

**REPORT TO THE  
UTAH STATE BAR COMMISSION  
OF THE  
COMMISSION TASK FORCE  
ON THE DELIVERY OF LEGAL SERVICES**

**JULY 2003**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vision and Mission of the Utah State Bar.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Introduction and Background .....	1
Creation of the Task Force.....	1
Mission of the Task Force .....	2
Task Force Membership.....	2
Task Force Proceedings .....	2
Other Developments.....	3
Observations and Findings.....	5
Recommendations.....	9
Conclusion .....	13
Resources Consulted .....	14
Appendix	
Qualitative Research Analysis, September 2002	
Materials provided by Prof. Linda Smith	
Agreement between Bar Commission and Utah Rep. Urquhart	
Model rules facilitating unbundled legal services	
Task Force Matrix	

## **VISION AND MISSION OF THE UTAH STATE BAR**

The vision of the Utah State Bar is to lead society in the creation of a justice system that is understood, valued, respected and accessible to all.

The Bar's mission is to represent lawyers in Utah and to serve the public and the legal profession by promoting justice, professional excellence, civility, ethics, respect for and understanding of the law.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Utah State Bar Commission created the Task Force on the Delivery of Legal Services for several reasons, including a desire to better understand the nature, scope and extent of any unmet need for legal services by the middle class. The Task Force consisted of six members of the Commission and a representative from the Bar's Legal Assistants Division. The Task Force met on a number of occasions, studied national research, and identified and explored various proposals for improving access to legal services. In addition, by conducting its own focus group research, the Task Force listened directly to middle-income Utah residents about their perceptions of their needs and ability to obtain legal services.

The Task Force concluded that there is a significant unmet need among middle-income Utahns. The Task Force also evaluated various proposals according to how effectively they would satisfy client needs as identified by the focus group research. Those needs fall into three basic categories: (1) a desire for more information about the law and legal services, including how to find the right attorney and how to manage the attorney-client relationship; (2) a desire for more control over the legal services provided, including the overall cost; and (3) a need to overcome a general distrust of lawyers and the legal system.

After further assessing the feasibility of various proposals, the Task Force arrived at several priority recommendations. Those recommendations include:

- create a well-publicized and easily navigated website to serve as a gateway for the public for obtaining credible and useful information about Utah law and legal resources;
- improve the Bar's Lawyer Referral Service by integrating it with the public website and creating a mechanism for better matching of attorneys and clients;
- increase public outreach efforts that involve individual attorneys in programs that educate the community about the rule of law, legal issues, and the role of lawyers in the legal system;
- seek amendments to court rules to better enable lawyers to provide unbundled services, pro se assistance, or limited representation;

- raise awareness among lawyers of methods of responsibly and economically providing unbundled or limited legal services; and
- educate lawyers about the results of the focus group research to encourage them to market their services and manage their practices to better satisfy the needs of middle-income clients.

By acting on these recommendations, the Utah State Bar can make a significant positive difference in the accessibility of legal services to middle-income Utahns. Improving such access will constitute a major step forward in building public trust and confidence in the legal profession and the courts.

## **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

### **Creation of the Task Force**

The Board of Bar Commissioners of the Utah State Bar formed the Task Force on the Delivery of Legal Services in July 2002 based upon a recommendation of an ad hoc committee formed following the Commission's May 2002 retreat. The decision to form the committee,<sup>1</sup> and later the Task Force, grew out of:

- two of the five core objectives of the Bar as set forth in its mission statement, which are "to facilitate the delivery of legal services," and "to lead in the improvement of the justice system."
- a desire to better understand the nature, scope and extent of any unmet need for legal services among the middle class;
- recognition that the perception that significant unmet need exists is harmful to both the Bar and the public;
- recognition that the Utah Supreme Court's Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services would issue a report that may include recommendations for the Bar and a desire to be prepared for any such recommendations.

### **Mission of the Task Force**

The Bar Commission developed the mission of the Task Force based upon the recommendations of the ad hoc committee. The mission was:

- to analyze the nature, extent, and scope of any unmet need for legal services in Utah, focusing upon the middle-class;
- report the Task Force's findings to the Bar Commission and make recommendations as to how the Bar might address any unmet need that may be found. Based upon a recommendation of the ad hoc committee, the Commission requested the Task Force to focus specifically on the

---

<sup>1</sup>The ad hoc committee consisted of Debra Moore as Chair, Commissioners Nanci Bockelie, George Daines, and Randy Kester, all of whom were appointed by the President of the Bar, John Adams.

feasibility of a Bar website that would serve as a clearinghouse of information on legal services for the public.

### **Task Force Membership**

Based upon the recommendations of the ad hoc committee, the Bar Commission appointed Debra Moore as Chair of the Task Force and the Chair appointed the remaining members, who were: Bar Executive Director John Baldwin and Commissioners D'Arcy Dixon Pignanelli (public member), David Bird, Nanci Bockelie, and George Daines. In September, Deborah Category, a representative from the Legal Assistants Division, joined the Task Force.

### **Task Force Proceedings**

The Task Force met on more than ten occasions, usually in several hour sessions. The Task Force immediately determined that there was a critical need to hear directly from middle-income Utahns about their perceptions of their access to legal services. Accordingly, the Task Force sought and received Bar Commission approval to engage an independent research firm to conduct five focus group sessions around the state. In September 2002, Dan Jones & Associates facilitated two focus group sessions in Salt Lake City, and one each in St. George, Provo, and Odgen. The research findings are contained in a Qualitative Research Analysis that was provided to the Bar Commission by Dan Jones & Associates, and which is included in the Appendix to this Report.

The Task Force gathered some national legal needs research studies which are noted in the Resources Consulted section of this Report. It also canvassed various other bar association, court, private on-line, and other programs for delivery of personal legal services. In August 2002, Debra Moore and John Baldwin attended a workshop on "Models for Delivery of High-Volume Personal Legal Services" presented by the National Conference of Bar Presidents in Washington, D.C. In October 2002, Nanci Bockelie and George Daines traveled to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to attend an ABA Workshop on Lawyer Referral and Information Services. Nanci Bockelie also traveled to Portland, Oregon to attend the Equal Access to Justice Workshop co-sponsored by the ABA and the National Legal Aid and Defender Association in April 2003.

Linda Smith, law professor at the S.J. Quinney College of Law at the University of Utah, attended a Task Force meeting and presented suggestions for improved access by the poor and the middle class. Prof. Smith also informed

the Task Force that she would be conducting a seminar entitled "Community Justice Study" in the Spring of 2003 that would work with west side Salt Lake City neighborhoods to study access issues. Copies of the material Prof. Smith submitted to the Task Force are included in the Appendix.

The Task Force made interim reports to the Commission at its regular meetings from August 2002 through January 2003. On August 30, 2002, President John Adams, John Baldwin, and Debra Moore met with Utah Supreme Court Justice Michael J. Wilkins to inform him, as the Chair of the Court's Committee on the Delivery Services, of the formation and direction of the Task Force.

The Task Force also made presentations to the Bar Leaders' Workshop in October, 2002 and to the Legal Assistants Division in November 2002. A short article was published in the Utah Bar Journal in January 2003. At the request of the Task Force, Bar staff updated and posted on the Bar's website a pamphlet entitled "Lawyers and Fees." In April 2003, Forrest Mosten, author of Unbundled Legal Services (ABA 2002), gave a keynote address at the Mid-Year Meeting in St. George and an article Mosten wrote was submitted to the Utah Bar Journal for publication in the March issue. Also in March, Debra Moore made a presentation to the Southern Utah Bar Association on the Task Force's work.

### **Other Developments**

In September 2002, the Utah Supreme Court's Committee on Delivery of Legal Services issued its final report and recommendations. In December 2002, the Court amended Rule 6(a) of its Rules of Lawyer Discipline and Disability to assert jurisdiction over the unauthorized practice of law by unlicensed persons. This rule change overturned the decision in Utah State Bar v. Petersen, 937 P.2d 1263 (1997), in which the Court had stated that the Legislature governed the unauthorized practice.

In December 2002, Utah Legal Aid received the approval of the Administrative Office of the Courts to begin providing paralegal assistance to self-represented litigants at the Matheson Courthouse. Wayne Riches and Fred Anderson of Utah Legal Services have also voluntarily provided assistance to such litigants for the last several years.

In March 2003, the Utah Legislature enacted Substitute H.B. 349, which narrowly redefines the practice of law as "appearing as an advocate in any criminal proceeding or before any court of record in this state in a

representative capacity on behalf of another person." The Legislature delayed the effective date of the bill until May 2004. The Bar opposed enactment of the bill on the ground that it conflicts with the constitutional power of the Supreme Court to regulate the practice of law and leaves the consumer of legal services without adequate protection. The bill's sponsors, Reps. Steve Urquhart and Greg Curtis, later indicated that they advanced the bill for the sole purpose of focusing attention on the need to make the justice system more affordable and accessible to the middle class. After a series of discussions with the bill's sponsors, the Commission agreed not to seek a veto of the bill and to undertake specific steps and the sponsors agreed to seek to repeal the narrow definition of the practice of law in the next legislative session and to seek the support of their colleagues in the House and Senate leadership. A copy of that agreement is included in the Appendix.

Utah State Senator Greg Bell has recommended creating a process to provide more efficient discovery methods in litigation and has invited the Bar's participation.

Prof. Smith and Prof. James Backman at the J. Reuben Clark Law School at BYU have offered to collaborate with the Bar to present a symposium on delivery of legal services issues.

A subcommittee of the Judicial Council's Public Outreach Committee is studying self-represented litigants, and has requested feedback from the Bar before they complete their work and report to the Public Outreach Committee.

On the national level, the American Bar Association's Task Force on the Model Definition of the Practice of Law has issued its report, which awaits consideration by the House of Delegates in August 2003. The report proposes a broad definition of the practice of law while recommending that "each jurisdiction should determine who may provide services that are included within the jurisdiction's definition of the practice of law and under what circumstances, based upon the potential harm and benefit to the public."

## **OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS**

1. There is a significant unmet need for legal services among middle income Utahns.<sup>2</sup> Qualitative research conducted nationally suggests that over

---

<sup>2</sup>Based on the 2000 U.S. Census, the median annual income of a Utah household in 2000 was \$ 45,230. See Website of University of Richmond Pew

half of those who have civil legal needs will not address those needs through the justice system. There is little, if any, reason to believe that Utah's experience varies significantly from the average national experience in this respect.

2. Common areas of need include family law, housing and real estate transactions, probate and estate (living wills), small claims court, contract review, bankruptcy, personal injury, employment law, and criminal defense.

3. Perceptions about lawyers and legal services among middle income Utahns create barriers to obtaining access to legal services. Those barriers include:

- a. Difficulty estimating legal fees (both as to hourly rates and total out-of-pocket costs for legal matters);
- b. A sense of lack of control over fees and costs once a lawyer is retained;
- c. Generalized distrust of lawyers;
- d. Reluctance to litigate;
- e. Lack of awareness of the preventive value of legal services;
- f. Not knowing how to select a lawyer despite a sense that plenty of lawyers are available;
- g. Uncertainty about the outcome of accessing legal services;
- h. Questionable value for the dollar as a result of few perceived tangible benefits

---

Center on the States at:

[http://www.stateline.org/state\\_header\\_facts.do?headerId=42&stateId=UT](http://www.stateline.org/state_header_facts.do?headerId=42&stateId=UT). The focus group participants in the research conducted by Dan Jones & Associates included residents with annual household incomes of between \$ 20,000 and \$ 60,000.

4. The above barriers fall into three broad categories: (1) a desire for more information about the law and legal services, including how to find the right attorney and how to manage the attorney-client relationship; (2) a desire for more control over the legal services provided, including the overall cost; and (3) a need to overcome a general distrust of lawyers and the legal system.

5. In particular, the consumers' inability to select the "right" lawyer for their problems and circumstances and a fear of uncontrollable costs create unmet need. Actual inability to afford legal services is also clearly a significant barrier, especially in litigation matters that lawyers do not typically accept on a contingent fee basis and for which no right to appointed counsel exists, such as non-felony criminal defense; claims for equitable relief; personal injury or property damages claims that are minor, weak, or costly to litigate; etc.

6. The number of self-represented litigants has been increasing even among those who are able to afford representation by an attorney. This increase is caused, at least in part, by some of the barriers noted above. Because most self-represented litigants lack even basic knowledge about the judicial system, they create substantial burdens on the courts. Providing assistance to self-represented litigants may increase the burden on the courts by encouraging more parties to represent themselves. However, such assistance may also help consumers overcome some of the barriers to obtaining more comprehensive advice and representation, resulting in a net decrease in the burden and more effective service to the consumer.

7. The lawyer advertising and marketing seen and heard by most middle-income Utahns does not assist them in overcoming the barriers noted above, and in fact sometimes exacerbates those barriers by increasing distrust of the profession.

8. Utah consumers express a strong desire for more information about their basic legal rights and the legal system that is not satisfied by most current lawyer advertising or any other existing source.

9. Although many Utah lawyers in private practice provide brief free consultations, most do not advertise such services to the public because they generally find that brief consultations are not a cost-effective method of obtaining legal work.

10. Although much legal information is available through the internet, obtaining trustworthy information is difficult and time-consuming for a lay

person. No single comprehensive source of information tailored to the specific needs of Utah citizens is available. Technological advances, such as website development, provide the Bar with cost-effective opportunities to create such a source and eliminate or reduce the barriers to obtaining legal assistance identified above. Although providing generalized legal information on the internet entails some risk of misleading consumers, two things offset that risk: first, consumers will be better informed than if they had no reliable resource at all; and second, the site can contain disclaimers and conspicuous encouragement to contact an attorney when appropriate. Pages can also be dated to inform consumers of how up to date the material is. Several Bar sections and committees have already developed helpful consumer resources and made them available on their websites, but there is currently no effective means to connect the public to those resources. At the Task Force's request, Bar staff reserved several URL's for use for a public website.

11. Middle-income Utahns prefer to obtain legal services from licensed attorneys, but may accept services from other providers as long as they are also licensed and are closely supervised by licensed attorneys.

12. The Bar's Lawyer Referral Service program is underutilized by lawyers and consumers. Many lawyers do not use the program because, as noted above, they do not find brief consultation services to be a cost-effective method of obtaining legal work. Better screening of referral requests would improve lawyer participation. Many consumers do not use the service because they are not generally aware of the service and because the service is ineffective in helping them select the right attorney for their particular needs. More individualized matching would improve consumer participation. Better participation by lawyers and consumers would justify allocating more resources to publicizing the program to consumers.

Some improvement can be achieved at minimal cost by automating the program on the Bar's website and incorporating additional criteria such as the lawyer's geographic location; the lawyer's experience level in the type of matter being referred; the range in which the lawyer's customary hourly fee falls and whether that fee is negotiable; whether the lawyer is willing to unbundle services, negotiate a flat fee, or follow a reduced fee schedule; whether the lawyer has experience in collaborative law, mediation, or other alternative dispute resolution methods; etc. Making the service available as part of a public information website would further enhance the effectiveness of the service by providing consumers with appropriate tools to assess their need for legal services. However, adequate improvement of the lawyer referral service

may require the use of trained screening personnel at a substantial up front cost to the Bar. The Bar's pro bono coordinator may be able to serve a role in this program. The Bar may or may not be able to recoup costs through fees charged to lawyers who receive referrals.

13. Bar staff has already begun to automate the referral service, but needs further guidance from the Commission to establish policies concerning the appropriate screening and matching criteria and to ensure that the service is user-friendly for both lawyers and consumers. In addition, Commission guidance is needed to determine how to integrate the referral service with the "Enhanced Web Listing Service" that for a small fee allows Bar members to list practice areas and biographical information on the Bar's website and to include a link to the member's own website.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Bar should take the following actions to reduce or eliminate the barriers noted above to obtaining legal services. These recommendations are listed in the order of priority based on the Task Force's assessment of their feasibility and effectiveness in overcoming the barriers to obtaining legal services as identified through the focus group research and other available studies.

1. Website. The Bar should improve the public pages on its website to create an information clearinghouse tailored to meet the needs of the individual consumer of personal legal services as those needs have been identified in the focus group research and other studies. Some legal service providers are already doing this successfully. The Bar can use their experience to improve our product and lower our costs. A list of some of the better websites is included in the Resources Consulted section of this Report. The website should be well-publicized by low cost methods such as search engine listings; links to other public information websites; notices posted at all courthouses; and flyers at selected distribution points such as court clerks' offices, public libraries, law libraries, title companies, licensing boards, community centers and other public information centers. The website should include:

- a. guidance on how to select an attorney, what to expect from an attorney, generalized information on the cost of legal services, and how to handle problems with an attorney;
- b. information about self-representation (including how consumers can determine whether self-representation is the right course for them), alternative dispute resolution, unbundled services, limited representation, prepaid legal services, and other alternatives to traditional full representation by an attorney;
- c. modules consisting of basic, Utah-specific information in the areas of the law that are the most commonly needed by the individual consumer;
- d. links to other helpful on-line resources such as the websites of the Community Legal Center, the Utah State Courts, the Small Business Administration, and the Utah Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing;

- e. attorney listings that provide useful and credible information and are searchable according to the potential client's criteria; because the credibility of the information is critical to overcoming public distrust, consideration should be given to disclosure of malpractice coverage and disciplinary records<sup>3</sup>;
- f. links to attorneys' own websites (preceded by a conspicuous disclaimer);
- g. a mechanism to assist consumers in finding an attorney who is likely to fit their needs (see recommendation below concerning the Bar's Lawyer Referral Service).

2. Improve Lawyer Referral Service. The Bar should automate the Lawyer Referral Service incorporating additional criteria to achieve better screening and individualized matching as discussed above. The ABA has significant resources available to assist bars, including no-cost on-site visits by a peer review team. The service should be integrated with the Bar's public website. With those improvements in place, the Bar should monitor use of the service to determine whether significant improvement in participation can be achieved through an on-line service. If not, the Bar should develop a business plan and provide seed money for the service under which the cost of trained personnel would be recouped through fees charged.

3. Public Outreach. The Bar should engage in public outreach to counteract generalized distrust of lawyers created by some popular media and lawyer advertising. The Bar should set aside funds as part of each budgeting cycle to be used for public outreach and education. Any general advertising campaigns must work in tandem with efforts to create meaningful resources for consumers and to educate consumers about the intangible benefits of the rule of law and the role of lawyers in the legal system.

Examples of useful outreach efforts include: Dialogue on Freedom; celebrations of important constitutional milestones, such as this year's anniversary of Marbury v. Madison; a Speaker's Bureau to provide presentations to targeted groups (such as senior citizens, neighborhood,

---

<sup>3</sup>There is a growing trend among state bar organizations toward such disclosures.

church, and PTA groups) about Bar programs, recent legal developments, and perhaps specific legal issues of concern to targeted groups. The Bar should collaborate with and support the efforts of the Public Outreach Committee of the Utah Judicial Council. Other efforts might include convening a symposium to focus on delivery of legal services issues, or sponsoring Citizens' Justice Conferences, such as those designed by the ABA Coalition for Justice.

4. Rule Amendments. The Bar should seek amendments to the Rules of Professional Conduct and other court rules to remove obstacles to lawyers who wish to provide unbundled services or limited representation. Specifically, the Bar should urge consideration of rules<sup>4</sup>:

- a. allowing an attorney and client to agree to reasonably limit the scope of the representation, such as the recently revised Rule 1.2(c) (scope of representation and allocation of authority between client and lawyer) of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct and Rule 4-1.2(c) (objectives and scope of representation) of the Rules Regulating the Florida Bar. See also Maine Bar Rules 3.4(i) (including model limited representation agreement), 3.5(a)(4), and 3.6(a)(2).
- b. allowing attorneys to communicate directly with an otherwise unrepresented person to whom limited representation is being provided, absent notice to the contrary, such as Rule 4-4.2 (communication with person represented by counsel) and 4-4.3(b) (dealing with unrepresented persons) of the Rules Regulating the Florida Bar. See also Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 4.2 and 4.3; Maine Bar Rules 3.6(f).
- c. permitting attorneys to draft pleadings for a pro se party with disclosure to the court, such as Rule 12.040(d) of the Rules Regulating the Florida Bar and Rule 11(b) of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure.
- d. permitting attorneys to make limited appearances in a court proceeding without undertaking representation for the remainder of the case, such as Rule 12.040 of the Rules Regulating the Florida Bar (applying to family law matters).

---

<sup>4</sup>Copies of the referenced rules are included in the Appendix.

- e. permitting attorneys who provide short-term limited legal advice or drafting assistance as part of a nonprofit or court-annexed limited legal services program to do so unless there are known conflicts of interest, such as Rule 6.5 of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct. See also Maine Bar Rule 3.4(j).

5. Unbundled Legal Services. The Bar should raise awareness among lawyers of methods of responsibly providing unbundled or limited legal services. For example, the Bar could provide specific ethical training, model fee agreements, and other tools to lawyers who wish to provide such services. Lawyers have historically felt compelled by their ethical obligations and desire to effectively resolve legal problems to provide comprehensive solutions to the legal needs of their clients. The provision of full and complete services has often led to uncertainty at the initial point of legal analysis about precisely the manner or extent of services which may be required and has lead to concerns by clients about the necessity and cost of the help.

"Unbundling" of services, or separating identifiable work for a specific result and for a specific fee with clear disclosure about limited representation and its advantages and disadvantages, may be an effective means to reduce the costs of the services and to make them more available to more people. Although unbundling seems to occur on a regular basis in specific situations by most lawyers with the understanding of their clients, greater awareness of methods of responsibly and economically providing unbundled services may encourage lawyers to expand their practices into the latent market of middle-income clients.

6. Group or Prepaid Legal Services. The Bar should support proposed federal legislation that would reenact a tax exemption to encourage employers to provide group or prepaid legal services plans as an employee benefit.

7. Lawyer Marketing and Office Management. The Bar should educate lawyers about the results of the focus group research to encourage them to market their services and manage their practice to better appeal to middle-income clients. The Bar should also develop practice resources, such as best law management practices tips, model practice management forms, marketing tips, lists of companies who provide marketing services, and a variety of other tools. A long-term option could be a Law Office Management

Assistance Program. Such a program would employ a law office management expert who would build programs and provide consulting services to attorneys.

8. Other means. For a brief analysis of additional ideas for how the Bar could improve the delivery of legal services to the middle class, see the Matrix in the Appendix.

9. This Task Force has made no attempt to define the practice of law or to identify legal services that may reasonably be provided by non-lawyers. However, any such attempt should take into consideration the findings and recommendations in this Report.

## **CONCLUSION**

The unmet needs of the middle class are significant. By listening and responding to the needs and desires of the middle class as expressed through the focus group research, Utah lawyers can and should reconnect with this large untapped market for legal services. The recommendations in this Report will help to meet the desires of middle class Utahns for more information about the law and legal services, and for more control over the cost and scope of legal services that are available to them. In addition, the recommendations will help counteract the generalized distrust of lawyers and the legal system that, in and of itself, creates a barrier to access to legal services. By implementing these recommendations, the Bar will not only enable middle-income Utahns to better protect their interests, but will also build public trust and confidence in the legal profession and the courts.

## RESOURCES CONSULTED

### Books

In the Interests of Justice: Reform of the Legal Profession, Deborah Rhode (Oxford University Press 2002).

Unbundling Legal Services, Forrest S. Mosten, (ABA 2000).

### Articles

Nancy J. Moore, "Symposium for the Middle Class - Foreword," 70 Fordham L. Rev. 623 (2001).

George C. Harris and Derek F. Foran, "Symposium for the Middle Class - The Ethics of Middle-Class Access to Legal Services and What We Can Learn From The Medical Profession's Shift to a Corporate Paradigm," 70 Fordham L. Rev. 775 (2001).

Judith L. Maute, "Symposium for the Middle Class - Pre-paid and Group Legal Services: Thirty Years After the Storm," 70 Fordham L. Rev. 915 (2001).

Doctors Pick Best Among Their Peers, Salt Lake Tribune, October 28, 2002.

"Preparing Petitions: It Irks the Lawyers, but is it Lawyering?" New York Times, August 15, 2002

"Self-Serve Legal Aid," ABA Journal, August 2002.

### Websites

Maryland's People's Law Library: [www.peoples-law.com](http://www.peoples-law.com)

Massachusetts Legal Services: [www.masslegalservices.org](http://www.masslegalservices.org)

Neighborhood Law, Essex Co., MA: [www.neighborhoodlaw.org](http://www.neighborhoodlaw.org)

Northern California Senior Legal Hotline: [www.seniorlegalhotline.com](http://www.seniorlegalhotline.com)

Pine Tree Legal Assistance, [www.ptla.org](http://www.ptla.org)

Law & Politics Magazine: <http://www.SuperLawyers.com>

Maryland Legal Assistance Network: <http://www.mdjustice.org>

Utah State Courts On-Line Court Assistance Program: [insert URL]

Arizona Supreme Court's Self-Service Center: <http://www.supreme.state.az/self-serve>

Civil Justice, Inc.: <http://www.civiljusticenetwork.org>

Martindale-Hubbell: [www.lawyers.com](http://www.lawyers.com)

[www.lawhelp.org](http://www.lawhelp.org)

[www.iLawyer.com](http://www.iLawyer.com)

[www.maine.org](http://www.maine.org)

## **Other**

Final Report of the Utah Supreme Court Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services, September 2002.

Innovations in the Delivery of Legal Services: Alternative and Emerging Models for the Practicing Lawyer, ABA Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services, ABA 2002.

Position paper, "Defining the Role of Lawyers in Pro Se Litigation," by William Hornsby, ABA Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services.

Agenda for Access: The American People and Civil Justice, Final Report on the Implications of the Comprehensive Legal Needs Study, Forward and Executive Summary, of the ABA Consortium on Legal Services and the Public.

"Lawyers and Fees," former publication of the Utah State Bar former Committee on Delivery of Legal Services.

"Public Perceptions of Lawyers - Consumer Research Findings, Report of the Litigation Section of the American Bar Association (2002)

"Perceptions of the U.S. Justice System," Survey and Report of the American Bar Association (1998)

Legal Needs and Civil Justice, A Survey of Americans: Major Findings from the Comprehensive Legal Needs Study, Survey and Report of the American Bar Association Consortium on Legal Services and the Public (1994).

ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct, Rules 1.2(c), 7.2(b), and 6.5 (as amended August 2000).

"Best Practice Guidelines for Legal Information Web Site Providers,"  
Elawyering Task Force, ABA Law Practice Management Section and ABA  
Standing Committee On the Delivery of Legal Services, approved on  
February 10, 2003 by ABA House of Delegates.

Legal Websites Best Practice Guidelines of the ABA Law Practice Management  
Section and Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services, April 25, 2002  
draft published for comment.

Final Report of the CCJ/COSCA Task Force on Pro Se Representation (2002)

Materials from National Conference of Bar Presidents workshop on "Models for  
Delivery of High-Volume Personal Legal Services: The Bar's Role" (August 2002)