

Amy Malone
1213 Whatcom St Apt 114
Bellingham WA 98229
(360) 441-7871
ladyamyt@wolverlass.com

April 30, 2021

Justices of the Washington State Supreme Court
P.O. Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504 Supreme@courts.wa.gov

Re: Washington Supreme Court Vote to Sunset the LLLT License

Dear Justices:

I am writing to express my disagreement and disappointment in the decision to continue moving forward with the sunseting of the Limited License Legal Technician program. This is an extremely needed and valuable service that LLLT's provide Washington citizens. And to close it to further entrants hurts some of our most underserved populations.

I am a 41-year-old disabled single mother of a 9-year-old. I enrolled in the Paralegal Program at Whatcom Community College in 2017 and graduated with my Paralegal Certificate in 2019. I immediately started looking for work and in the interim I volunteered as the Campaign Manager for Joy Gilfillan's bid for Whatcom County Sheriff in 2019. The Covid-19 pandemic struck a few months after the campaign ended and the job prospects dried up. So, I decided to expand my education and career options and enrolled in the LLLT program at WCC.

While at WCC getting my paralegal certificate, I volunteered for the Street Law Program run by Law Advocates and staffed by Nancy Ivarinen. The diversity of the clients and their diverse legal needs surprised me. Combined with the knowledge about the criminal justice system and it's need for reform and the need for civil legal assistance I began to see a bigger picture taking shape. Our legal system is expensive, slow and overwhelming. The average person can neither comprehend all their rights and how to protect them nor do they have the money to hire someone to help them. And after watching the annual meeting between you and the LLLT Board and seeing the results of the Stanford White Paper: The Surprising Success of Washington's Limited License Legal Technician Program, I am even more convinced than ever that LLLT's are sorely needed.

That paper was so profound to me that I feel a need to remind you of what it said.

- 1) "LLLTs provided legal services to many Washingtonians who would have otherwise proceeded without representation in their family law cases. In family law court, cost "is the most consistently referenced motivation for proceeding without an attorney." – This shows that LLLT's are not taking work away from attorneys.
- 2) "LLLTs provided expanded legal services to traditionally underserved communities, including Washington's immigrant communities." – This is one of the core reasons this program was developed in the first place.
- 3) "LLLTs allowed for more efficient proceedings and better decision-making for family law judges and commissioners by reducing procedural errors, submitting high-quality work product, and preparing clients to present their cases effectively." – This shows that the education LLLT's are receiving is thorough and effectual. LLLT's are able to effectively advise, support and prepare our clients for court.
- 4) "LLLTs obtained improved legal outcomes for moderate means clients and empowered clients to feel confident in the courtroom" – Again, this shows that LLLT's are providing a valuable and effective service to our clients.
- 5) "Adding LLLTs allowed lawyers to expand their practice by capturing a previously untapped market. Lawyers who hired LLLTs report that the relationship between LLLTs and attorneys at the firm is "absolutely symbiotic" with LLLTs providing services to clients the firm would have otherwise turned away and attorneys assisting LLLTs in matters that fall outside of LLLT scope of practice." – This shows again, that LLLT's are not taking work from lawyers. We are bringing clients into firms and helping to expand legal practices, and serving more clients.

Of course, there is more, and those were the main points, but you have the report and I hope you have read it and reread it and really let all the information sink in. LLLT's are not the enemy. We are not un-skilled wannabe lawyers. We are a passionate, highly educated and hard-working bunch who want to serve our clients to the best of our ability.

Justices, you made your decision to sunset the LLLT program without sufficient data. "The National Center on State Courts was in the middle of a full-scale evaluation at the time of sunseting, but the sunseting decision brought the evaluation to a halt." What additional information could be acquired if that evaluation could be completed? I believe that based on the findings of the Stanford Paper, that the NCSC findings would enhance and bolster what has already been discovered.

Justices, the Washington LLLT program has inspired 18 states and Canadian provinces to create programs and expand access to justice. They saw what we have and thought "Wow, what a great idea. Let's do that too." But with the sunseting of the program we are regressing. We, you, were leaders. Don't throw that away now. Please, LLLT's are needed. There will always be clients aplenty for everyone. Access to justice needs more tools, not less. Please re-open the program. Allow the NCSC to complete their evaluation. You will not be disappointed that you did.

With Respect,
Amy Malone
LLLT Student

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Linford, Tera](#)
Subject: FW: In Support of the LLLT Program
Date: Friday, April 30, 2021 11:50:32 AM
Attachments: [Supreme Court LLLT Letter.pdf](#)

From: Amy Malone [mailto:ladyamyt@wolverlass.com]
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2021 11:49 AM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: In Support of the LLLT Program

External Email Warning! This email has originated from outside of the Washington State Courts Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, are expecting the email, and know the content is safe. If a link sends you to a website where you are asked to validate using your Account and Password, **DO NOT DO SO!** Instead, report the incident.

Dear Justices:

I am writing to express my disagreement and disappointment in the decision to continue moving forward with the sunseting of the Limited License Legal Technician program. This is an extremely needed and valuable service that LLLT's provide Washington citizens. And to close it to further entrants hurts some of our most underserved populations.

I am a 41-year-old disabled single mother of a 9-year-old. I enrolled in the Paralegal Program at Whatcom Community College in 2017 and graduated with my Paralegal Certificate in 2019. I immediately started looking for work and in the interim I volunteered as the Campaign Manager for Joy Gilfillan's bid for Whatcom County Sheriff in 2019. The Covid-19 pandemic struck a few months after the campaign ended and the job prospects dried up. So, I decided to expand my education and career options and enrolled in the LLLT program at WCC.

While at WCC getting my paralegal certificate, I volunteered for the Street Law Program run by Law Advocates and staffed by Nancy Ivarinen. The diversity of the clients and their diverse legal needs surprised me. Combined with the knowledge about the criminal justice system and it's need for reform and the need for civil legal assistance I began to see a bigger picture taking shape. Our legal system is expensive, slow and overwhelming. The average person can neither comprehend all their rights and how to protect them nor do they have the money to hire someone to help them. And after watching the annual meeting between you and the LLLT Board and seeing the results of the Stanford White Paper: The Surprising Success of Washington's Limited License Legal Technician Program, I am even more convinced than ever that LLLT's are sorely needed.

That paper was so profound to me that I feel a need to remind you of what it said.

1. "LLTs provided legal services to many Washingtonians who would have otherwise proceeded without representation in their family law cases. In family law court, cost "is the most consistently referenced motivation for proceeding without an attorney." – This shows that LLTs are not taking work away from attorneys.
2. "LLTs provided expanded legal services to traditionally underserved communities, including Washington's immigrant communities." – This is one of the core reasons this program was developed in the first place.
3. "LLTs allowed for more efficient proceedings and better decision-making for family law judges and commissioners by reducing procedural errors, submitting high-quality work product, and preparing clients to present their cases effectively." – This shows that the education LLTs are receiving is thorough and effectual. LLTs are able to effectively advise, support and prepare our clients for court.
4. "LLTs obtained improved legal outcomes for moderate means clients and empowered clients to feel confident in the courtroom" – Again, this shows that LLTs are providing a valuable and effective service to our clients.
5. "Adding LLTs allowed lawyers to expand their practice by capturing a previously untapped market. Lawyers who hired LLTs report that the relationship between LLTs and attorneys at the firm is "absolutely symbiotic" with LLTs providing services to clients the firm would have otherwise turned away and attorneys assisting LLTs in matters that fall outside of LLT scope of practice." – This shows again, that LLTs are not taking work from lawyers. We are bringing clients into firms and helping to expand legal practices, and serving more clients.

Of course, there is more, and those were the main points, but you have the report and I hope you have read it and reread it and really let all the information sink in. LLTs are not the enemy. We are not un-skilled wannabe lawyers. We are a passionate, highly educated and hard-working bunch who want to serve our clients to the best of our ability.

Justices, you made your decision to sunset the LLT program without sufficient data. "The National Center on State Courts was in the middle of a full-scale evaluation at the time of sunset, but the sunset decision brought the evaluation to a halt." What additional information could be acquired if that evaluation could be completed? I believe that based on the findings of the Stanford Paper, that the NCSC findings would enhance and bolster what has already been discovered.

Justices, the Washington LLT program has inspired 18 states and Canadian provinces to create programs and expand access to justice. They saw what we have and thought "Wow, what a great idea. Let's do that too." But with the sunset of the program we are regressing. We, you, were leaders. Don't throw that away now. Please, LLTs are needed. There will always be clients aplenty for everyone. Access to justice needs more tools, not less. Please re-open the program. Allow the NCSC to complete their evaluation. You will not be disappointed that you did.

With Respect,
Amy Malone
LLLT Student