

**From:** [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)  
**To:** [Tracy, Mary](#); [Linford, Tera](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Mandatory insurance zombie again  
**Date:** Monday, August 17, 2020 9:30:51 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Ronald Santi [<mailto:r.j.santi@comcast.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, August 16, 2020 8:14 AM  
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>  
Subject: Mandatory insurance zombie again

Dear Justices:

Hundreds of our members expressed opposition to the prior proposal. Yet some narrow interests keep trotting out the zombie. Insurance in the conventional market would be a big hardship for those like me who are not really engaged in the private practice of law but who are in house counsel for family real estate landlord tenant issues. No one has made the case for the necessity or equitability of mandatory insurance unless there are sensible exemptions for those on the periphery.

If mandatory coverage is imposed then why not offer a pool of coverage whereby the Bar would charge a nominal fee of say \$50 per member who would be covered by the pool. It would generate over \$1.75 million for buying pooled coverage. This is much fairer than throwing members into the predatory commercial market, especially for those who have never had a disciplinary issue. How much coverage could the Bar buy for \$1.75 million a year. Why emulate Idaho in any respect. My hope is to die with an active license. Having to throw away \$2000-3000 would be prohibitive. This is a remedy in search of a problem, pushed by a self serving few. So please consider the hardship for those on the margins who pay thousands in CLE fees and license fees.

— Ron Santi  
#8817

Sent from my iPad