The survey was presented to PCBA members via PCBA’s email listserve on four different occasions between October 7, 2015 and October 15, 2015.

Wednesday, October 7, 2015 – individual email to PCBA listserve
Friday, October 9, 2015 – announcement in PCBA Weekly email
Tuesday, October 13, 2015 – individual email to PCBA listserve
Thursday, October 15, 2015 – announcement in PCBA Weekly email

# of Survey Respondents: 132

Response Rate: 10.3%

DEMOGRAPHICS

Age
Answered: 118 (Skipped: 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years</td>
<td>2.54% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-36 years</td>
<td>11.86% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 to 49 years</td>
<td>17.80% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50 to 59 years</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.36% (37)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60 to 74 years</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.81% (34)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>7.63% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PCBA Membership Classification

- Answered: 119  (Skipped: 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Attorney (private practice over 5 years)</td>
<td>59.66% (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Attorney (government/state agency over 5 years)</td>
<td>11.76% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>5.88% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Professor</td>
<td>0.84% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YLD (Private/public practice less than 5 yrs or less than 36 yrs of age)</td>
<td>10.92% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lawyers (70+ years)</td>
<td>6.72% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Attorney (officially designated as &quot;retired&quot;)</td>
<td>1.68% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Attorney (in good standing of any other State/U.S. Territory Bar than the State Bar of Arizona)</td>
<td>0.84% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Support Personnel</td>
<td>1.68% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Student Affiliate</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workplace Category

- Answered: 118  (Skipped: 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Category</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private - Sole Practitioner</td>
<td>22.03% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private - Small firm (2 to 4 attorneys)</td>
<td>25.42% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private - Medium firm (5 to 8 attorneys)</td>
<td>5.08% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private - Large firm (9 or more attorneys)</td>
<td>17.80% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private - Corporate</td>
<td>3.39% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public - Government/State</td>
<td>18.64% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public - Agency/Nonprofit/Other</td>
<td>2.54% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia/Education</td>
<td>2.54% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Comments): Family Law Specialist, Jail, Volunteer at SALA, In House Counsel</td>
<td>2.54% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1A. RECOMMENDATION: The State Bar of Arizona should continue to be integrated and supervised by the Arizona Supreme Court.

Answered: 132  Skipped: 0

- Favor: 81.1% (107)
- Oppose: 12.9% (17)
- No Opinion / Don't Know: 6.1% (8)

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #1A Recommendation above.

FAVOR (31 Responses)

- Only as a body to monitor compliance with MCLE and information on ethical concerns.
- Better oversight
- The Supreme Court regulates the admission of attorneys and discipline. Attorneys are officers of the court and as such the State Bar and court should be integrated.
- Mandatory membership is the only way to ensure the maximum compliance with the rules and spread the costs of governing the attorneys
- Judicial oversight is a good idea and helps maintain the independence of both the judiciary and the bar.
- believe should be under supervision of Court and that should be mandatory
- i think it is important to have the profession "police itself" and having a mandatory bar has everyone practicing in Arizona as members . It provides staff to develop and check compliance with mandatory CLE (of which i also approve) and other important functions.
- The legal profession is very technical and should not be governed by the legislature
- An integrated bar will help protect the legal profession from legislature oversight (which likely does not have the best interest of the profession in mind) and will prevent lawyers from fracturing into multiple opposing group. An integrated bar will also help prevent any one metropolitan area from dominating lawyer regulation.
- A unified bar is the only way to require all lawyers to support the profession. Otherwise there will always be free riders.
- Fragmented, voluntary membership would splinter the profession and shrink resources to levels where excellence could not be maintained.
- If it is not broken, don't fix it.
The Supreme Court has constitutional responsibility for the administration of justice.

Lawyers should be self regulated under the supervision of the Supreme Court to avoid political influence in the regulatory process.

The Bar should act independent of the Supreme Court.

If not the Supreme Court, then who? Certainly not the jokers down at the State Legislature.

If the Supreme Court doesn’t oversee, eventually the legislature will.

But the State Bar should not be ever-increasing in size and scope as it has in the past few years

The absence of an integrated bar would contribute to chaos in the practice of law in Arizona

Avoid any anti-trust issue.

Less regulation would endanger the public.

The AZ Supreme Court is the highest court in AZ and should have oversight.

Supreme Court oversight is fine....

A cohesive state organization should ensure a state wide identity

Court supervision provides an oversight that is beneficial to the public.

To be meaningful, State bar membership must be mandatory and supervised by the Arizona Supreme Court. Otherwise, it would be a paper tiger.

I prefer regulation by the Supreme Court as opposed to the Legislature possibly interfering as there would be no entity supervising the attorneys.

Independent bench and bar will best preserve justice. The judicial process and officers of the court should be part of the Arizona Supreme Court’s responsibility.

If remains as is gives good representation for the lawyers

An integrated Bar ensures we maintain a profession of law, as opposed to becoming just another occupation regulated by the Arizona legislature.

The current system is working, so no drastic changes are needed.

OPOPOSE (6 Responses)

The Supreme Court should run the public relations show with Discipline in their backyard---let the Bar be a lawyers’ group for lawyers!

To better avoid conflicts of influence, the bar and the judiciary probably should be independent of each other.

The bar is an organization of legal professionals and no more needs a babysitter than does the AMA. Professionals regulate themselves unless they are incapable of doing so, and then they are not professionals. The current system in AZ and many other states is patronizing and sends the public the message that lawyers are dangerous and incapable of acting professionally.

I think we should be a voluntary bar. Our dues are excessive and their focus and recently proposed changed Mission statement wants to make the primary purpose of the bar is to protect the public from attorneys.

Bar should not be part of government.

The State Bar has become a bloated bureaucracy run by and for big firms and rich attorneys. There’s no reason a smaller organization dedicated to only regulation can’t do the same thing cheaper.

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW (2 Responses)

Don’t have faith in the Bar or the Supreme Court

I’d prefer to have the court/government overseeing the bar rather than some non-entity even more concerned with its own survival.
1B. **RECOMMENDATION:** Membership in the integrated bar should be a requirement for practicing law in Arizona.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No Opinion / Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #1B Recommendation above.**

**FAVOR (26 Responses)**

- Better oversight, greater compliance with the ethical rules
- It provides a baseline for attorneys to practice here and mechanisms for enforcement
- This is appropriate for lawyer regulation.
- To provide both a threshold for entry qualifications, as well as to maintain quality control... yes.
- see above
- see above
- Oversight is required
- Membership into the integrated bar helps to assure at least a minimal level of competence.
- See my response above
- Mandatory membership fosters interaction, knowledge and involvement.
- It is the only way to maintain standards.
- It maintains a minimal standard of competence and ethics for lawyers practicing in Arizona.
- Standardization for purposes of services and disciplinary action. Some semblance of community it important.
- The ability of the Bar to continue the services it offers to lawyers and the public alike are enhanced by requiring membership of all licensed attorneys.
- There are enough problems with regulating the practice of law where everyone is required to be a member. Imagine the results to the public where anyone could hang out a shingle claiming to be a lawyer.
- We need to do what we can to keep unethical and incompetent people from harming the public.
Ethical and competence requirements are needed to protect the public.
We need licensed lawyers practicing law.
sane
Buy in is important
I think the Bar should and does represent all the lawyers. The Bar is more than an association of attorneys getting together.
If I wasn’t forced to be a member I’d drop out. It's a trade guild and exists mostly to keep the costs of legal services high.
Self policing will be the best way of handling discipline for lawyers, to make sure as much as possible that ethical rules and fiduciary responsibilities are followed and that there be ways to pull licenses for wrongdoing.
Helps keep quality of lawyers high
Every lawyer, whether he/she participates in Bar activities or not, has an obligation to support the administration of justice and the advancement of law in society – the integrated Bar is the means to that end. No lawyer should be permitted to waive this obligation.
Lawyers who are not willing to meet the requirements for membership in the State Bar, in my opinion, are also not willing to follow the law and ethical requirements.

OPPOSE (5 Responses)

There are many specialized Bar and professional organizations that provide equal or better training / Not sure that the magazine provides much benefit.
Bar membership should be something to which lawyers aspire because they see its value, not an imposition as a requirement for being able to practice. The true test of its usefulness would be whether lawyers continue to join once they are not forced to do so.
All lawyers admitted to a Bar Association in another State should be entitled to membership in Arizona’s Bar.
Waste and fraud. AZ Bar fees very high. Why?
The state bar provides little to no benefit to its members, especially members who work in the public interest. We often joke that it's the most expensive magazine subscription we've ever had. Non-required membership would force the bar to actually look for ways to benefit its membership.

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW (2 Responses)

Our profession needs a regulatory board, but the State Bar investigators tend to be out of touch with what it’s like to practice law.
There has to be regulation of the profession but the State Bar may not be the agency to do it
2. RECOMMENDATION: Amend Supreme Court Rule 32 to clarify that the primary mission of the State Bar of Arizona is to protect and serve the public, and secondarily, to serve its members.

Answered: 127  Skipped: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>50.4% (64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>39.4% (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion / Don't Know</td>
<td>10.2% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #2 Recommendation above.

FAVOR (16 Responses)

- The best interests of the bar should never be at odds with protection and service of the public.
- The state bar is not a union. To ensure the quality of attorneys and to protect clients from harm, this must be the primary purpose.
- The current rule is wordy and should be amended. Protection of and service to the public should be the main goal.
- clarity and ease of understanding is good
- in favor of more clarity
- Improving clarity and readability should be everyone's goal! Nevertheless, protecting the public helps the increase the public's trust in the profession.
- This requirement improves the public perception of the bar
- Primary mission is to protect the public, secondarily to serve the members, last to serve the public. Prioritizing service to the public politicizes the regulation of the Bar. Protection of the public is what is required. The lawyers themselves serve the public.
- I acknowledge that the Task force feels this change is necessary to prevent anti-trust action against the Bar.
- All who oppose this change should be required to give an oral presentation explaining the meaning of Rule 32 to a class of high school seniors.
- I continue to believe there should be a strong component that assists lawyers with the public, especially as it relates to the collection of attorney fees
- We should make the purpose of the Bar clear.
- It would be good to remind people why the Bar exists.
- I agree.
- State Bar is to primarily represent the interests of the Bar.
- The reason for the creation of the State Bar of Arizona in the first place
OPPOSE (20 Responses)

- I would rather have the purpose stated to be "to regulate the profession".
- The missions should have at least equal weight, if not putting the members first.
- The public does not pay dues into the State Bar Association; Attorneys do and one of the benefits of that is the service they are supposed to receive from the State Bar. Pima County Bar Association has programs in place to serve the public.
- "To Protect And Serve" is what is on the side of LAPD cruisers. The Bar does not "protect" the public, it serves it.
- Once again, why does the legal profession have such a dire view of itself? It seems masochistic and unworthy of our profession. The bar should serve its members first and foremost so that they are best equipped then to serve the public. This self-hating attitude serves no one.
- The only purpose of the Supreme Court should be to serve the law. Elected officials should protect and serve the public. It is offensive to the constitutional checks and balances and judicial neutrality to have judges worried about serving the "public"
- The primary mission should be to serve its members, and then to protect and serve the public.
- The primary function of the Bar should be supporting its members. An offshoot of that serves the public.
- By its nature, the legal profession protects and serves the public. Putting protection of the public AHEAD of serving the bar's members undermines and diminishes the profession. Perception is not trivial. Focusing on the good is far more important than singling out the bad. Focusing on a negative (bad lawyers) is dangerous and, counterintuitively, may create the need for even greater regulation and protection of the public. Please do not assume the worst and create a self-fulfilling prophesy. Keep our sights set high and leave Rule 32 alone.
- The State Bar should put its members first and the public second.
- I don't understand why they want to do this. Are they scared the legislature is going to make us voluntary? I support a voluntary bar. We can lobby the legislature just as all other businesses do. That would be a lot cheaper than what the bar is doing to us.
- Makes it look like lawyers are predators and this does little to polish our reputation -- something the Bar should be doing.. Bad lawyers are the exception not the rule.
- The existing mission statement already states that the SBA "serves the public". No change is necessary.
- Ineffective counsel should be reported to department within Sup. Ct.
- Skewed priorities. First mission is for its members. Otherwise, it is just a "police force monitoring members, often with poor results.
- Its primary purpose should be to serve and protect its members
- This change sounds more like appeasing the public. Its primary purpose in the past has been to serve its members through benefits and education. Disciplinary issues have apparently increased but there is a method to handle those matters. This organization is not a government agency that purpose is to serve the public, etc.
- This it is the role of a regulatory body-not a professional association.
- Should equally protect the public and be there to improve the quality of life of lawyers and to help the lawyers with their practice
- The State Bar of Arizona is for its members and regulation thereof. It is not entrusted with a broad mandate to protect the public.

NO OPINION / DON'T KNOW (5 Responses)

- Favor if it is in the way of making the State Bar more of a regulatory body and less of a mandatory Bar association.
- The two goals are of equal importance. One supports the other.
- Our profession needs regulation, but the State Bar investigators seem out of touch with what it's like to practice law.
- I have not read about this, need more information
- I understand the premise, but I think the Supreme Court serves that ultimate mission. The Bar should serve the profession as a whole, but not necessarily members.
3A. RECOMMENDATION: Reduce the State Bar’s Board size (currently 30 members) to either 15 or 18 members.

Answered: 127  Skipped: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor (54.3%)</th>
<th>(69)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppose (34.7%)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion / Don't Know (11.0%)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAVOR (26 Responses)**

- Like herding squirrels
- To make it more effective as described in the report
- 30 is too many.
- The 30-member size has become bloated and unwieldy. Reducing the number AND staggering elections (waves of 6 every year for an 18-member board serving 3-year terms) would be a great start.
- really difficult to accomplish things with too many members
- 30 members is too many. A smaller board can accomplish more tasks in a quicker amount of time.
- 30 is unmanageable and encourages a lack of involvement
- Fewer, hardworking directors will be more efficient and provides the desired level of diversity and input.
- The bar’s functions do not require a small army to run them.
- Reduce it even further, an executive board should max out at 9 members. Let others volunteer to be on committees.
- Functionality
- Smaller working boards are generally better. That is "best practices" in 2015. But, you must allow members outside of Phoenix to participate telephonically.
- Diversity of opinions, especially among a group like lawyers is very important. Leave it alone.
- I have served on non-profit boards for more than 50 years. 30 is unworkable. Even 15 to 18 is large, but in this instance, workable and needed.
- more efficient
- Smaller is better. Gone is best.
- Having been on many boards of different sizes including one that reduced its size while I was on it, my experience has been that boards with about 15 members are more efficient.
- Too large, too much $$ spent on board.
- A 30-person Board is unwieldy and inefficient. But out-counties MUST have representation. (A Senate, RATHER THAN A HOUSE type of representation).
this seems like a position to increase the power and leverage of the lawyers in Maricopa County. Fewer Board members means those remaining have more influence. I liken this proposal as reducing the number of federal representatives and senators.

Top heavy hierarchy. Too many cronies spoil the bar.
easier to do business
Anybody who knows anything about non-profit board governance will tell you 30 is way too many!
18
A smaller Board will be more workable. I favor Option Z
The proposal is for too small a board. While some reduction from 30 may be appropriate a 40 or 50% reduction is too far.

OPPOSE (14 Responses)

We need broad based representation and not power in a few. Arizona and the practice types are diverse and the Board should be also.
I oppose reducing the board size if that means that a YLD seat will be removed from the current board makeup.
diversity is very important
The proposed change essentially makes this the Maricopa County Bar Association. Rural counties lose their voice.
We need diversity and a broad statewide governance. This is not the State of Maricopa.
Reducing the size of the board gives disproportionate influence to Maricopa County and actually undermines diversity of interests on the Board.
Reducing the size of the Board necessarily means reducing representation of rural areas or alternatively providing disproportionately fewer representatives of Maricopa and Tucson
The legal community outside of Maricopa County is poorly represented currently. The proposed reduction in the size of the Board concentrates more power in Maricopa County and eliminates involvement of the Young Lawyers Division and the Deans of the three law colleges.
Strongly opposed. The Bar is not representative enough already. This is a huge mistake.
Statewide governance requires statewide participation, which is better served by the larger body
I oppose reducing the board because the fewer people who are on the board would mean more work for those that remain and that could cause a lower level of oversight.
Simply a way to increase the power of the legal royalty at the expense of those of us down in the trenches.
As usual, recommendations tend to give Maricopa County more power. It should have less. It does not have the interests of the rest of the state in mind. Everything that works in Phoenix doesn't work elsewhere, even in a large city like Tucson. Can I just vote for Baja Arizona and then we can be free of their tyranny completely?
I am concerned that Pima County will lose representation.

NO OPINION / DON'T KNOW (4 Responses)

agree with task force
I worry that Tucson and the southern regions of Arizona won't have fair representation.
Again, need information you decide
Whether to reduce the size depends on how the 15 to 18 are selected. If the 15 to 18 includes designated YLD, law school dean, etc., spots, then you should not reduce the size.
3B. RECOMMENDED METHOD: Eliminate ex officio board members (e.g., immediate past president, law school deans, Associate Justice).

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #3B Recommendation above.

FAVOR (19 Responses)

- agree with the reasoning in the report. They can visit or be liaisons
- Unless the opposition reasons are REALLY compelling, I think some of these provide valuable historical equity. The law school dean could also be a single position that would rotate annually amongst the 3 schools.
- Streamline!
- Make room for more practicing lawyers who live in the trenches and know the pressures of practicing law.
- These contacts enhance the bar's reach
- Diversity, valued input and inclusion.
- Their experience is helpful
- They are generally pretty useless and do not participate.
- I favor retaining the immediate past-president and eliminating all others, especially law school deans, whose working knowledge of the active practice of law is not only non-existent, but often at “odds” with those requirements.
- No good reason these people should be there
- Naturally.
- Simply being in one of those positions is not a good reason to be on the board.
- If primary goal is to serve the membership, then Board should not be “watered down” with outsiders.
- Keeping an Associate Justice is a good idea; eliminate the others.
- Except for the Justice of the Supreme court, you really should be elected to be help guarantee responsibility.
- The associate justice remains as a liaison under the proposal. Law school deans contribute very little.
- I favor ex officio members having input, but perhaps not voting as a member.
- Liaisons only
- Law school deans do not know about the actual practice of law
OPPOSE (14 Responses)

- Immediate past president should be kept, law school deans and association justice no
- Ex officios can provide valuable institutional knowledge.
- These provide continuity in governance
- They provide valuable insights and diverse perspectives
- Those are important voices. Instead, eliminate others whose input is superfluous or redundant.
- Strongly oppose.
- Same reason as above. Law school deans and an associate justice keep those organizations engaged with the Board and keep the Board informed of issues with law school education and issues affecting the Courts.
- Law School Deans represent the future of the practice. Having them as ex officio members does not (in itself) increase the size of the board since they are not voting members. Their input in extremely valuable.
- These people have valuable experience to offer. Let them decide if they want to be offered an ex-oficio position
- I favor the involvement of the ex officio members as beneficial to keeping the Board accountable to all segments of the Bar.
- You need past president for continuity. I would be in favor of eliminating the other two.
- They have institutional knowledge
- I am opposed to eliminating law school deans and similar board members who bring diversity to the board.
- Why. these individuals have experience and offer a divergent view of being an attorney.

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW (14 Responses)

- I am Ok with them going or staying—no strong feeling one way or the other.
- Why would we do this?
- They’re only there for show anyway.
3C. RECOMMENDED METHOD: Discontinue a board seat dedicated to the President of the Young Lawyers Section.

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #3C Recommendation above.

FAVOR (12 Responses)

- Young lawyers can serve on the general board; young lawyers do not need special representation
- Bloated/fluff
- Young lawyers are represented regardless simply as attorneys. Their efforts are better focused locally where they can provide actual help to young lawyers.
- It is important for young lawyers to become fully integrated in the profession this enhances that goal
- Young people don't know what they need to know to be useful.
- They have a right to be heard and participate
- Young lawyers are not any less lawyers than anyone else. If they don't have a seat on the board they will never be heard.
- Smaller better.
- Simply being in that position is not a good reason to be on the board.
- Great training ground for young lawyers who may wish to rise in the leadership to the Bar.
- Members are electing young lawyers as regular members of the Board already. This may have been important in the past, but not really anymore.
- Young lawyers are faced with unique problems and by having them involved in the governing process, you are ensuring participation in the bar by new lawyers.
OPPOSE (28 Responses)

- We need the newer attorneys represented—highly important
- Need to bring the young lawyers along.
- I strongly oppose this, as it is important for Young Lawyers to be represented on the board and learn about this process for future leadership of the bar.
- YLD members should have this position so that they can learn from it.
- Mentorship is an important part of the profession.
- Why?
- Of all the people to disengage, young lawyers?
- Whether the President or a YLD member, one of the board seats should be designated as a YLD seat because of the significance of the Division to public service and the administration of justice.
- Need the diversity.
- Strongly oppose
- Seriously?? Eliminate the seat for the good old boys instead.
- Participation on the Board encourages service by young lawyers.
- Tomorrow's leaders should not be denied a voice in today's processes that shape the profession's future.
- Where are we going to get the new young blood to keep the board going.
- It is better to have a "young lawyer" on the Board than not.
- I believe it is beneficial for Young Lawyers to be directly represented on the Board.
- I think the value to this position runs both ways, i.e., the YL President can explain Twitter to the Board and the Board can explain the ERs to the YL.
- Young lawyers need to see how the Board is run.
- This recommendation is the biggest head-scratcher. Sends the wrong message to young, would-be up-and-coming leaders that their interest in bar service is not welcome simply because they are "young lawyers."
- It is important that younger attorneys have a voice "and a vote" in any changes proposed by a board that is apparently composed primarily of older attorneys who don't have the same concerns as brand new attorneys struggling with economic and social conditions that were not present when the older attorneys were starting their own careers.
- YLD needs a voice.
- Obvious - a key part of SBA.
- The President of the Young Lawyers Section brings a much needed view to the board that only someone who is a newer attorney would have.
- Why. These individuals are the future and what is wrong with them having a say or input.
- Yeah-get those young whipper snappers off our regal panel.
- We will lose the ability to bring up outstanding leaders if this idea is implemented.
- Young lawyers encompass a distinct section of members with different challenges.
- Young Lawyers have much to contribute to the State Bar.

NO OPINION / DON'T KNOW (0 Responses)

(No responses)
3D. RECOMMENDED METHOD: Establish fewer electoral districts.

Answered: 125  Skipped: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion / Don't Know</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(38) (58) (29)

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #3D Recommendation above.

FAVOR  (10 Responses)
- It achieves a better ratio of representatives per capita, but option Z keeps it the widest of the 3 options.
- Current system to cumbersome.
- Streamline.
- May be workable especially if Maricopa County was broken up into multiple districts.
- The current configuration has run its course.
- Smaller is better.
- If we have elections, representation should be based at least somewhat on population.
- Less districts and members.
- Too much concentration results in too few opinions.
- Redrawing the districts might be appropriate but reducing them is not.

OPPOSE  (11 Responses)
- I oppose reduction of the Board.
- I am concerned that Maricopa County will make all of the representatives.
- Diversity, inclusion and fairness. Once again, this is not the State of Maricopa. Our small communities have value.
- Arizona’s current districts are widely divergent in their needs for both oversight and support. Fewer districts are unlikely to optimize their return on investment in the State Bar.
- So are we really making Phoenix the Center of the Universe?
- You should establish more. Diversity and fair elections in any group are fundamental to democracy.
- I oppose the concentration of power in Maricopa County, which will inevitably result from the proposed reduction in representative and electoral districts, whether intended or not.
- Many (most?) lawyers outside Maricopa County already feel they are not heard.
I don’t understand the need for this and what is to be accomplished. Obviously if there are to be fewer Board members, then fewer electoral districts would be appropriate. However, I perceive fewer Board members meaning that those in the rural counties as well as Pima County would be under represented.

This has got to be a subterfuge to get more power up to the Center of the Universe-aka Maricopa County.

I am concerned that Maricopa County will dominate and Pima County will lose representation.

**NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW** (4 Responses)

- As long as Phoenix doesn’t suddenly dominate decision making by sheer weight of its numbers. The surrounding cities - from Nogales to the Grand Canyon, and Flagstaff and Tucson in between, should still have fairly equal (not solely “proportional”) influence.

- It would depend on how the restructure goes. Smaller legal communities should continue to have a voice.

- Why would this be an issue? You need representation from all over the State. The big, corporate firm lawyers are the worst because they have a completely different understanding of law practice than most lawyers. That is just a fact.

- I don’t really have a problem with fewer electoral districts, as all counties are not equal, and I wouldn’t want a situation like how a Wyoming citizen has disproportionate electoral college power over a more populous state.
3E. What is your opinion of the THREE board composition options presented by the Task Force? (For more info, see Part IV, Section G of the Task Force's FINAL Report.)

**OPTION X** -- 15 total members (6 elected and 9 appointed)(a) Six elected attorney members from four districts -- three from Maricopa County, one from Pima County, one from the counties of Division One of the Court of Appeals (excluding Maricopa), and one from the counties of Division Two (excluding Pima)(b) Nine Court-appointed members -- 3 public, non-attorney members & 6 at-large attorney or non-attorney members

**OPTION Y** -- 18 total members (6 elected and 12 appointed)(a) Six elected attorney members from same four districts as in Option X above.(b) Twelve Court-appointed members -- 6 non-attorney members & 6 at-large attorney or non-attorney members

**OPTION Z** -- 18 total members (11 elected and 7 appointed)(a) Eleven elected attorney members from five districts: -- 6 from Maricopa County District -- 1 from West District (Yavapai, Yuma, and La Paz) -- 1 from North District (Mohave, Coconino, Navajo & Apache)-- 2 Pima County District-- 1 Southeast District (Pinal, Gila, Graham, Santa Cruz, Cochise & Greenlee)(b) Seven Court-appointed members -- 4 public, non-lawyers & 3 at large, lawyers or non-lawyers

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No Opinion / Don't Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION X</strong> Comments (32)</td>
<td>22.02%</td>
<td>63.30%</td>
<td>14.68%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION Y</strong> Comments (27)</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>77.45%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTION Z</strong> Comments (38)</td>
<td>47.75%</td>
<td>40.54%</td>
<td>11.71%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTION X COMMENTS  (32 Responses)

- too small
- Too small of a board; not broad enough representation
- Attorneys should still represent the majority of those who govern ourselves
- Seems the most fair.
- This gives Maricopa an automatic majority. I recognize Phx is huge -- and deserves the largest representative chunk -- but not an automatic majority?!
- Doesn’t seem to have enough lawyer representation.
- Elected members ought to be more than appointments.
- I favor a smaller board, however, this plan limits representation of the smaller population counties.
- Small boards are best
- Still too many
- I oppose the reduction of the size of the Board because it reduces, rather than enhances, the representation of interests throughout the State. This proposal (and all 3 proposals) concentrates a disproportionate amount of power in Maricopa County and relies upon the appointment of delegates to balance the weighting of the Board in favor of Maricopa County.
- Efficiency and manageability
- Under no circumstances should a situation be created where the State Bar Board is dominated by non-attorney members.
- Future Arizona Supreme Court Appointees will take office under elected officials who may not consider the public good. Elected members would be preferable.
- 15 is not enough members.
- Doesn't ensure enough geographic diversity
- Not enough input from non-Maricopa counties
- I completely oppose reducing the number in any manner.
- This unbalanced to appointed members who do not really represent any constituency. It is not diverse.
- The smaller the better, but I don't like the Maricopa county lean. There are already multiple advantages to that bar and it influences the state too greatly.
- Smaller size. I hope that the Supreme Court will appoint at least two attorneys.
- 15 seems like a good number.
- There should not be non-lawyer members. What do they know about Rules Changes, for example?
- Pima County is a large county and needs more than one representative
- I oppose only one member from Pima County. Pima County deserves more representation.
- Would be okay.
- I oppose reducing the number of Members and also reducing the number of elected members. Also Pima County should have more than 2.
- Keeps the power in the Court.
- 15 is a better number, enough to do business, but not so many as to be cumbersome
- too many appointments should be more democratic as to lawyer members
- Still too many court-appointed. Why aren't they all elected?
- Too little representation for Pima County.
OPTION Y COMMENTS  (27 Responses)

- not enough geographical diversity
- Potential for better representation of Pima County
- Not enough attorneys potentially
- Attorneys should still represent the majority of those who govern ourselves
- This gives Maricopa an automatic majority. I recognize Phx is huge -- and deserves the largest representative chunk -- but not an automatic majority?!
- Too little representation from Pima County.
- Elected members ought to be more than appointments.
- I favor a smaller board, however, this plan limits representation of the smaller population counties.
- Small boards are best
- Still too many
- I oppose the reduction of the size of the Board because it reduces, rather than enhances, the representation of interests throughout the State and favors Maricopa County.
- Same as X
- Future Arizona Supreme Court Appointees will take office under elected officials who may not consider the public good. Elected members would be preferable.
- I know that elections and campaigning are a drag. The key is the selection of the members.
- Doesn't ensure enough geographic diversity
- Don't like that many appointed members - bar members should get to vote for majority of members
- I completely oppose reducing the number in any manner.
- This unbalanced to appointed members who do not really represent any constituency. It is not diverse.
- I oppose so many non-lawyers.
- Too many non-attorney members.
- see above
- Keeps the power in the court.
- too many
- 12 appointed members is too many
- too much Supreme Court control over Bar too undemocratic as to lawyers
- Too many court-appointed members.
- Too little representation for Pima County.
best of the three options
Attorneys should still represent the majority of those who govern ourselves, best diversity of the 3
More members makes for a more robust exchange of ideas.
This gives Maricopa an instant majority too. I recognize Phx is huge -- and deserves the largest representative chunk -- but not an automatic majority?! I like the proportional distribution of the elected members.
Might be acceptable
like this option best
I favor a smaller board, however, this plan limits representation of the smaller population counties.
I'm in Pima County
Small boards are best
Still too many
I oppose the reduction of the size of the Board because it reduces, rather than enhances, the representation of interests throughout the State and favors Maricopa County.
I'm not keen on it, but this is the best of the three options.
Leave it as is - there is no need to change.
Generally favor but I would prefer that Maricopa County be broken up in to 3 separate geographical districts with two reps each.
If there is a change, this option provides greater statewide participation.
Maricopa County represents the needs of that specific metropolitan area rather than the needs of the State's inhabitants.
Larger election of lawyers than appointed lawyers is appropriate
Pima County and the other outlying counties have the greatest voice with option Z.
Except that the seat for the YLS should be retained - represents the future of the practice, concerns of lawyers starting out, and individuals not as well known so might be hard to be elected by general membership
I don't like too many appointments. Leads to cronyism and usually pursued by resume padders not people who have to gain the confidence of their peers.
Of the three options, this maintains the greatest direct representation by and of lawyers
This appears to be the best of the three options. Clearly the Task Force was either severely divided or lacked the intestinal fortitude to make a single recommendation to the Court. This plan has the best "balance" as to all the lawyers in the state, not just the State Bar of Maricopa.
More input from non-Maricopa counties
I completely oppose reducing the number in any manner.
This simplifies the number of people on the board while preserving democratic representation and diversity. Unreasonable emphasis on Maricopa county.
This is the better of the three options but I still oppose only one from Pima County.
Would be okay.
see above.
Not as bad as the other two.
too many
This seems like the best of the 3 options
more democratic but still too much court control Lawyers should elect the lawyer reps
Just looking at section A, Maricopa would have the power to do whatever it wanted even if every other county in the state opposed it. That's insane.
Of the three this is the least onerous, but it still results in a board which is too small for the work it needs to accomplish
Better representation
Too little representation for Pima County. Too much representation for Maricopa County.
3F. RECOMMENDATION: State Bar Board members serve staggered terms (to preserve continuity of the board’s leadership and its institutional knowledge).

Answered: 120   Skipped: 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>90.8% (109)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>4.2% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion / Don't Know</td>
<td>5.0% (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #3F Recommendation above.

FAVOR (19 Responses)

- agree with reason given
- For stated reasons.
- makes sense, smoother transitions, less loss of institutional memory over time
- There are more pluses to this method than minuses.
- continuity and institutional memory important
- better to have more stability than to change so many board members all at the same time
- Staggered terms makes sense.
- Nearly all organizations do this to improve continuity
- Always stagger, dumb not to
- Many, if not most, boards do this. It is beneficial for the reasons stated in the proposal.
- Makes sense.
- It just makes sense.
- Seems like a good idea.
- Staggered terms for a Board is a no-brainer. If someone has to explain it to you, you have no business making a decision.
- Good to never have the majority of members of the board be new to the board.
- This provides institutional knowledge.
- good planning.....
- preserves continuity.
- Continuation of institutional wisdom

OPPOSE (1 Response)

- Same reasons as given in recommendation

NO OPINION / DON'T KNOW (0 responses)
4A. QUALIFICATIONS RECOMMENDATION: Add a requirement that attorneys who serve on the State Bar’s board, whether as elected or appointed members, have a clean disciplinary record during a five-year period preceding their board service.

**Optional:** Briefly explain your opinion to #4A Recommendation above.

**Favor** (14 Responses)
- A "clean" record should mean zero findings of attorney misconduct by the Supreme Court.
- Most attorneys don't find it difficult to maintain a clean record; those with bar complaints are more likely to have difficulties with time management, organization, and inattention even if honesty is not the issue.
- I do not want some one on the board with an axe to grind.
- But the definition of "clean" needs to be pretty precise and not include minor stuff that could happen to anyone.
- Seems important - not that there are no complaints but no sanctions or findings of misconduct.
- This can only help to serve the function of protecting the public, otherwise why would the public trust the legal profession if we allowed persons with disciplinary problems to serve on the board.
- Board members representing the Bar should have untarnished backgrounds.
- No brainer.
- Favor, however, not strongly.
- Naturally.
- Board members should set standards for ethics, not excuse violations of the standards.
- We do not discipline lawyers speaking for others including me.
- Would support the idea for the public that attorneys regulate themselves.
- It ain't that hard to be clean. C'mon, you're a lawyer for gosh sakes!
OPPOSE (13 Responses)

- should be maybe 3 yrs
- I have a 20 year, spotless record. But I have to admit, in that time, I have met attorneys who are rebounding from serving a disciplinary "sentence" and they would provide constructive insight to new policies etc. Perhaps a minimum of one year post-reinstatement?
- What if the disciplinary function runs amok? Anyone should be able to voice their opinions, run for board.
- A board member must be an attorney in good standing but I believe full disclosure of the basis for any discipline within 5 years would accomplish the goal of having members in good standing representing the membership and governing the Bar. I can imagine circumstances where a member's discipline could arise from a technicality, or even a matter of civil disobedience, that should not bar service on the Board, provided that the circumstances are fully disclosed prior to election or appointment.
- Some errors are minimal and should not disqualify an attorney willing to serve
- What does disciplinary history have to do with being a great board member. Some of the best lawyers in Arizona have been disciplined for absolutely ridiculous issues.
- Is this really a problem? What about the wily, dishonest lawyers who are always unethical but never get caught. Are they ok to sit on the board?
- Frivolous complaints filed by vexatious former clients should not be a barrier to bar service.
- Someone could be disciplined to keep them from serving.
- I can’t imagine the Supreme Court appointing such or anyone being elected except in a smaller community where fewer lawyers may exist. However, it seems more like another appeasement to the public because it shoulds good.
- Has this been a problem?
- Should stay as is representing all of Arizona
- depends on type of discipline and what for.. The election process should weed out the undesireables

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW (1 Response)

- It depends on the basis of the “discipline.”
4B. TERM LIMITS RECOMMENDATION: The State Bar's board members should serve no more than three consecutive 3-year terms, & should then sit-out a full term before seeking reelection to additional terms.

Answered: 121  Skipped: 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>83.5% (101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>11.6% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion / Don't Know</td>
<td>5.0% (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #4B Recommendation above.

FAVOR (18 Responses)

- Gets new blood in there
- New blood is always good for an organization
- good not to have dynasties
- This will help to ensure that new persons at admitted to the board.
- One term, then get back to work, leave opportunities for more people
- This is reasonable, and is practiced by many other Boards in order to prevent "fiefdoms" or "dynasties."
- To provide more opportunity for others to serve
- We need diversity and encumbants have an unfair advantage to re-election.
- 9 years is plenty of time on the Board. The Board needs fresh ideas and needs to be open to more participants. Some Board members have effective established life tenure which is not good!
- Even 9 consecutive years is probably too long, but this is a no-brainer.
- Promotes fresh perspectives and opportunity for engagement of more members
- Cronyism is bad. Term limits helps avoid this.
- I would favor a two term limit. I'll accept this as an alternative.
- I would support only two consecutive terms.
- I think that two consecutive three year terms would be a better term limit.
- Same as presidential term limit....... 
- That would limit a term to 9 years. Plenty and time for others to be able to participate.
- It seems like Board seats and officers are shuffled among the same people like ministers to the Crown.
OPPOSE (11 Responses)

- Prefer the option to keep in competent elected officials over a mandatory boot to the establishment.
- There should be term limits, but three terms seems like too many. With a smaller board there should be more opportunity for new people to serve, not just the same people.
- These terms are far too long. Two consecutive 3-year terms should be the max, followed by a 3-year fallow term before seeking office again.
- why?
- A good representative should not be term-limited. Institutional knowledge is valuable.
- I just don't think there are many that want to serve. Why make it more difficult. They can always get voted out.
- Three 3 year terms seems like too many. How about two terms.
- Term limits are not a good idea. If a person has the interest and energy, why restrict their service?
- You lose people that are willing to speak out and have institutional memory
- Some folks like to be represented by a person with lots of experience. Appointments may be different they are restricted.
- If someone wants to serve and other lawyers elect them then should not put up artificial barriers to service

NO OPINION / DON'T KNOW (1 Response)

- Is this really an issue? I generally favor experience on the board
4C. TERM LIMITS RECOMMENDATION: Rule 32 should include a process for removing a board member with good cause (i.e., a process that would allow removal of a board member for good cause by a two-thirds vote of the board).

Favor (18 Responses)

- Makes sense
- Sometimes a board can get a "whack-a-doodle" and there needs to be a way of removing her/him.
- It scares me to think of how/when this might be necessary... so, yes.
- a good fail-safe
- Naturally, the board should have the ability to remove members for cause.
- There needs to be a mechanism for removal of attorneys who are not a credit to the profession or who fail to serve for whatever reason
- As described in the Task Force's Report, I agree with the process and feel it gives adequate due process.
- Seems like good governance
- Makes sense.
- Favor on condition "good cause" is defined.
- Just have a great definition of "good cause."
- Probably can do this anyway without another Rule.
- This issue does not merit consideration of any opposition. Throw the rascals out should be enumerated.
- Hopefully we never need the process, but it should be spelled out in case we do.
- 2/3 seems fair.
- This provision is typically found in corporation bylaws.
- If you can't keep the Board happy with your work, time to move on.
- You need a process to clear out folks who are not helping the Board get the job done

Oppose (8 Responses)

- 6.6%

No Opinion / Don't Know (5 Responses)

- 4.1%

Answered: 122  Skipped: 10

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #4B Recommendation above.
OPPOSE (4 Responses)

- This should not be adopted unless there is clearly articulated standards of conduct for Board Members and a clearly articulated process including formal notice, a right to be heard and the right to be represented by counsel.
- A system such as “recall elections” would be better.
- Who gets to determine “good cause”?
- Board members should only be removed for official misconduct or committing a crime.

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW (2 Responses)

- Problem with what one considers “good cause.”
- Good cause would be defined as what?

5A. RECOMMENDATION: The leadership track of the board should consist of three officers (president, president-elect, & secretary-treasurer) – rather than the current five officers (president, president-elect, first vice president, second vice-president, secretary-treasurer).
OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #5A Recommendation above.

FAVOR  (16 Responses)

- I don't know why we need two vice presidents.
- More efficient with fewer at the top
- Do not need as many officers as have now.
- More bloat. Great idea.
- if can function with fewer officers, should
- Simplify by getting rid of the multiple vice-presidents.
- Efficiency and simplicity
- The current method works and makes sense to have someone as President who is knowledgeable and has a good historical reference.
- A five year track to the presidency is too long.
- Otherwise, good candidates will get locked out for 5 years instead of 3.
- Less is more.
- The president-elect should also be the only vice president.
- Yes w/ less board members lesser need for leadership track.
- Streamline…..
- Anything to reduce the number of our colonial overlords.
- need to streamline officers

OPPOSE  (4 Responses)

- The leadership "track" has deeper problems than their titles.
- The number of lawyers in this state has increased dramatically. I could see removing the second Vice-President but none other.
- Makes the executive committee more diverse and shouldn't have just 3 people running the bar
- I would support 4 officers, but not a joint secretary/treasurer as both of these jobs are too involved for one officer.

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW  (3 Responses)

- don't really have an opinion so I guess would support task force recommendation
- It is difficult to evaluate the benefit of a protracted leadership track. It provides for experience in Bar leadership but may discourage more members from pursuing leadership positions.
- As long as there is training and experience before you get to the Presidency, who cares?
### 5B. RECOMMENDATION: Appointed as well as elected board members should be eligible to hold office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No Opinion / Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Answered: 121   Skipped: 11

#### OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #5B Recommendation above.

**FAVOR (15 Responses)**

- only elected members should be eligible to hold office
- Why not?
- Why not. Some very good member could be appointed and very bad members elected.
- Letting a rising star shine!
- Board members should be treated equally regardless of how they get onto the board.
- If someone good is willing to serve and has the time, why lose him or her; many of us don't have the time.
- There is no reason why an appointed member would not be as well qualified as an elected member to hold office. This is particularly true because all three options proposed for reducing the size of the Board depend upon appointed representative balancing the greater number of elected positions granted to Maricopa County.
- One presumes they are equally qualified regardless of the method by which they made it on the board
- Why not?
- If the individual is well qualified, why should it matter. Southern Arizona Legal Aid has had two non-lawyer presidents in its long history and continues to thrive.
- Non lawyers public members should not hold office.
- The board should be able to elect its officers from all of its members.
- Yes
- If all are lawyers, all qualify......
- Yes, but ONLY LAWYER MEMBERS.
OPPOSE (9 Responses)

- This is a bar association of attorneys, and should be lead by attorneys, not non-attorneys
- Non attorneys should not be an officer in an attorney organization.
- Officers should be lawyers!!!!!!
- Non-attorneys cannot know the ethical rules and regulatory structure required to "herd the cats."
- In an organization of this size, I could see many conflicts and all puts too much influence and power over individuals serving in two positions. The board is to set the strategy and insure the officers perform and enforce their policies. Having the same people establish the policies and then enforce them is the theory being the police, the judge and the jury.
- If they’re qualified let them stand for election.
- Leadership track should be different than membership. Too different functions.
- Elected by the lawyers should be president
- Lawyers should pick bar leadership not the Courts Our interests are not always the same

NO OPINION / DON'T KNOW

0 Responses

---

6A. RECOMMENDATION: Change the name of the SBA’s “Board of Governors” to the “Board of Trustees” to emphasize the fiduciary role of the board.

Answered: 120  Skipped: 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>(45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion / Don’t Know</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #6A Recommendation above.

FAVOR (2 Responses)

- Not a bad idea.
- The Supreme Court governs the Bar.

OPPOSE (16 Responses)

- The inclusion of “Governors” is more dignified and conveys the message that this Board is at least quasi-governmental and has responsibilities that differ from those of the boards of private corporations or nonprofit groups.
- Makes it sound like the Board is managing property and money rather than providing oversight and discipline for lawyers and thereby protecting the public.
- “Board of Trustees” sends a message of non-accountability to the public for Attorney Malfeasance.
- Based on the report, the primary focus of the Board is to protect the public, so the emphasis is regulation rather than protection of resources for members.
- The status quo is fine.
- Strongly oppose. Implies a fiduciary standard of care that most attorneys would be willing to adopt as a condition of serving on Board.
- This is the triumph of “form” over substance. If directors owe fiduciary duties to non-profits in Arizona, as they do, why don’t “Governors” owe fiduciary duties to the SBA. Only nit-picking lawyers could fight over this distinction.
- This is a prime example of form over substance. Whatever you call it, the elected ‘Directors’ have and should uphold their fiduciary obligations - regardless of the name of the board they sit on.
- This is a coat of paint and then calling something new. The real issue is trust.
- Present name fine........
- This is the biggest joke of all. By all means make their title sound better so the public remains in the dark about the true reason for the Bar’s existence.
- No reason to change and is descriptive
- window dressing
- If the participants do not understand their fiduciary responsibility, they should not be serving.

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW (9 Responses)

- I understand the motivation for the change, but I don’t know if it is necessary.
- meaningless
- A name change seems like a shallow solution, likely to a non-existent problem.
- That’s just spin
- The name is a trifle. What matters is its function and whether it is working to promote the best practices amongst lawyers in serving the public
- Complete waste of time with this issue. Really? This is what you folks are talking about?
- Can’t believe the name makes any difference
- Really does not matter.
- Semantics. Unless you think Governors don’t have a fiduciary role.
6B. RECOMMENDATION: As a condition of serving on the board, board members should participate in an orientation that specifically addresses their fiduciary duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion / Don't Know</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #6B Recommendation above.

**FAVOR (15 Responses)**

- Makes sense
- You mean they do not get it now???? Why!
- It's a good reminder... the kind that I sentimentally enjoy when I happen to catch a new swearing-in ceremony every few years.
- Absolutely give the board members some special training.
- IF the people serving don't understand their fiduciary duties a workshop won't help
- I'd assume the board members get training in all of their duties.
- This is reasonable since the fiduciary duties of the Board of Governors (or Trustees) is beyond the common experience of most practicing attorneys.
- This is elementary
- It should also include training on how to read financial reports.
- Orientation helps new board members avoid mistakes.
- Why would we not require training.
- Passing on knowledge......
- good idea.
- Need to learn to do what you need to do and what is expected of you. More training , the better.
- No brainer
OPPOSE (6 Responses)

- If grown adults/lawyers don’t know fiduciary from third base by now, they shouldn’t be there in the first place. Let’s assume basic intelligence.
- Fiduciary duty to the public to protect them from attorneys? Really? You want my bar dues for this?
- Might make sense for the non-lawyer members but presumably attorney know the responsibilities of a fiduciary
- If the SBA has to run a training session for its board’s fiduciary duties it is proof that the law schools have failed to teach any meaningful thing to its students.
- They ought to know what they are doing if they run. They don’t need an orientation.
- Absolutely! That required course on professionalism we had to take has been so beneficial. There are no more unprofessional attorneys in Arizona!! Its magic!!

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW (1 Response)

- Who would provide this “orientation”?

7. RECOMMENDATION: Include rule amendments that would provide Supreme Court supervision over the State Bar’s Board of Legal Specialization (in response to North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. FTC).

Answered: 120  Skipped: 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Favor 60.0% (72)</th>
<th>Oppose 16.7% (20)</th>
<th>No Opinion / Don’t Know 23.3% (28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
OPTIONAL: Briefly explain your opinion to #7 Recommendation above.

FAVOR  (13 Responses)

- For the reasons stated in the report
- While I don't think N.C Dental Board vs FTC would have the same impact on State Bars, tweaking a few procedural measures is good insurance.
- I think the Supreme Court should oversee specialization and rigorously ensure that members qualify.
- An appeal route to the court system should be provided after a member works their way through the Board of Legal Specialization process.
- This is a reasonable proposal, in light of the above-referenced Supreme Court decision.
- I like the provision for judicial review of decisions of BLS.
- Better the Supreme Court than OAC rules without comment period or other supervision of their activities.
- The current process for legal specialization in Arizona is a total joke. The process should be similar to the way medical doctors become board certified.
- The Supreme Court decision clearly requires it.
- The Supreme Court should govern this advertising factivity.
- The AZ Supreme Court should make sure specialization is done correctly.
- I am familiar with issues with the Bar supervising the Board. There have been conflicts of opinion and inconsistent positions taken. Also, it is not clear as to who has authority over certain aspects of the legal specialization as opposed to other departments of the Bar.
- Long overdue

OPPOSE  (5 Responses)

- Works fine without Supreme Court supervision, this is one area where other specialists are more competent to ascertain qualifications
- There is virtually no chance that the functions of the Board of Legal Specialization will implicate antitrust concerns. Additional involvement of the Supreme Court is not the answer.
- If we were a voluntary bar, then it would not matter.
- I agree with the Alito dissent in that case.
- Hell no!! Another power grab by the Court.

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW  (2 Responses)

- Haven’t read the case and not familiar with arguments
- I tend to lean favor, just because I trust the government more than I trust some weird non-governmental-entitled State Bar. The State Bar could also eliminate specialization altogether.
8A. Do you have any final comments you wish to make concerning any of the recommendations mentioned in this survey?

COMMENTS (23 Responses)

- No
- No
- Please do not diminish the role of attorneys from counties other than Maricopa. Too often Maricopa attorneys can be the “Tail wagging the dog.”
- No
- I recognize that the Judiciary/Article 3 is bestowed or taxed with the responsibility of overseeing the lawyers that are admitted to practice. But perhaps because so many legislators are lawyers, I also see the independent function of a body that governs its lawyers. It may be impossible to “separate” the Supreme Court from the SBA, but preserving some adversarial distance (for lack of a better phrase) is still healthy -- for both institutions.
- The State Bar has virtually no impact on me or my legal practice. That said, I support reducing its role if it means reducing the amount of the state bar dues.
- Thank God I’m old enough that I won’t have to endure this proposed trash for very long. The Supreme Court and the White Trash, er, White Shoe law firms are determined to fashion a State Bar that’s disinterested in practitioners but very fond of classy slogans and buzzwords. Who’s going to advocate for the membership? Smelly Wilmer? Kootie Rock? Dream on.
- The old adage, “Don’t fix it if it ain’t broke,” comes to mind.
- The Executive Summary of the Plan says it all: It is a solution in search of a problem. The State Bar has done a good job of protecting the public and serving its members and it should not change its governing structure to potentially put those responsibilities in the hands of non-lawyers who have not sworn an oath to serve the Constitution and laws of the State and Nation. Lay participation on the Board is good, lay control of the organization is not.
- No
- No
- I don’t understand why the State Bar wants to make an adversary relationship with their members. Can someone explain the rational for that. These proposals make me want to support an initiative for a voluntary bar. I will pay money to whatever organization or legislator is going to propose that idea if this is what I have to deal with as a State Bar.
- No. Good survey.
- There is enough regulation of lawyers by the Bar. None of the rules changes do much except the one where the Bar’s primary function is not to serve its members but rather to “protect the public.” Quite frankly, the bar doesn’t do either very well and changing slogans is not going to change function.
- No
- Ongoing concern about the weight given to Maricopa problems that only need Maricopa solutions. There are matters that most of the state does not need to address and those should be handled by the Maricopa Bar, not the State Bar.
- I hope that the results can be shared for all to see.
- No
- I strongly feel lawyers should back up judiciary - we do not need non-lawyers on Board.
- Pima County should be more equitably represented on the board.
- Change is hard, but necessary.
- no
- I am concerned that Pima County will be shortchanged and the Board will only concern itself with issues in Maricopa County.
8B. Do you think the PCBA Board of Directors should make a formal statement concerning the Task Force's proposed changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion / Don't Know</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered: 119  Skipped: 13

Optional: Briefly explain your opinion to #8B Recommendation above.

**FAVOR** (25 Responses)

- Very important that the Pima County position be presented coherently
- Assuming your survey has a consensus, go with that; or issue a report stating how many favored/opposed/were neutral based upon your survey.
- We should find a nice way to tell them to let the Bar be a gathering of lawyers. The Supreme Court can run the Disciplinary show and punish lawyers for not behaving properly. Let's tell them we don't want the Bar to be so "integrated."
- There are portions of the report that lament Maricopa's Under-representation on the board. I think that a more "senate-like" representation rather than a more populace or "house of rep-like" representation is fairer to all.
- Please emphasize the need for an increased number of Pima County seats and oppose the idea of eliminating the young lawyers division president.
- Somebody needs to be the voice of reason
- I trust the PCBA way more than anyone associated with the State Bar.
- I believe this is a matter of sufficient importance to warrant a formal statement by PCBA unless this survey reveals that there is no clear consensus of the membership on the proposals in question.
- See the comments I have spent considerable time writing.
- PCBA has a proven track record of thoughtful responses to these types of proposals. It WILL make a difference.
Based on survey results - Pima County needs more input

The proposed change in the mission statement is harmful to Arizona's legal profession and it assumes the worst of Pima County lawyers.

Pima County is very different from Maricopa County.

Because most lawyers don't know what is going on and if they did they would certainly voice an opinion to many of the proposals.

The board should report the results of this survey and provide cogent arguments in favor or opposition of the various points accordingly.

If the PCBA can't take a stand on this critical issue concerning the practice of law, what the hell is its purpose? To plan the Skyline Affair?

I think that the survey results should be shared for all to see.

Gather info of PCBA members and make it known - otherwise why am I doing this.

But minority opinions & reasons should be reported also, based on this survey.

If there is to be opposition to certain aspects of the changes, I think a formal statement from local bar associations can have a strong influence in opposing or favoring the change as opposed to individuals.

We need to step up

only if large majority are in agreement

Pima should speak up against Maricopa often and always.

The proposed changes are significant and deserve some comment from the PCBA board

Support option Z

OPPOSE (4 Responses)

Too many splintered views for the Association to purport to speak on behalf of all members. Maintain role as an information provider and this survey is helpful.

Should convey survey results but doubt Board will be in a position to speak on behalf of the members

not without knowing what the PCBA members think

This is another power grab by the State Bar-it has nothing to do with efficiency, transparency, or accountability.

NO OPINION / DON’T KNOW (5 Responses)

The video and documentation are enough.

It depends on what the PCBA position is.

Only if there is a clear consensus position.

I know about it. Everyone should know about it as well. Besides what's "a formal statement" anyway?

One of the issues the PCBA board should consider is the effect of these changes on the PCBA board. In particular, if the State Bar were to become a voluntary bar, how would that relationship change...i.e. would the voluntary state bar be more or less supportive of the PCBA.