

Digital Planning Podcast (Season 4, Episode 4): The Uniform Electronic Estate Planning Documents Act

Speakers: Jen Zegel, Ross Bruch, Justin Brown, Suzanne Brown Walsh and Professor Gerry Beyer

Justin Brown:

Welcome to the Digital Planning Podcast. I'm Justin, and I'm here today with my co-hosts, Ross and Jen. And, today, we are so happy to have two titans in the estate's world, Suzanne Brown Walsh, and Professor Gerry Beyer, to talk to us about the Uniform Electronic Estate Planning Documents Act or UEEPDA. Suzy is a partner at Murtha Cullina in Hartford, Connecticut, she's a fellow in the American College of Trust and Estates Counsel, and she was the chair of the Committee of the Uniform Law Commission that created UEEPDA. Gerry Beyer is the Governor Preston E. Smith Regents Professor of Law at the Texas Tech School of Law. He's also an ACTEC fellow and he joined Suzy on the Uniform Law Commission Committee that drafted UEEPDA. Suzy, Gerry, welcome to the Digital Planning Podcast.

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

Thank you.

Gerry Beyer:

Thank you.

Justin Brown:

So, before we go into UEEPDA, Suzy, can you talk to us a little bit about the role of the Uniform Law Commission and why the creation of uniform laws is so important?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

Sure, I'd love to do that. For those who are not familiar with it, the ULC is a national nonpartisan organization. It's been in existence for 130 years. Its members are all lawyers, and that is the sole requirement. Obviously, some are also judges, legislative staff, et cetera. They're appointed by their respective state governments in various ways, and we also have members from the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands. The ULC has a scope committee that decides what projects would be appropriate for the ULC. There are criteria for that, interest in the subject matter, prospects for enactment, not terribly controversial because that would obviously negate enactment.

And so this is a perfect example of a subject area where the ULC adds a lot of value. We were able to create this law in a year. Usually, the drafting cycle is two years and it's a product of the input of commissioners from all of the jurisdictions, practitioners all over the country, and so it's not just commissioners who participate in the process, it's anyone. Anyone who has expertise in a subject area who wants to be an observer is welcome to attend our meetings and provide us with input. We do what would be, I think, unaffordable if it had to be replicated in a private setting because everyone's a volunteer and the costs for the meetings themselves is borne by the ULC.

Jennifer Zegel:

Thank you for that explanation. For those of our viewers who didn't know, UEEPDA was finalized in July of 2022, and the goal of UEEPDA is to provide a framework for states to adopt a uniform law that permits the electronic execution of nontestamentary estate planning documents. Now we're going to go into a little bit about what that means, but, Suzy, can you tell us a little bit about the basis for creating UEEPDA and why the ULC believed that this project was so important?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

Sure. This really flows out of a prior drafting project, that of the Uniform Electronic Wills Act. While we were framing the Uniform Electronic Wills Act and determining how wide its scope should be, we determined that all of the other documents that our clients sign, trusts, powers of attorney, and the like, the ones covered by this act, we thought they were all allowed under UETA which is the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act. That turned out to be not the case. There's some doubt about that.

Gerry and I talked to the ULC leadership and we made a case against this drafting project. We said, "Why don't we just go ahead and amend the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act?" Gerry can explain a little bit more about why, ultimately, we decided that UETA didn't facilitate the signing of these other nontestamentary estate planning documents. But the bottom line is the project is very important because there are a lot of practitioners who we all use DocuSign, right, in our practices in some manner, and I think, a lot of people, your go-to is DocuSign, and you naturally think, "I'll just send that to the client to be electronically signed." And the purpose of this project was to make sure those documents will be validated just as other documents that are e-signed or validated.

Jennifer Zegel:

Thank you for that background. As we all know, COVID really, really accelerated the discussion of executing estate planning documents through electronic mediums. And, while there's some that believe that the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act already permits the execution of certain electronic estate planning documents that are not wills, there are many believe that the comments in the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act that pertain to the unilateral nature of those documents should prohibit the electronic execution of those documents. There's a divergence amongst practitioners on whether there are appropriate provisions that allow it and then some that really believe that they're disallowed. What are your opinion and, Gerry, what do you think about this?

Gerry Beyer:

Well, when you look at the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act, it says that it deals with transactions, and transactions require two people to be interfacing, and most estate planning documents are unilateral. I thought, as did many others, that, although it is debatable, there is definite authority, or definite strong arguments, that the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act would not apply to unilateral documents. That type of uncertainty is not acceptable for attorneys who practice law to know, well, maybe it works or maybe it doesn't work. That's not good for a practitioner.

And so it's clear that attorneys desire the convenience of being able to handle these documents electronically, so we decided that something needed to be done. The first thing I thought about, as did others, is, oh, all we have to do is make about a one or two sentence change to UETA, let it apply to unilateral documents, and we'll be good to go. And, that idea, that didn't work, because there would be lack of uniformity if some states adopted the amendment and others did not, plus there is a very important interface with the federal e-sign laws and, if we disrupted UETA, that interface might be lost. The best thing to do was to create a separate act, yes, formulated on the same type of structure as UETA, but designed instead for unilateral estate planning documents.

Ross Bruch:

With that, let's dive into some of the specifics of UUEEPDA. As Jen said a moment ago, UUEEPDA only applies to nontestamentary estate planning documents. Can you define what we mean by that?

Gerry Beyer:

Yes. Well, this is an interesting discussion to have, actually, because we had to discuss and had to figure out how to define what these types of documents were. The first approach we came up with was to come up with a laundry list of documents that would be designated as nontestamentary estate planning documents that the act would apply to. That got to be cumbersome trying to list everything. Then we switched to trying to have a broad definition, a capacious definition, that we could use to define what the documents would be. But, after we worked on that definition, we discovered that that didn't work

either, and so we went back to a laundry list. The laundry list in the statute covers things like trusts and related trust documents, financial powers of attorney, advance directives, and similar health documents, powers of appointment, guardian declarations, disclaimers, body disposition documents, et cetera.

And then certain documents are specifically excluded from the scope of the act. Obviously, wills and codicils are excluded, real property deeds are excluded, certificates of title for motor vehicles, watercraft, and aircraft are excluded. And then, in the comments, states are given the option to add or subtract from that list because, for example, in the list is a community property survivorship agreement. Well, many states aren't community property and they wouldn't have that type of agreement so they could remove it. Some states don't have body disposition documents, so that can be removed, or maybe the state wants to add other documents to the list. Although there is a formulated definition, states can add or subtract documents from that list as they so desire.

Now one thing I do want to mention about the documents that is important, the act is restricted to records that are readable as text. You can't use oral or video recordings as documents. Following the lead of the Uniform Electronic Wills Act, they all must be text-based types of documents.

Justin Brown:

Gerry, that's very helpful in your explanation of what nontestamentary estate planning documents are. One of the questions that I have had, when I've been reading UEEPDA, is that the definition is broad, but there are very specific things that are listed within the definition. And then, at the end of the definition, there's a catch-all phrase that essentially says any other record that's intended to carry out an individual's intent would be included as a nontestamentary estate planning document, and I guess my question is what were you guys thinking the scope of that catch-all provision would be?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

I'll take that one, Justin. I think our recollection of what the drafting committee intended was that that last item in the laundry list of electronic estate planning documents, nontestamentary, was supposed to be a catch-all and that the catch-all is intended to cover, or capture, any documents that aren't otherwise allowable under UETA. For example, I've observed that beneficiary designations of retirement accounts and life insurance are being electronically signed more often than they're being signed in ink, and I'm sure that's because the companies who offer those contracts correctly view those beneficiary designations as a contract between the custodian of the account or the life insurer and the owner of the policy or the account holder. But there's probably a lot of documents we didn't list, or that'll arise in the future that we didn't list, and the catch-all could pick those up.

And then we felt that that was a safe way to approach it because then we have, in the next section, B, in this definition, we have a means for states to exclude documents they don't think should be covered. And our thought there was there's a whole world of those that really look like they're nontestamentary estate planning documents, maybe they're titles to vehicles, maybe they're real property deeds, that other regulators or other groups are going to want to cover separately and aren't going to want to have them fall under this law, and so, in our world, that's an enactment reason. We don't want too many people coming in interested in a bill, we want it to be cleaner, and we want estate planners talking about this and elder law attorneys. We don't necessarily want auto dealerships coming up and talking about this. That's the idea behind how we drafted this.

Jennifer Zegel:

I'm also really curious as to how decisions generally get made in creating legislation and the process that goes on behind the scenes. Is there anything that you can share about working with the committee on UEEPDA that was really interesting or stories that came up highlighting the need for modern signing options?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

I don't recall people coming in and... Well, I'll give you one example that I had in my head. I'm not sure the committee talked about it. And our clients are wealthy. This statute was drafted still when the pandemic was a little more active, and so I actually had a client who jetted off to some island somewhere in the middle of a sale of a business and was still able to facilitate all the

business sale documents signing under UETA, but also, at the same time, as often happens, there were estate planning documents being generated, and they happened to be more in the nature of trustee changes and administrative changes.

And, of course, then the question was, "Well, okay, Suzy, can you send me those via DocuSign? I'm here on this island isolating because I caught COVID when I was away," and I said, "No. We've got to get you back here to sign them." I think clients, business owners particularly, are used to electronically signing, and so we all, I think, on the committee recognized the need for this. And I've heard from a lot of practitioners who say, "I didn't really think we needed to have a statute. We're already doing this." I think there's a lot of reasons to do this.

Ross Bruch:

So, UEEPDA could have been drafted in a very detailed way that runs through specific circumstances for executing nontestamentary estate planning documents. Instead, there was an approach to draft it more broadly. For example, if a nontestamentary estate planning document requires a witness signature, then the signature can be electronic. If it requires notarization, the notarization can be electronic. Why did the committee decide to go in that direction with its drafting?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

You're absolutely right. That was a conscious decision. We, Gerry and I and the committee, referred to it as the mini-UETA approach. We'll just take the provisions of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act that we need to use here to facilitate electronic signing when we don't have a transaction and we'll drop them into the statute, and Gerry did that quite capably. The only substantive decision, or substantive provision, that we included in the black letter of this law is one Gerry previously mentioned, we made a policy choice that the document had to be readable as text at the time it was signed.

Now that's an interesting policy choice because I happen to be serving on another drafting committee for the Uniform Health-Care Decisions Act update, and that committee doesn't like that. They don't want to be limited to documents readable as text. They want the new Health-Care Decisions Act to apply to oral declarations. So, right away, we have a situation where another statute is going to take a different approach. I think that validates the approach we took here. It's the default approach. Let's make all the execution requirements the same if you want them to be electronic.

And then we have the provision that basically says all of your underlying law applies to that document that already is there. If you have a state that wants to enact what will end up being the new Health-Care Decisions Act and wants to recognize oral declarations or declarations that are dictated or recorded on a video, they could change that as to just those documents, and they could do that in their Health-Care Documents Act as opposed to in this statute.

My answer is I think it's just a simpler approach. The simplest approach would've been one like Delaware's, where you bootstrap and you simply say, "Well, every document of this nature will be deemed to be a transaction under our [cite to our state UETA statute]," and I don't think anyone ever thinks that that's the best way to draft a state law, but it is the quickest. And so I think states that have done that are going to then go back and take this more thorough approach, where Gerry has drafted, and the committee has drafted, a mini-UETA, where we took the provisions we think we needed and apply them directly.

Justin Brown:

Gerry, to oversimplify some of UEEPDA, UEEPDA essentially provides that, if a signature on a nontestamentary estate planning document is required, it may be in either ink or in electronic form. But one of the things that we as practitioners had to deal with during the pandemic was remote witnessing and physical presence of remote witnesses. Why didn't the committee dive into the physical presence requirement for witnesses and notaries and instead leave those decisions to the individual states?

Gerry Beyer:

The answer to your question Justin, is real simple. We want the act to be able to be enacted quickly by as many states as possible. The people in different states have tremendously diverse views as to whether or not remote witnessing, and even remote notarization, should be allowed. And, if we put a remote witnessing component into the act, I think it would've slowed

up enactment, and so we decided that we are not going to require an enacting state to authorize the remote signing of witnesses if the validity of a document is dependent on having witnesses, but the act does have optional language. If a state wants to make that decision that remote witnessing is to be allowed, that they can appear by electronic presence rather than being physically present, they're free to enact it. But, again, like I said, we were afraid that putting in a remote witnessing component as a requirement would slow enactment. That was the reason for why we did it.

Suzanne Brown:

I'm going to chime in and add one more thing and that is that, when we started our discussions with the drafting committee, we talked about this, do we want to delve into these requirements? And, initially, the committee said, "No, no, no, just leave that alone. We don't need to cover that." And then, at one of our last meetings, I proposed the inclusion of this optional section that allows states to expressly say you can have remote witnessing if you want to. And I made that case, that's in section 207 of the act, because I think, if you're going to electronically sign, you have to recognize the possibility that folks don't want the witnesses in that room.

And the ULC has this experience with its notarial law, the Revised Uniform Law on Notarial Acts, where we did this initial step approach of allowing notarization of an electronic document, but the notary had to be present, and no one really does that. The whole point, especially emphasized during the pandemic, is electronic signing facilitates remoteness in a time or a place where people don't necessarily want to be, or aren't able to be, in the same room. I felt like we really had to include that. But, as Gerry said, there are states, like mine, where we have a notable group of lawyers who are just concerned, they're concerned, they're unfamiliar with technology, and so it might take some time.

Ross Bruch:

One of the problems that's arisen with electronic wills is retention of those electronic documents and who can act as custodian, does it have to be an attorney, a nonprofit entity, a for-profit company, or does it have to be a government agency, and, also, should that custodian be bonded? How does UEEPDA address the retention of nontestamentary estate planning documents that are executed electronically, and what are the requirements about who can hold and retain that document?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

Ross, that's a great question, and the answer is it doesn't, and it doesn't address those requirements deliberately for a couple of reasons. Number one, the ULC has had a positive result drafting the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act to be less prescriptive of technology, and that act has been in place for a long time without the need for an update because of updates in technology. Number two, we looked at the existing drafting models for electronic wills when we started drafting that act, and a lot of them included some prescriptive custodian requirements. There had been a previous law enacted in Nevada, which was very prescriptive of the technology that had to be employed, which no one used. We had this history of over-prescribing equals disuse, no one's going to do that, and so then we had this decision in the Uniform Electronic Wills Act not to prescribe, not to address custodians.

Why do we think that was the right result? Essentially, what we're doing is we're leaving that to market forces, right? We're leaving Suzy Walsh, trust and estates practitioner, to make the case to a client that I ought to be the custodian of their electronic will, if I want to do that, or their electronic estate planning document. As a practical matter, most of these documents, I have some of them in my file, right? I use a document-signing, electronic document-signing, platform. I rely on that platform to encrypt the document, make it safe, perhaps to store it. I then have a means of storing it and keeping it safe within my workspace, let's call it, here. And so we would call that leaving it to market forces. If a client wants to electronically sign and doesn't kick the tires on the lawyer who's representing them and maybe isn't sure about how things are being encrypted or saved, well, that may not be the right choice. But, in this day and age of pretty easy encryption and safe storage, I think it will work.

Last point I'll make is we all recognize the benefit of centralized storage, in a state, of wills, a central registry of wills, everyone loves that idea, and that was one of the sales pitches we thought we would make with the Uniform Electronic Wills Act to practitioners, "You may hate this idea, but you can get rid of your wills vault," which is the bane of existence of every practitioner. You've got these 80-year-old wills and nobody's claimed them and what do you do with them, and it's a big mess,

and so folks would love to offload that problem. And, in Florida, I believe they spoke to the circuit court clerks who were going to offer a storage repository. In Nevada, I think it was the Secretary of State, they were going to offer a storage repository. And that's all a much more feasible thing with electronic documents than it is with paper. We don't want folks resorting to limestone caves like the IRS. You're right, it's not in there, but it's not in there deliberately, and we thought that was the right way to go.

Justin Brown:

Do you guys see states going with whatever they have decided for wills with the nontestamentary estate planning documents? For example, if there's a state that has specific requirements as to how electronic wills should be stored or who may store them, do you think that, when they're adopting UUEPDA they will go with that same type of storage requirement, or do you think that these are different documents, right? Wills are so sacrosanct, right? There's a process for executing them and storing them. You only have one original. Do you think there's a difference between the significance of wills versus nontestamentary estate planning documents that will translate into custodianship?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

It could. A lot of these documents, we all have in our files now, right? All the trustee resignations and the trustee appointments and all of this administrative stuff you do, all of it's being done electronically, frankly, now anyway, or at least it's stored electronically. I suppose it would be reasonable to think that a state bar, an enactment group, might say, "We're not going to get all caught up in who's the custodian of this because we don't have any rules on that now." And I'm always amused by our view of wills as being ... which we adopted, right, in the ULC, we did a separate law for electronic wills. That's just the view. They're this sacrosanct creation.

In my state, they're not. We don't use wills. That's not the primary driver of an estate plan. It's a funded revocable trust. But I do understand that there are states where ... and, Gerry, is Texas, one of them, are you still a big will probate state? And so I would expect, Justin, you get this reaction when you go up to the legislatures from the fewer legislators who are lawyers, "Well, I took a whole class on this in law school. I had Professor Beyer teach me how important a will is. Don't you tell me the storage requirements aren't important." We'll have to see, but I do think that's a natural reaction that folks have. Wills are more important, everything else is less.

Jennifer Zegel:

If you had a crystal ball, where would you predict we'll be in 20 years, as an industry, with estate planning documents and signings and probate processes? I definitely won't hold you to this, but I'm just curious as to where you think we're going and where we'll be in 20 years.

Gerry Beyer:

I think, in the future, that we will move continuously into more electronic documents. And you asked me to predict what I would like to see happen in 20 years, well, I'd like to see one estate planning document where it is a will, it's a trust, it's a power of attorney, it's a financial power of attorney, health care, body disposition, the whole thing in one document rather than having seven or eight documents. And I know, in my state, the execution requirements are all different. Some need witnesses, some need notarization, some need notarization and witnesses, some need notarization or witnesses. They're all different. To have one estate planning document and then have everything together, all electronic, is what I'd like to see happen in 20 years.

Jennifer Zegel:

One ring that controls them all, right?

Gerry Beyer:

There you go.

Jennifer Zegel:

Suzy, any thoughts?

Suzanne Brown:

I've given up trying to predict behavior, but, certainly, I see more and more demand for these services. I get very grumpy when I'm acting as trustee and I'm dealing with a financial institution that can't send me stuff, the garden variety stuff I have to sign, authorizing a distribution, authorizing whatever. I get pretty grumpy when I can't e-sign it because it's so much easier for me to do that and it's something I can just take care of whether or not I'm in my office, if I'm away. I think more people are like that. They're going to expect this.

Gerry Beyer:

There is one significant difference between UETA and this act, and that is that the signer does not need to specifically indicate consent to electronic signature because, under UETA, before you sign it electronically, you have to check a little box or do something to acknowledge that you are going to allow it to be signed electronically. But, for a unilateral document, it is obvious that the signer is consenting to using electronic signature because the person is using an electronic signature. That requirement of UETA was not placed into this act.

Jennifer Zegel:

I completely agree with that. And, as a drafts person, I'm always concerned about whether documents that I draft and clients sign are going to be valid in other jurisdictions if my client relocates. Under UEEPDA, what happens if someone signs electronic nontestamentary estate planning documents in a jurisdiction that has UEEPDA but then they move to a jurisdiction that it's not recognized? What do you think? Is the document and the signature still valid?

Gerry Beyer:

The answer to that question is going to depend upon that new state, the state that they move to, what type of savings statute they have with regard to giving validity to documents that are valid in other states. Almost all states have a statute for wills that says, if the will is valid in the state where executed, it will be valid in our state even if it doesn't meet our state's requirements. A common example would be, in Texas, we can have a handwritten will without witnesses and it is valid, take it to another state where all wills have to be witnessed, they might have a savings statute that would validate it.

It gets interesting with electronic wills because there are a few states that will not recognize an electronic will, even though it's valid in the state where executed. They've said, "Our policy is no." It's going to depend upon what states have with regard to their own statutes giving validity to documents executed in other states, which already exists because it already exists with regard to paper documents, so it should also exist with regard to electronic documents, unless the state has decided to exclude an electronic document from its savings statute.

Justin Brown:

Suzy, UETA provides for the inclusion of the Uniform Electronic Wills Act in article three. Do you see any situation where a state would adopt UEEPDA, but then doesn't adopt some version of the Uniform Electronic Wills Act?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

I do. That hasn't occurred yet, but I do see it in here. I thought of it because I'm in Connecticut where we have this resistance to new technology within our bar, very entrenched. I had actually talked to our current chair of our subject matter section and he very much wanted to go ahead with both. And I suggested, "Well, if you encounter this resistance, go ahead with UEEPDA first," because, again, we talked about this, how people have this view that wills are sacrosanct and special somehow, so lead with the documents that people are less concerned with, lead with your garden variety trustee change or all of the documents facilitating trust certification and that kind of thing that no one really worries about.

The ones, I think, practitioners tend to obsess over are wills and, to some extent, powers of attorney, but the powers of attorney is an easy conversation to have with your elder law bar and sort of reassure them that the world isn't going to end and it's all going to be fine. That's what I envision, that enactment will be more robust with UEEPDA and will lead to the enactment of the Uniform Electronic Wills Act after the sky hasn't fallen. But I am seeing, in Connecticut, that, even that approach, you still have this, "The sky is falling, the sky is falling," the Chicken Littles all come out, and we're just going to all have to work through that and be reassuring. And, frankly, I think the biggest driver for this is going to be clients. If you're getting enough enraged calls from your clients who are upset that you can't offer them electronic signing, you are going to be more supportive of this legislation and less resistant to it. That's what I think.

Ross Bruch:

Some states have adopted the Uniform Electronic Wills Act as crafted by the ULC and some states have made substantial changes to that uniform act when they pass their own legislation. What do you see happening with UEEPDA? Do you think that states will lean more towards adopting it as is or do you see it as more of a starting point for states to create their own legislation?

Gerry Beyer:

I think that it will be enacted pretty much as is. Unlike the other acts, which there's more what I would call debate upon the terms, this is a pretty simple act to just authorize electronic signatures, where a lot of people already thought they could do it. The hope is they'll enact it as is. About the only change they'll make is maybe adding or subtracting documents from the definition of a nontestamentary estate planning document that we talked about earlier. I anticipate it will be enacted in very uniform form. That's my hope and that was our intent.

Other things, like the remote witnessing, remote notarization, electronic wills, all of that can be added separately if a state so desires. The hope is that, because of the need for this that was brought home during the pandemic, we're hoping that states will just enact it as is quickly to allow the electronic signing, which, as both Suzy and I have discussed many times before, many lawyers already think can be done, and there is an extreme client demand for being able to do it electronically.

Justin Brown:

Sometimes, when uniform laws are created, there are many states that are quick to jump onto the train and they quickly pass the version that was passed by the ULC. Have you guys heard of any states that are looking into adopting UEEPDA quickly, or what feedback have you guys heard?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

I know, for example, in my state, our state bar, as I mentioned, was really eager to get this off the ground, but, unfortunately, in some states, the trust and estates bar, like New Hampshire, it used to be like this, they pretty much could just send things off to the legislature and they would be enacted ipso facto presto, as Turney Berry likes to say. In other states, no matter what you do, you run into a problem. We don't have, unfortunately, I wish we did, we don't have a crystal ball. I do know there's interest. I do know, for example, in Connecticut, there's a bill being drafted and which they hope to have raised. I think we will know better in a couple of months as legislative sessions start to ramp up.

And, don't forget, in some states, it's every other year. Usually, there's quite a variation in the schedule. I think, I hate to say this, but we don't know that right now. We'll know better soon. But what I can tell you, from experience, is this is, to me, an easy bill. It's one subject, it's short, it's easy to explain, and I challenge you to find anybody at a legislature who hasn't had to e-sign something, so they understand it. For that reason, I would like to think this would be easy for state bars or state commissioners to run up the flagpole, as we say.

Jennifer Zegel:

This has been a fantastic conversation and really eye-opening and interesting. If our listeners want to hear more or learn more about UEEPDA potentially coming to their state, how can they learn more?

Suzanne Brown Walsh:

Well, thanks, Jennifer. There are lots of resources available that the Chicago Office of the Uniform Law Commission produces, things like quick summaries of the act and an enactment kit that they produce. You don't even have to remember any of that. If you can remember my name, you can look me up online and I will put you in touch with the appropriate person at the ULC or provide you with things like PowerPoints to use to your state bar or explanations, or we're always available just to answer the phone. And then the support that the ULC provides can be very detailed and granular, such as, "I'm trotting up to my public hearing at the legislature to try and have this enacted for you folks, can you help me with the testimony?" Whatever you need, we will try to provide it, so just let us know.

Jennifer Zegel:

Fantastic. Many, many, many thanks to our esteemed guests, Suzie and Gerry, today. It was an honor to have you on the podcast and we greatly value your time and expertise. It will really be interesting to see how this develops. And, on behalf of Justin, Ross, and myself, thank you for listening to the Digital Planning Podcast. Please feel free to reach out to us with any questions. You can find us at digitalplanningpodcast@gmail.com. And, if you have an idea for a show topic, we'd love to hear it. We'd love to hear from you. And, until next time, thank you and be well.