

**Tracy, Mary**

---

**From:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK  
**Sent:** Friday, September 7, 2018 2:42 PM  
**To:** Hinchcliffe, Shannon  
**Cc:** Jennings, Cindy; Tracy, Mary  
**Subject:** FW: Do Not Expand the LLLT Program

**From:** Dayna Ducey [mailto:dayna.ducey@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 7, 2018 2:40 PM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>  
**Subject:** re: Do Not Expand the LLLT Program

Good Afternoon,

As a WSBA attorney (who previously practiced in Canada), I have serious concerns about the proposed expansions to the LLLT program (and the LLLT program as a whole).

I am a family law attorney and executive committee member of the Low Bono Section. Along with the majority of family law attorneys in the state, I am disappointed that unqualified practitioners are being invited to assist the most vulnerable of populations. Family law practitioners are so frustrated that many of them are distancing themselves from the WSBA. In fact, some 500 family law attorneys joined the non-WSBA affiliated and *attorney only* DRAW group (Domestic Relations Attorneys of Washington).

WSBA's website says, "The Washington Supreme Court directed the WSBA to develop and administer the LLLT license as part of the effort to make legal services more available for people with low or moderate incomes." What low bono attorneys are seeing is that many LLLTs charge close to (or more!) than what we as low bono *attorneys* charge.

I'm concerned that we are supporting LLLTs *to the detriment of new and young lawyers*. As a young attorney, I know of many peers (attorneys) who are struggling to find employment. All while they must pay off student debt. We should be supporting young attorneys, not unqualified LLLTs. It is also frustrating that attorneys are paying for the LLLT program.

I urge you to think of the clients who are being poorly served by unqualified LLLTs. Family law is not an area to be dabbled in by inexperienced, unqualified non-lawyers.

Dayna Ducey  
51533