Stay Home - Stay Healthy' proclamation dated March 23, 2020, choose the statement that best describes any change in your business volume:



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Has substantially decreased	18.60%	109
Has somewhat decreased	26.11%	153
Has stayed the same	21.84%	128
Has somewhat increased	15.87%	93
Has substantially increased	7.00%	41
Not applicable	10.58%	62
TOTAL		586

Q2 Since the first 'Stay Home - Stay Healthy' proclamation, choose the statement that best describes any change in your income:



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Has substantially decreased	21.90%	127
Has somewhat decreased	25.69%	149
Has stayed the same	40.69%	236
Has somewhat increased	8.79%	51
Has substantially increased	2.93%	17
TOTAL		580

Q3 During the pandemic, how easy is it for you to get information about hearings, trials, or court operations where you regularly practice?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Very easy	14.82%	87
Somewhat easy	20.78%	122
Neutral - neither easy nor difficult	16.35%	96
Somewhat difficult	21.47%	126
Very difficult	9.03%	53
Not applicable	17.55%	103
TOTAL		587

Q4 As a result of the pandemic, I am considering the following professional changes: (Select all that apply)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Adding a new practice area to the matters I handle	13.92%	81
Working with a new or different firm	10.14%	59
Working with a public agency or non-profit	8.08%	47
Working as in-house counsel	6.19%	36
Reducing workload or number of clients	15.29%	89
Retiring	12.20%	71
Leaving the practice of law	15.46%	90
None	43.64%	254
Other (please specify)	13.23%	77
Total Respondents: 582		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Leaving spokane because this county is awful	12/3/2020 10:33 AM
2	Starting my own firm	12/2/2020 5:02 PM
3	increasing my rates	11/30/2020 8:40 AM
4	Stop taking litigation matters	11/25/2020 8:45 AM
5	Reliance on Zoom & other technology, more	11/25/2020 6:17 AM
6	May need an additional employee to keep up with workload	11/24/2020 7:28 PM
7	I went paperless and moved to an at-home office because of the pandemic. And that is why I am making more money for about the same amount of work.	11/24/2020 7:15 PM
8	Moving to another state	11/23/2020 8:51 PM
9	Taking clients with more flexibility, to accommodate family needs, to include schooling.	11/23/2020 4:40 PM
10	growing the practice	11/23/2020 4:35 PM
11	Being more selective about what clients I take	11/23/2020 4:34 PM
12	More marketing	11/23/2020 4:31 PM
13	Becoming more involved in race and social justice initiatives	11/23/2020 4:07 PM
14	working remotely post-pandemic, allowing me to have extended time away from the area while continuing to work.	11/23/2020 12:27 PM
15	Moving out of state	11/20/2020 7:57 AM
16	Seek Flex-work with more telecommuting.	11/20/2020 5:33 AM
17	changing marketing strategies	11/19/2020 5:46 PM
18	more \$\$ spent on marketing	11/19/2020 4:22 PM
19	Looking at other practice areas	11/19/2020 3:47 PM
20	hiring more attorneys	11/19/2020 3:37 PM
21	Adding on additional staff	11/19/2020 3:29 PM
22	Starting my own practice.	11/19/2020 2:54 PM
23	Keeping most of my practice remote	11/19/2020 2:23 PM
24	Having my legal assistant work from home exclusively.	11/19/2020 2:23 PM
25	Increasing up front advance on earned fees; changes in using digitized signatures	11/19/2020 2:21 PM
26	Hiring more associates.	11/19/2020 1:26 PM
27	Moving to another state	11/19/2020 12:50 PM
28	Clerking or working for govt	11/19/2020 12:47 PM
29	reducing overhead costs	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
30	Additional Marketing	11/19/2020 12:25 PM
31	I am not considering making any changes as a result of the pandemic. I will not let the pandemic dictate my course of action, but I will do my best to follow God's guidance about how, if at all, I can serve people as a lawyer in this time.	11/19/2020 11:50 AM
32	Relocating to a different state	11/19/2020 11:49 AM
33	Not handling matters in certain courts because of the difficulty of covid procedures in place at those courts.	11/19/2020 10:26 AM
34	I teach part-time (fall quarter) but am otherwise retired. Teaching is via Zoom. For our next class (fall 2021), we are considering how to continue to use Zoom as part of our teaching	11/18/2020 11:06 PM LM-88

model even if the pandemic is over and in-person is again the norm. We have found some
benefits to using Zoom in our small (<15 students), highly interactive class

	benefits to using Zoom in our small (<15 students), highly interactive class	
35	Dropping Emeritus Pro Bono membership due to the high cost I have to pay to the Bar Association.	11/18/2020 9:00 PM
36	I wish I could retire, but my husband is also an independent contractor and his income has been cut by 75%. We are both over 65, but with significant debt because my start-up costs back in 2013 were quite high.	11/18/2020 5:06 PM
37	I was able to hire an admin assistant to deal with vast increase in details that must now be tracked (eg how to Zoom in to this particular court, did the client return the signed pleadings, etc).	11/18/2020 5:02 PM
38	I have considered joining a committee so I can bring light to some extremely concerning patterns that I am seeing. It is exceedingly difficult to get any information about court procedures. Recently I represented an individual trying to get a protection order and I was shock and appalled at the how long it took, how many unnecessary hoops we had to jump through, and how utterly uninformed the clerks were. In addition, rules of evidence are not being followed and corners are being cut with no repercussions. For example, witnesses are allowed to look up information on their computers without identifying what they are looking at and without having it marked as an exhibit. Witnesses are not following the sequestration rule and are listening to the witness before them testify. Credibility is being assessed properly. The courts are not ensuring the courtrooms are open to the public as required by the Constitution. There has been a lack of respect for the court because in video or phone hearing it doesn't have the same element of formality and does not feel like court so witnesses talk over the judge and speak disrespectfully. And it is very difficult to hear on the phone or video. Not to mention it does not create a good record. I also do appeals and the trial transcripts from zoom hearing are a mess. It is so chaotic is makes it hard the Court of Appeals to conduct a meaningful review. The use of electronic signatures also facilitates fraud. I cannot confirm who signed the document. In at least one case this was an issue and I still have not been able to confirm the defendant actually signed the document.	11/11/2020 8:33 AM
39	Possibly subscribing to additional deskbooks, because KC Law Library and UW Law Library are closed.	11/10/2020 6:56 PM
40	Making Working from home the norm, instead of the abnormal.	11/10/2020 1:34 PM
41	starting new mediation practice	11/10/2020 8:34 AM
42	As much as I love my work, I also love being able to afford food. The dues increase during this time is a giant "F-U" to the members. We are struggling, but you only care about adding additional costs and burdens on us.	11/9/2020 2:41 PM
43	more working remotely from home	11/9/2020 8:03 AM
44	Narrowing my practice area	11/6/2020 4:09 PM
45	Closed brick and mortar office	11/6/2020 1:22 PM
46	arbitrator/mediator	11/6/2020 11:40 AM
47	Moving abroad	11/6/2020 9:42 AM
48	working remotely more long-term	11/6/2020 8:55 AM
49	Delaying retirement until itis over as I plan on an active traveling retirement	11/6/2020 8:32 AM
50	Fixed remote work most of the time	11/5/2020 7:33 PM
51	Creating a new business model, hiring staff, marketing	11/5/2020 4:42 PM
52	Working as a paralegal	11/5/2020 4:38 PM
53	I'm hoping that the pandemic shows that people can work from home - including attorneys. And therefore make it practicable to work even in another state!	11/5/2020 3:58 PM
54	I just graduated, and I am widening my areas of application beyond nonprofits/government jobs, which was my original, intended career path.	11/5/2020 3:27 PM

56	taking cases I may have turned down in the past	11/5/2020 2:37 PM
57	Laid off, started new job with new entity	11/5/2020 2:13 PM
58	Expanding	11/5/2020 1:09 PM
59	getting different office space/equipment	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
60	Leaving Washington	11/5/2020 12:46 PM
61	working remotely from a different state on a more permanent basis	11/5/2020 12:34 PM
62	making a profession of suing the state government for unconstitutional overreach	11/5/2020 12:24 PM
63	Manage as best I can during the pandemic.	11/5/2020 12:14 PM
64	Working from home more, staff also	11/5/2020 12:02 PM
65	Pursuing more judicial work.	11/5/2020 11:58 AM
66	Expanding my client base	11/5/2020 11:39 AM
67	I have closed my Seattle office. I work remotely from home.	11/5/2020 11:17 AM
68	increase internet marketing	11/5/2020 11:10 AM
69	Conducting business by video only	11/5/2020 11:09 AM
70	go solo	11/5/2020 10:56 AM
71	No longer volunteer pro Bono anymore I've done this beginning more than a year ago	11/5/2020 10:55 AM
72	Hiring a lawyer from a struggling firm to join our practice	11/5/2020 10:45 AM
73	I took a new position from firm to in-house during the pandemic but not as a result of it	11/5/2020 10:43 AM
74	Maintain what we have	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
75	Leaving the satanic state of WA	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
76	Growing practice to accommodate more work.	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
77	not sure	11/5/2020 10:12 AM

Q5 What changes to your practice brought on by the pandemic would you like to continue using in the future: (Select all that apply)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Remote or online meetings with clients	67.02%	378
Remote or online court hearings	52.48%	296
Remote or online depositions	25.71%	145
Remote or online hearings	44.68%	252
Remote or online trials	16.13%	91
Use of electronic signatures on legal documents	71.10%	401
Use of remote or electronic notarization	38.65%	218
Remote work (work from home)	73.40%	414
Online collaboration with other lawyers	39.01%	220
Online meetings with opposing counsel	33.87%	191
Online socialization with other lawyers	16.84%	95
Online CLE's or other training	76.24%	430
Online marketing and client development	13.48%	76
Social distancing and masks	27.48%	155
Other (please specify)	5.85%	33
Total Respondents: 564		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Incorporating the outdoors- meeting outside	12/3/2020 12:04 PM
2	Easier access to court documents from home office (King County)	12/2/2020 7:56 PM
3	Online and remote is helpful BUT MUST BE OPTIONAL AND NOT COPELLED once all this is over. In SOME situations it works but it is not substitute for live interaction at some depositions, hearings, etc.	12/2/2020 4:02 PM
4	Nothing, as the pandemic has a 99%+ survival rate.	12/2/2020 3:37 PM
5	Instead of scheduling a hearing for routine and uncontested matters, people in my practice area (guardianship) have been giving notice and submitting documents ex parte after the notice period has run. I have no intention of going back to scheduling hearings in the future unless I am forced to. My impression is that others, including the judges, feel them same. I wonder why we have thought having an in-person hearing is so important when there is no controversy for a judge to rule on. Just habit and a slow-to-change culture in our profession, I imagine.	11/24/2020 7:15 PM
6	Remote or online filings	11/24/2020 12:20 PM
7	I think in-person contact is necessary to the practice of law.	11/23/2020 4:30 PM
8	I don't like any of these exclusively, but like to include them as options in my practice going forward.	11/23/2020 4:14 PM
9	No paper filings or service of hard copies.	11/23/2020 1:27 AM
10	Online filing	11/21/2020 8:32 AM
11	I would like to return to in person meetings and gatherings. I prefer working at my office to working at home.	11/19/2020 7:35 PM
12	Remove the Governor	11/19/2020 1:15 PM
13	CLE's that involve improvement to practice and cutting overhead in this new erahis online	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
14	Mediation by videoconference	11/18/2020 4:56 PM
15	No waiting room. One client in the office at a time. Separate rooms divided by a glass wall so we still have face-to-face consultations.	11/18/2020 4:33 PM
16	electronic submission of litigation documents	11/15/2020 9:31 PM
17	I was already largely online and so the pandemic hasn't changed the way I do business, the loss of childcare and schooling for my children has just made it very challenging to continue working and be full time mom at the same time.	11/12/2020 2:11 PM
18	By "in future", I assume you mean from now on. Will reassess after pandemic. Most would still be useful, though not the social distancing and masks.	11/12/2020 10:53 AM
19	Every single one of these changes have been a detriment to the legal profession. They have all eroded the integrity of the court. We need to get rid of these temporary rules and get back to requiring in person hearings with real signatures. Otherwise, we are heading down a slippery slope.	11/11/2020 8:33 AM
20	It's easier to make networking commitments when it's remote and I don't have to deal with traffic.	11/6/2020 5:47 PM
21	No CV19 impacts, other than work from home.	11/6/2020 2:22 PM
22	Need remote witnessing for estate planning	11/6/2020 1:22 PM
23	When I had a practice (I'm doing a non-law job out of state), I almost never met in person with clients, anyway, so this is not much of a change.	11/5/2020 3:58 PM
24	None of the above. All remote options harm the practice of law, increase time spent and therefore client costs on matters, and disrupt the personalzied and client-oriented aspects of our profession.	11/5/2020 3:11 PM
25	some combo or work from home and real-life work	11/5/2020 1:02 PM

26	Zoom mediations.	11/5/2020 11:17 AM
27	Zoom attendance to volunteer meetings support	11/5/2020 10:55 AM
28	none	11/5/2020 10:51 AM
29	Signage, locking doors	11/5/2020 10:45 AM
30	Remote mediation	11/5/2020 10:34 AM
31	None it is all evil and wrong	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
32	None	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
33	Practice efficiencies from cutting staff and overhead.	11/5/2020 10:14 AM

Q6 Which of the following remote or online solutions do you most frequently use to communicate with courts, clients, other attorneys, and staff during the pandemic? Please rate each solution on a scale of Most Frequent to Never Used







Most Frequently 📕 Frequentl

Frequently 📒 Not Frequently

Never Used

	MOST FREQUENTLY	FREQUENTLY	NOT FREQUENTLY	NEVER USED	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
FaceTime	0.82%	4.70%	19.84%	74.64%		
	4	23	97	365	489	3.68
GoToMeetings	3.85%	10.73%	29.35%	56.07%		
	19	53	145	277	494	3.38
Google Hangouts	1.02%	1.84%	11.27%	85.86%		
	5	9	55	419	488	3.82
Google Meetings	1.62%	2.43%	18.46%	77.48%		
	8	12	91	382	493	3.72
Skype	1.42%	5.06%	25.10%	68.42%		
	7	25	124	338	494	3.61
Skype for	2.87%	6.56%	15.57%	75.00%		
Business	14	32	76	366	488	3.63
Slack	1.04%	2.29%	7.71%	88.96%		
	5	11	37	427	480	3.85
Microsoft Teams	15.06%	13.65%	25.10%	46.18%		
	75	68	125	230	498	3.02
Telephone	57.82%	34.16%	6.11%	1.91%		
	303	179	32	10	524	1.52
Zoom	49.03%	35.45%	13.05%	2.47%		
	278	201	74	14	567	1.69
Other	26.42%	19.17%	14.51%	39.90%		
	51	37	28	77	193	2.68

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	email	12/3/2020 1:08 PM
2	WebEx	12/2/2020 10:06 PM
3	WebEx	12/2/2020 5:01 PM
4	WebEx	12/2/2020 4:57 PM
5	Legaler	12/2/2020 4:50 PM
6	Bluejeans; webex	12/2/2020 4:30 PM
7	text and emails	12/2/2020 3:48 PM
8	Webex	12/2/2020 3:39 PM
9	WebEx	12/2/2020 10:07 AM
10	Ring Central has video + chat options / the seattle immigration court will be implementing WebEx, which I've never used.	11/27/2020 10:38 AM
11	Telephone and email	11/27/2020 9:06 AM
12	Join.Me	11/25/2020 9:44 PM
13	Facebook Messenger, What's App	11/25/2020 11:16 AM
14	occasional in person at a safe distance and place	11/24/2020 11:06 PM
15	email!	11/24/2020 7:15 PM
16	Email and text	11/24/2020 6:54 PM
17	email	11/24/2020 6:14 PM
18	Email	11/24/2020 5:39 PM
19	email	11/24/2020 5:04 PM
20	Webex	11/24/2020 4:54 PM
21	Workplace from Facebook	11/24/2020 12:47 PM
22	WebEx	11/24/2020 11:12 AM
23	Webex	11/24/2020 8:33 AM
24	WebEx	11/24/2020 6:57 AM
25	Cisco Webex	11/23/2020 11:52 PM
26	Duo	11/23/2020 4:53 PM
27	WebEx	11/23/2020 4:31 PM
28	Email & U. S. Mail	11/23/2020 4:30 PM
29	Email	11/23/2020 4:14 PM
30	email	11/23/2020 4:11 PM
31	Legaler, Modron Spaces, VirBELA	11/23/2020 4:07 PM
32	Webex, Hopin, Jabber	11/23/2020 2:37 PM
33	WebEx	11/23/2020 2:33 PM
34	Email	11/23/2020 2:20 PM
35	Webex	11/23/2020 1:27 AM
36	Letter writing, emails	11/20/2020 1:43 PM
37	Cisco Webex	11/20/2020 12:30 PM LM-98

38	Email and text message exchanges	11/20/2020 10:48 AM
39	WebEx	11/20/2020 9:03 AM
40	Email	11/20/2020 7:57 AM
41	Webex	11/19/2020 8:00 PM
42	Ring Central	11/19/2020 7:29 PM
43	i write letters	11/19/2020 7:20 PM
44	Email	11/19/2020 6:10 PM
45	webex	11/19/2020 5:02 PM
46	We use Facebook to talk with our clients and attend court hearings in one of the small city jails.	11/19/2020 2:54 PM
47	WebEx	11/19/2020 1:30 PM
48	Webex	11/19/2020 12:46 PM
49	WebEx	11/19/2020 12:44 PM
50	Legaler	11/19/2020 12:38 PM
51	Very difficult for any of the above because my internet is bad in this area.	11/19/2020 12:37 PM
52	Web-X	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
53	US MAIL, and very frequently email	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
54	text	11/19/2020 12:12 PM
55	Local courts utilize webex	11/19/2020 10:26 AM
56	WebEx (for court hearings)	11/19/2020 9:48 AM
57	email	11/19/2020 6:23 AM
58	Email	11/19/2020 5:28 AM
59	Webex	11/19/2020 3:55 AM
60	WebEx (County court system)	11/18/2020 11:43 PM
61	Email and Texting	11/18/2020 9:44 PM
62	Email	11/18/2020 6:46 PM
63	WebEx	11/18/2020 5:25 PM
64	VoIP-provided videoconferencing for intra-office communications	11/18/2020 5:09 PM
65	mail through my client portal	11/18/2020 5:06 PM
66	Instant messenger with my staff	11/18/2020 4:36 PM
67	Email	11/15/2020 9:31 PM
68	Ring Central Meetings	11/12/2020 10:18 AM
69	WorkPlace, Bluejean	11/11/2020 11:00 AM
70	I only use these because I am forced to do so. I always object and request an in person hearing but the court does not always grant it.	11/11/2020 8:33 AM
71	I was on a presentation to the KCBA Solo Section meeting in Oct. 2020: KCBA used Adobe Pro as the platform.	11/10/2020 6:56 PM
72	E-mail	11/10/2020 6:39 PM
73	Ring Central	11/10/2020 1:22 PM

TTT	וווש וווככנווושט	11/5/2020 10.45 AM
110	ring meetings	11/5/2020 10:45 AM
109	WebEx meeting, Microsoft TEAMS	11/5/2020 11:10 AM 11/5/2020 10:56 AM
108	Webex, email	11/5/2020 11:17 AM 11/5/2020 11:10 AM
107 108	Court has required Zoom Email	11/5/2020 11:21 AM 11/5/2020 11:17 AM
106	Text Messages	11/5/2020 11:27 AM
105	Blue Jeans	11/5/2020 11:36 AM
104	E-mail	11/5/2020 11:37 AM
103	RingCentral	11/5/2020 11:39 AM
102	Email	11/5/2020 11:58 AM
101	8x8	11/5/2020 12:05 PM
100	WebX; Jabber Video	11/5/2020 12:07 PM
99	Court Links to their own vendors usually but not always affiliated w/ above	11/5/2020 12:08 PM
98	Webex	11/5/2020 12:13 PM
97	StarLeaf connection with local jails	11/5/2020 12:14 PM
96	Email	11/5/2020 12:16 PM
95	I don't know how to use these and haven't got the tech.	11/5/2020 12:32 PM
94	email	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
93	No Clients	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
92	email	11/5/2020 1:28 PM
91	Lifesize	11/5/2020 1:34 PM
90	Our firm uses BlueJeans (a Zoom-like platform)	11/5/2020 1:47 PM
89	WEB EX	11/5/2020 2:48 PM
88	WebEx	11/5/2020 3:47 PM
87	Email, text messages, online message portals	11/5/2020 4:42 PM
86	WebEx	11/5/2020 4:48 PM
85	The telephone - happy to use the phone the same I did before the pandemic	11/5/2020 7:33 PM
84	Webex	11/5/2020 9:17 PM
83	Cisco WebEx	11/5/2020 11:02 PM
82	Blue Jeans Meetings	11/6/2020 6:21 AM
81	Remo	11/6/2020 9:07 AM
80	Webex and Webex Teams	11/6/2020 11:40 AM
79	email.	11/6/2020 2:22 PM
78	Cisco WebEx	11/6/2020 5:47 PM
77	WebEx	11/8/2020 6:55 PM
76	webex	11/9/2020 8:03 AM
75	Ring	11/9/2020 8:39 AM
74	email, text	11/9/2020 1:56 PM
74	email text	11/0/2020 1.56 DM

112	Jabber	11/5/2020 10:44 AM
113	Blue Jeans, Virbela	11/5/2020 10:43 AM
114	ABA had virtual meeting format not sure which one	11/5/2020 10:33 AM
115	Webex	11/5/2020 10:29 AM
116	Google Duo	11/5/2020 10:24 AM
117	email	11/5/2020 10:18 AM
118	Webex for nonprofit board meetings	11/5/2020 10:17 AM
119	Face to face meetings (masked up, of course).	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
120	Duo	11/5/2020 10:05 AM
121	WebEx	11/5/2020 9:53 AM
122	e-mail	11/5/2020 9:51 AM
123	email; text messages	11/5/2020 9:49 AM

Q7 Which of the following remote or online solutions do you prefer to use to communicate with courts, clients, other attorneys, and staff during the pandemic? Please check one only:



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
FaceTime	1.22%	7
GoToMeetings	2.27%	13
Google Hangouts	0.35%	2
Google Meetings	1.22%	7
Skype	0.70%	4
Skype for Business	1.22%	7
Slack	0.17%	1
Microsoft Teams	8.90%	51
Telephone	27.40%	157
Zoom	46.77%	268
Other	7.16%	41
n/a	2.62%	15
TOTAL		573

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	email	12/2/2020 9:34 PM
2	WebEx	12/2/2020 4:57 PM
3	Legaler	12/2/2020 4:50 PM
4	I'm familiar with zoom or the video option from Ring Central	11/27/2020 10:38 AM
5	email	11/27/2020 9:06 AM
6	Join.Me	11/25/2020 9:44 PM
7	Learning alternate methods is a time suck.	11/25/2020 5:22 PM
8	I'd like to learn more about each of them. We were thrown in learning as we scrambled, so anything we "prefer" is under a measurable amount of duress.	11/24/2020 7:31 PM
9	email	11/24/2020 5:04 PM
10	Email	11/24/2020 5:02 PM
11	WebEx	11/24/2020 11:12 AM
12	Email(Outlook)	11/23/2020 5:31 PM
13	WebEx	11/23/2020 5:15 PM
14	text messages	11/23/2020 4:34 PM
15	Text	11/23/2020 4:31 PM
16	The unavailability to reach people by telephone at the courthouse makes the practice of law very difficult.	11/23/2020 4:30 PM
17	Email	11/23/2020 4:14 PM
18	Email	11/23/2020 2:20 PM
19	Combination of telephone and email are preferred.	11/23/2020 1:27 AM
20	Email for communications	11/20/2020 1:43 PM
21	email	11/20/2020 10:48 AM
22	Email	11/20/2020 7:57 AM
23	Email (and Zoom for hearings)	11/19/2020 2:54 PM
24	any	11/19/2020 1:42 PM
25	Return to normal	11/19/2020 1:15 PM
26	None, ideally, but Zoom if no other choice.	11/19/2020 1:05 PM
27	Email	11/19/2020 12:47 PM
28	of course constant email	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
29	email	11/19/2020 6:23 AM
30	Email	11/19/2020 5:28 AM
31	email	11/18/2020 7:05 PM
32	Second choice is Skype, since it allows crosstalk.	11/18/2020 5:02 PM
33	Email	11/15/2020 9:31 PM
34	I have found Zoom to be far easier / accessible and reliable than nearly every other option on the marketplace. Microsoft teams has caused numerous problems / had loads of connectivity issues. That said I also spend a fair amount of time doing business by phone as well.	11/12/2020 2:11 PM
35	email	11/12/2020 10:18 AM LM-104

36	None of these solutions can replace in person hearings. You cannot assess credibility over video particularly when it glitches. Having to repeat yourself or constantly ask someone to repeat or speak up interrupts the flow of examination.	11/11/2020 8:33 AM
37	Zoom is the only platform used by our (Thurston Co.) courts. Our office (Thurston Co. Prosecuting Attorney's Office) has moved from Skype for Business to exclusively Microsoft Teams for all video communications - at least in-house.	11/10/2020 11:40 AM
38	email	11/9/2020 1:56 PM
39	webex	11/9/2020 8:03 AM
40	email.	11/6/2020 2:22 PM
41	Webex	11/6/2020 11:40 AM
42	Cisco WebEx	11/5/2020 11:02 PM
43	email	11/5/2020 9:50 PM
44	WebEx	11/5/2020 3:47 PM
45	Court has it's own group line	11/5/2020 3:10 PM
46	No Clients	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
47	#1 choice phone; #2 choice in person; #3 choice Zoom	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
48	Email	11/5/2020 12:35 PM
49	email	11/5/2020 12:32 PM
50	Email	11/5/2020 12:16 PM
51	Email	11/5/2020 12:16 PM
52	I also like video options but I could only select one item	11/5/2020 12:07 PM
53	8x8	11/5/2020 12:05 PM
54	E-mail	11/5/2020 11:37 AM
55	email	11/5/2020 11:24 AM
56	email	11/5/2020 11:10 AM
57	And telephone	11/5/2020 10:55 AM
58	E-mail	11/5/2020 10:38 AM
59	Jabber	11/5/2020 10:34 AM
60	email	11/5/2020 10:18 AM
61	None	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
62	Face to face meetings (masked up, of course).	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
63	e-mail	11/5/2020 9:51 AM

Q8 Rate the following ways in which the WSBA could support you (and/or your practice) as the pandemic continues: (5 is most important, 1 is least important)








📕 1 📕 2 📕 3 📕 4 📕 5 📕 N/A

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Job search resources	19.42% 94	5.58% 27	9.09% 44	7.23% 35	17.98% 87	40.70% 197	484	4.21
Job search support groups	28.06% 133	8.65% 41	7.17% 34	6.12% 29	6.54% 31	43.46% 206	474	3.85
Affinity groups with lawyers facing similar issues	16.80% 82	14.96% 73	17.01% 83	16.80% 82	12.91% 63	21.52% 105	488	3.59
Mental health and well-being resources	13.92% 70	10.74% 54	15.51% 78	16.90% 85	25.84% 130	17.10% 86	503	3.81
Physical health and well-being resources	18.00% 88	10.63% 52	17.18% 84	17.79% 87	20.65% 101	15.75% 77	489	3.60
Mentoring resources	19.79% 95	11.04% 53	14.58% 70	15.21% 73	13.33% 64	26.04% 125	480	3.69
Ethics resources specific to the pandemic	11.92% 59	10.71% 53	22.83% 113	19.80% 98	19.39% 96	15.35% 76	495	3.70
Best practices for working with clients in a pandemic	9.54% 48	10.74% 54	20.48% 103	22.27% 112	23.66% 119	13.32% 67	503	3.80
Practice Management resources specific to pandemic	12.15% 61	10.76% 54	18.53% 93	19.52% 98	23.90% 120	15.14% 76	502	3.78
Pro- or low-bono opportunities	27.37% 130	16.21% 77	18.53% 88	9.89% 47	8.00% 38	20.00% 95	475	3.15
Other	18.52% 30	0.62% 1	1.85% 3	0.62% 1	12.35% 20	66.05% 107	162	4.86

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
# 1	Free or very low cost subscriptions to Lexis and Westlaw. Monthly payment of license fees.	12/3/2020 1:34 AM
2	People should stop being snowflakes. Get over it and figure it out.	12/2/2020 4:02 PM
3	networking, resources with other legal professionals	12/2/2020 3:48 PM
4	I have clients contact me already who do not have money. I already take cases at a lower or	11/25/2020 6:17 AM
-	no fee.	11/20/2020 0.17 / 10/
5	Forms and Briefs Banks for solo/small firm lawyer who tend to practice in more than one or two areas	11/24/2020 11:06 PM
6	since venue and food is not a factor in providing cles now, i think the wsba should provide more low and no cost cles from now on and stop 1) the preference for in-person formats and 2) charging the same for virtual as in-person trainings	11/24/2020 7:15 PM
7	substantive/law related CLE; reduced licensing, section & CLE fees	11/24/2020 5:11 PM
8	Lower bar fees based on income	11/24/2020 3:09 PM
9	increase communication betwee the various courts and lawyers. some counties do good others particularly smaller counties and federal courts have done poorly	11/24/2020 1:36 PM
10	Either represent the members or admit that the WSBA is not for the members benefit. It's fine to be regulated, but the pretense of "for our benefit" is not appreciated.	11/23/2020 6:43 PM
11	Reducing or forgiving annual fees for at least two years. And for that to apply to those of us who are unable to return to our careers as a result of the pandemic's effect on families. Specifically mothers who are forced to stay home instead of enter the paid workforce.	11/23/2020 1:27 AM
12	Provide Flex Job Opportunities	11/20/2020 5:33 AM
13	n/a - retired; occasionally pro tem	11/19/2020 9:09 PM
14	Child care resources	11/19/2020 6:10 PM
15	Significant reductions in annual dues.	11/19/2020 4:27 PM
16	I've given up. Don't care anymore.	11/19/2020 1:56 PM
17	stand up for the constitutions and our rights	11/19/2020 1:15 PM
18	Return to God.	11/19/2020 11:50 AM
19	Support for hearing impaired and lip readers who struggle with videoconferencing and mask wearers	11/19/2020 5:28 AM
20	At this time of serious belt-tightening at our house (and with most lawyers I know), I would appreciate WSBA's stopping the constant refrain of do pro bono and lowering my required fees. We are struggling to stay afloat.	11/18/2020 5:06 PM
21	Waiver of bar fees for small firms making less than 100k	11/18/2020 4:48 PM
22	Oppose the governor's un-scientific restrictions on everyone under age 50	11/18/2020 4:33 PM
23	Continue offering big selection of online CLEs	11/18/2020 9:48 AM
24	I have considered changing practice areas, or expanding in order to better serve the clients that I do have - mentoring opportunities would be significant -i.e. a list of attorneys who are open to phone calls and quick questions by practice area. That would be really helpful.	11/12/2020 2:11 PM
25	To support our profession the WSBA should be conducted bench bar meetings to alert the court about the procedural failures and unconstitutional practice during this so-called "pandemic." We need to be protecting the constitution not eroding it.	11/11/2020 8:33 AM
26	I belong to the WSBA Solo and Small Practice Section; the listserv is my best WSBA resource.	11/10/2020 6:56 PM
27	Reduce the costs and burdens.	11/9/2020 2:41 PM
28	Provide office space that can be used on an as need basis	11/9/2020 2:21 PM LM-110

29	Unionizing	11/7/2020 9:42 AM
30	relevant free CLEs have been extremely appreciated	11/7/2020 8:50 AM
31	WSSC & WSBA deadline accomodations made.	11/6/2020 2:22 PM
32	Eliminate state by state bar	11/6/2020 9:42 AM
33	Some courts are determined to clear the docket at the expense of attorney well being. They are pushing us to trial and not understanding of needs for additional time for discovery etc - but we all are struggling with disruptions in our own lives and it feels like the bench isn't taking the well being of the bar into account.	11/5/2020 7:33 PM
34	Dollar for dollar school loan credit for doing pro bono or low bono work, loan resources (small business loan), temp help, technical resources - help set up technology	11/5/2020 4:42 PM
35	Online bar books like Oregon has with the cost of bar dues.	11/5/2020 3:10 PM
36	address how courts should be following and enforcing safety protocols	11/5/2020 2:20 PM
37	Free CLES	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
38	The WSBA should become a non-mandatory bar association	11/5/2020 12:37 PM
39	Discount, free and delayed CLE requirements are much appreciated.	11/5/2020 12:32 PM
40	Free CLEs to help with the cost of renewal of license	11/5/2020 12:30 PM
41	Pressuring the anti-modern counties to take the modest steps they need to take to promote justice during the pandemic. My county's practices are disparately impacting pro se folks. There need to be some standards so that anti-change administrators can't drag their feet forever.	11/5/2020 11:58 AM
42	Fee waiver	11/5/2020 11:37 AM
43	Job placement assistance	11/5/2020 11:37 AM
44	Campaign to end the shutdown	11/5/2020 11:01 AM
45	Activate ABA Free Legal Answers for remote pro bono	11/5/2020 10:33 AM
46	What legal measures to get my rights back	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
47	Expanded and free CLEs.	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
48	The WSBA is incompetent, I doubt it can do any of the above.	11/5/2020 10:05 AM
49	Actively working to address racial diversity issues (by acknowledging at the least and working with minority bar associations)	11/5/2020 9:53 AM

Q9 Rate the impact of the following factors on your ability to provide legal services during the pandemic? (5 is most impactful, 1 is least impactful)







	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	TOTAL
Caring for children	15.08%	4.28%	4.66%	5.59%	16.57%	53.82%	
	81	23	25	30	89	289	537
Providing home schooling for children	15.67%	2.61%	3.73%	4.85%	14.55%	58.58%	
	84	14	20	26	78	314	536
Caring for parent or other family member	18.03%	7.62%	8.55%	6.69%	8.36%	50.74%	
	97	41	46	36	45	273	538
Sharing a computer or internet connection	19.96%	9.33%	12.13%	11.94%	10.63%	36.01%	
	107	50	65	64	57	193	536
Slow or poor internet connection	20.07%	12.45%	14.31%	13.20%	17.10%	22.86%	
	108	67	77	71	92	123	538
Feeling isolated staying and working from home	17.09%	12.18%	16.36%	17.64%	23.64%	13.09%	
	94	67	90	97	130	72	550
Lack of secure hardware for myself and staff	28.71%	13.32%	9.57%	8.44%	5.44%	34.52%	
	153	71	51	45	29	184	533
Lack of private space to do work	25.70%	13.32%	9.94%	9.38%	9.57%	32.08%	
	137	71	53	50	51	171	533
Other	8.40%	2.29%	2.29%	3.05%	10.69%	73.28%	
	11	3	3	4	14	96	131

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Inability to sit down face to face and work things out with another person	12/2/2020 5:49 PM
2	Requirements of job to occasionally meet clients in person makes me feel unsafe	12/2/2020 4:50 PM
3	mental health	11/27/2020 10:38 AM
4	Clients can't afford to pay	11/27/2020 9:06 AM
5	There were many more challenges early on before we got VPN up, before I got a disguised phone number, web cam, microphone all of which were hard to find. Those problems are solved.	11/25/2020 5:22 PM
6	time difference because i am in another country due to the pandemic	11/24/2020 7:15 PM
7	Lack of adequate and secure connection and storage	11/24/2020 6:23 PM
8	lack of consistency with court scheduling, procedures, and poor communication outside of King County	11/24/2020 1:36 PM
9	Working in a home with a spouse working from home practicing law	11/23/2020 8:51 PM
10	Trying to practice law in a pandemic is very difficult. I think the courts say it is difficult for everyone, but I do not feel they are truly sympathetic.	11/23/2020 4:30 PM
11	Distractions trying to work from home	11/23/2020 2:20 PM
12	Cannot re-enter the workforce due to family caregiving demands.	11/23/2020 1:27 AM
13	Had to relocate office	11/22/2020 10:53 AM
14	Learning about a variety of new technologies, while at home lack of access to copiers, etc. that is at the office.	11/21/2020 8:32 AM
15	n/a	11/19/2020 9:09 PM
16	Finding a job	11/19/2020 5:28 AM
17	Defiance of public health protocols	11/19/2020 3:23 AM
18	unknown Covid exposure in court cases (public defender cases); failure to have a Covid enforcer in court	11/18/2020 9:29 PM
19	Lack of viable and safe pro bono opportunities.	11/18/2020 9:00 PM
20	The need for child care relates to my support staff who have childrenand that's been a problem with school out.	11/18/2020 4:56 PM
21	Having access to a real law library - look at books	11/18/2020 9:48 AM
22	my assistant has children to homeschool now affecting our ability to work cohesively	11/17/2020 8:18 AM
23	Other is just "no reprieve." Juggling work and childcare with my hubby, while we are both working, has felt like a marathon. Without childcare or school of any kind (except online), no- one is getting any breaks. My mental fatigue has some days made me just want to opt-out of work altogether so that I can at least focus my attention well in one direction (children), but so far I haven't been willing to throw in the towel.	11/12/2020 2:11 PM
24	Closure of the KC Law Library and UW Law Library. These are important resources for me, since my practice is 100% legal research and wrting.	11/10/2020 6:56 PM
25	WSBA does not represent us. WSBA should just be the King, Pierce, Snohomish, Spokane Bar Association. The rest of us do not like what you do.	11/9/2020 2:41 PM
26	sameness of days; lack of routine; lack of home/work separation	11/6/2020 9:07 AM
27	ex parte submissions without being able to discuss a case with the commissioner	11/5/2020 2:41 PM
28	No Clients	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
29	Inadequate court practices.	11/5/2020 11:58 AM
30	Needing a job	11/5/2020 11:2774116

31	Lack of effective networking opportunities	11/5/2020 10:33 AM
32	There should be no lock down ever	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
33	burnout - blurred lines between "work" and "home"	11/5/2020 10:18 AM
34	Government mandates have vastly grow my practice.	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
35	keeping up with utility payments to avoid shutoff of internet and phone services	11/5/2020 9:49 AM

Q10 Overall, what is the biggest challenge you are facing in your practice because of the pandemic?

Answered: 452 Skipped: 164

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	The company from which I rented the office closed due to COVID-19. High risk age group to look for other, so just closed / "retired" 11/2020 (age 72 with older spouse concerned about if either of use had COVID	12/4/2020 11:55 AM
2	Inability to obtain a court date for a hearing within 14 days.	12/3/2020 8:14 PM
3	Loss of networking and connecting with other professionals	12/3/2020 12:04 PM
4	Prosecutors and Judges in Spokane have been even more difficult, surprisingly in the face of a global pandemic that may take 500k U.S. lives. Larry Haskell should lose his law license.	12/3/2020 10:33 AM
5	Inability to meet with clients in-person	12/3/2020 10:28 AM
6	The ever-changing local practices and procedures during COVID has been the biggest challenge. Another significant concern is the failure to enforce social distances and mask use when at the courthouse. Pro se litigants wander the halls with their masks pulled down.	12/3/2020 10:14 AM
7	Not being able to attend meetings with my client.	12/3/2020 9:33 AM
8	I think managing stress, burnout, and anxiety. Trying to manage my practice which has increased in both volume and new areas/issues related to covid, with homeschooling and caring for my child at home and taking necessary precautions to not contract the disease particularly for days when I have to go into the office, as our family outside of our child are all considered high risk, including my elderly mother who lives with us. Additionally, I work for an employer who is willing to let people telework, but often at the spur of the moment will change their mind and want more and more people back in the office, despite the Governor's orders and recommendations to have everyone telework as much as possible-especially given that we are a government entity in a Phase 2 County, which is now seeing a spike in positive cases and hospitalizations. All of this increases dramatically daily stress and burnout levels, as well as anxiety levels.	12/3/2020 9:19 AM
9	The crash of the WSBA website and the failure of the Bar to notify its members of the nature of the breach and what we should be doing to protect ourselves. This failure is a major issue and the transparency of the Bar is pretty awful.	12/3/2020 8:49 AM
10	Isolation / lack of personal interaction with colleagues and friends	12/3/2020 8:32 AM
11	Isolation - lack of regular social interaction and movement from going to and being at an office, even if just a few days a week.	12/2/2020 10:06 PM
12	Impossible to network and get more work. I am at the mercy of what I had going in March 2020.	12/2/2020 7:56 PM
13	Cost of PPE for my work as a contract public defender in a inpatient mental health hospital.	12/2/2020 7:25 PM
14	difficulties working with people online	12/2/2020 5:49 PM
15	clients being reluctant to come in for advice or services	12/2/2020 5:24 PM
16	Unemployment. I was previously with a boutique firm and was laid-off in March 2020.	12/2/2020 5:02 PM
17	Support staff working from home rather than being in the office.	12/2/2020 5:01 PM
18	Socializing	12/2/2020 4:57 PM
	Increased workload	12/2/2020 4:55 PM
19	Increased workload	12/2/2020 4.551 10
19 20	Productivity. Stress and anxiety had reduced productivity and focus. Work from home environment not ideal, not enough personal space.	12/2/2020 4:50 PM
	Productivity. Stress and anxiety had reduced productivity and focus. Work from home	
20	Productivity. Stress and anxiety had reduced productivity and focus. Work from home environment not ideal, not enough personal space.	12/2/2020 4:50 PM
20 21	Productivity. Stress and anxiety had reduced productivity and focus. Work from home environment not ideal, not enough personal space. Unpredictability	12/2/2020 4:50 PM 12/2/2020 4:27 PM
20 21 22	Productivity. Stress and anxiety had reduced productivity and focus. Work from home environment not ideal, not enough personal space. Unpredictability Loneliness	12/2/2020 4:50 PM 12/2/2020 4:27 PM 12/2/2020 4:23 PM

26	Other people over reacting. Large firms and insurance companies taking it on themselves to try to change the civil rules to suit them.	12/2/2020 4:02 PM
27	The court system is a cluster F, I am not being called for hearings, prop orders are not being given to commissioner, no response from FL, Clerk, Facilitators are taking over 3 weeks to review final documents, keeping up on new rule changes, yet if rules not followed it seems its okay but then sometimes not	12/2/2020 3:48 PM
28	The authoritarian "solutions" (stay home, wear a mask, social distance) that outweigh the "problem." One can't help but think that certain entities are using the "pandemic" for nefarious meansespecially as we now know the survival rate is over 99%. Suicides, from isolation, are at an all-time high, but that's being ignored.	12/2/2020 3:37 PM
29	Working from home during the pandemic has blurred the lines of work-life balance. All of my clients have my cell phone number now and call me or text me at all hours of the day.	12/2/2020 3:12 PM
30	I'm a prosecutor and our backlog of trial cases is overwhelming	12/2/2020 3:11 PM
31	Inadequate work space at home.	12/2/2020 3:11 PM
32	Finding employment as a new Washington attorney	12/2/2020 2:57 PM
33	Day-to-day in-person contact with support staff.	12/2/2020 2:54 PM
34	Parenting school-aged kids and trying to work remotely.	12/2/2020 10:07 AM
35	Lack of potential clients or paying clients. A stagnation or lack of profit.	12/1/2020 8:14 PM
36	in-person witnessing requirements for estate planning documents, burnout	11/30/2020 8:40 AM
37	Mental health challenges for myself and my staff	11/27/2020 10:38 AM
38	Clients can't afford to pay	11/27/2020 9:06 AM
39	More online tools and court hearings should be online forever so we can plan accordingly	11/27/2020 8:43 AM
40	Decreased income.	11/26/2020 10:10 AM
41	Clients can't afford attorneys fees	11/26/2020 9:39 AM
42	Inability to safely meet with clients in person	11/25/2020 9:44 PM
43	Productivity (multifactorial including remote staff means things don't flow well; tech interruptions (losing connection to VPN), loss of opportunity to see clients face to face (which was a very important motivator and pleasure for me) an just plain motivation to grind on the bigger projects.	11/25/2020 5:22 PM
44	I practice administrative law and our state and federal governments are so inefficient at the moment. It is very frustrating.	11/25/2020 5:04 PM
45	uncertainty	11/25/2020 3:53 PM
46	Tie between finding a COVID safe place to quickly meet a client in person and setting up a secure, efficient, and well-organized place for hard copy documents.	11/25/2020 3:11 PM
47	anxiety	11/25/2020 11:46 AM
48	I work with self-represented clients, and earlier on, it was difficult to find resources for pro se's as to new court procedures required because of the pandemic. It's improved over time, though.	11/25/2020 11:16 AM
49	taking depositions and doing trials.	11/25/2020 8:45 AM
50	I cannot think of one. Sometimes, it's difficult to obtain records from clients, but we use Dropbox to share records & sometimes, clients will drop off records outside my home office door. I've worked from home for 10 years, so I was already working remotely. That made the transition easier.	11/25/2020 6:17 AM
51	meeting with people in person at offices, cafés, courthouses, other gathering places for work and networking.	11/24/2020 11:06 PM
52	I like it. No challengers.	11/24/2020 7:34 PM
53	Inconsistencies in court practices.	11/24/2020 7:31 PM LM-120

54	Increased work load a reduced efficiency due to myself and my assistant working remotely from each other.	11/24/2020 7:28 PM
55	Stress is making it very hard for me to maintain good work practices - focus is impacted negatively. I am losing sleep due to stress, uncertainty and worry. I find I waste a lot of time trying to figure out how to do things differently (DocuSign, Adobe, Zoom, other meeting and document handling apps etc. for working remotely). Close second: antiquated ways of doing business in Cowlitz County. Cowlitz County is causing problems regarding signature requirements - they want an ink signature and I cannot deliver one. They are temporarily allowing DocuSign due to the pandemic. Electronic signatures should be normal and accepted in every court all the time. Also, Cowlitz County is not allowing efiling, which is problematic, especially when the mail is delayed and disrupted and no one wants to go deliver things in person. It's 2020, time for efiling!	11/24/2020 7:15 PM
56	Slightly lower volume of work.	11/24/2020 6:54 PM
57	time management (could stay working at home until late at night)	11/24/2020 6:23 PM
58	I opened my solo practice in August 2019. Just as my practice was beginning to gain some positive results, the pandemic occurred. Networking with other attorneys is difficult during the pandemic.	11/24/2020 6:14 PM
59	Fatigue, head aches	11/24/2020 6:00 PM
50	Gov Inslee shutting down 75% of my practice	11/24/2020 5:39 PM
51	Not being able to meet clients in person for initial consultations, to exchange documents, or to obtain signatures	11/24/2020 5:33 PM
62	Isolation.	11/24/2020 5:28 PM
3	Research	11/24/2020 5:21 PM
4	Execution of estate planning documents while attempting to remain appropriately distanced.	11/24/2020 5:04 PM
5	No unique challenges.	11/24/2020 5:02 PM
6	In person meetings with clients - a bit hesitant.	11/24/2020 4:54 PM
67	No income	11/24/2020 3:09 PM
68	Not being able to collaborate with co-workers easily- stopping by their office to ask a quick question, etc.	11/24/2020 2:35 PM
69	Inability to get trials out or to know if they are going out until the last moment which is usually a no. We had one go out which was a relief. But numerous other trials were pushed forward - some still have no trial dates assigned. this is terrible not only for our clients, most of whom have waited years, but the expense of experts and all the costs and human expenses involved i npreparing a case with uncertain trial dates that cannot be confirmed or not because some jurisdictions act as if the pandemic doesn't exist, but then as the case is ready to be tried the case cannot go forward because the court can't handle the trial as we all knew but for the judge.	11/24/2020 1:36 PM
70	(1) The courts are a mess. If attorneys (esp solo) can figure out how to navigate this pandemic then judges, commissioners, and court staff should be able to have figured it out by now. There is little if any consistency in procedure and information flow. Meanwhile clients are being prejudiced by this lack of ability to get accurate, timely, and professional communications from court clerks and JA's (and I should mention respectful communication) about the various new procedures and protocols that don't end up being accurate when applied. (2) Office lease issues - expenses for unused space.	11/24/2020 1:23 PM
71	Lack of camaraderie through in person contact (at office and court)	11/24/2020 12:20 PM
2	Opportunity for informal in-office collegiality	11/24/2020 11:12 AM
73	Opening a probate is cumbersome and slow; however, my clients have been advised of this so it's not particularly difficult. Also, obtaining signatures on estate plan documents is more difficult.	11/24/2020 7:56 AM
74	access to the office for the rare paper files	11/24/2020 6:57 AM L M-12 1

75	Fundraising problems.	11/24/2020 5:54 AM
76	Feelings of isolation and loneliness.	11/24/2020 1:53 AM
77	Enforcing masks for clients that need to come in.	11/23/2020 11:20 PM
78	Working from home isolated with small children and no childcare.	11/23/2020 8:51 PM
79	Meeting clients when there are prohibitions. Practicing from home with no opportunity to meet other people, socially or professionally face to face.	11/23/2020 8:09 PM
80	Policing employees to not lick each other.	11/23/2020 6:43 PM
81	mental health and stability feelings of isolation and disassociation with the world in general	11/23/2020 5:54 PM
82	Reluctance of some clients to proceed with needed work until the pandemic is over	11/23/2020 5:31 PM
83	Remaining apprised of Healthcare Compliance issues	11/23/2020 5:28 PM
84	No real change in challenges. I have worked virtually since I started my solo practice almost 5 years ago.	11/23/2020 5:15 PM
85	Loneliness, which also makes it hard to stay motivated.	11/23/2020 5:08 PM
86	Isolation, I wasn't able to increase my client portfolio.	11/23/2020 5:01 PM
87	executing estate planning documents especially for those in care facilities -	11/23/2020 4:53 PM
88	Balancing family's needs with work and my own mental health/sanity. I have a 4 and 6 year old - youngest is in in-person preschool part-time, with pick-up in the middle of the day. Oldest needs regular supervision and assistance with schooling, and one-on-one time time during some recesses and breaks.	11/23/2020 4:40 PM
89	Figuring out how to keep the firm culture alive and the members of the firm connected	11/23/2020 4:35 PM
90	Keeping up with the increasing demand for family law representation.	11/23/2020 4:34 PM
91	Lack of investment in new technology and trademarks by small businesses, and budget trimming of same areas by larger businesses.	11/23/2020 4:31 PM
92	Unavailability of pertinent CLEs. The Supreme Court should consider waiving the requirement of CLE attendance (both law subjects and ethics) for the duration of the pandemic. In other words, there should not be any CLEs required from March 15, 2020 until the end of the pandemic, the 13 + 2 required CLEs should be reduced on a prorated basis for 2020, as well as in 2021 and thereafter. The Supreme Court should also consider allowing ALL lawyers to carryover from the prior reporting period, any unused credits that exceed the 13 + 2 credits they would have normally carried forward. In other words, had I earned over 52 law credits and/or over 8 ethics credits in the prior reporting period, I should be able to carry those excess credits to this reporting period as well as the normal 13 + 2 carry over credits.	11/23/2020 4:30 PM
93	Business is down, so revenue is down, covering overhead and keeping my staff employed means less income for me.	11/23/2020 4:14 PM
94	Clients who still want in-person meetings.	11/23/2020 4:11 PM
95	With the isolation, clients are unable to get to the office.	11/23/2020 4:09 PM
96	Depression and anxiety, inability to resolve cases.	11/23/2020 4:01 PM
97	Maintaining networks	11/23/2020 3:26 PM
98	I work in civil legal aid and the number of clients eligible for our services has increased significantly since the pandemic and economic crisis began. However, the capacity of legal aid and pro bono volunteer attorneys has not increased proportionally, so the demand for the existing staff and volunteers has gone up greatly.	11/23/2020 3:04 PM
99	children at home needing to be educated	11/23/2020 3:04 PM
100	Lacl of Childcare/assisting with education and working from home	11/23/2020 2:51 PM
101	Changes as imposed by the governor's proclamations. Specifically, the routine extension or modifications to proclamations and the need to spent time in each prior version to insure	11/23/2020 2:34 PM
		I M-12

	compliance.	
102	Isolation	11/23/2020 2:33 PM
103	Money! Lack thereof.	11/23/2020 2:30 PM
104	courts are stalled. backlog in criminal filings means less new clients coming through	11/23/2020 2:22 PM
105	Despite Zoom meetings, it is easier to connect with certain coworkers at the office	11/23/2020 2:21 PM
106	Working from home. Do not have easy access to folders/binders/papers with necessary client information.	11/23/2020 2:20 PM
107	Childcare and the care of a terminally ill parent	11/23/2020 2:15 PM
108	Having no physical office space.	11/23/2020 2:12 PM
109	Maintaining community with colleagues and connecting with clients.	11/23/2020 12:27 PM
110	No particular challenge. I am part time of counsel, and have been able to work remotely easily.	11/23/2020 11:42 AM
111	The inability to safely and reasonably return to my career due to the need to care for my baby and aging parent.	11/23/2020 1:27 AM
112	I haven't been actively practicing law but I have been involved in political issues. Trying to stay current with accurate information and maintaining my well-being while promoting justice and democracy have been the biggest challenges with Covid AND the current political situation.	11/22/2020 11:17 AM
113	My office suite closed its doors I was required to relocate my office.	11/22/2020 10:53 AM
114	Managing staff disruption caused by staff taking on roles they are not accustomed to (including child care and home schooling.)	11/21/2020 8:32 AM
115	Income	11/20/2020 4:49 PM
116	I am looking at being furloughed once every two weeks beginning in January, this will also result in an 8% decrease in income. Also balancing kids and remote learning with working.	11/20/2020 2:51 PM
117	Lack of in person, face to face communications.	11/20/2020 1:43 PM
118	Difficulty meeting face to face with clients, in person; Inability to present to Courts in person; Delays in outside/third-party providers of records and services actually providing those records and services; The inability to conduct in person depositions is a significant (negative) issue; The delays in the Court calendar/docket is a significant (negative) issue All of these things can have a prejudicial effect on the practice of law and client interests.	11/20/2020 12:30 PM
119	Personal communication with clients	11/20/2020 10:56 AM
120	Face to face meetings for executing documents - changed most interviews to phone	11/20/2020 10:49 AM
121	Reduced face time with prospective or new clients.	11/20/2020 10:48 AM
122	on line pleadings	11/20/2020 10:17 AM
123	hard to network with other lawyers	11/20/2020 9:56 AM
124	Being able to respond quickly. My office goes to voice mail and if I miss returning calls, quickly, I miss out on opportunities. Being able to respond quickly to deadlines; including recording and court filings.	11/20/2020 9:29 AM
125	GOV INSLEE'S CLOSING BARS & RESTAURANTS.	11/20/2020 9:03 AM
126	Isolation	11/20/2020 7:57 AM
127	I will not take mass transit - and getting into the city (Seattle) from the south end (with the pandemic and W. Seattle Bridge problem is getting worse	11/20/2020 5:33 AM
128	I think it's time to call the hoax for what it is.	11/19/2020 10:06 PM
129	getting pro tem work and getting CJE's	11/19/2020 9:09 PM
130	The energy required to be on zoom 12 hours a dayw	11/19/2020 8:58 PM

131	Reduced court staff productivity	11/19/2020 8:47 PM
132	Hiring attorneys	11/19/2020 8:00 PM
133	It is difficult to be productive at home.	11/19/2020 7:35 PM
134	networking and gathering clients	11/19/2020 7:29 PM
135	Focus and distraction, especially from school age child and news cycle.	11/19/2020 6:10 PM
136	Access to courts	11/19/2020 6:09 PM
137	probably overworking due to always being home and not being able to do things	11/19/2020 5:46 PM
138	Everything is slower and more cumbersome, especially with my own staff.	11/19/2020 5:34 PM
139	Lack of clear options to increase work flexibility	11/19/2020 5:11 PM
140	Income. It's very tight right now. Stable, fast internet is a close second.	11/19/2020 4:27 PM
141	loneliness/isolation, lower client calls	11/19/2020 4:22 PM
142	lack of personal connection	11/19/2020 3:58 PM
143	Client contact	11/19/2020 3:47 PM
144	Staying clear of COVID 19	11/19/2020 3:41 PM
145	Very high workload and client demands.	11/19/2020 3:37 PM
146	handling the increase of need for access to justice for low to middle income clients	11/19/2020 3:29 PM
147	Lack of work.	11/19/2020 3:22 PM
148	Navigating the constantly changing court rules in both Federal and State Courts in a variety of jurisdictions.	11/19/2020 3:21 PM
149	Figuring out so many different rules from the courts - no consistency makes it really difficult.	11/19/2020 3:12 PM
150	isolation	11/19/2020 3:10 PM
151	It's terribly difficult to set up interpreters via the Language Line when you're already on the phone with the client (yes, I know about conference calling), and if you have to meet with the client by video, I don't think the client or the interpreter would be able to hear each other over the terrible GTL connection at the jail, or even over a good sound connection. Something about putting an interpreter on speakerphone and then trying to get the phone close enough to my computer speaker so the client can hear, and making sure the volume is up high enough that the interpreter can heat the client speak over the Zoom connection.	11/19/2020 2:54 PM
152	Anxiety and depression.	11/19/2020 2:38 PM
153	helping clients ensure that documents are properly executed	11/19/2020 2:23 PM
154	Getting a trial date that will stick. Insurance companies are loving this.	11/19/2020 2:23 PM
155	Some opposing counsels and many clients have lost any sense of boundaries and good social judgment. Clients are demanding intensive case servicing but refusing to pay adequate advances on earned fees. Second to this, I had a problem with an opposing counsel who took a PDF of proposed order with my digitized signature and used it to forge my firm's pleading papers, drafted orders on the forged pleading paper without my consent or knowledge, and added my digitized signature to the forged pleadings and submitted them to the court as "proposed orders."	11/19/2020 2:21 PM
156	Getting let go by my firm in July and starting my own firm out of necessity because I do not feel safe working in Seattle right now.	11/19/2020 2:18 PM
157	Getting my work done/being efficient at home.	11/19/2020 2:17 PM
	Lack of new clients.	11/19/2020 2:12 PM
158	Lack of new circles.	
158 159	Social isolation	11/19/2020 2:01 PM

161	No income. No work.	11/19/2020 1:56 PM
162	Cabin fever	11/19/2020 1:43 PM
163	WFH and never seeing colleagues makes it hard to learn and effectively practice law.	11/19/2020 1:42 PM
164	Not meeting in person means meetings are longer and communication is not as effective.	11/19/2020 1:30 PM
165	Not enough time to do all the work.	11/19/2020 1:26 PM
166	The Governor and his unrestrained orders	11/19/2020 1:15 PM
167	Government executive orders	11/19/2020 1:14 PM
168	Lack of personal contact, especially with new clients, who usually need reassurance about their case. The face mask inhibits facial non-verbal communication.	11/19/2020 1:08 PM
169	Clients losing their businesses and business opportunities. It's really tragic to witness the financial impact on hard-working Americansparticularly where the efficacy of the process seems dubious over the long haul.	11/19/2020 1:05 PM
170	Uncertainty and its impact on my mental health	11/19/2020 1:04 PM
171	Keeping my solo practice open at all.	11/19/2020 12:50 PM
172	Lack of clients/work.	11/19/2020 12:48 PM
173	I did a lot of coverage work and now with virtual its not available. Also really mis camaraderie of live court. Mental health is stressed right now which is making overall practice difficult. Timing of caseload is hard.	11/19/2020 12:47 PM
174	Uncertainty, disruption of routine, following evolving local rules of court.	11/19/2020 12:46 PM
175	Not knowing procedural court processes. The Court hasn't clearly explained how to handle ex parte issues, default issues, and others, and it's taking a long time to accomplish things that would normally take a couple weeks.	11/19/2020 12:46 PM
176	Decreased income and client opportunity and nothing beyond minimal assistance from governing agencies to bridge gap until pandemic resolves. What is the point of PPP for 10 weeks with nothing to cover the remaining 7 to 12 months.	11/19/2020 12:46 PM
177	Attracting new clients.	11/19/2020 12:45 PM
178	Lack of motivation.	11/19/2020 12:44 PM
179	Instructing staff	11/19/2020 12:38 PM
180	Mental and financial health equally	11/19/2020 12:37 PM
181	lack of communication/connection with team in office	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
182	same or increased overhead with lesser income	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
183	moratoriums affecting volume	11/19/2020 12:26 PM
184	Hard to get things signed and get documents from clients who all have differing levels of access to technology and familiarity with technology.	11/19/2020 12:26 PM
185	Less volume of new PI clients.	11/19/2020 12:25 PM
186	mental health	11/19/2020 12:22 PM
187	Uncertainty and inability to plan.	11/19/2020 12:12 PM
188	none	11/19/2020 12:09 PM
189	Maintaining physical conditioning regime	11/19/2020 12:03 PM
190	getting clients	11/19/2020 11:58 AM
191	Access to King County Law Library.	11/19/2020 11:50 AM
192	Lack of an office space to print documents and use certain office supplies. Also, the lack of	11/19/2020 11:49 AM
	food events is forcing me to spend time to prepare meals.	LM-125

193	Using remote technology is more complex and takes more time to manage. Completing tasks takes longer	11/19/2020 11:13 AM
194	Communicating with co-workers.	11/19/2020 10:55 AM
195	Trying to get my boss to respond to emails in a timely fashion & in a manner that actually answers my question.	11/19/2020 9:48 AM
196	Difficulty with work-life balance. Not able to leave home and focus on work. Also, not able to work and focus on home.	11/19/2020 7:24 AM
197	Unemployment, discomfort working anyway due to hearing disability impacting work with clients wearing masks, cost of my law license and prohibitive cost to apply to practice anywhere else	11/19/2020 5:28 AM
198	Childcare	11/19/2020 3:55 AM
199	Starting a new practice	11/19/2020 3:23 AM
200	Keeping up with huge quantities of e-mail and setting client expectations because everything is harder to accomplish and slower.	11/18/2020 11:43 PM
201	Seeing incarcerated clients. In Pierce County, I can only see them at 9 am, scheduled 2-3 days in advance. For federal clients, prescheduled visits and only in the past month.	11/18/2020 9:44 PM
202	Constantly changing rules and continuances	11/18/2020 9:29 PM
203	Significant income loss.	11/18/2020 7:05 PM
204	Not meeting with clients face to face in the jail or courthouse. It's harder to communicate over the phone.	11/18/2020 6:46 PM
205	Connectivity with my clients, who are mostly homeless	11/18/2020 6:03 PM
206	Scheduling hearings	11/18/2020 5:59 PM
207	Navigating the different platforms and rules among counties	11/18/2020 5:25 PM
208	clinets who are unable to participate in their matters effectively, because they are flooded& unable to tolerate the uncertainty	11/18/2020 5:16 PM
209	Meeting the variable expectations of clients, opposing counsels, and arbitrators for what is the new "normal". Some, because they are working remotely for the first time and/or working different hours due to their personal obligations expect me to be available almost 24-7. Others seem to want to pretend that everything's "business as usual", which is absolutely not accurate of law practice during a pandemic.	11/18/2020 5:09 PM
210	\$\$\$\$ internet stability	11/18/2020 5:06 PM
211	Vast increase in details. Every court does things differently, there are hundreds of orders and operational memos from across the state, newer orders often don't supersede older orders, so I have to read them all. And this for tasks that used to be trivial (setting hearing, appearing in court, getting client and interpreter signatures, etc).	11/18/2020 5:02 PM
212	Representing landlords is basically impossible! As that was the main source of my steady income, I am stressing over not having money right now.	11/18/2020 5:01 PM
213	changing rules	11/18/2020 4:57 PM
214	Dilatory pleadings and practices by defense attorneys and insurers	11/18/2020 4:56 PM
215	Consistently getting Contracts Signed by clients who retain remotely.	11/18/2020 4:54 PM
216	Way more admin work than prior I can't bill for. Miserable work space.	11/18/2020 4:48 PM
217	people are depressed, using more controlled substances, suffering from more mental health issues	11/18/2020 4:41 PM
218	The backlog in the courts due to the pandemic which has led to crowded dockets, a burdensome trial schedule, and increased client frustration.	11/18/2020 4:38 PM
219	Opposing counsel using the pandemic as a bad faith excuse to indefinitely delay trials, slow	11/18/2020 4:36 PM LM-126

down discovery, etc. Low-tech opposing counsel refusing to avail themselves of reasonable tech solutions to conduct efficient remote depositions, etc. General bad behavior by a few opposing counsel related to pandemic.

	opposing course related to paralerine.	
220	Lack of toilet paper	11/18/2020 4:33 PM
221	Taking care of my 20+ staff members, coordinating their efforts to work in office or at home, keeping them healthy, and the stress that comes from being a small business owner with little to no guidance from the state about what to do.	11/18/2020 4:30 PM
222	Growing discussions on the topic of Diploma Privilege and advocates claiming without evidence that the Bar is a disparate barrier to entry. The wide differences in quality of Law Schools nationwide and even within our state dictate that simply graduating should not entitle aspiring lawyers to anything but a diploma.	11/18/2020 12:41 PM
223	Isolation	11/18/2020 12:40 PM
224	As a contract attorney, it seems I am farther away from full time opportunities with employment benefits.	11/18/2020 9:48 AM
225	Anxiety about when trials will start happening again and restrictions.	11/18/2020 8:24 AM
226	huge reduction in cases, people pursuing legal matters	11/17/2020 8:18 AM
227	Washington's Governor's stay-at-home order portrays that law firms are shut down, courts are not operating and legal services are unavailable during the pandemic. In reality, for the private sector, clients' (and potential clients') issues and causes of action do not stop during the pandemic, and neither does the legal community serving them. When the Governor conveys to the public that law firms and legal resources/services are shut down during the pandemic, it stymies the public from seeking out services, therefore slowing business for small to medium private firms.	11/15/2020 9:31 PM
228	Securing new client matters and making sufficient income to cover personal expenses	11/14/2020 2:56 PM
229	Adopting procedures for safe meetings for Will signings, Notarization, and Declarations that require physical signature	11/14/2020 1:52 PM
230	Staying healthy and safe	11/14/2020 9:27 AM
231	Slow internet speeds without the ability to upgrade to a better network (no one will come out to my location)	11/13/2020 11:09 AM
232	Too much work and not enough time.	11/13/2020 9:18 AM
233	Job market	11/12/2020 9:09 PM
234	Reduction in the number of new paying clients and the number of prospective clients contacting me.	11/12/2020 6:19 PM
235	Balancing childcare and work. Without ANY support of any kind on the personal front, trying to manage balancing children and taking care of a home with running my practice has been a monumental challenge.	11/12/2020 2:11 PM
236	Working with clients (I do family law) who are dealing with new challenges from the pandemic.	11/12/2020 10:53 AM
237	Delay in ongoing litigation. It just gives the defense more time to put money into experts, etc with no end date on the horizon for resolution.	11/12/2020 10:18 AM
238	Mental health and social bonding	11/11/2020 11:00 AM
239	The biggest challenge is dealing with the courts. No one knows what is going on. I have been given wrong information on multiple occasions and the clerks do not know what is going on. Several of the clerks I have dealt with in King County are rude and impatient. The integrity of the court has been compromised and the bar doesn't seem to be doing anything about it.	11/11/2020 8:33 AM
240	Closure of the libraries. I have a comprehensive subscription to Lexis, so I am able to do my work (research and writing for hiring attorneys), but I can't use law library resourcesWash. Practice, Am.Jur., WSBA deskbooks and various treatises.	11/10/2020 6:56 PM
241	I am a landlord attorney who does evictions. My gross revenue for the 2nd quarter of 2020 was 1/3 of my gross revenue for the first quarter of 2020. I have had to re-invent my practice.	11/10/2020 6:39 PM
		LM-127

242	Opposing counsel who use the pandemic as an excuse for lack of preparation, lack of timely response, lack of proper procedure, etc. and the resulting costs and delays to my clients. The courts should start running out of sympathy by now.	11/10/2020 5:47 PM
243	Childcare and homeschooling	11/10/2020 1:22 PM
244	I am a prosecutor and had rotated in Jan. 2019 from 32 years doing criminal to civil involuntary commitments. Guess what has significantly increased during the pandemic?	11/10/2020 11:40 AM
245	Disruptions when teleworking, and logistics and stressors from limited childcare and homeschooling.	11/10/2020 10:38 AM
246	Decreased business and income.	11/10/2020 9:30 AM
247	Not being able to work in my actual office with access to a printer and other supplies	11/10/2020 9:14 AM
248	balancing childcare and work	11/10/2020 9:06 AM
249	lack of interacting with co-workers in person	11/10/2020 9:06 AM
250	managing employees in remote setting	11/10/2020 8:38 AM
251	Working from home while also homeschooling two children	11/10/2020 8:34 AM
252	lack of physical socializing	11/10/2020 8:34 AM
253	With closure of law libraries, it has been difficult to access resources that are not in house.	11/10/2020 8:22 AM
254	Limited ability to have face to face meetings.	11/9/2020 6:06 PM
255	Potential clients are reluctant to spend money. They don't know if they will be able to pay rent, so forget about paying an attorney.	11/9/2020 2:41 PM
256	Fear of not earning enough money to pay my bills and save for retirement/emergencies	11/9/2020 2:21 PM
257	social isolation	11/9/2020 2:11 PM
258	Keeping income up	11/9/2020 1:56 PM
259	Additional stress in an already extremely stressful profession.	11/9/2020 10:57 AM
260	Balancing practice, both parents working, and managing school for K, 3rd, and 6th Grade, Clients who lack understanding around all of this and get impatient.	11/9/2020 10:07 AM
261	My boss - I work in house and I have underlying health conditions and a very fragile family member, my boss sees social distancing as silly and wants everyone in the office. He has allowed work from home, but it's a constant philosophical battle between safety and health and his need for social interaction. I know from working with other employers, this is a common struggle. Law firms overall struggle with managing partners who believe they have to physically "see" someone working to know they are working (even though they don't really know they are working just because their butt is in a seat). It's also a struggle to balance family and work - and I have a boss and HR person who have no children and don't get it. I'm able to balance things because I have a lot of resources, not necessarily the case for support staff.	11/9/2020 8:39 AM
262	Co workers who do not take the pandemic seriously and challenge the mask wearing rules	11/9/2020 8:13 AM
263	Decreased revenue, low morale.	11/8/2020 6:55 PM
264	Reduced productivity on certain tasks when working from home means I work more hours than i bill clients for.	11/8/2020 4:07 PM
265	Staff not working full time due to children at home.	11/7/2020 11:05 PM
266	The economic crash and depression to take work seriously	11/7/2020 9:42 AM
267	Dealing with home schooling a small child while trying to maintain my practice.	11/7/2020 8:50 AM
268	Unpredictable ebbs and flows in motivation. Typically I'm very self motivated, but I've found myself thinking to myself "what's the point?"	11/6/2020 4:09 PM
269	Frustration with the endless conversation. Institutionalized delays in process (unwarranted).	11/6/2020 2:22 PM
270	Juggling work with kids and no daycare.	11/6/2020 1:22 PM L M-128

271	Flexible work schedules - no one works consistent hours or even days anymore, making it more difficult to gain traction to get things done (e.g., settlement).	11/6/2020 11:40 AM
272	Uncertainty means future work remains in limbo.	11/6/2020 10:27 AM
273	I cannot afford my bad dues this coming year because of significant financial hardship and my job used to pay them for me but is going through financial cuts that might include that	11/6/2020 10:05 AM
274	No in person school and children's activities	11/6/2020 9:42 AM
275	Not being able to network and resulting lack of clients	11/6/2020 9:23 AM
276	motivation to initiate progress (vs just treading water)	11/6/2020 9:07 AM
277	Getting used to mask wearing	11/6/2020 8:59 AM
278	Avoiding getting Covid	11/6/2020 8:32 AM
279	Trying to stay safe and protect others	11/5/2020 11:48 PM
280	Expectations that the output level should be the same as before the pandemic. We're all just trying our best.	11/5/2020 11:02 PM
281	Getting new clients. Convincing clients that we can work by phone, email and zoom.	11/5/2020 9:50 PM
282	Losing the ability to personally interact with clients and their care providers. I work on ITA cases under a contract.	11/5/2020 9:17 PM
283	I used to go law library once a month or more to do legal research. As a semiretired person who is now a solo practitioner, this was the easiest and best way to do research. I have avoided some cases including some pro or low bono cases because of this.	11/5/2020 8:38 PM
284	A mixed bag here: Court hearings/motion practice is a little awkward, but on the other hand it's nice to be able to advocate from the comfort of my office without taking the trouble to drive, park, pass the weapons detectors, wait for case to be called, etc.	11/5/2020 8:09 PM
285	dealing with Govrnment.	11/5/2020 7:44 PM
286	Zoom depositions are difficult due to home disruptions but I do not feel safe doing them in person. The courts' lack of understanding that we are not robots and we are also facing challenges in our lives. Moving the docket forward is important and timely resolution for litigants is important but not at the expense of the bar's well being. A push of trials in King County has also prolonged important motions so it feels counterproductive to push trials through but backlog issues requiring resolution in pretrial stages.	11/5/2020 7:33 PM
287	Lack of informal contact	11/5/2020 5:46 PM
288	Non-work demands on my time	11/5/2020 5:20 PM
289	Turn down and closures of small businesses has hurt practice volume.	11/5/2020 5:11 PM
290	Children at home and not doing well with staying at home and online learning.	11/5/2020 4:48 PM
291	Meeting clients	11/5/2020 4:44 PM
292	Working remotely - technical problems	11/5/2020 4:42 PM
293	Isolation and lack of "in between" time and casual communication with colleagues knowledge transfer has to be intentional and scheduled now, which can make it challenging.	11/5/2020 4:38 PM
294	People losing their jobs and not being able to afford attorneys	11/5/2020 4:38 PM
295	Open up the economy. Sooner or later keeping the economy closed is going to decrease the value of my investments.	11/5/2020 4:16 PM
296	reduction in clients / income	11/5/2020 3:59 PM
297	I work in a non-law job out of state - but would really like to practice law. So the pandemic absolutely isn't the problem. It's lack of mentorship etc. and the total lack of what's needed in the "real world" to be a decent attorney.	11/5/2020 3:58 PM
298	communication logistics with remote work	11/5/2020 3:47 PM
		LM-129

299	Lack of interaction with co-workers and subordinate attorneys.	11/5/2020 3:44 PM
300	Finding a job.	11/5/2020 3:27 PM
301	lack of private work space and additional background noise	11/5/2020 3:12 PM
302	Inability to fluidly connect and communicate with colleagues, clients, and outside counsel.	11/5/2020 3:11 PM
303	Paying rent for an office we don't use.	11/5/2020 3:11 PM
304	Loneliness and lack of access to Washington practice manuals without paying \$400 and up for a practice area. Why aren't these free access for bar members online????	11/5/2020 3:10 PM
305	Having to do pure isolation in my private life because nothing has changed when it comes to cases filed or client contact.	11/5/2020 2:52 PM
306	Like of organization with my employer. They weren't prepared for this (obviously none of us were).	11/5/2020 2:49 PM
307	mAKING MONEY	11/5/2020 2:48 PM
308	Inability to travel for international work.	11/5/2020 2:46 PM
309	Safely witnessing wills	11/5/2020 2:41 PM
310	Evictions and collection activity	11/5/2020 2:38 PM
311	not meeting with clients in person	11/5/2020 2:37 PM
312	Client communication	11/5/2020 2:25 PM
313	Mental health	11/5/2020 2:13 PM
314	I was laid off by my firm in April.	11/5/2020 2:13 PM
315	Emotional and professional burnout.	11/5/2020 2:09 PM
316	Juggling childcare with my job while working from home	11/5/2020 1:47 PM
317	I spend about 3 hours a week on education of my client base. We do a weekly Q&A that gets about 70 attendees to answer general questions that started about Covid.	11/5/2020 1:46 PM
318	Concern about impending flood of cases	11/5/2020 1:41 PM
319	Not being able to ever see their entire face (nor they mine). My new clients and I could never "bump" into each other out in public and recognize each other. I value so much reading someone's entire face when communicating with them. You do get to really look at a person's eyes.	11/5/2020 1:34 PM
320	1. Too much screen-time 2. I am old and old-school and miss my organized binders; I prefer paper documents	11/5/2020 1:28 PM
321	Uncertainty in clients' ability to pay; fear that clients will not be able to remain in business	11/5/2020 1:21 PM
322	I could not hire a new paralegal and associate attorney yet.	11/5/2020 1:09 PM
323	Getting everyone to pratice social distancing and masking.	11/5/2020 1:09 PM
324	No earned income	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
325	I resent the intrusion of work into my personal life and space.	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
326	Social stress. I feel like the world is falling apart and the future is bleak. Perhaps a general sense of dread.	11/5/2020 12:46 PM
327	Fear	11/5/2020 12:35 PM
328	Motivation. I am used to a very collaborative and connected practice, and I miss the natural and organic interactions that just don't happen on Zoom!	11/5/2020 12:34 PM
329	Lack of business - I've GROSSED \$15,000 so far this year. Otherwise, it hasn't changed much since court is electronic and I practice solo at home anyway. Lack of connection with my colleagues.	11/5/2020 12:32 PM
		LNA 120

330	Growing my business. Learning the technology, internet connections.	11/5/2020 12:30 PM
331	Getting laid off.	11/5/2020 12:26 PM
332	Keeping up with the moving target that is the court calendar where we do not get adequate notice or information about what changes they are contemplating.	11/5/2020 12:24 PM
333	Backlog in the courts.	11/5/2020 12:16 PM
334	Getting notarized signatures and paper documents from clients as well as getting bench copies to the Judges.	11/5/2020 12:16 PM
335	Inability to conduct jury trials	11/5/2020 12:14 PM
336	Tasks take significantly longer outside the office setting, and my employer has significantly increased the workload while reducing staff, without any commensurate increase in compensation or assistance. I feel like I've been spread too thin for too long. I wasn't happy with my practice before this started, and now I feel burnt out and ready to stop being a lawyer altogether. I've been applying for non-legal positions for months and I plan to resign from my current job soon, regardless of whether I get hired somewhere else because I can't take it anymore. I haven't slept well in months and I'm having panic attacks latelyI've never had these before in my life. Working with counselors has not been helpful. I think the problem is simply the job, and it's just not worth how unhappy it's making me.	11/5/2020 12:13 PM
337	Challenges faced by staff with young families. Much higher burden on them and it requires other staff to step up	11/5/2020 12:10 PM
338	State agency clients who aggressively ignore Governor's mandates and the challenges that poses in representation and ethics including candor to the court and parties as well as community safety	11/5/2020 12:08 PM
339	Working alone and in a space not dedicated to my practice; we all don't own or rent large houses/apartments with extra rooms for offices!	11/5/2020 12:08 PM
340	Staying connected with colleagues.	11/5/2020 12:07 PM
341	My biggest challenge was that my book of business basically came to a schreeching halt for 2 months.	11/5/2020 12:05 PM
342	Inability to have informal legal discussions and coordination with colleagues about issues and cases.	11/5/2020 12:04 PM
343	Virtual schooling my children when I have a trial. The court setting hearings without the courtesy of asking my availability.	11/5/2020 12:01 PM
344	Informal interaction with other attorneys	11/5/2020 11:59 AM
345	8 year old at home	11/5/2020 11:58 AM
346	Inadequate court practices for safety, access to technology, lack of rule updates to rectify how the pandemic has affected access to justice. I'm SO frustrated with my county. There are so many great ideas and cheap fixes available, and they're generally ignored. Our administration appears to think it can wait the pandemic out and it's hurting lawyers and the public. There is also VERY inconsistent application of the mask and social distancing regs.	11/5/2020 11:58 AM
347	Clients need help, but refuse to pay. Are angry about legal bills.	11/5/2020 11:55 AM
348	Depression	11/5/2020 11:55 AM
349	I am "retired." My practice for the past couple years has been participation in legal aid/pro bono activities. The pandemic has made it much more difficult for people needing legal aid (other than public defense) to obtain it. For example, it has made it impossible to have in person "legal aid clinics" formerly held by Clallam/Jefferson Co Pro Bono Lawyers. When we had a Zoom-based event for those needing help with the eviction moratorium, we found that potential clients had trouble finding us. I have no brilliant ideas for solving this problem.	11/5/2020 11:55 AM
350	Trying to figure out how each county is scheduling hearing etc.	11/5/2020 11:54 AM
351	Prefer to be in-person with vulnerable witnesses, which can be challenging with virtual	11/5/2020 11:54 AM

352	Staying connected to my team and my colleagues. Staying emotionally available for my	11/5/2020 11:49 AM
353	 clients and work. I own the firm and employ 2 associates and 5 support staff. Starting in late March everyone in the office worked remotely. The lack of instant communication and being able to work on projects together easily was a huge challenge for us. After the first week, we had worked out some of the issues, such as mailing and fax filing, which the support staff does, but the attorneys have to approve and/or sign. Ultimately, we all came back to the office after a month or so. Since then, the biggest challenge has been dealing with what "sick" means, staying aware of potential exposure for each of the staff members, and keeping our distance. FYI - I practice in Kitsap County, which wasn't in the list of counties at #5. 	11/5/2020 11:48 AM
354	Substantial reduction in criminal filings have destroyed my practice.	11/5/2020 11:46 AM
355	eviction delays	11/5/2020 11:44 AM
356	Inability to do client development and obtain engagements	11/5/2020 11:41 AM
357	Access to information and resources its harder to talk to people so we're relying more on sites and pages that just don't have correct or enough information. Also emphasizes the ways in which we aren't well connected across stakeholders or resource centers.	11/5/2020 11:41 AM
358	Not enough work	11/5/2020 11:39 AM
359	Needing a job	11/5/2020 11:37 AM
360	State moratoria are reducing the amount of work that I usually do as a bankruptcy/debtor- creditor lawyer. That will change, but I'm bored now.	11/5/2020 11:36 AM
361	Mental staying in the game. Not burning out due to work compounded by covif.	11/5/2020 11:35 AM
362	Emotional uncertainty	11/5/2020 11:35 AM
363	My practice thrives best on relationships and being physically present to provide legal advice, but that is unwise given the pandemic.	11/5/2020 11:35 AM
364	Childcare/schooling issues.	11/5/2020 11:32 AM
365	Declining deal flow volume.	11/5/2020 11:31 AM
366	I do Landlord-tenant law. The Governor's eviction moratorium has eliminated 60% of my practice. I spend a lot of time explaining to desperate landlords why they can't evict non-paying tenants and discouraging thier ideas of self-help solutions to save their properties from foreclosure. The Bar needs to join in demands for government assistance to impacted landlords.	11/5/2020 11:30 AM
367	Unemployment. Hardly anyone is hiring anymore and the market is incredibly tough for the jobs that are hiring because employers know they can afford to be picky because lawyers are desperate for work. If you're not a top-tier lawyer with lots of experience or at least stellar academic credentials, the Seattle job market doesn't want you.	11/5/2020 11:29 AM
368	Too much work.	11/5/2020 11:29 AM
369	I have a 5 and 7 year old. The schools being online only, while it has impacted me, has had a terrible impact on my children's (and more so, for low income children) edcuation achievement.	11/5/2020 11:28 AM
370	Being able to meet with clients to finalize estate planning documents.	11/5/2020 11:27 AM
371	Low client count Speed of any transaction has subsequently decreased (covid excuses from everyone from banks to notary to insurance adjusters)	11/5/2020 11:26 AM
372	The time consumption associated with accommodating the number of people in a courtroom and conducting jury trials.	11/5/2020 11:26 AM
373	Income uncertainty	11/5/2020 11:23 AM
374	Constantly changing court rules and procedures	11/5/2020 11:23 AM
375	Limiting me and my assistant's exposure to infected people.	11/5/2020 11:23 AM
376	Staying connected with colleagues	11/5/2020 11:22 AM

377	Government involvement and decisions picking losers and winners	11/5/2020 11:21 AM
378	Finding new clients	11/5/2020 11:20 AM
379	Not being able to screen forwarded phone calls (getting too much chatter from vendors).	11/5/2020 11:18 AM
380	Lack of ability to work with my teams in person; casual interactions in the office that lead to better work by all	11/5/2020 11:17 AM
381	Creating more opportunities to having more hearings and mediations conducted via Zoom or similar.	11/5/2020 11:17 AM
382	25% decrease in salary	11/5/2020 11:16 AM
383	Protecting self in crowded courtroom	11/5/2020 11:15 AM
384	No challenges to speak of.	11/5/2020 11:14 AM
385	mental and physical wellness	11/5/2020 11:14 AM
386	keeping everyone set up to work remotely	11/5/2020 11:12 AM
387	Determining whether and when I am willing to re-enter the courthouse, courtroom and jails.	11/5/2020 11:10 AM
388	Lack of socialization	11/5/2020 11:10 AM
389	Client's financial situation and ability to pay for services.	11/5/2020 11:10 AM
390	Convincing clients to accept video hearings	11/5/2020 11:09 AM
391	Unemployment.	11/5/2020 11:08 AM
392	Ability to collaborate with co-workers about work-related issues more readily and frequently.	11/5/2020 11:08 AM
393	I have been pulled into a lot of time schooling at home with my children while working full-time.	11/5/2020 11:08 AM
394	isolation and loneliness	11/5/2020 11:05 AM
395	Potential clients staying home and not seeking legal assistance	11/5/2020 11:04 AM
396	Uncertainty about the proper procedures, and the risk of re-closure. If a closure is necessary due to action by the governor, or because of a co-worker becoming infected, it is unclear what resources we would have available to help out.	11/5/2020 11:03 AM
397	To much work and clients very anxious about estate planning and potential tax changes.	11/5/2020 11:02 AM
398	Fears not based in fact and/or a realistic assessment of the risk.	11/5/2020 11:01 AM
399	long waits for court hearings	11/5/2020 11:00 AM
400	Dealing with online hearings.	11/5/2020 10:58 AM
401	Many of our clients don't seem to believe in it! We have begun meeting with people in person again, but we may have to stop because our staff must babysit them to ensure they keep their masks on! Or, they get upset when an attorney wants to meet virtually instead of in person.	11/5/2020 10:57 AM
402	Now that I'm solo, I'm struggling to bring in enough business to keep myself & my business afloat	11/5/2020 10:56 AM
403	Lack of interaction with team members in firm	11/5/2020 10:55 AM
404	I used to meet with people for troubleshooting strategies and coaching for them to handle task on their own No in person meeting anymore	11/5/2020 10:55 AM
405	Nothing to do with pandemic, the level of personal safety and security when walking to and from parking garage during broad daylight has changed since June, 2020, for the worse. No longer feel safe walking on the streets, very alert and aware of who is near you and/or approaching you from in front and behind. Do not have confidence in the ability of law enforcement to timely respond or respond at all if I had emergency or need their help. Very unsafe and getting worse. Shocking.	11/5/2020 10:54 AM
406	Meeting with in-custody clients in a confidential way.	11/5/2020 10:52 AM
407	Bar Association Surveys	11/5/2020 10:51 AM LM-133

408	Zoom voir dire and trials during the pandemic - clients, witnesses, my staff, and other attorneys feeling insecure about the process and that the all the risks (physical and to the cases) are not worth it. Lack of cooperation and collegiality with the plaintiffs' bar on discovery in pandemic times.	11/5/2020 10:50 AM
409	I do a lot of real estate and the biggest challenge is moving between paper and electronic documents for the oversized documents of a real estate practice: plats, construction drawings, etc.	11/5/2020 10:45 AM
410	Less income Logistics of seeing clients, sanitizing, etc. On line trials are unconstitutional The eviction ban was not tied to financial impact to tenant, due to covid. Gov. gave deadbeats with ability to pay a free rein to simply not pay rent and face NO consequences. Way overly broad.	11/5/2020 10:45 AM
411	Building a home office	11/5/2020 10:44 AM
412	The reduction in clients' funds for legal services has reduced workload significantly. The reduced funds are directly related to shut-downs and stay-at-home orders that impact R&D and manufacturing (which cannot be easily done from home).	11/5/2020 10:44 AM
413	Balancing my employer's desire to have me in office against my own concerns about health and safety.	11/5/2020 10:43 AM
414	Use of virtual hearings with witnesses in arbitrations	11/5/2020 10:40 AM
415	Just "keeping ther doors open".	11/5/2020 10:38 AM
416	Inability to conduct in-person depositions and hearings - Zoom, etc. is a relatively poor substitute.	11/5/2020 10:38 AM
417	Hard to meet with clients to build trust	11/5/2020 10:37 AM
418	Learning the next technology	11/5/2020 10:36 AM
419	Socialization is unsafe, stigmatized, or both. It's hard to foster a team mindset or even communicate about weekend plans. There's nothing to talk about.	11/5/2020 10:34 AM
420	Finding topical local CLE on cutting edge pandemic related issues (e.g. enforceability of City of Seattle's recent ordinances preventing enforcement of certain contract remedies)	11/5/2020 10:33 AM
421	Never being helped at unemployment. My income is sometimes \$200.	11/5/2020 10:31 AM
422	Business has substantially slowed down	11/5/2020 10:30 AM
423	2021 income as cases received in 2020 do not resolve for 12-18 months on average	11/5/2020 10:30 AM
424	Poor internet service when working from home; restricted in-person meetings due to social distancing in office, teleworking, and client concerns	11/5/2020 10:29 AM
425	Clients unable to conduct retail business.	11/5/2020 10:28 AM
426	Keeping up on the home bills,office overhead	11/5/2020 10:24 AM
427	Uncertainty	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
428	Jay Insless	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
429	It is difficult to focus and be productive at home - as someone with moderate to severe ADHD, not having a clearly defined workspace and coworkers to keep me on task makes it harder to focus.	11/5/2020 10:18 AM
400	Reduced collaboration with colleagues and staff	11/5/2020 10:17 AM
430		11/5/2020 10:10 AM
	Miss my colleagues	11/5/2020 10:16 AM
431	Miss my colleagues Maintaining productivity and profitability among many lawyers in our firm; maintaining camaradarie and teamwork when unable to interact face to face with co-workers.	11/5/2020 10:16 AM
430 431 432 433	Maintaining productivity and profitability among many lawyers in our firm; maintaining	
431 432	Maintaining productivity and profitability among many lawyers in our firm; maintaining camaradarie and teamwork when unable to interact face to face with co-workers.	11/5/2020 10:16 AM

436	Not sure about the future. Worried my business will survive.	11/5/2020 10:12 AM
437	Limited ability to meet in-person with clients, court staff, and colleagues. Not just motion practice and trials happens at court, a lot of the time, it provided an opportunity to collaborate or conference with colleagues on other outstanding cases. Not having Court in-person is not as effective or meaningful. The sense of formality of being in a courtroom, wearing a suit, and delivering an oral argument really cannot be replicated by remote participation.	11/5/2020 10:12 AM
438	Making enuough money to live	11/5/2020 10:11 AM
439	Managing increased amount of work	11/5/2020 10:05 AM
440	I've been trying to retire and instead I'm working more. Existing clients reaching out.	11/5/2020 10:05 AM
441	Laid off early in the pandemic. Fortunate to find a new position after a few months.	11/5/2020 10:00 AM
442	King County is constantly changing family law practices and procedures	11/5/2020 9:58 AM
443	Inability to stay connected with people	11/5/2020 9:57 AM
444	I am a new attorney (licensed in September of this year) and it is challenging to try to learn how to practice while I work from home. I think the partners at my firm do an incredible job of making sure that they frequently check in and provide good feedback, but I wish I could go in to the office to ask questions or work alongside other young lawyers. Working remotely is very isolating.	11/5/2020 9:55 AM
445	Not being able to have in-office client conferences	11/5/2020 9:51 AM
446	access to court in a timely manner	11/5/2020 9:49 AM
447	Long-term effects of having had Covid on my health, especially fatigue. Paying rent and loans.	11/5/2020 9:49 AM
448	Boredom. I telecommute 100% and I am not supposed to go to the office unless absolutely necessary. Although I am an introvert, I have begun to miss the social aspects of being in the office. My whole world is pretty much my house now. The boredom has cause me to struggle with focus and concentration on my work.	11/5/2020 9:46 AM
449	I practice Collaborative Family Law which involves a team. We usually meet with 5 or more people and have team meetings. These meetings are not ideal on Zoom because of the hard conversations we have, and one misses reactions.	11/5/2020 9:42 AM
450	Lack of clients	11/3/2020 10:19 PM
451	The economic insecurity. At first business just slowed way down, then it was super busy, no super slow again. Just inconsistent up and down. Also USCIS has slowed WAY down. I used to be able to file a case and have it close in 3-6 months. Under Trump things can take 3-7 times as long. That is a lot of extra calls, email from clients.	11/3/2020 4:10 PM
452	Remote working, lack of in person interaction with other firm attorneys and staff	11/2/2020 11:53 AM

Q11 Overall, what is the biggest advantage to your practice because of changes brought about by the pandemic?

Answered: 438 Skipped: 178

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Like the resources online, the zoom and other virtual meetings and CLEsmade events available to me that were not before	12/4/2020 11:55 AM
2	Remote hearings.	12/3/2020 8:14 PM
3	Ability to work from which avoids the communte- saves almost 3 hours a day.	12/3/2020 12:04 PM
4	Getting to wear shorts under my suit for zoom hearings.	12/3/2020 10:33 AM
5	Less paper generated, less travel time	12/3/2020 10:28 AM
6	The pandemic has definitely caused Spokane to make its dockets more efficient, which has been a terrific change for the better	12/3/2020 10:14 AM
7	Others are moving to electronic communications and meetings.	12/3/2020 9:33 AM
8	The ability to telework and conduct court remotely has been fantastic and allowed me to be more productive as I am able to block out time where I don't have any disruptions as I would have throughout the day when I am in my office.	12/3/2020 9:19 AM
9	None.	12/3/2020 8:49 AM
10	Reduced workload coupled with reduced expenses	12/3/2020 8:32 AM
11	Greater work efficiency and flexibility	12/2/2020 10:06 PM
12	I get to see my wife and kids more.	12/2/2020 7:56 PM
13	My area of practice is considered essential	12/2/2020 7:25 PM
14	My commute is delightful	12/2/2020 5:49 PM
15	Virtual meetings and hearings.	12/2/2020 5:02 PM
16	Not having to travel to court or depositions.	12/2/2020 5:01 PM
17	More clients	12/2/2020 4:57 PM
18	I love working from home	12/2/2020 4:55 PM
19	It has provided much more accessibility and flexibility for clients. I appreciate that clients don't need to take an entire day off of work to participate in a hearing. Many of my clients have health or mobility concerns, so remote meetings etc. are a huge benefit for those able to use those technologies.	12/2/2020 4:50 PM
20	Zoom Depositions	12/2/2020 4:27 PM
21	Being able to observe court all over the state, meet with colleges across the state by zoom	12/2/2020 4:18 PM
22	Zoom actually increases contacts with other attorneys nationwide	12/2/2020 4:12 PM
23	Saving gas and parking fees	12/2/2020 4:08 PM
24	Nothing	12/2/2020 4:02 PM
25	More clients than I can handle.	12/2/2020 3:48 PM
26	Not having to travel. I like doing everything remotely from home office.	12/2/2020 3:43 PM
27	No commute, so more time to rest and/or work.	12/2/2020 3:37 PM
28	Working from home has saved on my commute. I have more time to enjoy my mornings or I'm able to cook lunch instead of having to prepare it ahead of time or order food.	12/2/2020 3:12 PM
29	I'm glad this showed that we CAN work from home, because we were previously unable. Hopefully we're allowed to work from home more even when things are back to "normal."	12/2/2020 3:11 PM
30	Clients needing more employment management advice & counsel.	12/2/2020 3:11 PM
31	Remote opportunities.	12/2/2020 2:57 PM
32	Less/shorter meetings.	12/2/2020 2:54 PM L M-137

33	Some courts' willingness to have remote pro forma hearings.	12/2/2020 10:07 AM
34	Money is the the core issue. No paying clients, no business at all.	12/1/2020 8:14 PM
35	Clients have stopped procrastinating about estate planning.	11/30/2020 8:40 AM
36	Having to expose myself to the virus at the jail and in person hearings(I'm high risk) Loss of income because client's can't pay.	11/28/2020 5:53 AM
37	Setting up a home office	11/27/2020 10:38 AM
38	Less time getting dressed up and traveling to court	11/27/2020 9:06 AM
39	Flexibility to attend court hearings and meeting online - love this!	11/27/2020 8:43 AM
40	Learning that we can function remotely and will be more efficient for us to continue some virtual work in the future.	11/26/2020 10:10 AM
41	None	11/26/2020 9:39 AM
42	Chance to slow down, rethink how we're doing things, regroup for 2021	11/25/2020 9:44 PM
43	More time for personal health (more sleep, more exercise, more healthy meals, more time for needed "home" work)in other words, better for my personal life, not necessarily my professional life.	11/25/2020 5:22 PM
44	It was time for my practice to grow and I had the business, so I hired a coach and a new CPA and we grew it! I am not certain I would have done this without the pandemic.	11/25/2020 5:04 PM
45	court hearings are simpler on Zoom- less travel time, less conflict between litigants	11/25/2020 3:53 PM
46	Meeting clients via Zoom.	11/25/2020 3:11 PM
47	efficiency	11/25/2020 11:46 AM
48	Divorce rate is up, and I've been very busy.	11/25/2020 11:16 AM
49	doing hearings and motions by phone and Zoom; it saves time and client money.	11/25/2020 8:45 AM
50	I appreciate having court hearings remotely, by telephone. It saves clients money, because they do not have to pay for me to wait at the courthouse for their hearing.	11/25/2020 6:17 AM
51	Efficiency and time savings of being at home, dressing more casually, although it is hard to maintain separation from one's work	11/24/2020 11:06 PM
52	Being alone, at home, privacy, freedom, use little gas, watching TV and YouTube whenever I choose, keeping my cocker spaniel close and enjoying my Budgie bird singing during phone hearings, and so on	11/24/2020 7:34 PM
53	Dramatic increase in the need for conflict resolve. And the mute button on video calls.	11/24/2020 7:31 PM
54	Zoom consults may continue. Easier for some clients.	11/24/2020 7:28 PM
55	Now it is normal to work remotely, so my desire to live near my overseas children and granddaughter is suddenly not a problem because EVERYONE is working remotely. Also, I am making more money since going home office and paperless - costs are way down without a rented office space, ink and paper. I have to contract out my mailings, but that costs way less than doing it myself in a rented space. Who knew? Plus no walk-in clients disrupting my work flow. It is terrific having a home office very far from my clients.	11/24/2020 7:15 PM
56	My desire to work from home is now supported as a norm for practice.	11/24/2020 6:54 PM
57	flexibility in life style adaptation	11/24/2020 6:23 PM
58	Enjoying my husband and son	11/24/2020 6:00 PM
59	None. I was already pretty much online	11/24/2020 5:39 PM
60	I was already cloud-based and worked from home, which made my transitions during the pandemic much easier. Further, I am fortunate for my low overhead and may forgo getting a physical office to meet clients as a result of this pandemic.	11/24/2020 5:33 PM
61	None	11/24/2020 5:28 PM LM-138

53 54 55 56 57	my practice has always been from my home and I tend to do most of my work virtually. Can't think of anything. Working from home is acceptable and not seen as being illegitimate, lazy or unmotivated!	11/24/2020 5:04 PM 11/24/2020 5:02 PM
5		11/24/2020 5:02 PM
6	Working from home is acceptable and not seen as being illegitimate, lazy or unmotivated!	
		11/24/2020 4:54 PM
57	None	11/24/2020 3:09 PM
	Flexible schedule.	11/24/2020 2:35 PM
8	We were already paperless and were using office 365, teams etc so could go remote on one day's notice.	11/24/2020 1:36 PM
69	Lowering of overhead.	11/24/2020 1:23 PM
0	Moving to virtual/online hearings and meetings	11/24/2020 12:20 PM
'1	No commute and focused priorities	11/24/2020 11:12 AM
2	Meeting virtually with clients.	11/24/2020 7:56 AM
'3	lack of commute means more focused work time, and more time to myself for personal well being	11/24/2020 6:57 AM
4	Took different opportunities in new practice areas.	11/24/2020 5:54 AM
'5	I can work very efficiently from home and don't miss commuting.	11/24/2020 1:53 AM
6	I work for a government agency, so my source of income is secure.	11/23/2020 11:52 PM
7	Opportunity to reorganize and increase efficiency through adoption of technology	11/23/2020 11:20 PM
'8	The majority of my practice was online with the courts in DC prior to Covid. It's nice that now everyone else is having to be caught up.	11/23/2020 8:51 PM
'9	Moved my practice to the cloud and electronically about 10 years ago, so the pandemic cause little change.	11/23/2020 8:09 PM
30	Remote court hearings for pointless hearings. A 5 minute hearing should not require billing a client for driving to the court, and then sitting there for 2 hours nor require trying to balance out how much of that fee to waive when my 2 hours are spent due.	11/23/2020 6:43 PM
31	working remotely saves so much time no more travel time more time to work, closer connections with family members more time with pets and home	11/23/2020 5:54 PM
2	Less desire to meet in person	11/23/2020 5:31 PM
3	increased volume of pandemic-related questions (e.g., how to comply with governor's proclamations, new agency rules or new legislation, etc.)	11/23/2020 5:15 PM
4	learning we can do things differently if needed	11/23/2020 4:53 PM
35	I'd already been working with courts that were adept at e-filing, and telephone/video appearances. The main advantage is being able to work from home even more, and having more flexibility than before.	11/23/2020 4:40 PM
36	We're pushing to be a virtual office before COVID and the pandemic made it possible. As a result, we are a better running firm and mostly COVID proofed.	11/23/2020 4:35 PM
57	Initially I had time to do some office updating and housecleaning of files. Currently income has been up.	11/23/2020 4:34 PM
8	Less stigma of small firm or office location or remote working for clients, regardless of whether they are remote, or not. Since many folks are working out of the office, it makes the location of my firm largely irrelevant for many prospective clients.	11/23/2020 4:31 PM
9	I think the pandemic only brought disadvantages to my practice.	11/23/2020 4:30 PM
0	More me time, if there is no work to do, and moving staff to shifts gave everyone extra time on their own.	11/23/2020 4:14 PM

91	More time for client work because I spend less time driving to meet clients or driving child to school.	11/23/2020 4:11 PM
92	It is nice to not have to drive so many miles.	11/23/2020 4:09 PM
93	Acceptance of ODR (online dispute resolution) by attorneys who were previously resistant to trying "new" technologies.	11/23/2020 4:07 PM
94	None	11/23/2020 4:01 PM
95	DV survivors being able to appear remotely in DVPO hearings has been something that advocates had been asking for for years, so it is great that it is now available and I hope it continues even after the pandemic ends.	11/23/2020 3:04 PM
96	Client familiarity and comfort with virtual meetings.	11/23/2020 2:51 PM
97	It has opened our firms eyes to the ability for attorneys to work remotely, which will likely continue after the pandemic to some degree. Additionally, court hearings are more efficient because travel time is no longer required	11/23/2020 2:34 PM
98	There have been no advantages as a result of the pandemic.	11/23/2020 2:30 PM
99	remote hearings- less waste of time comminuting for hearings.	11/23/2020 2:22 PM
100	Less time in the car.	11/23/2020 2:21 PM
101	Ability to work from home	11/23/2020 2:15 PM
102	Remote hearings, trials, depositions, etc.	11/23/2020 2:12 PM
103	Not spending hours per day in traffic getting to and from meetings and the office.	11/23/2020 12:27 PM
104	Again, no particular change as I did a lot of work remotely for years prior to the pandemic.	11/23/2020 11:42 AM
105	Paperless practices and the elimination of in-person contacts where another medium (Zoom/Webex) is just as effective and ultimately far more efficient.	11/23/2020 1:27 AM
106	Electronic options cut down on travel time and the risk of travel.	11/22/2020 11:17 AM
107	Not having to commute to court	11/22/2020 10:53 AM
108	I gave up my physical office, and work from home.	11/21/2020 8:32 AM
109	It education	11/20/2020 4:49 PM
110	My work life balance has improved in some ways due to being able to work from home.	11/20/2020 2:51 PM
111	I don't have to drive from Vancouver to Longview every week for juvenile dependency court. Also, I get more done by using the iPad for Zoom, leaving my computer free to work in between my juvenile dependency matters on the docket.	11/20/2020 1:43 PM
112	Perhaps reduced need to travel, but still not a net-positive versus the ability to meet in person and/or attend Court proceedings in person and/or conduct depositions in person	11/20/2020 12:30 PM
113	Some non-productive and time-wasting meetings are eliminated	11/20/2020 10:56 AM
114	Not expected go to an "office" or getting dressed up	11/20/2020 10:49 AM
115	Reduced overhead by working from home.	11/20/2020 10:48 AM
116	none	11/20/2020 10:17 AM
117	remote work to cut down commute time	11/20/2020 9:56 AM
118	I have been able to make a living and have made lemonade out of lemons.	11/20/2020 9:29 AM
119	NONE	11/20/2020 9:03 AM
120	More business (divorces)	11/20/2020 7:57 AM
121	A lot fewer commuting trips into Seattle from the south end.	11/20/2020 5:33 AM
122	not applicable	11/19/2020 9:09 PM

123	Saving money on gas. Food, clothiu	11/19/2020 8:58 PM
124	None.	11/19/2020 7:35 PM
125	Working alone at my office	11/19/2020 7:29 PM
126	Slower pace	11/19/2020 6:09 PM
127	courts being open to remote options	11/19/2020 5:46 PM
128	Nothing seems to be an advantage.	11/19/2020 5:34 PM
129	Eliminating commute times for hearings and meetings, and increasing productivity while waiting for my matter to be called.	11/19/2020 5:11 PM
130	Umstill waiting for an advantage.	11/19/2020 4:27 PM
131	Short court hearings are done remotely! Older attorneys are adapting technology I have used for a long time.	11/19/2020 4:22 PM
132	I have gained time to work when I would otherwise be travelling to the office or the courthouse.	11/19/2020 4:02 PM
133	ability to meet with people who might otherwise not have made themselves available	11/19/2020 3:58 PM
134	Time is less than before	11/19/2020 3:47 PM
135	None	11/19/2020 3:41 PM
136	Increase in business.	11/19/2020 3:37 PM
137	Love the ability to file, attend hearings, mediations and sign pleadings online	11/19/2020 3:29 PM
138	Courts have embraced Zoom.	11/19/2020 3:22 PM
139	Not having to wear professional attire.	11/19/2020 3:21 PM
140	Not having to go to the office and spend time driving - not having to ask clients to come to our office.	11/19/2020 3:12 PM
141	Less time commuting, more time working	11/19/2020 3:10 PM
142	I'm much more productive. (Except for today.)	11/19/2020 2:54 PM
143	Everyone is saving time by not traveling to meet me in an office and meeting online instead.	11/19/2020 2:23 PM
144	Now that both my legal assistant and I work from home, I don't have the commute expense, reduced my office expenses by 70%, can sell my office space and technically share a space with another law firm.	11/19/2020 2:23 PM
145	None.	11/19/2020 2:21 PM
146	I get to have my own firm - something I've been working towards for a while. I wasn't quite ready to start now, but circumstances required it.	11/19/2020 2:18 PM
147	Less travel and less time spent in meetings.	11/19/2020 2:17 PM
148	Not sure	11/19/2020 2:12 PM
149	No time spent commuting	11/19/2020 2:01 PM
150	Working from home	11/19/2020 1:57 PM
151	Advantages because of the pandemic, are you kidding? NONE. Plenty of huge negative impacts. Like put me out of business.	11/19/2020 1:56 PM
152	I don't have to appear in person for court hearings.	11/19/2020 1:43 PM
153	Save time commuting to do other things.	11/19/2020 1:42 PM
154	More efficiency by doing some work from home.	11/19/2020 1:30 PM
155	Delays inherent in the legal system are less problematic because the pandemic delays are worse.	11/19/2020 1:26 PM
156	It is hurting my competitors	11/19/2020 1:14 PM LM-141

187	Not having to see people I don't want to see	11/19/2020 9:48 AM
186	Zoom hearings	11/19/2020 9:58 AM
185	Working from home!	11/19/2020 10:55 AM
L84	I like working from home. I have fewer interruptions and I am better able to step away from working all the time.	11/19/2020 11:13 AM
.83	I don't have to deal with anyone in person and they can't come find me at my usual space where my desk is located at the office.	11/19/2020 11:49 AM
.82	An increase in reasons and in pressure to trust the Lord to help me serve my clients to the highest professional standard.	11/19/2020 11:50 AM
.81	established an at-home work space.	11/19/2020 11:58 AM
.80	Workload and income have remained constant	11/19/2020 12:03 PM
.79	none	11/19/2020 12:09 PM
.78	More time to work as I wish without client pressure.	11/19/2020 12:12 PM
.77	Court hearings are much cheaper for clients, which is good.	11/19/2020 12:20 PM
.76	remote working	11/19/2020 12:22 PM
.75	Efficiencies of zoom and remote client meetings, remote hearings, depositions, arbitrations, and trials.	11/19/2020 12:25 PM
.74	Easier to schedule client intakes over the phone rather than in person.	11/19/2020 12:26 PM
.73	working from home	11/19/2020 12:26 PM
.72	doing all necessary former in person contacts, proceedings by Zoom or phone. The phone hearings should stay permanently as they are vastly more cost effective for counsel and their client paying for such services. There is just no need to be in person unless a very extreme case. Clients and counsel need not pay or absorb the parking, travel, waiting in court without being able to multitask at a hearing. Clients also are much more able to attend phone hearings without cost or interruption to their work, life	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
71	time saved not commuting	11/19/2020 12:28 PM
70	I can't think of anything. Life is horrible right now.	11/19/2020 12:37 PM
69	Not having to drive to court for a 5-minute appearance. These are now handled by phone.	11/19/2020 12:38 PM
68	Working got a firm with resources to support remote work.	11/19/2020 12:40 PM
.67	Working from home on most days.	11/19/2020 12:44 PM
.66	Able to appear on more than one court calendar at a time.	11/19/2020 12:45 PM
.65	reduced overhead, more efficient, travel time, more time for clients and working on their resolutions. Better work life balance with higher quality output.	11/19/2020 12:46 PM
.64	The overall acceptance of teleworking has been a positive.	11/19/2020 12:46 PM
L63	More remote appearances	11/19/2020 12:46 PM
162	I can practice in any county! Commute time wasting is gone.	11/19/2020 12:47 PM
L61	Cost savings from not having office space.	11/19/2020 12:48 PM
160	I was working from home in any event, so that was an advantage.	11/19/2020 12:50 PM
59	Getting set up with new technology that allows me to work remotely and connect with clients	11/19/2020 1:03 PM
58	Some additional work resulting from clients needing to navigate the shutdown restrictions and	11/19/2020 1:05 PM

217	The ability to work remotely	11/18/2020 8:24 AM LM-143
216	Greater flexibility to do what I want.	11/18/2020 9:48 AM
215	Online collaboration and more members of the profession willing to embrace technology	11/18/2020 12:40 PM
214	It will be easier to filter through new law graduates's credentials when making hiring decisions. It is my belief that those who work hard will reject the Diploma Privilege option if it exists and will have a UBE score, while those who take Diploma Privilege can be easily discarded from the pile of resumes unless they clearly articulate specific reasons for having done so.	11/18/2020 12:41 PM
213	Less travel means less costs for us.	11/18/2020 4:30 PM
12	My estate planning business is booming although so many people don't have an income to pay the bill.	11/18/2020 4:33 PM
211	Recaptured at least 40 hours per month formerly used for my commute.	11/18/2020 4:36 PM
10	None.	11/18/2020 4:38 PM
209	n/a	11/18/2020 4:41 PM
208	I was work from already and this has normalized children in professional lives.	11/18/2020 4:48 PM
207	No commute to work means I have a better sleep schedule.	11/18/2020 4:48 PM
206	Efficiency: the commute from downstairs to upstairs after meals cannot be beat.	11/18/2020 4:54 PM
205	More productive because of far fewer interruptions and no time lost in travel to and from court, depositions, mediations.	11/18/2020 4:56 PM
204	traffic is wonderful	11/18/2020 4:57 PM
203	working from home, remotely.	11/18/2020 5:01 PM
202	I should have hired an assistant a long time ago. Also, not having to travel to courts means I can appear in multiple counties in one day, with cost savings for clients.	11/18/2020 5:02 PM
201	I think about leaving the practice of law.	11/18/2020 5:06 PM
	phone system service!	
00	expenditure nineteen pounds nineteen and six, result happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery." - Wilkins Micawber in Charles Dickens' David Copperfield Finally putting to use all those remote-work applications and devices that came with our VoIP	11/18/2020 5:09 PM
.99	35+ years of practice, w/ "uncertain financials" caused me to routinely live below my means, and as a result, I have some reserve and relatively low overhead - guys w/ huge space downtown may be eaten alive - Micawber was right: "Annual income twenty pounds, annual	11/18/2020 5:16 PM
.98	Ability to appear remotely and to file electronically	11/18/2020 5:25 PM
197	Eliminating my commute and having more flexible work hours as I'm doing it on my own schedule at home	11/18/2020 6:03 PM
196	Scheduling is awesome now because it was very hard to drive between the downtown and juvenile courthouses when I had afternoon hearings at both.	11/18/2020 6:46 PM
195	None	11/18/2020 7:05 PM
194	Reduced travel time to court; our county accepts online filings now	11/18/2020 9:29 PM
L93	The only slight advantage is not having to travel to federal court but appear only virtually.	11/18/2020 9:44 PM
192	Improved use of technology.	11/18/2020 11:43 PM
191	New opportunities	11/19/2020 3:23 AM
190	No need to commute	11/19/2020 3:55 AM
	Lol	11/19/2020 5:28 AM

218	Development of electronic submission and communication with the court.	11/15/2020 9:31 PM
219	No commute to office	11/14/2020 2:56 PM
220	Estate planning is a growth practice area as potential clients are more aware of the need to have documents in place in case of illness or death	11/14/2020 1:52 PM
221	More resolutions because of lack of civil trial time in the courts	11/14/2020 9:27 AM
222	Ability to work from home and more flexibility on when I work.	11/13/2020 11:09 AM
223	Lots of multi-tasking.	11/13/2020 9:18 AM
224	Work from home means no commute, so I have more time to devote to work	11/12/2020 9:09 PM
225	Greatly reduced time spent traveling to & from local courthouses.	11/12/2020 6:19 PM
226	I was already almost exclusively online before the pandemic, so I have not experienced any big advantage. But obviously "more time with family" is both the challenge AND the silver lining!	11/12/2020 2:11 PM
227	No travel time to and from court or waiting time in court	11/12/2020 10:53 AM
228	No staff member has resigned for other opportunities.	11/12/2020 10:18 AM
229	WFH and flexibility	11/11/2020 11:00 AM
230	Absolutely nothing. This has been a nightmare.	11/11/2020 8:33 AM
231	None	11/10/2020 6:39 PM
232	We do elder law. Elderly and less abled clients are now on a more even playing field, where their lack of mobility, lack of hearing, lack of good eyesight can be compensated when they appear by zoom on their own computers from their own homes.	11/10/2020 5:47 PM
233	Shockingly, the global pandemic actually increased Kitsap Superior Court's efficiency by allowing zoom appearances and electronic filings of sorts.	11/10/2020 1:54 PM
234	More efficient meetings via Zoom	11/10/2020 1:22 PM
235	Video court. We did not have it before hand and drove to the different facilities. That took time out of our day, and we did not have flexibility to add onto dockets a third facility on 2-facility docket days. Thanks to using virtual court we now can. I do not believe that we'll go back to "on site" hearings on a regular basis after the pandemic is (hopefully) over.	11/10/2020 11:40 AM
236	More sleep. I am less concerned about having to dress-up everyday and I don't have to commute everywhere.	11/10/2020 10:38 AM
237	Online court hearings, depositions and client meetings.	11/10/2020 9:30 AM
238	Spending a lot of time with my cat	11/10/2020 9:14 AM
239	Remote work and opportunities	11/10/2020 9:06 AM
240	teleworking from home/lack of commute	11/10/2020 9:06 AM
241	more efficient	11/10/2020 8:38 AM
242	Remote contact either with the client or the court, has cut down on travel time and expenses. I also enjoy working at home as it cuts out 2 hours of commuting every day.	11/10/2020 8:34 AM
243	convenience and time management	11/10/2020 8:34 AM
244	The use of electronic signatures and submission of documents has helped to streamline things.	11/10/2020 8:22 AM
245	Great home office.	11/9/2020 6:06 PM
246	Locking the office has decreased foot traffic.	11/9/2020 4:06 PM
247	None.	11/9/2020 2:41 PM
248	Working from home; I've cancelled my office space lease and will not go back to using an	11/9/2020 2:21 PM
	office space.	LM-144
249	Learning to Zoom	11/9/2020 1:56 PM
-----	--	-----------------------------
250	Finally having electronic filing and using e-signatures in smaller counties (though now going away in some).	11/9/2020 10:57 AM
251	I think there is a real advantage for remote communication for clients who may have difficulty fighting traffic to come to appointments.	11/9/2020 10:07 AM
252	I love working from home and I can get more done. People are being forced to think outside the box and think about new ways of getting things done. Things that were said to be impossible are now known to be possible.	11/9/2020 8:39 AM
253	Work from home and being able to help my employer clients.	11/9/2020 8:13 AM
254	remote working from home	11/9/2020 8:03 AM
255	Better communication with colleagues in other offices.	11/8/2020 6:55 PM
256	The biggest advantage is, I think, in how law offices staff up and allocate office space in the future. I think receptionists may disappear and lawyers will use their cell or direct dial. i think there will be smaller office spaces, more office sharing, more working from home, and law firms will downsize their office space (and reduce their rental overhead) as a result.	11/8/2020 4:07 PM
257	Remote attendance at court hearings.	11/7/2020 11:05 PM
258	Being together at home	11/7/2020 9:42 AM
259	Not having to attend meetings around the Puget Sound has been a plus.	11/7/2020 8:50 AM
260	I get to see my family a lot more.	11/6/2020 4:09 PM
261	Biggest advantage is I work for DCS with the Office of Administrative Hearings and really, nothing has changed. We were already doing what is an adjustment for everyone else. Just ordered to work from home.	11/6/2020 2:22 PM
262	No advantage	11/6/2020 1:22 PM
263	My office was already prepared for a change from traditional work environments to work-from- home. We did not miss a beat.	11/6/2020 11:40 AM
264	Flexible work spaces and hours are a big win.	11/6/2020 10:27 AM
265	Working from home	11/6/2020 10:05 AM
266	Flexibility regarding telework	11/6/2020 9:42 AM
267	Huge drop in business and income	11/6/2020 9:23 AM
268	arbitrating remotely; mentoring remotely	11/6/2020 9:07 AM
269	Zoom hearings	11/6/2020 8:59 AM
270	Zoom hearings	11/6/2020 8:32 AM
271	Less meeting travel time allows for more productivity	11/6/2020 6:21 AM
272	Working from home	11/5/2020 11:48 PM
273	No commute!	11/5/2020 11:02 PM
274	Not having to go to court. Having court hearings from my office.	11/5/2020 9:50 PM
275	I am in a high risk demographic (over 65, person of color, take an immunosuppressant drug for a pre-existing illness, diabetic) so being able to work from home is huge.	11/5/2020 9:17 PM
276	Biggest advantage is that I am already mostly retired. This would be brutal if I weren't. The questions above raised several problems that I haven't even thought about.	11/5/2020 8:38 PM
277	see comment above	11/5/2020 8:09 PM
278	there are no advantages	11/5/2020 7:44 PM
279	Working from home	11/5/2020 7:42 PM LM-145

280	working from home	11/5/2020 5:20 PM
281	More people comfortable with remote work and use of technology	11/5/2020 5:11 PM
282	No commute.	11/5/2020 4:48 PM
283	Online hearings seem to be the wave of the future.	11/5/2020 4:44 PM
284	No commute time so no lost productivity.	11/5/2020 4:38 PM
285	Remote	11/5/2020 4:38 PM
286	none	11/5/2020 4:16 PM
287	Use of zoom, remote hearings - huge savings in travel time to court appearances	11/5/2020 3:59 PM
288	I can work from home! But see above.	11/5/2020 3:59 PM
289	greater flexibility and a bit more patience from colleagues and clients	11/5/2020 3:47 PM
290	None.	11/5/2020 3:44 PM
291	N/A	11/5/2020 3:27 PM
292	clients' willingness to meet remotely	11/5/2020 3:12 PM
293	NONE.	11/5/2020 3:11 PM
294	Moved the practice almost exclusively remote.	11/5/2020 3:11 PM
295	More time with family.	11/5/2020 3:10 PM
296	Efiling. Court didn't used to do it and now does welcome to the latter part of the 20th century.	11/5/2020 2:52 PM
297	More family time.	11/5/2020 2:49 PM
298	VERTUAL OFFICE NO BRICK AND MORTAR	11/5/2020 2:48 PM
299	As an in-house counsel, being able to tell arrogant, over-priced AmLaw 100 firms to take a hike.	11/5/2020 2:46 PM
300	I like having more telephone meetings with people.	11/5/2020 2:41 PM
301	I have been working from home for 20 years.	11/5/2020 2:38 PM
302	commute time to work and hearings	11/5/2020 2:37 PM
303	Remote contact is more acceptable and likely to last as a result.	11/5/2020 2:13 PM
304	I like my new job in an industry organization way more than my prior job in a law firm	11/5/2020 2:13 PM
305	I no longer have to hang around the courthouse for hours for a 10 min hearing.	11/5/2020 2:12 PM
306	Pandemic increased work in our practice areas. I would rather there be no pandemic than increased work, however. 2020 is a joy killer.	11/5/2020 2:09 PM
307	The lack of a long commute, which has given me more time in the day	11/5/2020 1:47 PM
308	meeting via zoom instead of driving to in person meetings.	11/5/2020 1:46 PM
309	Normalizing work from home for my staff	11/5/2020 1:41 PM
310	A reduction in travel expenses (driving, parking, etc.) and less waste of time traveling. I still find my challenge (#10) more impactful than my advantage.	11/5/2020 1:34 PM
311	Working from home is less stressful and I have more recreation time getting outside etc. without my long commute	11/5/2020 1:28 PM
312	The PPP and EIDL loans were helpful, and the SBA making loan payments through the end of the year really helped.	11/5/2020 1:09 PM
313	Outstanting on-line resoureses are much more readily available.	11/5/2020 1:09 PM
314	No advantage	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
		LM-146

315	No commute	11/5/2020 1:02 PM
316	Flexibility.	11/5/2020 12:46 PM
317	Increased time to work	11/5/2020 12:35 PM
318	I think the pandemic has forced a (in some cases, begrudging) acceptance of the fact that people can, in fact, be just as productive and in some instances, more so when working remotely.	11/5/2020 12:34 PM
319	Just a comment (nowhere else to put it): It has made me realize how much you get from your colleagues simply from waiting your turn for a hearing. It has also seriously emphasized how much more effective I can be with my consumer clients by having them come to the office instead of interacting on the phone. It takes more time, but get better information from them and, let's face it, I miss the connection.	11/5/2020 12:32 PM
320	Hearings, CLE, and other events via Zoom. I can attend things and do things I otherwise couldn't if it had to be in person.	11/5/2020 12:30 PM
321	Working from home	11/5/2020 12:26 PM
322	Not going physically to court has reduce the amount of commute time.	11/5/2020 12:24 PM
323	Forced work/life balance, working from home options, the general slowing down of the world.	11/5/2020 12:16 PM
324	Attending court via Zoom. It does not require a time commitment before and after for travel. Some hearings are scheduled for specific times which shortens the client's billing time even further.	11/5/2020 12:16 PM
325	Increased reliance on videoconferencing	11/5/2020 12:14 PM
326	I like working from home more than I expected to. It's great to be around my spouse all the time.	11/5/2020 12:13 PM
327	Learning how technology supports WFH well	11/5/2020 12:10 PM
328	Efficiency in written documents (like appellate briefs) when working remotely	11/5/2020 12:08 PM
329	Working remotely can be advantageous at times	11/5/2020 12:08 PM
330	Having the option to attend meetings via video or telephone reducing the need to travel.	11/5/2020 12:07 PM
331	I have added a new practice area, virtual meeting and court are faster for some types of routine matters and agreed orders.	11/5/2020 12:05 PM
332	No commute.	11/5/2020 12:04 PM
333	Remote options with work, clients and court hearings. Also, increased electronic filing. By the way I didn't see Kitsap County as a choice for county of pratice.	11/5/2020 12:02 PM
334	None	11/5/2020 12:01 PM
335	Greatly reduced travel costs and time attending hearings and depositions	11/5/2020 11:59 AM
336	total remote working is great	11/5/2020 11:58 AM
337	Love Zoom hearings. So easy and efficient.	11/5/2020 11:58 AM
338	None. I want it over.	11/5/2020 11:55 AM
339	The opportunity to work from home	11/5/2020 11:54 AM
340	Reduced risk of contracting COVID and passing it on to elderly family members, friends and colleagues.	11/5/2020 11:54 AM
341	More self-awareness around being emotionally available for my clients, family and staff.	11/5/2020 11:49 AM
342	The biggest advantage has been the ability to appear for hearings without leaving my desk. I'm not wasting time driving to and from court, or charging my clients for that time. I can also get some work done while waiting for my case to be called. The second biggest advantage is the ability to email documents to the Judge's office. Kitsap does not have e-filing.	11/5/2020 11:48 AM
	None	11/5/2020 11:46 AM

0.4.4		
344	nothing. absolutely nothing.	11/5/2020 11:44 AM
345	None	11/5/2020 11:41 AM
346	More focus time and less fuss with travel and commuting.	11/5/2020 11:41 AM
347	I'm not getting colds or flu as much as I usually do.	11/5/2020 11:39 AM
348	Working remotely	11/5/2020 11:37 AM
349	I work primarily in tenant defense, and with the governor's eviction moratorium, the advantage provided to my clients is huge.	11/5/2020 11:37 AM
350	As a bankruptcy/debtor-creditor lawyer, I'm not worried about lack of work in the future.	11/5/2020 11:36 AM
351	Distant clients	11/5/2020 11:35 AM
352	Work from home	11/5/2020 11:35 AM
353	I feel like I have a much better understanding of various technologies, some of which I would want to continue to use beyond the pandemic.	11/5/2020 11:35 AM
354	More online filings/hearings.	11/5/2020 11:32 AM
355	Working from home, and being forced to essentially work part-time.	11/5/2020 11:31 AM
356	My office power bill is lower due to non-use.	11/5/2020 11:30 AM
357	Attending night meetings remotely from home, so don't have to travel home after meeting.	11/5/2020 11:29 AM
358	None	11/5/2020 11:28 AM
359	By appearing for court hearings by zoom, I'm not wasting so much time traveling to/from court and sitting around waiting for my case to be called. I can also appear for court from anywhere where I have a wifi connection to connect to zoom.	11/5/2020 11:27 AM
360	There has been none. Actually strike that- I can wear yoga pant s while I appear in court via Zoom.	11/5/2020 11:26 AM
361	Acceptance of working remotely.	11/5/2020 11:24 AM
362	New ways to meet with clients	11/5/2020 11:23 AM
363	No commuting to an office.	11/5/2020 11:23 AM
364	I can appear by phone and Zoom to meetings. Meetings conducted in this fashion tend not to drag on.	11/5/2020 11:23 AM
365	More time: working from home and avoiding the daily commute frees up 3 hours a day.	11/5/2020 11:22 AM
366	Zero	11/5/2020 11:21 AM
367	Spending time with family	11/5/2020 11:20 AM
368	No commute!	11/5/2020 11:18 AM
369	Kindness and good humor by everyone doing the best they can in the face of remote WFH glitches	11/5/2020 11:17 AM
370	I closed my Seattle office to work remotely from my summer home and from Henderson NV. People now accept having hearings and mediations conducted via Zoom or similar so I don't have to travel so much.	11/5/2020 11:17 AM
371	Working remotely	11/5/2020 11:16 AM
72	fewer court dates	11/5/2020 11:15 AM
373	Not having to spend time in the office with my partners.	11/5/2020 11:14 AM
374	expanded understanding of other communication tools	11/5/2020 11:12 AM
375	No interruptions working at home. No on else is here.	11/5/2020 11:10 AM
376	availability and financial flexibility to meet client's needs.	11/5/2020 11:10 AM

377	Working full time from home.	11/5/2020 11:09 AM
378	Less travel, more time to actually practice	11/5/2020 11:09 AM
379	N/A	11/5/2020 11:08 AM
380	No commute time.	11/5/2020 11:08 AM
381	Not having to commute into the office every day and spend a lot of wasted time sitting in traffic.	11/5/2020 11:08 AM
382	Lack of commute time	11/5/2020 11:08 AM
383	remote depositions and hearings.	11/5/2020 11:05 AM
384	None	11/5/2020 11:04 AM
385	Online meetings, hearings, and court appearances take less time than going in person	11/5/2020 11:03 AM
386	Too much work, ability to be more efficient with virtual meetings.	11/5/2020 11:02 AM
387	none	11/5/2020 11:01 AM
388	ability to work remotely	11/5/2020 11:00 AM
389	Less travel time	11/5/2020 10:58 AM
390	Online court	11/5/2020 10:58 AM
391	We've been incredibly busy. Usually we see a summer slow down with people going on vacations, but that did not happen this year.	11/5/2020 10:57 AM
392	Work from home - It REALLY cut expenses for fuel, parking, clothes, eating on the go, less Starbucks More time for family.	11/5/2020 10:56 AM
393	Flexibility to not always be in office	11/5/2020 10:55 AM
394	Zoom for in person support and educational opportunities	11/5/2020 10:55 AM
395	Pierce County continues to evolve as needed with pandemic developments.	11/5/2020 10:52 AM
396	None	11/5/2020 10:51 AM
397	1. Our pool of prospects to join our firm includes more lawyers who are unhappy at other firms or whose firms have encountered financial trouble - our recruiting pool has never been better. 2. We were able to lock in a five-year lease on new space at a very attractive rate, in the same Class A building and at substantially less per office than what we had been paying on a lease from 2015.	11/5/2020 10:45 AM
398	We can survive, but knew it, didn't have to endure this to prove it. Concern of exposure of staff and clients to covid.	11/5/2020 10:45 AM
399	Allowing me to remote fully remotely	11/5/2020 10:44 AM
400	The overall acceptance of remote working and remote meetings.	11/5/2020 10:44 AM
401	Flexibility to work from anywhere	11/5/2020 10:43 AM
402	Increased use of virtual conferencing	11/5/2020 10:40 AM
403	None really. We are just operating in the same fashion but we are having a great deal of difficulty in dealing with the Courts. They seem to have real problems.	11/5/2020 10:38 AM
404	No advantage to my practice per se, but it does demonstrate that the Firm possibly does not need to have office space in the downtown core.	11/5/2020 10:38 AM
405	remote depositions and hearingsmuch easier to schedule than non remote.	11/5/2020 10:37 AM
406	No in person meetings.	11/5/2020 10:36 AM
407	Travel costs lowered, which benefits clients and gives us more time.	11/5/2020 10:34 AM
408	Accelerated remote work capabilities and clients' acceptance of remote work arrangements.	11/5/2020 10:33 AM

409 410 411 412	At home none	11/5/2020 10:31 AM 11/5/2020 10:30 AM
411		11/5/2020 10:30 AM
412	Virtual court hearing time savings are passed on to client	11/5/2020 10:30 AM
	Greater ability to interact remotely due to covid-specific changes in office policy.	11/5/2020 10:29 AM
413	None	11/5/2020 10:28 AM
414	Not having to appear in court and sit and wait twirling my thumbs. LOVE telephonic appearances	11/5/2020 10:24 AM
415	We were just about paperless before this so this allowed us all to work from home very easily	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
416	more confirmation to leave this state	11/5/2020 10:20 AM
417	My mental health is somewhat better, since I don't have a long commute and I can take a break after a complex case or tense meeting.	11/5/2020 10:18 AM
418	Demand for estate planning services	11/5/2020 10:17 AM
419	Lots of new work, more convenience in working from home	11/5/2020 10:16 AM
420	Business cost savings.	11/5/2020 10:16 AM
421	Remote working	11/5/2020 10:15 AM
422	None.	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
423	Telework, even for oral argument, eliminates 3 hours daily of commuting.	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
424	Government mandates. The harder the lockdowns, the more business.	11/5/2020 10:14 AM
425	We are set up for remote work.	11/5/2020 10:12 AM
426	Being able to "blame" the pandemic on not being able to meet with certain clients or attorneys in-person.	11/5/2020 10:12 AM
427	Online/cloud computing	11/5/2020 10:05 AM
428	I've worked with clients remotely for a long time, so the difference is not that great.	11/5/2020 10:05 AM
429	Avoiding the terrible commute due to the West Seattle bridge problems.	11/5/2020 10:00 AM
430	None	11/5/2020 9:58 AM
431	Working from home	11/5/2020 9:57 AM
432	As a new attorney, I like that I have been able to observe more depositions, mediations, motions hearings, and trials at home. It's been a great learning opportunity to watch how people practice from my living room. I also like that I don't have a commute and can work more flexible hours.	11/5/2020 9:55 AM
433	Seriously?	11/5/2020 9:51 AM
434	none	11/5/2020 9:49 AM
435	The expansion of electronic capabilities for work.	11/5/2020 9:46 AM
436	I like not commuting, having the clients not have to commute. I also think some of the current court procedures save money for my clients, by me being able to remotely submit orders, rather than having to appear in person.	11/5/2020 9:42 AM
437	I think my clients like the online meetings, my office is in W Seattle so with the bridge closed, it is very difficult for many people to get to my office now.	11/3/2020 4:10 PM
438	Paperless technology	11/2/2020 11:53 AM



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Attorney-Active	93.00%	558
Attorney-Emeritus Pro Bono	0.83%	5
Attorney-Honorary	0.00%	0
Foreign Law Consultant	0.00%	0
Judicial	0.17%	1
LLLT-Active	0.67%	4
LPO-Active	0.33%	2
House Counsel	2.00%	12
Other	3.00%	18
TOTAL		600



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Employed, full-time	77.70%	460
Employed, part-time, not attributable to COVID	9.29%	55
Employed, part-time, as a result of COVID	6.42%	38
Unemployed but not attributable to COVID	2.87%	17
Unemployed as a result of COVID	3.72%	22
TOTAL		592

Q13 Current Employment Status. Please check one:



Q14 Primary Practice Area. Please check one:







ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Administrative	1.52%	9
Agricultural	0.34%	2
Animal Law	0.17%	1
Antitrust	0.00%	0
Appellate	0.84%	5
Aviation	0.00%	0
Banking	0.00%	0
Bankruptcy	1.69%	10
Business-Commercial	4.72%	28
Cannabis	0.17%	1
Civil Litigation	6.91%	41
Civil Rights	0.34%	2
Collections	0.84%	5
Communications	0.34%	2
Constitutional	0.00%	0
Construction	0.67%	4
Consumer	0.17%	1
Contracts	0.67%	4
Corporate	1.35%	8
Criminal	9.44%	56
Debtor-Creditor	0.34%	2
Disability	0.51%	3
Dispute Resolution	1.18%	7
Education	0.17%	1
Elder	1.35%	8
Employment	3.04%	18
Entertainment	0.17%	1
Environmental	0.51%	3
Estate-Probate	6.24%	37
Family	10.96%	65
Foreclosure	0.34%	2
General	1.18%	7
		LM-157

Government	6.24%	37
Guardianships	1.01%	6
Health	1.52%	9
Housing	0.34%	2
Human Rights	0.00%	0
Immigration	1.85%	11
Indian	1.35%	8
Insurance	1.01%	6
Intellectual Property	1.69%	10
International	0.17%	1
Judicial Officer	0.51%	3
Juvenile	0.67%	4
Labor	0.67%	4
Landlord-Tenant	1.35%	8
Land Use	0.34%	2
Legal Ethics	0.34%	2
Legal Research	0.34%	2
Legislation	0.84%	5
LGBTQ	0.00%	0
Litigation	3.04%	18
Lobbying	0.00%	0
Malpractice	0.34%	2
Maritime	0.34%	2
Military	0.17%	1
Municipal	1.01%	6
Non-profit	0.67%	4
Oil-Gas-Energy	0.17%	1
Patent	0.51%	3
Personal Injury	4.05%	24
Real Property	4.05%	24
Real Prop-Land Use	0.67%	4
Securities	0.17%	1
Sports	0.00%	0
Subrogation	0.00%	LM-158

Tax	1.18%	7
Torts	0.84%	5
Traffic Offenses	0.00%	0
Works Comp	1.52%	9
Other	2.70%	16
N/A	2.19%	13
TOTAL		593



Q15 Secondary Practice Area. Please check all that apply:







ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Administrative	6.63%	32
Agricultural	0.62%	3
Animal Law	1.04%	5
Antitrust	0.83%	4
Appellate	4.14%	20
Aviation	0.00%	0
Banking	0.00%	0
Bankruptcy	2.07%	10
Business-Commercial	8.07%	39
Cannabis	0.83%	4
Civil Litigation	9.73%	47
Civil Rights	2.69%	13
Collections	1.24%	6
Communications	0.83%	4
Constitutional	1.66%	8
Construction	2.28%	11
Consumer	1.45%	7
Contracts	5.80%	28
Corporate	3.93%	19
Criminal	5.18%	25
Debtor-Creditor	1.86%	9
Disability	1.45%	7
Dispute Resolution	1.45%	7
Education	1.45%	7
Elder	2.69%	13
Employment	4.76%	23
Entertainment	0.41%	2
Environmental	1.86%	9
Estate-Probate	11.80%	57
Family	5.80%	28
Foreclosure	0.83%	4
General	1.86%	9
		LM-164

Government	5.18%	25
Guardianships	2.28%	11
Health	1.86%	9
Housing	0.83%	4
Human Rights	1.04%	5
Immigration	1.04%	5
Indian	1.04%	5
Insurance	1.86%	9
Intellectual Property	2.69%	13
International	0.41%	2
Judicial Officer	1.04%	5
Juvenile	1.86%	9
Labor	1.66%	8
Landlord-Tenant	1.86%	9
Land Use	1.66%	8
Legal Ethics	0.62%	3
Legal Research	1.45%	7
Legislation	1.45%	7
LGBTQ	0.41%	2
Litigation	4.76%	23
Lobbying	0.41%	2
Malpractice	1.04%	5
Maritime	0.62%	3
Military	0.21%	1
Municipal	1.66%	8
Non-profit	2.28%	11
Oil-Gas-Energy	0.00%	0
Patent	0.21%	1
Personal Injury	5.38%	26
Real Property	8.28%	40
Real Prop-Land Use	1.04%	5
Securities	0.62%	3
Sports	0.00%	0
Subrogation	0.21%	LM-165 ¹

Тах	1.04%	5
Torts	2.07%	10
Traffic Offenses	0.83%	4
Works Comp	0.83%	4
Other	3.73%	18
N/A	7.87%	38
Total Respondents: 483		



Q16 Where You Practice. Please Check all that apply:

Kittitas





ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Adams	3.13%	18
Asotin	2.26%	13
Benton	3.65%	21
Chelan	3.47%	20
Clallam	2.95%	17
Clark	7.81%	45
Columbia	1.91%	11
Cowlitz	4.86%	28
Douglas	2.60%	15
Ferry	1.91%	11
Franklin	3.30%	19
Garfield	1.74%	10
Grant	4.34%	25
Grays Harbor	6.08%	35
Island	4.86%	28
Jefferson	3.13%	18
King	56.94%	328
Kitsap	9.55%	55
Kittitas	3.65%	21
Klickitat	2.26%	13
Lewis	4.69%	27
Lincoln	2.43%	14
Mason	4.51%	26
Okanogan	2.43%	14
Pacific	2.78%	16
Pend Oreille	1.74%	10
Pierce	17.71%	102
San Juan	3.13%	18
Skagit	6.94%	40
Skamania	2.26%	13
Snohomish	21.35%	123
Spokane	10.59%	61

Stevens Thurston	3.65% 14.06%	21 81
Wahkiakum	1.56%	9
Walla Walla	3.30%	19
Whatcom	7.12%	41
Whitman	2.95%	17
Yakima	6.08%	35
Out of State	11.63%	67
Outside the USA	1.39%	8
Total Respondents: 576		



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Bank	0.00%	0
Escrow Company	0.17%	1
Government	13.25%	77
In-house Counsel	4.65%	27
Non-profit	4.82%	28
Title Company	0.34%	2
Other	4.48%	26
Solo	30.46%	177
Solo Shared Office	6.54%	38
2-5 Members	18.76%	109
6-10 Members	5.68%	33
11-20 Members	4.48%	26
21-35 Members	3.27%	19
36-50 Members	1.03%	6
51-100 Members	2.41%	14
100+ Members	4.65%	27
Total Respondents: 581		

Q18 If you work with individual clients, please select the income group that best applies to most of your clients:



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Annual income is below \$25,520 (low income)	10.59%	59
Annual income is between \$25,521-\$51,040 (moderate means)	13.64%	76
Annual income is above \$51,041	38.24%	213
Not applicable	37.52%	209
TOTAL		557



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Under 6	14.72%	87
6-10	14.21%	84
11-15	11.68%	69
16-20	11.17%	66
21-25	11.34%	67
26-30	9.98%	59
31-35	6.94%	41
36-40	9.48%	56
41 and over	10.49%	62
TOTAL		591



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Female	53.07%	311
Male	40.10%	235
Non-binary	0.68%	4
Transgender	0.17%	1
Two-Spirit	0.68%	4
Prefer not to disclose	5.63%	33
Not listed (please specify)	1.37%	8
Total Respondents: 586		

#	NOT LISTED (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	human	11/19/2020 5:10 PM
2	(note on question 19 you have excluded several answers. my answer is 10.1, which is not in the range of 1-10 nor 11-15, which makes your data inaccurate.	11/19/2020 4:24 PM
3	I don't believe that this question is relevant to this survey.	11/19/2020 1:07 PM
4	cis-male	11/19/2020 6:28 AM
5	There are 2 genders. What is this?	11/5/2020 8:11 PM
6	None of your business	11/5/2020 4:19 PM
7	Skylarian; it's the third planet orbiting the star Polaris	11/5/2020 2:15 PM
8	There is only Male and Female. Thank you	11/5/2020 10:14 AM



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Asexual	1.25%	7
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Pansexual, or Queer	7.31%	41
Heterosexual	76.11%	427
Two-spirit	0.53%	3
Prefer not to disclose	13.55%	76
Not listed (please specify)	2.14%	12
Total Respondents: 561		

#	NOT LISTED (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Why do you care? I find this question offensive	12/2/2020 10:09 PM
2	Only in washington would you present all these options. Gender is what you have. Not what you want to have but don't	12/2/2020 4:05 PM
3	This is an offensive question. It is not relevant and should not be included.	11/20/2020 1:47 PM
4	human	11/19/2020 5:10 PM
5	I don't believe that this question is relevant to this survey.	11/19/2020 1:07 PM
6	Other	11/19/2020 11:52 AM
7	Why do you need to know?	11/18/2020 7:16 PM
8	This is disgusting that the WSBA would put this as an option. What does someone's sexuality have to do with being a lawyer?	11/11/2020 8:37 AM
9	None of your business	11/5/2020 4:19 PM
10	Octavian. People from the Planet Syklar must mate in groups of 8	11/5/2020 2:15 PM
11	Why is this even a question. It's no-one's business but my own.	11/5/2020 12:23 PM
12	As by God's design	11/5/2020 10:14 AM



Q22 Race/Ethnicity Identity. Please check all that apply:

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
American Indian, Native American, or Alaskan Native	1.22%	7
Asian - Central Asian	0.17%	1
Asian - East Asian	3.32%	19
Asian - South Asian	1.22%	7
Asian - Southeast Asian	0.87%	5
Black, African American, or African Descent	1.75%	10
Hispanic/Latinx	3.50%	20
Middle Eastern Descent	1.40%	8
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	0.70%	4
White or European Descent	78.50%	449
Multi-Racial or Bi-Racial	3.15%	18
Prefer not to disclose	10.66%	61
Not listed (please specify)	1.75%	10
Total Despondents: 572		

Total Respondents: 572

#	NOT LISTED (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	You do realize don't you that actual Mexicans think the whole latinx, etc., thing is stupid? To them, it is just a pronoun. Here, it is a chance to value display.	12/2/2020 4:05 PM
2	White - Scandinavian descent	11/20/2020 1:47 PM
3	I don't believe that this question is relevant to this survey.	11/19/2020 1:07 PM
4	Icelandic romanian	11/9/2020 4:08 PM
5	None of your business	11/5/2020 4:19 PM
6	On Skylar we have approximately 20 different "colors" I'm plaid	11/5/2020 2:15 PM
7	American.	11/5/2020 12:16 PM
8	Mixture of white or european descent and Jewish	11/5/2020 12:07 PM
9	Basque	11/5/2020 11:09 AM
10	Born in The United States Of America	11/5/2020 10:14 AM