

Spring 2023 Conference 18 - 20 May 2023 Cleveland, Ohio



Host Firm:



Meyers, Roman, Friedberg & Lewis

A Legal Professional Association



phone: **216.831.0042** fax: **216.831.0542** www.**meyersroman**.com

Dear LawPact friends and partners,

It is our pleasure to welcome you to Cleveland, Ohio the city of "progress and prosperity" and, of course, rock and roll!

We are looking forward to our time together, to networking, learning, and collaborating both personally and professionally. It is our hope that each of you finds your presence and participation in the Spring 2023 Conference to be rewarding, enjoyable, and beneficial to shared goals and individual aspirations.

Welcome to Cleveland!



Seth P. Briskin Managing Partner Chair, Labor and Employment



Jenifere R. Singleton Administrative Partner *Chair, Divorce and Family Law*



Bryan J. Dardis Finance Partner Chair, Real Estate









LawPact Spring 2023 Conference Agenda May 18-20, 2023 Hilton Cleveland Downtown, Cleveland, Ohio

Moving Your Firm Forward after Covid

Thursday May 18, 2023 Board Meeting and Welcome Reception		
4:00 – 5:30 PM	Board Meeting: All Members and guests are invited to attend.	Veterans Room C
7:00 – 10:00 PM	Welcome Reception: Please join LawPact members and guests for an opportunity to review the past six month's happenings and welcome our new participants.	Veterans Room A-B
	Friday May 19, 2023	
	(Veterans Room A-B)	
7:30 – 8:30 AM	Breakfast	Veterans Room A-B
8:30 – 10:00 AM	Opening Remarks and Member Firm Introductions Delegates introduce themselves and provide updates about their firms	Doug Conover, LawPact President
10:00 – 10:15 AM	Break	
10:15 – 11:15 AM	Improving Lateral Hires with Emotional Intelligence Screening	Ellen Freedman, Freedman Consulting
11:15 – 12:30 PM	Artificial Intelligence in our Lives and Law Practices	Ellen Freedman, Freedman Consulting
12:30 – 1:30 PM	Lunch	Veterans Room C-D

1:30 – 3:00 PM	Marketing Strategies for Smaller Law Firms in the Post-Covid Era	Jocelyn Brumbaugh , Builden Partners
3:00 – 3:15 PM	Break	
3:15 – 4:00 PM	The Alternative Workplace – The Realties of the Post-Covid Workforce	Seth Briskin, Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis
4:00 – 4:45 PM	Hiring a Non-Lawyer CEO	Member Panel Discussion Bryan Dardis Moderator Nathan Watson Bridget Bennett Mark Hoyt
7:00 PM	Dinner	Red – The Steakhouse Cleveland, Ohio

	Saturday May 20, 2023	
(Veterans Room A-B)		
7:30 – 8:30 AM	Breakfast	Veterans Room A-B
8:30 - 9:15 AM	Friday Follow Up Discussion and Takeaways	Scott Collins and John Pickervance (discussion leaders)
9:15 - 10:30 AM	LawPact Regional Group Breakout Meetings	
10:15 - 10:30 AM	Break (Adjust time as necessary)	
10:30 – 11:15 AM	LawPact Website – Updates and Upgrades	Sherri Cook and Nathan Watson
11:15 - 12:00 PM	What's New in Technology	Eric Siegel, THK Law
12:00 – 12:45 PM	Member Discussion – Open forum regarding LawPact and what we can be doing to support our members. LawPact Finances LawPact Business Membership Development Website and Forums	Doug Conover
	Future Conference Schedule Final Announcements	
12:45 – 1:30 PM	Lunch	Veterans Room C-D
1:45 – 4:00 (approximate)	Group Event – Tour of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame	Meet in the hotel lobby, walk to the venue
5:00 (approximate)	Group Dinner optional	Nuevo Modern Mexico



2023 Spring Conference Cleveland, Ohio May 18 - 20, 2023

Conference Delegates and Guests

Program Presenters





Jocelyn Brumbaugh President Builden Partners Chicago, Illinois

Prospective Members

Russell Beck Beck Reed Riden LLP Boston, Massachusetts
Hu Kai-Hsiang The Initiators Attorneys at Law Taipei City, Taiwan

Delegates and Guests (Alphabetical by firm name)

Christopher Stevenson Adair Myers Stevenson Yagi PLLC Houston, Texas Guest: Audra Stevenson
Kenichi Yagi Adair Myers Stevenson Yagi PLLC Houston, Texas Guest: Masae Tomoda
Paul Leclair Adams Leclaire, LLP Rochester, New York First time delegate Guest: Rebecca Leclair
Takahiro Shinano Asai Law Firm Osaka, Japan
Frederic Beele Lawfirm Beele Gent, Belgium
Charles Van Horn Berman Fink Van Horn Atlanta, Georgia

Neal Weinrich Berman Fink Van Horn Atlanta, Georgia
Jim Radabaugh Bowen, Radabaugh & Milton, P.C. Troy, Michigan Guest: Barbara Radabaugh
Nathan Welch Bowen, Radabaugh & Milton, P.C. Troy, Michigan
Jeremy Garner Bowie & Jensen, LLC Towson, Maryland
Robert BrouilletteBrouillette LawMontreal, Quebec, CanadaMember of the Board of DirectorsGuest: Francine LeDuc
Douglas Conover Law Offices of Douglas Conover LLC Chicago, Illinois President of LawPact and Member of the Board of Directors Guest: Cindy Conover

Chen Eldar Estline & Co. Tel Aviv, Israel First time delegate
John Pickervance Forbes Solicitors Manchester, England <i>Member of the Board of Directors</i>
Todd Oberdick Forge IP, PLLC Shelton, Connecticut
David Azrin Gallet Dreyer & Berkey, LLP New York, New York
David Gaw Gaw Estate Planning Napa, California Vice President - North America, and Member of the Board of Directors
Christopher Clemson Gordon, Fournaris & Mammarella, P.A. Wilmington, Delaware

Thomas Mammarella Gordon, Fournaris & Mammarella, P.A. Wilmington, Delaware Guest: Barbara Marsh
Scott Collins Helsell Fetterman LLP Seattle, Washington
Kameron Kirkevold Helsell Fetterman LLP Seattle, Washington
Nathan Watson (firm administrator)Helsell Fetterman LLPSeattle, WashingtonLawPact Website Committee
Nav Shokar Keyser Mason Ball, LLP Mississauga, Ontario, Canada Guest: Mike Shokar First time delegate
Amandeep Sidhu Keyser Mason Ball, LLP Mississauga, Ontario, Canada Guest: Mona Sidhu

Murphy Fletcher McGuire, Wood & Bissette, P.A. Asheville, North Carolina Guest: Milton Fletcher
Bridget Bennett (firm administrator) Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis Cleveland, Ohio Guest: Mark Annichine
Seth Briskin Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis Cleveland, Ohio Guest: Shelly Briskin
Peter Brosse Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis Cleveland, Ohio Guest: Tammy Brosse
David Croft Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis Cleveland, Ohio Guest: Amanda Croft
Bryan Dardis Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis Cleveland, Ohio Guest: Sarah Dardis

Steven Dlott Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis Cleveland, Ohio First time delegate
Joseph Pokornoy Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis Cleveland, Ohio First time delegate
Jenifere Singleton Meyers Roman Friedberg & Lewis Cleveland, Ohio Guest: Kevin Singleton
Kevin Godbout Neubert, Pepe & Monteith P.C. New Haven, Connecticut
Aaron Lovaas Newmeyer Dillion Las Vegas, Nevada

Mark Hoyt Sherman Sherman Johnnie & Hoyt Salem, Oregon <i>Treasurer of LawPact, and Member of the Board of Directors</i>
Kathy Speaker MacNettSkarlatos ZonarichHarrisburg, PennsylvaniaMember of the Board of DirectorsGuest: Colleen MacNett
Robert Lee Synergy Business Lawyers LLP Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
Adam Russell THK Law South Bend, Indiana First time delegate
Eric Seigel THK Law South Bend, Indiana
Sergio Yarritu Yarritu Gonzales & Asociados Mexico City, Mexico

Madeleine ("Maddy") Lebedow MfL Associates, Inc. Lincolnwood, Illinois Executive Director of LawPact
Sherri Cook Burr Ridge, Illinois <i>Social Media and Public Relations Coordinator</i>



Board of Directors' Meeting Thursday, May 18, 2023 4:00 Eastern U.S. Time

LawPact Board of Directors:

Robert Brouillette Dave Gaw John Pickervance Kathy Speaker MacNett Douglas Conover Mark Hoyt Scott Pohlman Ian Wick Tomas Contreras Bernd Lichtenstern Martin Preslmayr

Invited Guests:

Madeleine Lebedow, Executive Director Nathan Watson, Technical Advisor Sherri Cook, Media Advisor Jenifere Singleton Bryan Dardis

Treasurer's Report: Mark Hoyt

Old Business

Weekly Zoom Conferences May 18 - 21, 2023: Cleveland, Ohio October 19 - 21, 2023: La Jolla, California Spring (April) 2024: Tel Aviv, Israel Website revamp: Zealth Digital Marketing engagement (Sherri Cook and Nathan Watson) Membership Development

New Business

LawPact Europe (Bernd Lichtenstern, John Pickervance, and Martin Preslmayr) LawPact Latin America (Tomas Contreras) Report on Inpact (DC) Other new business?

Next meeting (conference call) June 14, 2023 via Zoom

Adjournment



Speakers

Host Firm:



Meyers, Roman, Friedberg & Lewis

A Legal Professional Association

ELLEN FREEDMAN, CLM



Ellen Freedman is founder and President of Freedman Consulting, which was established in 1998. Freedman Consulting assists PA law firms with a full range of issues on the business side of a law practice. Services include but are not limited to strategic planning including retreat facilitation planning; leadership and management structure evaluation and modification; strategic intelligence and research; financial management and profitability enhancement; disaster planning and recovery; human resource management; insurance and risk management, law firm life cycle support including start-up, growth, sale, purchase, merger, acquisition, closing and dissolution; marketing and strategic planning; practice management audits; records management and retention; technology upgrades including needs assessment and implementation; partner compensation; and more. Information about Ellen and her law practice management services may be obtained at http://www.FreedmanLPM.com. Ellen also publishes the Law Practice Management blog at www.PA-

LawPracticeManagement.com.

Ellen serves as the Law Practice Management Coordinator for the Pennsylvania Bar Association. She has held this position since 1999. In that capacity she assists PBA's members with management issues and decisions on the business side of their practice. Ellen is also a regular presenter, in person and through online webinars, for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute.

Ellen holds the designation of Certified Legal Manager through the Association of Legal Administrators (ALA), the credentialing body for the CLM degree. Ellen was one of the first 20 members globally to have achieved this designation. ALA has @11,000+ members, of which approximately 300 have earned the CLM degree. Ellen holds a Certification in Computer Programming from Maxwell Institute, and a Certification in Web Site Design and a B.A. in Liberal Arts from Temple University.

Ellen was inducted as a Fellow of the College of Law Practice Management in October, 2020. Membership in the College is by invitation only. Eligible nominees include those who have made significant contributions to the field of law practice management for over ten years. Since its establishment over twenty years ago, nearly 300 practitioners from 5 different countries have become Fellows of the College.

Ellen managed inside law firms for twenty years. Most of that time was spent in a mid-size (35+ attorney) firm environment. She launched her consulting practice in 1998, and joined the Pennsylvania Bar Association in 1999.

Ellen is an associate member of the American Bar Association, and its Law Practice Management and General Practice & Small Firm sections. She was a member of the Association of Legal Administrators for over 20 years, and founded the Independence Chapter. She is a frequent author and speaker on law firm management issues on a national level.

Freedman Consulting, Inc. 313 Bridle Path Road Lansdale, PA 19446-1565 Phone/Fax: 215-628-9422 Ellen@FreedmanLPM.com www.FreedmanLPM.com

JOCELYN BRUMBAUGH

FOUNDER, BUILDEN PARTNERS

Jocelyn Brumbaugh's experience includes 20+ years in marketing and communications roles at top law and financial services firms building departments, counseling CEOs and driving strategy.

As the founder of Builden Partners, she is changing the way law firms think about marketing by offering process-driven solutions to law firms from premier boutiques to the best known global brands.

While at top global law firm Baker McKenzie, locelyn oversaw the communications strategy for seven international office acquisitions. She launched numerous innovative tools for increased awareness of strategy, laterals and key marketing initiatives, including a chairman's blog, a global news portal and the firm's first coordinated deal collection process.



Prior to that, she built the first communications department at Foley & Lardner, including handling the communications strategy for numerous office acquisitions, and managed consumer and healthcare accounts at Edelman Public Relations.

At the global financial services firm Citadel, Jocelyn developed the firm's first strategic internal communications plan, including orchestrating all CEO communications and employee touchpoints.

In 2006, Jocelyn founded Legal & Professional Services Council, a nonprofit trade group known for high-quality programming on law firm business development, marketing and communications. Over the course of 15 years, she grew LPSC to more than 600 members across the country and advanced the professional development of more than 5,000 people through 100+ events.





Marketing Strategy for Law Firms PROCESS, DRIVEN.

BUILDEN PARTNERS

CHANGING THE WAY LAW FIRMS THINK ABOUT MARKETING

BUILDEN is changing the way law firms think about marketing by using our process-driven approach to turn random acts of marketing into strategies that drive business development.

Our team of seasoned legal marketers helps firms of all sizes better engage with clients, prospects and talent. Founded in 2014, Builden has solely focused on marketing and communications support for law firms. Over the years, we have expanded our service offerings while maintaining our focus on law firms.

Builden has worked with nearly 100 firms, from AmLaw 20 firms to well-known regional boutiques, and we are proud that many clients from our earliest days are still with Builden today.

Using our signature Marketing Infrastructure Model, we provide strategy and execution services for law firms to grow their brands, keep lawyers top of mind with clients and prospects and drive revenue.

Additional services include:

- Outsourced marketing solutions
- Fractional and interim marketing support
- Business development coaching
- PR and media relations
- Change management
- Content development

BUILDEN'S FIVE STEP MARKETING INFRASTRUCTURE MODEL

A systematic approach to capturing the good work attorneys already do and delivering it where clients, prospects and referral sources are.









Improving Lateral Hires with Emotional Intelligence Screening



Ellen Freedman, CLM President Freedman Consulting, Inc.

Improving Lateral Hires with Emotional Intelligence Screening

Table of Contents

- 1. Speaker biography
- 2. PowerPoint handout

Note: For your convenience, and to save trees, all of the material included in this table of contents may be downloaded directly to your computer from Hightail at https://tinyurl.com/LawPact-EQ

HOW TO DOWNLOAD THE SEMINAR MATERIALS:

Note that you do NOT have to register or open an account to download. If you are prompted to do so, close your browser, and reopen and try again.

Your access code is **2023**

1) Enter the URL in your browser. You will go to the download page on Hightail. You will see the image of the handout Cover Page on the left. Directly above that area on the far right, you will see 5 Options in Circles. 2) Click the 4th button with the down-facing arrow for **Download All**. 3) The document will appear to open on the screen. Put your cursor anywhere to once again Select the Download Option on the right. 4) Windows Explorer will open your dialog box. Navigate to the exact folder in which you want to save the document, and then select **SAVE**.]

- 3. Is It Time to Hire?
- 4. Hiring Techniques to Ensure Success
- 5. Communicate Your Expectations Clearly
- 6. Enticing Entrepreneurial Lawyers

Improving Lateral Hires with Emotional Intelligence Screening

Table of Contents

Page 2 of 4

- 7. How to Successfully Recruit and Retain Associates
- 8. Profile of a Partner
- 9. Coaching to Improve Skills
- 10. Indispensable People: Joys and Risks
- 11. Catch Them Doing Something Right!
- 12. Convert New Hires Into Future Superstars
- 13. Making Better Hiring and Retention Decisions Think Inside the Box
- 14. Killer Bees and Sacred Cows
- 15. Avoiding Staff Turnover Syndrome
- 16. Calculating the True Cost of Turnover
- 17. Use Exit Interviews to Improve Your Firm
- 18. The Perfect Storm Is Here
- 19. Thoughts, Attitudes, Habits and Behaviors
- 20. Interview Protocol
- 21. Do-It-Yourself Lateral Hiring
- 22. Evaluating Mentoring Programs
- 23. How to Harness Emotional Intelligence to Ensure Success
- 24. How to Hire a Paralegal
- 25. Implementing a New Model for Attorney Training
- 26. Law Firm Culture The Generational Divide

Improving Lateral Hires with Emotional Intelligence Screening

Table of Contents

Page 3 of 4

- 27. Leveraging Generational Diversity
- 28. Managing Millennials in the Legal Workplace
- 29. Managing Millennials
- 30. Putting Law Firm Hires to the Test
- 31. Resilience and Lawyer Negativity
- 32. Tips for Multigenerational Hiring and Retention
- 33. Managing Partner Burnout
- 34. The Art of Active Listening
- 35. The Psychologically Savvy Leader
- 36. Accountability 101 Part One
- 37. Accountability 101 Part Two
- 38. Accountability 101 Part Three
- 39. Accountability 101 Part Four
- 40. Are You In Control of Your Actions?
- 41. Hiring Emotionally Intelligent Associates
- 42. 11 Tested Emotional Intelligence Questions
- 43. Interview Questions About Your Emotional Intelligence
- 44. Asking a Partner to Leave The Courage to Act
- 45. How a Firm Can Deal with a Difficult Partner
- 46. Critical Questions to Qualify a Lateral Candidate

Improving Lateral Hires with Emotional Intelligence Screening

Table of Contents

Page 4 of 4

- 47. Active Listening: Do I Really Need to Say This?
- 48. Part I Hiring Legal Employees in Remote Environments
- 49. Part II Onboarding Remote & Hybrid Legal Employee
- 50. Part III Effectively Managing Remote & Hybrid Legal Teams
- 51. Next Level Resilience: Strengthen Your Brain for Optimum Performance Using Neuroscience
- 52. Be Resilient And Life's Troubles Will Make You Better
- 53. How Emotionally Intelligent People Use the Mark Twain Rule to Become Exceptionally Persuasive
- 54. Problem Resolution: Holding Employees Accountable
- 55. How People With Very High Emotional Intelligence Use the Fortune Cookie Rule to Become Super-Resilient
- 56. When Being a Star Rainmaker is Not Enough Why EQ Leads to Even Better Business Results

ELLEN FREEDMAN, CLM



Ellen Freedman is founder and President of Freedman Consulting, which was established in 1998. Freedman Consulting assists PA law firms with a full range of issues on the business side of a law practice. Services include but are not limited to strategic planning including retreat facilitation planning; leadership and management structure evaluation and modification; strategic intelligence and research; financial management and profitability enhancement; disaster planning and recovery; human resource management; insurance and risk management, law firm life cycle support including start-up, growth, sale, purchase, merger, acquisition, closing and dissolution; marketing and strategic planning; practice management audits; records management and retention; technology upgrades including needs assessment and implementation; partner compensation; and more. Information about Ellen and her law practice management services may be obtained at http://www.FreedmanLPM.com. Ellen also publishes the Law Practice Management blog at www.PA-

LawPracticeManagement.com.

Ellen serves as the Law Practice Management Coordinator for the Pennsylvania Bar Association. She has held this position since 1999. In that capacity she assists PBA's members with management issues and decisions on the business side of their practice. Ellen is also a regular presenter, in person and through online webinars, for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute.

Ellen holds the designation of Certified Legal Manager through the Association of Legal Administrators (ALA), the credentialing body for the CLM degree. Ellen was one of the first 20 members globally to have achieved this designation. ALA has @11,000+ members, of which approximately 300 have earned the CLM degree. Ellen holds a Certification in Computer Programming from Maxwell Institute, and a Certification in Web Site Design and a B.A. in Liberal Arts from Temple University.

Ellen was inducted as a Fellow of the College of Law Practice Management in October, 2020. Membership in the College is by invitation only. Eligible nominees include those who have made significant contributions to the field of law practice management for over ten years. Since its establishment over twenty years ago, nearly 300 practitioners from 5 different countries have become Fellows of the College.

Ellen managed inside law firms for twenty years. Most of that time was spent in a mid-size (35+ attorney) firm environment. She launched her consulting practice in 1998, and joined the Pennsylvania Bar Association in 1999.

Ellen is an associate member of the American Bar Association, and its Law Practice Management and General Practice & Small Firm sections. She was a member of the Association of Legal Administrators for over 20 years, and founded the Independence Chapter. She is a frequent author and speaker on law firm management issues on a national level.

Freedman Consulting, Inc. 313 Bridle Path Road Lansdale, PA 19446-1565 Phone/Fax: 215-628-9422 Ellen@FreedmanLPM.com www.FreedmanLPM.com

Improving Lateral Hires with Emotional Intelligence Screening

Ellen Freedman, CLM President Freedman Consulting, Inc.

1

Ellen Freedman, CLM

- President Freedman Consulting (1998)
 Law Practice Manager
- Law Practice Manager PA Bar Assoc (1999)
- Instructor PA Bar Institute (2006)
- 20 years managing inside law firms
- One of @300 out of 11,000+ members of ALA who've earned CLM - one of first 20 globally (2007)
- Fellow, College of Law Practice Management (2020)
- Nationally-recognized author and lecturer

2

We're going to cover:

- Understanding emotional intelligence
- Most frequent hiring mistakes
- Best hiring practices
- Training & Orientation
- Retention

Understanding Emotional Intelligence









Other behaviors of high EQ

- Admit to and learn from mistakes
- Keep emotions in check
- Have thoughtful discussions on tough issues
- Listen actively
- Take criticism well
- Show grace under pressure

7

How important is EQ?

 Repeated studies have shown that 80% of success is linked to EQ rather than IQ



- IQ rarely improves
- EQ can be significantly improved with self improvement or outside coaching











- Temper tantrums
- Devil's Advocate : day is night, night is day
- Difficult communications
- Refusal to be held accountable
- Blame game
- Rules don't apply



































Attorney Retention

- Find out their intentions
- Provide frequent and honest feedback
- Solicit their feedback
- Illuminate the path to partnership
- Provide adequate "face time" to develop the glue that binds



26

Staff Retention

- Equal treatment no sacred cows
- Handbook
- Eliminate killer bees
- Public praise
- Private criticism
- Honest evaluations
- Clear instructions / answer questions
- Reasonable time off



Summary

- Hiring is not a precise science
- Hiring methods can always be improved
- Turnover is costly and disruptive
- Life is too short!
- No one is irreplaceable

29



Connect with me !

Ellen Freedman, CLM

215-628-9422 Ellen@FreedmanLPM.com

Blog: www.PA-LawPracticeManagement.com Facebook: www.facebook.com/freedmanconsultinginc LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/ellenfreedman Twitter: @PA_PMA


Artificial Intelligence in Our Lives and Law Practices



Ellen Freedman, CLM President Freedman Consulting, Inc.

Artificial Intelligence in Our Lives and Law Practices

Table of Contents

- 1. Speaker biography
- 2. PowerPoint handout

Note: For your convenience, and to save trees, all of the material included in this table of contents may be downloaded directly to your computer from Hightail at https://tinyurl.com/LawPact-AI

HOW TO DOWNLOAD THE SEMINAR MATERIALS:

Note that you do NOT have to register or open an account to download. If you are prompted to do so, close your browser, and reopen and try again.

Your access code is **2023**

1) Enter the URL in your browser. You will go to the download page on Hightail. You will see the image of the handout Cover Page on the left. Directly above that area on the far right, you will see 5 Options in Circles. 2) Click the 4th button with the down-facing arrow for **Download All**. 3) The document will appear to open on the screen. Put your cursor anywhere to once again Select the Download Option on the right. 4) Windows Explorer will open your dialog box. Navigate to the exact folder in which you want to save the document, and then select **SAVE**.]

- 3. Article entitled "3 Predictions for How A.I. Will Change Business Practices in the Near Future"
- 4. Article entitled "7 Questions Lawyers Should Ask AI Vendors"

Artificial Intelligence in Our Lives and Law Practices

Table of Contents

Page 2 of 3

- 5. Article entitled "AI and a Judge's Ethical Obligations"
- 6. Article entitled "AI and Legal Contract Management"
- 7. Article entitled "AI ethics AI code of ethics"
- 8. Article entitled "AI in Law Transforming Legal Practice"
- 9. Article entitled "AI in Law and Legal Practice A Comprehensive View of 35 Current Applications"
- 10. Article entitled "AI predicts crime a week in advance with 90 per cent accuracy"
- 11. Article entitled "Am Law 200 Firm Finds Fresh Use For AI: Attorneys' Budgeting"
- 12. Article entitled "Artificial Intelligence and Automated Systems Legal Update"
- 13. Article entitled "Artificial Intelligence and Corporate Legal Departments"
- 14. Resource entitled "Artificial Intelligence Buyers Guide 2021"
- 15. Article entitled "Benefits & Risks of Artificial Intelligence"
- 16. Article entitled "Building 'Good Stuff In, Good Stuff Out' Artificial Intelligence"
- 17. Article entitled "Challenges of AI"
- 18. Article entitled "Data Analytics and Artificial Intelligence in Litigation"
- 19. Article entitled "Developing Trustworthy Systems"
- 20. Article entitled "Does it Compute Limits of AI"
- 21. Article entitled "From AI Compliance to Competitive Advantage"
- 22. Article entitled "Hitchhikers Guide to AI"
- 23. Article entitled "How Artificial Intelligence Helps Lawyers and Their Clients"
- 24. Article entitled "If You're Working This Weekend It Might Be Because Your Bosses Are Dropping The Ball"
- 25. Article entitled "Is Artificial Intelligence a Threat to Privacy?"
- 26. Article entitled "Just Calling A Product 'Artificial Intelligence' Isn't Good Enough"

Artificial Intelligence in Our Lives and Law Practices

Table of Contents

Page 3 of 3

- 27. Article entitled "Law Bots How AI Is Reshaping the Legal Profession"
- 28. Article entitled "Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges and vulnerabilities"
- 29. Article entitled "Litigation In The Age Of Big Data: How Everlaw Is Tackling The Most Complex Technical Issues In eDiscovery"
- 30. Article entitled "Problems with AI"
- 31. Article entitled "Recent Developments in Artificial Intelligence Cases 2021"
- 32. Article entitled "Scaling AI Giving Data Its Due"
- 33. Article entitled "We Need Concrete Protections From Artificial Intelligence Threatening Human Rights"
- 34. Article entitled "Why Risk Not Knowing What's In Your Contracts When This Product Can Show You Everything?"
- 35. Article entitled "How to write better ChatGPT prompts (and this applies to most other text-based AIs, too)"
- 36. Article entitled "Tracking Generative AI: How Evolving AI Models Are Impacting Legal"
- 37. Article entitled "Artificial Intelligence and the Practice of Law"
- 38. Article entitled "ChatGPT Artificial Intelligence: Will It Replace Lawyers and Legal Staff?"
- 39. Article entitled "As AI Automation Evolve So Do Lawyers' Ways of Operating"
- 40. Article entitled "AI Powered Robot Lawyer Takes Its First Court Case"
- 41. The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) "Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights: Making Automated Systems Work for the American People"

ELLEN FREEDMAN, CLM



Ellen Freedman is founder and President of Freedman Consulting, which was established in 1998. Freedman Consulting assists PA law firms with a full range of issues on the business side of a law practice. Services include but are not limited to strategic planning including retreat facilitation planning; leadership and management structure evaluation and modification; strategic intelligence and research; financial management and profitability enhancement; disaster planning and recovery; human resource management; insurance and risk management, law firm life cycle support including start-up, growth, sale, purchase, merger, acquisition, closing and dissolution; marketing and strategic planning; practice management audits; records management and retention; technology upgrades including needs assessment and implementation; partner compensation; and more. Information about Ellen and her law practice management services may be obtained at http://www.FreedmanLPM.com. Ellen also publishes the Law Practice Management blog at www.PA-

LawPracticeManagement.com.

Ellen serves as the Law Practice Management Coordinator for the Pennsylvania Bar Association. She has held this position since 1999. In that capacity she assists PBA's members with management issues and decisions on the business side of their practice. Ellen is also a regular presenter, in person and through online webinars, for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute.

Ellen holds the designation of Certified Legal Manager through the Association of Legal Administrators (ALA), the credentialing body for the CLM degree. Ellen was one of the first 20 members globally to have achieved this designation. ALA has @11,000+ members, of which approximately 300 have earned the CLM degree. Ellen holds a Certification in Computer Programming from Maxwell Institute, and a Certification in Web Site Design and a B.A. in Liberal Arts from Temple University.

Ellen was inducted as a Fellow of the College of Law Practice Management in October, 2020. Membership in the College is by invitation only. Eligible nominees include those who have made significant contributions to the field of law practice management for over ten years. Since its establishment over twenty years ago, nearly 300 practitioners from 5 different countries have become Fellows of the College.

Ellen managed inside law firms for twenty years. Most of that time was spent in a mid-size (35+ attorney) firm environment. She launched her consulting practice in 1998, and joined the Pennsylvania Bar Association in 1999.

Ellen is an associate member of the American Bar Association, and its Law Practice Management and General Practice & Small Firm sections. She was a member of the Association of Legal Administrators for over 20 years, and founded the Independence Chapter. She is a frequent author and speaker on law firm management issues on a national level.

Freedman Consulting, Inc. 313 Bridle Path Road Lansdale, PA 19446-1565 Phone/Fax: 215-628-9422 Ellen@FreedmanLPM.com www.FreedmanLPM.com

Artificial Intelligence in Our Lives and Law Practices



Ellen Freedman, CLM President Freedman Consulting, Inc.

1

Ellen Freedman, CLM

- President Freedman Consulting (1998)
- Law Practice Manager PA Bar Assoc (1999)
- Instructor PA Bar Institute (2006)
- 20 years managing inside law firms
- One of @300 out of 11,000+ members of ALA who've earned CLM - one of first 20 globally (2007)
- Fellow, College of Law Practice Management (2020)
- Nationally-recognized author and lecturer

2

What We'll Cover Today

- Definitions
- Al at home and in social interaction

•3

- Al in the law firm
- Risks & ethical issues
- Al rules & regulations
- □ AI code of ethics

Definitions

- Artificial Intelligence ("AI") a combination of many different technologies working together to enable machines to sense, comprehend, act, and learn with human-like levels of intelligence.
 - Machine learning
 - Natural language processing
 - Data analytics
 - Automation
 - Algorithms

4



5

Definitions

- General or Strong AI: machines which emulate human intelligence, thinking strategically, abstractly and creatively, with the ability to handle a range of complex tasks.
 - General or Strong AI is intended to be a replacement for human capabilities

•6



Definitions Machine learning ("ML") Develop Al algorithms using historical data as input, to

- predict new output values
 Generative AI: analyze content and
- generate completely new content
- AI Emergent behavior: new content including strategies containing novel creative expressions; to win games, discover new drugs etc
- 8



 Smart smoke alarms (Nest Protect) – early notification and provide cause

•9



- Smart home automation systems: learns human behavior patterns, automates user preferences
 - Temperature, lights on/off, air purifier
 - Running vacuum
 - Adjusting washer and dryer settings based on climate and air quality
 - Distributed energy generation, storage, vehicle charging, lower grid usage by optimizing resource consumption

AI - Home & Social Interaction

- Virtual Reality: gaming and education
- Social event scheduling: inviting, tracking responses, reminders, photo sharing
- Online: Customization of news feeds, photo and personal information sharing, connecting with like-minded people, finding a mate
 - Facebook, LinkedIn, TikTok, Twitter, Snapchat, Pinterist etc etc

11



•12

•10

e 11



AI - Medicine

- Starting to be used to make clinical decisions
 - What medicine to use
 - What mental health treatment is necessary
 - What physical therapy is best
- Reading MRIs, X-Rays and other imaging results
 - Al better at finding things humans miss
- Al combined with virtual reality being used in
 cognitive behavioral therapy.

14

AI in the Law Firm

•15

- Contract management
 - Review for compliance, consistency
 - Analyze adherence to negotiations
 - Generate
 - Sharing & reviewing / Versioning
 - Redlining / Comparison
 - Signing
 - Tracking renewals

AI in the Law Firm

Litigation

- Discovery organization and labeling using technology assisted review ("TAR")
- Legal research including semantic search
- Determining relevance of cases to strategy
- Predicting legal outcomes
- Cost-benefit analysis
- Analyzing discovery to develop case theories and strategies

16



17

AI in the Law Firm

Criminal

- Advise judges on bail and sentencing decisions
- Assess recidivism risk
- Recommendation on pre-trial detention or early release
- AI can predict location of crimes in coming week with up to 90% accuracy!
- Does it perpetuate bias?

•18

•17

AI in the Law Firm

- Gavelytics providing AI-powered analysis of tens of millions of state court litigation documents (10 states) to find behavior patterns of
 - Judges
 - Law firms
 - Litigants
 - Motion filings
 - Opposing counsel case filings and outcomes

19

AI in the Law Firm Blue J Legal using machine learning on tax and employment law cases, to predict how court would rule in specific scenarios Lawyers use questionnaire with facts about unique case, to get prediction of case outcome

- Lawyers can change facts and analyze change in outcome
- Blue J claims 90% accuracy in predictions

20

AI in the Law Firm

Litigation finance:

Legalist using data from 15 million court cases across US to predict which lawsuits are likely winners

- Historical data includes length of litigation
- Historical data includes probable amount of settlement or judgment

•21

•20

AI in the Law Firm

Invoicing and Spend Control

- E-billing find overbilling, inconsistencies, errors for clients
- Invoice review for firm flag potential inconsistencies and non-compliance with billing arrangement

•22

- Budgeting
- Task-based billing

22

AI - Client Relations & Marketing

- Chatbots for client intake and quick questions
- Automatic client file organization
- Automatic generation of client/matter updates and reminders of upcoming events
- Automatic follow-up for necessary data
- More time to focus on clients and their work
- Generation of blog posts, newsletters, client alerts, predict client Q&A for key words











Risks & Ethical Issues

- Potential discrimination in HR
- The global legal system is not yet ready for the legal issues which will arise
- Insurers are not yet ready to refine language and coverage to deal with future liability issues arising from AI
- Cybersecurity vulnerabilities, lack of contestability, legal personhood issues, intellectual property issues, adverse effects on workers, privacy and data protection issues, liability for damage and lack of accountability



AI Rules & Regulations

Currently no federal regulation of AI in U.S.

- Department of Commerce directed National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to develop a voluntary risk management framework for trustworthy AI systems.
- Federal Trade Commission published blog April 2022 making it clear FTC will use Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) and Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA) to pursue use of biased algorithms.

31

AI Rules & Regulations

In Sept 2022, the E.U.-U.S. Trade and Technology Council (TTC) released joint statement to cooperate on developing

"Al systems that are innovative and trustworthy and that respect universal human rights and shared democratic values."

32

AI Rules & Regulations

Food and Drug Administration (FDA) released the Artificial Intelligence / Machine Learning-Based (AI-ML) Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) Action Plan.

FDA intends to update regulatory framework in order to use SaMD to treat, diagnose, cure, mitigate or prevent disease or other conditions.

•33

• 32





35



•36

•34

.

AI Code of Ethics

- Al system must be endowed with positive purpose, and safeguarded from being exploited for bad purposes.
- Al system must collect and use data responsibly, observing data privacy rights.
- Al system should only collect data when needed, and only with granularity as narrow as possible to meet the purpose. Data no longer required should be deleted routinely.

•37

37



38



Connect with me !

Ellen Freedman, CLM LawPractice@PaBar.org

.

Blog: www.PA-LawPracticeManagement.com Facebook: www.facebook.com/freedmanconsultinginc LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/ellenfreedman Twitter: @PA_PMA

















































		0			P
And t	hen!		5		0-0
	Edit experience		×		
	Notify network Turn on to notify your network of key profile changes (such as new job) and work anniversaries. Updates can take up to 2 hours. Learn more about sharing profile change	off O			6
	* Indicates required				
	Founder				
	Employment type				
—	Please select Learn more about employment types.				
	Company name*		1	a.	
~/~.)	Builden Partners			Ь	25
25					






















































Memo To: Keyser Mason Ball, LLP, Amandeep Sidhu File: No File Selected Research ID: #40001189780207c Jurisdiction: Ontario, Canada Date: May 5, 2023 Regarding: 28346-1

Issue

What factors do courts consider when discrediting an expert witness in real estate valuation cases?

Research Description

We have a summary judgment coming up. The parties have conflicting expert reports and the experts have been cross examined. What factors does a court consider when discrediting an expert in real estate valuations?

Conclusion

In <u>Orr v MTCC 1056</u>, 2016 ONSC 7630 (CanLII), the parties had conflicting real estate valuation opinions. The Court determined it perferred the opinion of one expert as it was the most comprehensive in terms of the work done in arriving at the opinion. The expert attended at the premises, took many photos of the location, the house, the views, interior finishes and layout. The expert also considered the sales activity over the years in the complex and included photos of the comparable units, both interior and exterior. As oppose to the other expert who failed to attend and inspect the location and had limited information on comparable properties. As well, the other experts' opinions were underminded on cross-examination.

In <u>*Palladino v. Durham et al.*, 2021 ONSC 4909 (CanLII)</u>, the Court considered the real estate appraiser's impartiality as well as accuracy in drafting the report to determine which opinion was more reliable.

Although in relation to a family law context, the Court in <u>Bidulock v Bidulock</u>, 2018 ABQB 474 (<u>CanLII</u>) considered the qualifications of the real estate valuation expert, their methodology, and their experience with commercial appraisals to determine which opinion it preferred.

In <u>General Motors of Canada Company v Municipal Property Assessment Corporation Region</u> 23, 2023 CanLII 12249 (ON ARB), the Board considered the application of the methodology each appraiser used, as well as the data used by the appraisers, and the lack of analysis to discredit their opinion.

In <u>Trask et al v. Groves Memorial Community Hospital</u>, 2014 ONSC 26 (CanLII), the Court looked at both expert's opinions and considered the selection of comparable sales as part of the sales comparison approach completed by the appraisers, and assessed the various adjustments applied by the experts to determine the validity of the opinion.

Law

In <u>Orr v MTCC 1056, 2016 ONSC 7630 (CanLII)</u>, in assessing each of the expert's opinions, the Court considered their qualifications, the failure of one appraiser to attend and inspect the property, and the lack of data considered:

[28] Counsel agreed each of the experts called was properly qualified as an expert to offer an opinion to the court on the valuation of townhouse 113 as of December 2, 2014. Each expert had similar qualifications; there was not one who stood out as being more qualified than the others. In my view, in determining the value of the loss of the third floor to the Plaintiff, I must scrutinize the expert opinions and decide which one I accept.

[29] In my opinion, Lee's opinion is not as reliable as that of the other experts principally because she did not attend and inspect the Plaintiff's unit. Given that she

was asked to value a property and she was using other units to make the comparison, it seems to me it was essential to go to the unit to obtain a sense of its location within the complex, its layout and the quality of finishes in particular. It is difficult to appreciate these features by simply looking at photographs. It was not the case that she was unable to attend the premises; simply that she understood that this option was not available to her. When questioned on this point, she agreed that the fact that she had not inspected the townhouse placed her at a disadvantage compared to the other experts who had done so and I agree with this statement. As a result, I give much less weight to her opinion.

[30] Furthermore, Lee had only limited information on the comparables. For example, she did not know that there were a number of three-storey townhouses at Grand Harbour and she was not aware which of the comparables had lake views, which she agreed was a significant factor in her analysis. She did not know that the unit next door to the Plaintiff, townhouse 114, which was a smaller unit, sold for \$1,510,000 in 2011 and it was listed for sale in May 2015 with a price of \$1,898,800. She was unaware that an offer was made in 2015 for that same unit for \$1.6 million.

[...]

[33] Parthenis testified that he was not familiar with the text "*The Appraisal of Real Estate*" by the Appraisal Institute of Canada, which was acknowledged by both Bottero and Lee as the authoritative text for appraisers in Canada. This admission was surprising, given the evidence of the other two experts and makes me question the reliability of the opinion of Parthenis. Bottero and Lee agreed that this book directs that when doing an appraisal, it is not good practice to average the value indicators of comparable properties. When Parthenis was asked if averaging the value indicators of the comparable properties as a means of arriving at a valuation was contrary to the text, he did not know.

[...]

[37] The Bottero report was clearly the most comprehensive in terms of the work

done in arriving at the opinion. Bottero and his associate attended at the premises, took many photos both of the location of the townhouse, its views, interior finishes and layout. Bottero considered the sales activity over the years of units in the complex. He also included photos of the comparable units, both interior and exterior, so I was able to get a sense of the differences between the comparables and the Plaintiff's townhouse.

[...]

[43] It is interesting to note that the valuations done by Bottero are actually less than the appraisals of the expert retained by the Defendant Gowlings. This gives credence to the reasonableness of the valuations done by Bottero. Furthermore, the Plaintiff bought the unit in 1998 as a three-storey townhouse for \$955,000. She then spent hundreds of thousands of dollars renovating the unit. It makes no sense that after doing so, the value of her townhouse would only have increased by \$200,000 over a period of seventeen years, which is the opinion of Lee. The evidence of Parthenis contradicts this conclusion because he testified that from 2009 to 2014, the properties in Grand Harbour increased by about seven percent (7%) per year. The other experts did not disagree with this estimate.

Of note, in <u>Orr v MTCC 1056, 2016 ONSC 7630 (CanLII)</u>, the Court confirmed the most reliable appraisal opinion involved research that was thorough, a well-founded analysis, and his opinion was not undermined on cross-examination the same way the other opinions were:

[45] I agree that the appraisal of real estate is not an exact science; rather, it is an art. Following the direct comparison approach allows an analysis of a piece of property based on comparisons with similar properties with appropriate adjustments to take into account features of the property at issue. In my view, the most reliable opinion on the value of the loss of the third floor of unit 113 is that of Bottero. His research was thorough, his analysis was well-founded and his opinion was not undermined on cross-examination in the same way that the opinions of Lee and Parthenis were. I accept the opinion of Bottero as to the valuations of the unit and therefore find that the loss of the third floor of the Orr townhouse as of December 2,

2014 is \$465,000 and I fix the damages of the Plaintiff in that amount.

In assessing the expert real estate opinions in <u>*Palladino v. Durham et al.*, 2021 ONSC 4909</u> (<u>CanLII</u>), the Court considered the impartiality of the expert, and the errors noted in both reports with respect to adjustments and measurements in determining which opinion was more reliable:

[69] The Court has concerns with both expert opinions as to market value. First, each opinion provided is that, an opinion. They are at best educated guesses. They are considerations by the author of the opinion on what the market value could be given, the assumptions made and information provided. As Edwards J., as he then was, indicated in *Gamoff*, it is "crystal ball gazing."[13]

[70] The concerns that this Court has with the opinion of Mr. Epstein are that there are several occasions in his reports and in his testimony that Mr. Epstein went from a neutral expert to that of an advocate. His impartiality was compromised. Occasions of the impartiality of Mr. Epstein that gives the Court concurs, include:

a) His statements that Ms. Garbens reports were misleading and unethical. He states that the data used by Ms. Garbens was unethical. He refers to the Appraisal Standards (CUSPAP), section 5.2 throughout is Review Report[14] to imply that Ms. Garbens was unethical. He opines that Ms. Garbens' report "is misleading and in violation of the CUSPAP standards."[15]

b) His Review Report reads more like a submission than impartial objective evidence for the benefit of the Court. In his review report, he makes conclusions on the conduct of the plaintiff "in hiring an expert in the field of real estate transactions by engaging a real estate brokerage to handle both of his 2017 transactions on the property."[16]

c) He makes conclusionary comments that the price obtained by the plaintiff meets the definition of market value. He goes on and concludes in his testimony and report that the transaction in October 2017 met the test of reasonable exposure and the plaintiff acted

knowledgably.

d) The conclusion of price in his reports denotes that the price of \$625,000 was reasonable. He does not provide an independent market value assessment. It appears to the Court that his finding that \$625,000 as a reasonable value indicate a result orientated approach, that is, to support the price sold by the plaintiff rather than providing an impartial valuation of the market value of the Property at the time of sale in October, 2017.

[71] These frailties of the evidence and reports of Mr. Epstein detract, significantly, to its persuasiveness and reliability.

[...]

[73] Even with the issue of time constraints, Ms. Garbens' reports have numerous errors and re-calculations that gives the Court pause with respect to its reliability. There were errors in:

(a) driveway adjustments which required a recalculation;

(b) in the sale price of Comp. 2, which required a recalculation;

(c) failure to indicate in her report the deductions and increases made to each comparable to contrast with the Property. This prevented one from reading the report to clearly ascertain the percentages and figures utilized in the adjustments;

(d) the lot size of Comp. 5.

[74] Furthermore, the Court has concerns with the time adjustment percentage that Ms. Garbens utilized. There is no question that the Property was a one-storey waterfront property in Innisfil. However, Ms. Garbens used a HPI for all houses in Innisfil and did not restrict, as Mr. Epstein did, to one-storey homes. This decision by Ms. Garbens results in the percentage used for time adjustment to be lower than

if one used a one-storey defined HPI. The effect is that the prices of comparables used by Ms. Garbens is not decreased to the same degree. The time adjustment for all homes during the time periods in question, June to October 2017, is 10.5 percent rather than 15.84 percent for one-storey homes.

[75] I determine that the time adjustments used by Mr. Epstein appears to be more pertinent in the circumstances of this case giving the volatility of the market and the type of home that was the Property. To restrict the types of homes to the type of home that was the Property makes more logical sense. That comparison is more accurate. There were no questions that the numbers of homes in the one-storey category in Innisfil were sufficient as opposed to a nonexistent sample for one-storey waterfront homes in Innisfil.

[76] Taking all these factors into consideration, I have concerns on the reliability of Ms. Garbens' reports and figures.

In <u>Bidulock v Bidulock</u>, 2018 ABQB 474 (CanLII), there were conflicting opinions between the parties real estate valuation experts. Although in relation to a family law context, the Court considered the qualifications of the expert appraisers, their methodology, and their experience with commercial appraisals:

[82] I conclude that the opinions of Mr. Davis regarding the values of the two properties are more reliable than the opinions of Mr. Vallee for the following reasons:

1) Qualifications – Mr. Davis' designation as AAIC requires a higher level of education than does the DAC which Mr. Vallee possesses. Mr. Davis also has a university degree and a Post Graduate Certificate in Valuation from the University of British Columbia. This is reflected in the higher level of sophistication and a more detailed analytical approach demonstrated in the Davis reports.

2) Experience with commercial appraisals - Mr. Vallee is 71 years old and has been involved in the real estate business in east central Alberta for over 40 years. At times, he was also a real estate broker and operated an insurance business. While Mr. Vallee has done commercial real estate appraisals, this represents only 10% of his practice. On the other hand, Mr. Davis has been an appraiser of real estate for much less time, but his experience is much more directly focused on commercial real estate appraisals such as the appraisals in this case.

3) Direct Experience in St. Paul Appraisals – Mr. Davis had recent experience in appraising commercial properties in St. Paul and those properties were subsequently sold within the range of his appraised values.

4) Davis used St. Paul Comparables – For the Direct Sales Comparison Approach, Mr. Davis was able to use recent sales of commercial real estate in St. Paul to arrive at an estimate of value. In relation to the Power Merchant lands three of the four comparables were located in St. Paul. In relation to the Boathouse, two of the four comparables were located in St. Paul. On the other hand, Mr. Vallee used nine comparables to value both the Power Merchants lands and the Boathouse, but only one of those properties was in St. Paul. The two comparables which Mr. Vallee used to value Power Merchants lands were both located in Bonnyville.

5) Vallee Inconsistent Approach – When estimating the value of the Boathouse Mr. Vallee relied exclusively on the results of the Direct Sales Comparison Approach (which was substantially less than the value indicated via the Income Approach). However, when estimating the value of the Power Merchants lands, Mr. Vallee concluded that the Direct Sales Comparison Approach resulted in a much higher value than that indicated by the Income Approach. Instead of using the Direct Sales Comparison Approach as he had done with the Boathouse, Mr. Vallee averaged the results of the Income Approach and the Direct Sales Comparison Approach. This caused his estimate of fair market value to be less than would have been the case if he had relied exclusively on the Direct Sales Comparison Approach. He offered no explanation for this apparent inconsistent approach.

6) Direct Sales Comparison Approach Preferable – Both the Power Merchants lands and the Boathouse have been owner occupied for many years. It is more likely than not that a purchaser of these properties would use them in a similar way. It is unlikely that the properties would be used for rental and investment purposes. For these reasons Mr. Davis relied on the Direct Sales Comparison Approach and simply used the Income Approach as support for his valuation. Mr. Vallee did not adopt this approach when valuing the Power Merchants lands. As a result he understated the value of the property.

7) Use of the Elk Point Comparable – A property in Elk Point was one of the nine comparables identified by Mr. Vallee as part of the Direct Sales Comparison Approach. The Elk Point property was essentially a garage with an overhead door; it was sold in a foreclosure. The sales price for that property reflected a price per square foot of \$49.18. While Mr. Vallee did not use this comparable to estimate the value of the Power Merchants lands, it clear that the Elk Point transaction was the major factor (or perhaps the only factor) in his valuation of the Boathouse. Of the nine comparables used, Elk Point had the lowest price per square foot. The next lowest price per square foot was \$78.78. The average of the comparables, excluding Elk Point was \$115.83 per square foot, more than twice the unit price for Elk Point. Based on the nine comparables, Mr. Vallee reported that the "unadjusted value range" was \$49 to 158.33. The low end of the range was clearly Elk Point. Mr. Vallee then adjusted the range to account for location and in doing so reduced the per square foot price by an adjustment "as high as 30%". He then expressed his opinion that the value range was \$35 to \$45 per square foot. The Elk Point unit value

of \$49.18, reduced by a location adjustment of 30%, would yield an adjusted per square price of \$34.42. It is obvious that the low end of the range is directly related to Elk Point. Mr. Vallee offered no explanation for how the high end of the adjusted range (\$45) was arrived at. A 30% discount from the next lowest priced comparable (\$78.78) would result in an adjusted value of \$55.15, more than \$10 per square foot higher than the high end of the adjusted range. As a result, I conclude that the high end of Mr. Vallee's range is completely unrelated to any of the eight comparables other than Elk Point. Despite his viva voce evidence, I find that in determining the value of the Boathouse via the Direct Sales Comparison Approach, the only comparable which Mr. Vallee relied on was the Elk Point property. I find that the Elk Point property is not a fair comparable and that the use of Elk Point was not appropriate. Furthermore, no explanation was offered as to why any adjustment was necessary when comparing Elk Point real estate to St. Paul real estate. I find that Mr. Vallee significantly understated the fair market value of the Boathouse by relying on the Elk Point property.

8) "Mortgage Equity Concept" v. "Market Capitalization" – Mr. Vallee used the "Mortgage Equity Concept" because of the "absence of sufficient market data" with which to estimate the "Market Capitalization" rate. The "Market Capitalization" data consisted of extremely old sales data. The most recent comparable sale took place in July 2011. One of the comparables was a sale in 1999. Because of this weak data, Mr. Vallee developed the "Mortgage Equity Concept". However, despite the "Market Capitalization" data being very weak, he gave it and the "Mortgage Equity Concept" equal weight when estimating the value via the Income Approach for the Power Merchants lands. This process resulted in a reduced appraisal of the Power Merchants lands. In <u>General Motors of Canada Company v Municipal Property Assessment Corporation Region</u> <u>23, 2023 CanLII 12249 (ON ARB)</u>, the Board considered the application of the methodology each appraiser used, as well as the data used by the appraisers, and the lack of analysis to discredit their opinion:

[38] The Board begins by first observing that appraisal theory indicates that the import of identifying a property's Highest and Best Use is that is serves to narrow the focus market data to be considered when conducting the appraisal, "to data that is especially pertinent to the appraised property" (see page 12.1). Thus, Highest and Best Use informs both the choice of the appraisal methodology to be applied, and the appraiser's selection of market data that is relevant when forming an opinion as to the value of the property being appraised.

[39] The Board also observes that appraisal theory does not provide that a different Highest and Best Use can be specified for the land as distinct from the improvements on the land. As noted in the excerpt from *The Appraisal of Real Estate*, noted above, the improvements on the land must be considered together with the land in determining Highest and Best Use and, by extension, in developing an opinion of the market value of the property. For this reason, the Appellant's appraisal expert's articulation of the Subject Property's Highest and Best Use is unclear, as it does not indicate whether the Highest and Best Use is large scale manufacturing or, instead, the manufacture of motor vehicles.

[...]

[42] Regarding the issue of whether the Subject Property qualifies as a specialpurpose property, the Board observes that, although the Appellant's appraisal expert's sales evidence does indicate market activity where automotive assembly plants were repurposed for alternate manufacturing purposes, this sales evidence (only seven transactions) does not indicate a high level of sales activity. It also clearly indicates that there are relatively few potential buyers for an automobile assembly plant at any particular point in time, and that the alternate uses for an automobile assembly plant are very limited. For this reason, the Board does not accept the Appellant's appraisal expert's opinion that the CAMI Plant is not a special-purpose building. Accordingly, as observed in *The Appraisal of Real Estate* in respect of special purpose properties, the Highest and Best Use of the Subject Property as improved is *probably* the continuation of its current use if that use remains viable.

[...]

[45] It is commonly understood that 'maximum productivity' means the use that will produce the highest value for the property (i.e. maximize economic return). As noted above, the difficulty when determining Highest and Best Use, in particular, the assessment of 'maximum productivity', is the practical problem that there may be limited market evidence available to determine which use would be maximally productive. Nevertheless, this determination must be made. In this regard, the Board observes that the Appellant's appraisal expert, although he referenced the maximum productivity criteria, provides no analysis evaluating whether the alternate uses identified in the sales transaction data would produce a higher economic return than the Subject Property's current use as an economically viable automotive assembly plant.

[46] As will be discussed below, MPAC challenges the relevance of this sales transaction data on the basis that most of these sales occurred in circumstances where the automotive assembly properties were no longer economically viable at the time of sale. Irrespective of whether this is the case, the Highest and Best Use analysis must be made as of the applicable valuation day. Consequently, in this case, the current use value of the Subject Property must reflect its value as a financially successful and productive use. It is not disputed that significant costs must be incurred to convert an automobile assembly plant to an alternate use, and such costs must be deducted from the anticipated value of the property if it were to be converted to the alternate use. Because such conversion costs would not be incurred if the Subject Property's current use is maintained, it is highly improbable that any feasible alternate use would be more productive than the Subject Property's current use. In this regard, the Board observes that the sales transaction data provided by the Appellant's appraisal expert does not indicate that alternative uses would be more productive, nor does he provide any other analysis to establish that this could be the case.

[...]

[71] As no evidence or analysis has been provided to explain the discrepancy in the areas and associated values, the Board selects MPAC's areas and associated values, as MPAC's evidence provides a detailed breakdown of individual building areas, which suggests it is the more accurate resulting value.

[...]

[73] Regarding the Model Plant, as noted above, MPAC's appraisal expert has reported that its Normalized Annual Production Capacity is 216,576 vehicles per year, whereas the Appellant's appraisal expert has reported this value as 200,000 vehicles per year, indicating that he obtained this value from MPAC's property records. As no evidence or analysis has been provided to explain the discrepancy in these values, the Board selects MPAC's value as it appears the value reported by the Appellant's appraisal expert may have been an approximation.

[...]

[104] In support of its position, the Appellant submits that its appraisal expert's analysis considers specific issues identified at the Subject Property, such as the roof, concrete floors, and ceiling and paint. However, the Board observes that these are described as curable physical deterioration, and the Appellant's appraisal expert expressly confirms that he made no deduction for this type of physical deterioration.

[...]

[131] The Board begins by noting that MPAC and the Appellant adopt very different approaches. One might have expected that, in order to resolve this dispute, the Board would simply identify which approach is correct. However, that is not the case. MPAC's reviewing expert, who reviewed both appraiser's reports, has stated that MPAC's appraisal is "well supported and appropriate", and that the Appellant's appraisal is "market supported and appropriate", (see his conclusions at page 48 of his written report), notwithstanding that the difference in the values derived by the two appraisal experts are literally tens of millions of dollars apart.

[132] In light of the above opinion evidence, the Board accepts that neither approach should be rejected on the basis that it is an incorrect methodology. Instead, in order to resolve the parties' dispute, the Board must examine the specific application of each methodology in this case. In this regard, the Board will first examine the Appellant's approach.

[...]

[136] In reaching this conclusion, the Board observes that the Appellant's appraisal expert's reason for not choosing economic life, is simply that he didn't know what the length of economic life would be. While the Board agrees that accurately estimating economic life is a particularly difficult exercise for automobile assembly plants, this is not a persuasive reason for choosing useful life.

[...]

[181] The Board finds that the Appellant's appraisal expert's analysis creates two uncertainties regarding the reliability of his estimation of Economic Obsolescence:(i) uncertainty whether the property sales used in the Appellant's appraisal expert's analysis reflect the automobile assembly market; and (ii) uncertainty whether Economic Obsolescence varies with effective age. The Board will address each uncertainty in turn.

[...]

[198] In light of the above analysis and findings, the Board concludes that MPAC's appraisal expert's methodology used to determine whether there is economic obsolescence, and, if so, the percentage rate to be used when calculating the value of economic obsolescence on each Valuation Day, is more reliable than the

methodology and values advanced by the Appellant's appraisal expert. Consequently, the Board finds the correct values for economic obsolescence to used when calculating the current value of the Subject Property are the values advanced by MPAC for all the taxation years under appeal.

In <u>Trask et al v. Groves Memorial Community Hospital</u>, 2014 ONSC 26 (CanLII), the Court looked at both expert's opinions and considered the selection of comparable sales as part of the sales comparison approach completed by the appraisers, and assessed the various adjustments applied by the experts to determine the validity of the opinion:

[36] In my view, the selection of comparable sales as part of the sales comparison approach should be focused on local properties, rather than on properties outside of the Township, or certainly outside the County. Consideration of lands for residential development by a potential purchaser would depend upon such a purchaser projecting the demand for and sale prices of residential properties in the local market, rather than a remote market, at the time that the lands would be anticipated to come on stream. Similarly, institutional uses, such as hospitals, municipal facilities, libraries, or places of worship would be expected to serve local needs, and the demand of such facilities would depend upon local conditions, rather than on conditions in remote locations. I would therefore discount the comparability of the church property in Woolwich Township and the Conestoga College property located between Cambridge and Kitchener, both in the Region of Waterloo as identified by Mr. Hasyj as properties 1 and 2 in his initial report.

[...]

[40] I agree with Mr. Youngblood's position that a time factor should be applied to the comparable sales to reflect the fact that their purchasers would have discounted their purchase prices to reflect the lost return on the invested capital for the anticipated period prior to the lands becoming ready for development. I find the rate of 7% compounded semi-annually referred to in Mr. Youngblood's report to be reasonable, resulting in an adjusted value for the Keating Property of \$41,946.98, rounded to \$42,000.

[41] With respect to the Taylor-Turner Properties, Mr. Youngblood applied a downward adjustment of 20% to reflect their superior location and serviceability. It is noted that, at the time that these properties were acquired, they were not yet within the urban boundary and they therefore benefitted from the subsequent OMB order including them within it. I find the minus 20% adjustment proposed by Mr. Youngblood to be reasonable, as well as the time adjustment based upon a 7% semi-annual compound rate, resulting in an adjusted value of \$62,153 per acre rounded to \$62,200.

[...]

[44] Mr. Youngblood, in preparing his addendum report, applied a 10% reduction from the valuation in his initial report which valued the Option Lands as of December 1, 2007 to reflect a reduction in commercial sector activity corresponding with a reduction in activity in the vacant land sector in the intervening year. He also applied a further adjustment of 5% to acknowledge the volatility of the vacant land market in reference to the credit crisis in the fall of 2008.

[45] Mr.Hasyj, in his initial report, under the heading "market overview" addressed the then current credit crisis by observing that its impact remained unknown, and that the market conditions for institutional lands appeared to remain relatively stable.

[46] I am not satisfied, based on the evidence, that a reduction in the value of the Subject Lands as of the Reference Valuation Date, to reflect the credit crisis then in existence is warranted. Mr. Youngblood's opinion with respect to the impact of the credit crisis was expressed in his addendum report while in the midst of it, without the fuller insight respecting its impact that would be available from a retrospective standpoint. He observed that the effect of the crisis was to essentially freeze the market, such that both vendors and purchasers were remaining on the sidelines, and properties were not being offered at "fire-sale" prices.

Authorities

Orr v MTCC 1056, 2016 ONSC 7630 (CanLII)

Palladino v. Durham et al., 2021 ONSC 4909 (CanLII)

Bidulock v Bidulock, 2018 ABQB 474 (CanLII)

<u>General Motors of Canada Company v Municipal Property Assessment Corporation Region 23,</u> 2023 CanLII 12249 (ON ARB)

Trask et al v. Groves Memorial Community Hospital, 2014 ONSC 26 (CanLII)



MEMBER FIRM DIRECTORY

May 2023

LAWPACT®

Member Firm Directory (as of May 2023^A)

CANADA	
BRITISH COLUMBIA	
Synergy Business Lawyers, LLP	#2300 – 925 West Georgia Street Vancouver, BC V6C 3L2
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone 604.685.8186
Brian Rudy <u>brudy@synergylaw.ca</u>	Fax 604.685.8187 Website: <u>www.synergylaw.ca</u>
ONTARIO	
Keyser Mason Ball, LLP	3 Robert Speck Parkway Suite 900
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Mississauga, Ontario, Canada, L4Z 2G5
Amy Delisle adelisle@kmblaw.com	Phone: 905-276-9111
Ian J. Wick <u>ianwick@kmblaw.com</u>	Fax: 905-276-2298 Website: <u>www.kmblaw.com</u>
QUEBEC	
Brouillette Legal, Inc.	1050, Côte Du Beaver Hall, No. 1500 Montreal (Quebec) Canada H2Z 0A5
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: 514-395-8500
Robert Brouillette <u>rb@brouillette.ca</u>	Fax: 514-395-8554
Philippe Brouillette <u>pb@brouillette.ca</u>	Website: <u>www.brouillette.ca</u>
MEXICO	
Gil Elorduy	Benjamin Hill 205, Colonia Hipodromo 06100 Mexico, D.F.
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: 52 55 9000-8700
Lic. Francisco Gil-Elorduy francisco.gil@gilelorduy.com	Fax:
	Website: <u>www.gilelorduy.com</u>
Yárritu Gonzalez	Rio Marne 6, Colonia Cuauhtémoc,
	Delegación Cuauhtémoc, 06500.
Representative and e-mail address:	Cuidad de México, México
Lic. Sergio Yárritu syarrit@yarritu.com.mx	Phone: 55 1204-1337
	Fax: Website: <u>www.gilya.com</u>
ALABAMA	
Tanner & Guin, L.L.C.	Capitol Park Center 2711 University Boulevard 35401-1465
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403-3206
Bert M. Guy <u>Bert@tannerguin.law</u>	Phone: 205-633-0200
Hannah B. Morgan <u>hannah@tannerguin.law</u>	Fax: 205-633-0290
·······	Website: www.tannerguin.law
	a costor a a maniner Samman

CALIFORNIA	
Blanchard, Krasner & French	800 Silverado Street, 2 nd Floor
	La Jolla, CA 92037
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone 858.551.2440, ext. 303
Kipp Williams <u>kwilliams@bkflaw.com</u>	Website: <u>www.bkflaw.com</u>
	Reno, Nevada Office:
	5470 Kietzke Lane, Suite 200
	Reno, Nevada 89511
	Phone 775.384.0022
Gaw Estate Planning	1500 Third Street, Suite F
6	Napa, California 94559
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: 707-681-5556
David B. Gaw dave@gawestateplanning.com	Fax: 707-252-0792
	Website: <u>www.gawestateplanning.com</u>
GVM Law	1000 Main Street, Third Floor
	Napa, California 94559
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: 707-252-9000
Jamie Watson JWatson@gvmlaw.com	Fax: 707-252-0792
	Website: <u>www.gvmlaw.com</u>
Samuels, Green & Steel, LLP	19800 MacArthur Blvd., Suite 1000
, , ,	Irvine, California 92612-2433
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: 949-263-0004
Scott Albrecht scott.albrecht@sgsattorneys.com	Fax: 949-263-0005
	Website: <u>www.sgsalaw.com</u>
COLORADO	
Minor & Brown, P.C.	650 Cherry Street, Suite 1100
	Denver, Colorado 80246
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: 303-320-1053
Kim Ritter, Esq. kritter@minorbrown.com	Fax: 303-320-6330
Barbara J. Wells, Esq. <u>bwells@minorbrown.com</u>	Website: <u>www.minorbrown.com</u>
CONNECTICUT	
Neubert, Pepe & Monteith, P.C.	195 Church Street, 13th Floor
-	New Haven, Connecticut 06510-2009
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: 203-821-2000
Kevin M. Godbout kgodbout@npmlaw.com	Fax: 203-821-2009
Douglas S. Skalka <u>dskalka@npmlaw.com</u>	Website: <u>www.npmlaw.com</u>
Forge IT, PLLC	1077 Bridgeport Avenue, Suite 301
	Shelton, Connecticut 06484
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: (203) 204-1260
David Aldrich <u>daldrich@forge-ip.com</u>	Fax: (203) 687-4197
Todd Oberdick toberdick@forge-ip.com	Website: <u>www.forge-ip.com</u>

DELAWARE	
Gordon, Fournaris & Mammarella, P.A. Representative and e-mail address: Thomas Mammarella <u>tmammarella@gfmlaw.com</u>	1925 Lovering Avenue Wilmington, Delaware 19806 Phone: 302-652-2900 Fax: 302-652-1142 Website: <u>www.gfmlaw.com</u>
FLORIDA	
Meland • Russin Representative and e-mail address: Peter Russin <u>prussin@melandrussin.com</u> Eric Ostroff <u>eostroff@melandrussin.com</u>	3200 Southeast Financial Center 200 South Biscayne Blvd. Miami, Florida 33131 Phone T: 305.358.6363 Fax 305.358.1221 www.melandrussin.com
GEORGIA	
Berman Fink Van Horn P.C. Representatives and e-mail addresses: Jeffrey N. Berman jberman@bfvlaw.com Benjamin I. Fink <u>bfink@bfvlaw.com</u>	3475 Piedmont Road, NE, Suite 1100 Atlanta, Georgia 30305 Phone: 404-261-7711 Fax: 404-233-1943 Website: <u>www.bfvlaw.com</u>
IDAHO	
Jones Williams Fuhrman Gourley, P.A. Representatives and e-mail addresses: Todd Winegar <u>twinegar@idalaw.com</u> William Fuhrman <u>bfuhrman@idalaw.com</u>	225 N 9 th Street, Suite 820 Boise, Idaho 88702 Phone 208-338-1170 Website: <u>www.idalaw.com</u>
ILLINOIS	
Law Offices of Douglas Conover LLC Representative and e-mail address: Douglas Conover <u>dconover@dclawchicago.com</u>	1901 South Calumet Avenue, Suite 1406 Chicago, Illinois 60616 Phone: 312-928-9389 Fax: 312-803-2770 Website: <u>www.dclawchicago.biz</u>
Latimer LeVay Fyock LLC Representative and e-mail address: John L. Ambrogi jambrogi@llflegal.com	55 West Monroe Street, Suite 1000 Chicago, Illinois 60603 Phone: Direct: 312-667-1357 Fax: 312.422-8001 Website: <u>www.llflegal.com</u>
INDIANA	
Tuesley Hall Konopa, LLP Representative and e-mail address: Thomas J. Hall, Esq. <u>thall@thklawfirm.com</u> Eric W. Seigel, Esq. <u>eseigel@thklawfirm.com</u>	212 East LaSalle Avenue South Bend, Indiana 46617 Phone: 574-232-3538 Fax: 574-232-3790 Website: <u>www.thklawfirm.com</u>

LOUISIANA	
Taylor, Porter, Brooks & Phillips, LLP	Baton Rouge Office:
Representatives and e-mail addresses: Bob Barton <u>bob.barton@taylorporter.com</u>	450 Laurel Street, 8th Floor Baton Rouge Louisiana 70801 Phone: (225) 387-3221
Rick Norman <u>rnorman@normanblc.com</u>	Lake Charles Office: 145 East Street Lake Charles, LA 70601 Phone: (337) 436-7787 Fax: (337) 436-7758 Website: www.taylorporter.com
MARYLAND	
Bowie & Jensen LLC	29 W. Susquehanna Avenue, Suite 600 Towson, Maryland 21204
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: Tow
Gina M. Harasti <u>harasti@Bowie-Jensen.com</u>	Fax: 410-583-2437
Matthew G. Hjortsberg <u>hjortsberg@bowie-jensen.com</u>	Website: <u>www.bowie-jensen.com</u>
Jeremy T. Garner <u>garner@bowie-jensen.com</u> J. Nicole Windsor <u>Windsor@bowie-jensen.com</u>	
MICHIGAN	
Bowen, Radabaugh & Milton, P.C.	100 E Big Beaver Rd., Ste 350 Troy, Michigan 48083 Phone: 248-641-8000
Representative and e-mail address:	Fax: 248-641-8000
James M. Radabaugh jmradabaugh@brmattorneys.com	Website: <u>www.brmattorneys.com</u>
MINNESOTA	
Fabyanske, Westra, Hart & Thomson	333 South Seventh Street, Suite 2600 Minneapolis, MN 55402
Representative and e-mail address: Nathan Sellers <u>NSellers@fwhtlaw.com</u>	Phone: 612-359-7600 Fax 612.359.7602
	Website: <u>www.fwhtlaw.com</u>
NEVADA	
Newmeyer & Dillion LLP	3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 530 Las Vegas, NV 89169
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: 702-777-7519
Aaron D. Lovaas <u>aaron.lovaas@ndlf.com</u>	Fax: 702-777-7559 www.newmeyeranddillion.com

NEW MEXICO	
Business Law Southwest LLC	320 Gold Avenue SW
	Suite 610
Representative and e-mail address:	Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102-3299
Laurence S. Donahue Idonahue@14sb.com	Phone: 505-848-8581
	Fax: 505-848-8593845
	Website: www.skm-law.com
NEW YORK	
Adams Leclair LLP	28 East Main Street
	Suite 1500
Representative and e-mail address:	Rochester NY 14614
Steven E. Cole <u>scloe@adamsleclair.law</u>	Phone: 585-327-4108
Steven E. Cole <u>serecte adamsteriat naw</u>	Fax: 585-327-4200
	Website: www.adamsleclair.law
Gallet Dreyer & Berkey, LLP	845 Third Avenue, 5 th Floor
	New York, New York 10022
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: 212-935-3131
David T. Azrin dta@gdblaw.com	Fax: 212-935-4512
David L. Berkey <u>dlb@gdblaw.com</u>	Website: www.gdblaw.com
David S. Douglas dsd@gdblaw.com	<u>mercenter</u>
David S. Douglas <u>dsd@gdblaw.com</u>	
NORTH CAROLINA	
	Drhumour Building
McGuire, Wood & Bissette, P.A.	48 Patton Avenue
	Asheville, North Carolina 28802
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: 828-254-8800
Joseph P. McGuire jmcguire@mwbavl.com	Fax: 828-254-2438
Thomas Grella tgrella@mwbavl.com	
	Website: <u>www.mwbavl.com</u>
OHIO	
Meyers, Roman, Friedberg & Lewis	28601 Chagrin Boulevard, Suite 500
incycrs, itolian, i ficadorg & Lewis	Cleveland, Ohio 44122
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: 216-831-0042
Seth Briskin <u>sbriskin@meyersroman.com</u>	Fax: 216-831-0542
Scott Lewis, Esq. <u>slewis@meyersroman.com</u>	Website: <u>www.meyersroman.com</u>
Peter D. Brosse, Esq. <u>pbrosse@meyersroman.com</u>	
OREGON	
	693 Chemeketa Street. NE
Sherman Sherman Johnnie & Hoyt, LLP	
	Salem, Oregon 97301
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: 503-364-2281
Mark Hoyt mark@shermlaw.com	Fax: 503-370-4308
Gina Anne Johnnie gina@shermlaw.com	Website: <u>www.shermlaw.com</u>
PENNSYLVANIA	
SkarlatosZonarich LLC	320 Market Street, Suite 600 West
	Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101
Representative and e-mail addresses:	Phone: 717-233-1000
Kathy Speaker MacNett, Esq. <u>ksm@skarlatoszonarich.com</u>	Fax: 717-233-6740
rand, spoulor muchou, Esq. Kontesscondron.com	Website: www.skarlatoszonarich.com

TEXAS	
Adair Myers Stevenson Yagi, PLLC	3120 Southwest Freeway, Suite 320
	Houston, Texas 77098
Representative and e-mail address:	713-522-2270
Christopher Stevenson cas@am-law.com	713-522-3322
Kenichi Yagi <u>ky@am-law.com</u>	Website: <u>www.am-law.com</u>
WASHINGTON	
Helsell Fetterman LLC	1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4200
	Seattle, Washington 98154
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Phone: 206-292-1144
Scott Collins scollins@helsell.com	Fax: 206-340-0902
Laura Hoexter <u>lhoexter@helsell.com</u>	Website: <u>www.helsell.com</u>
Nathan Watson <u>nwatson@helsell.com</u>	
VIRGINIA	
Pohlman Law Group, PLC	10511 Judicial Drive
	Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	phone - 703.591-4900 ext 1308
Scott W. Pohlman spohlman@haleball.com	direct - 703.218-8350
John Callahan Hale jhal@haleball.com	fax - 703.591-5082
	Websites: <u>www.haleball.com</u>
Central American Member Firms	Contact Information
PANAMA	
Arias, Aleman & Mora	Edificio PH 909 Piso 16
	Calle 74 Este San Francisco
Representative and e-mail address:	Panamá, República de Panamá
Luis Mastellari Imaste@aramolaw.com	Phone: (507) 270-1011
	Fax: (507) 270-1074
	Website: <u>www.aramolaw.com</u>

South American Member Firms	Contact Information
BOLIVIA	
Urenda Abogados	Santa Cruz
8	C. Rafael Peña 222
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Т. (591-3) 336-7788
Juan Carlos Urenda jcu@urenda.bo	La Paz
	C. Yanacocha 290
	Edif. Casanovas Piso 5to. Of. 506
	T. (591-2) 240-6951
	Website: <u>www.urenda.bo</u>

BRAZIL	
Almeida Prado & Hoffman	Alameda Casa Branca, 652, 6º e 9 º andares
	São Paulo – SP - Brazil
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	CEP 01408-000
Luiz Hoffman <u>luiz@aphoffmann.com.br</u>	Phone: (55-11) 3085-3360
João Almeida Prado joao@aphoffmann.com.br	Website: <u>www.aphoffmann.com.br</u>
CHILE	
SIV Abogados	Av. Andrés Bello 2687 piso 23, Las Condes,
	Santiago – Chile
Representative and e-mail address:	Código Postal 7550611
Tomás Contreras tcontreras@siv.cl	Phone: (56-2) 25108900
	Fax (56-2) 25108941
	Website: <u>www.siv.cl</u>
COLOMBIA	
Envesta S.A.S.	Calle 90 No. 14 - 26
	Of. 401, Bogotá, 110221
Representative and e-mail address:	Colombia
Monica Ordonez monicaordonez@envesta.co	Phone: +57 (1) 601.7800
	Website: <u>http://envesta.co</u>
ECUADOR	
LexAdvisor Consultores y Abogados Associados	Shyris and Belgium corner
v O	Edif. Shyris Century, 10th Floor Of. 10C
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	Quito, S.A.
Patricia Alvear palvear@lexadvisorecuador.com	Ecuador
Jaime Martinez jmartinez@lexadvisorecuador.com	Phone + (593) 2 380 0928
Cristóbal Montúfar <u>cmontufar@lexadvisorecuador.com</u>	Website: <u>https://lexadvisorecuador.com/</u>
PERU	
	Av Canaval v Maravra Nº 480, 10th Elasa
Martinot Abogados	Av. Canaval y Moreyra N° 480, 10 th Floor, San Isidro, Lima, Perú
T	Phone 511-748 2288
Representative and e-mail address:	
Luis Fernando Martinot Oliart	Website: <u>http://www.martinotabogados.pe</u>
fernando.martinot@martinotabogados.pe	

European Member Firms	Contact Information
AUSTRIA	
Preslmayr Legal Rechtsanwalte GmbH	Rotenturmstraße 16-18, Stiege 2, 7.OG
	Eingang Fleischmarkt
Representative and e-mail address:	1010 Wien, Austria
Martin Preslmayr mp@preslmayr.legal	Tel: +43 1 343 1111
	Fax: +43 1 343 1111 11
	Website: www.preslmayr.legal
	www.facebook.com/preslmayr.legal

BELGIUM	
Beele Law Firm	Gebroeders De Cockstraat 2,
	B-9000 GENT Belgium
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: 32 9 220.99.78
Frederic Beele Frederic.beele@be-law.eu	Fax: +32 9 220.16.20
Treache Beele <u>Treache.beele(w/be-law.eu</u>	Website: www.be-law.eu
CYPRUS	
N. Savvides Zannetou LLC	3 Demetriou Vikella street,
	Nicosia 1061,
Representative and e-mail address:	Cyprus
Nandia Savvides <u>savlaw@cytanet.com.cy</u>	Phone: 357 22 673974
	Fax: 357 22 670900
	www.zannetoulaw.com
ENGLAND U.K.	
Forbes Solicitors	Ribchester House
	Lancaster Road
Representatives and email addresses:	Preston
*	Lancashire England UK
John Pickervance	PR1 2QL
John.Pickervance@forbessolicitors.co.uk	Phone: 01772 220022
Gabrielle Broomhead	www.forbessolicitors.co.uk
gabrielle.broomhead@forbessolicitors.co.uk	
FRANCE	
CleverLex	61, rue de l'Arcade
	75008 PARIS
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: +33 (0) 01.55.27.88.00
Bernadette Brugeron <u>b.brugeron@cleverlex.com</u>	Fax: +33 (0) 01.55.27.88.10
	Website: <u>www.cleverlex.com</u>
GERMANY	
Lichtenstern Rechtsanwälte	Büro Landsberg:
Lichtenstern Kechtsanwalte	Eichteilstraße 19
	86899 Landsberg am Lech
Representative and e-mail address:	Germany
Bernd Lichtenstern <u>berndli@lichtenstern-rae.de</u>	Phone: 49-8191-320-1010
	Fax: 49-8191-320-1019
	1 u.x. 19 0191 520 1019
	Büro München:
	Widenmayerstraße 49
	80538 München
	Tel. +49 89 / 418 696-36
	Fax +49 89 / 418 696-836
	Website: www.lichtenstern-rae.de
ITALY	
Cortellazzo & Soatto	Via Porciglia 14 35121
Curtenazzu & Suattu	Padova (Padua), Italy
Demographic interest and a method demographic	Phone: +39 49 8237311
Representatives and e-mail address:	Fax: +39 49 8237492
Anna Soatto, Esq. <u>soatto@cortellazo-soatto.it</u> Giovanni Tagliavini, Esq. <u>tagliavini@cortellazzo-soatto.it</u>	Website: www.cortellazzo-soatto.it
olovanni ragnavnii, Esq. <u>tagnavnii(<i>w</i>)cortenazzo-soatto.it</u>	

ISRAEL	
Estline & Co.	35 Ahad Ha'am Street,3rd Floor
	Tel - Aviv 65 202
Representative and e-mail address:	Israel
Yair Estline <u>yair@eblaw.co.il</u>	Phone: 972 (3) 72-66-111
	Fax +972 (3) 72-66-222
	http://www.eblaw.co.il/
POLAND	
TGC Corporate Lawyers	ul. Hrubieszowska 2
L V	01-209 Warszawa, Poland
Representative and e-mail address:	Phone: +48 22 295 33 00
Wojciech Marczyszyn <u>wmarczyszyn@tgc.eu</u>	Direct: +48 22 295 33 40
	Website: <u>www.tgc.eu</u>
PORTUGAL	
Santiago Mediano Abogados	Emp. Nova Amoreiras ~ R. Artilharia Um
5 5	71 a 77, Lote 7, 3º piso, Fracçao 10
Representative and e-mail address:	1250-038 Lisbon (Portugal)
Paulo Correia pcorreia@santiagomediano.com	Phone + 351 21 240 99 61
	Fax: + 351 21 240 95 32
	Website: http://www.santiagomediano.com
THE NETHERLANDS	
Mark Advocaten	Baronielaan 28
	4818 RA Breda
Representative and e-mail address:	Netherlands
Christel van den Reek <u>vandenreek@markadvocaten.nl</u>	Postbus 2172
	4800 CD Breda
	Netherlands
	Phone: + (076) 533-5435
	Fax: +(076) 514-7365
	Website: <u>www.markadvocaten.nl</u>
SWITZERLAND	
Kronbichler & Tourette	Rond-Point de Plainpalais 6
	Case postale 507
Representatives and e-mail addresses:	1211 Genève 4
Stephan Kronbichler <u>Stephan.kronbichler@kt-legal.ch</u>	Switzerland
Pascal Tourette pascal.tourette@kt-legal.ch	Phone: +41 22 705 11 22
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Fax: +41 22 705 11 21
	Website: <u>www.kt-legal.ch</u>

Asia/Pacific Member Firms	
JAPAN	
Asai Law Firm Representatives and e-mail addresses: Kenta Asai <u>k-asai@asai-lawfirm.jp</u> Takahira Shinano <u>ts856@cornell.edu</u>	Amashin Bldg 8F. 4-13-8 Nishitenma, Kita Ward, Osaka City, Osaka Prefecture Amishin Phone: +011 81-6-613-3110 Fax: +011 81-6-613-3111 Website:
INDIA	
AMC Law Firm Representative and e-mail address: Ashish Makhija <u>ashish@amclawfirm.com</u>	B-30, Lajpat Nagar - 3 New Delhi 110024 India Phone: +91 (11) 41 354 354 Fax: +91 (11) 29 841 673 Website: <u>www.amclawfirm.com</u>
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	
Cresco Legal Representative and e-mail address: Michael Waechter <u>michael.waechter@cresco.ae</u>	P.O. Box 102755 Gold & Diamond Park - 4-215 Dubai United Arab Emirates Phone: +971 (4) 406 9660 Fax: +971 (4) 341 6877 Website: <u>www.crescolegal.com</u>

^A There are 57 member firms as of May 2023.

LawPact directors and officers:

Douglas Conover, President and Director David B. Gaw, Vice President – North America and Director Bernd Lichtenstern, Vice President – Europe and Director Tomás Contreras, Vice President – South America and Director Mark Hoyt, Treasurer and Director Robert Brouillette, Director Scott Pohlman, Director John Pickervance, Director Martin Preslmayr, Director Kathy Speaker MacNett, Director Ian Wick, Director

Program Committee:

Scott Pohlman (chair)

Madeleine Lebedow, Executive Director 3741 Mission Hills Road, No. 505 Northbrook, Illinois 60062 admin@lawpact.org (847) 329-7555