HOUSE BILL REPORT
ESHB 1620

As Passed House:
March 8, 2025

Title: An act relating to limitations in parenting plans.

Brief Description: Concerning limitations in parenting plans.

Sponsors: House Committee on Civil Rights & Judiciary (originally sponsored by Representatives Taylor, Goodman, Reed and Hill).

Brief History:
Committee Activity:
Civil Rights & Judiciary: 1/29/25, 2/7/25 [DPS].
Floor Activity:
Passed House: 3/8/25, 86-7.

Brief Summary of Engrossed Substitute Bill

- Amends provisions governing limitations a court may impose in a parenting plan on residential time with a child, decision-making authority, and dispute resolution by reorganizing language and making revisions and additions to substantive provisions.
- Adds additional factors a court must consider when establishing residential provisions of a parenting plan where limitations are not dispositive of a child's residential schedule.
- Requests the Administrative Office of the Courts to establish judicial training and continuing education curricula relating to trauma-informed resolution and best practices in family law proceedings involving contested parenting plans.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS & JUDICIARY

This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.

Majority Report: The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 10 members: Representatives Taylor, Chair; Farivar, Vice Chair; Abell, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Burnett, Entenman, Goodman, Peterson, Salahuddin, Thai and Walen.

Minority Report: Do not pass. Signed by 2 members: Representatives Walsh, Ranking Minority Member; Graham.

Minority Report: Without recommendation. Signed by 1 member: Representative Jacobsen.

Staff: Edie Adams (786-7180).

Background:

Parenting Plans.
In dissolution or legal separation cases, the court must establish a parenting plan that provides for the care of any minor children. The parenting plan must include an allocation of decision-making authority to one or both parents, establish a residential schedule for the child, and provide for the resolution of future disputes between the parents.

In establishing a parenting plan, the court is either required or allowed to impose limitations on residential time, decision-making, and dispute resolution based on specified conduct of the parent or a person with whom the parent resides. In cases where the required or allowed limitations are not dispositive, the court must establish residential provisions that encourage each parent to maintain a loving, stable, and nurturing relationship with the child, consistent with the child's developmental level and the family's social and economic circumstances considering a number of specified factors.

Mandatory Limitations on Decision-Making and Dispute Resolution.
The parenting plan must not establish mutual decision-making or a dispute resolution process other than court action if a parent has engaged in: willful abandonment that continues for an extended period or substantial refusal to perform parenting functions; physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of a child; or a history of acts of domestic violence or an assault or sexual assault that causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm or that results in a pregnancy.

Mandatory Limitations on Residential Time.
A parent's residential time with a child must be limited if the parent has engaged in the following conduct: willful abandonment that continues for an extended period of time or substantial refusal to perform parenting functions; physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of a child; a history of acts of domestic violence or an assault or sexual assault that causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm or that results in a pregnancy; or a conviction as an adult of specified sex offenses.

A parent's residential time with a child must be limited if the parent resides with a person who has engaged in the following conduct: physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of a child; a history of acts of domestic violence or an assault or sexual assault that causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm or that results in a pregnancy; or conviction or adjudication of specified sex offenses.

The court must not enter an order allowing a parent to have contact with a child if the parent has been found by clear and convincing evidence to have committed sexual assault against the child's parent, and that the child was born within 320 days of the sexual assault.

Limitations Based on Sex Offenses or Sexual Abuse of a Child.
Sexual Predator. If a parent has been found to be a sexual predator, the court must restrain the parent from contact with a child, and if the parent resides with a person who has been found to be a sexual predator, the court must restrain the parent from contact with the child except contact that occurs outside that person's presence.

Rebuttable Presumption Based on Sex Offenses. There is a rebuttable presumption that: (1) a parent who has been convicted as an adult of specified sex offenses poses a present danger to a child; and (2) a parent who resides with a person who has been convicted as an adult or adjudicated as a juvenile of specified sex offenses places a child at risk of abuse or harm when that parent exercises residential time in the presence of the person.

Unless the parent rebuts the presumption, the court must restrain the parent from contact with a child. If the parent rebuts the presumption, the court may allow the parent to have residential time with the child, or to have residential time with the child in the presence of the person convicted or adjudicated of the offense, supervised by a neutral and independent adult pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision. The court must not approve a supervisor unless the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm.

Rebutting the Presumption. The presumption arising from commission of a sex offense by a parent or by a person who resides with the parent may be rebutted only after a written finding based on clear and convincing evidence that the child was not conceived and born as a result of a sexual assault committed by the parent, that contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, the parent or person has successfully engaged in sex offender treatment or is making progress in treatment, and the treatment provider believes contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child. If the child was the victim of the sex offense and the child is in or has been in therapy for victims of sexual abuse, the child's counselor must believe contact is in the child's best interest.

No Presumption. If no presumption of danger is created by a parent's prior offenses, or the prior offenses of a person residing with the parent, the parent's residential time with the child must nonetheless be limited if the parent has been convicted as an adult, or the person who resides with the parent has been convicted as an adult or adjudicated as a juvenile, of specified sex offenses.

Limitations imposed by the court must be reasonably calculated to protect the child from physical, sexual, or emotional abuse or harm that could result if the child has contact with the parent, and to provide for the safety of the parent who may be at risk of physical, sexual, or emotional abuse or harm that could result if the parent has contact with the other parent. Limitations the court may impose include, but are not limited to, supervised contact between the child and the parent or completion of relevant counseling or treatment. If the court expressly finds that limitations on residential time with the child will not adequately protect the child from the harm or abuse that could result if the child has contact with the parent, the court must restrain the parent from all contact with the child.

Sexual Abuse. The court must not allow a parent to have contact with a child if the parent has been found by clear and convincing evidence in a civil action or a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency action to have sexually abused that child, except upon recommendation by an evaluator or therapist that the child is ready for contact with the parent and will not be harmed by the contact. The court must not allow a parent to have contact with the child in the presence of a person who resides with the parent and who has been found by clear and convincing evidence in a civil action or a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency action to have sexually abused a child, unless the court finds the parent accepts that the person engaged in the harmful conduct and the parent is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm.

Discretionary Limitations.
The court may limit or preclude residential time if the parent's involvement or conduct may have an adverse effect on the child's best interests. Factors to be considered include: neglect or substantial nonperformance of parenting functions; a long-term emotional or physical impairment that interferes with the performance of parenting functions; a long-term impairment resulting from drug, alcohol, or other substance abuse that interferes with the performance of parenting functions; the absence or substantial impairment of emotional ties; the abusive use of conflict that creates a danger of serious damage to the child's psychological development; a parent's withholding the child from the other parent without good cause; and any other factor the court finds adverse to the child's best interest.

Unsupervised Contact.
A court must not order unsupervised contact between a parent and a child who was sexually abused by that parent.

If a parent subject to supervised residential time based on a sex offense committed by the parent or by a juvenile who resides with the parent, unsupervised contact may be ordered if supervised residential time has occurred for at least two years and the parent, or the person who resides with the parent, has no further arrests or convictions of sex offenses involving children and certain other conditions are met.

Determination Not to Impose Limitations.

A court may elect not to impose required limitations under some cases, excluding those where: a rebuttable presumption applies, the parent or person who resides with a parent has been found to be a sexual predator, or the child was sexually abused by the parent. The court need not apply limitations if it expressly finds that contact will not cause abuse or harm to the child and the probability that the abusive conduct will recur is so remote that limitations would not be in the child's best interests, or that the parent's conduct did not have an impact on the child.

Summary of Engrossed Substitute Bill:

Provisions of law governing when a court either must or may impose limitations in parenting plans are reorganized and revised through a number of substantive changes and additions. Provisions governing limitations that arise as a result of sexual abuse of a child or sex offenses committed against a child are separated into a separate section of law.

Purpose.
A statement of purpose is added that understanding the effects of domestic violence and child abuse on all members of a family is crucial to discerning the best interest of a child in cases with evidence of such abuse, and that determination of a child's best interest first requires that existing best interest factors be evaluated in light of the domestic violence or child abuse considering additional domestic abuse factors.

General Considerations and Definitions.
Language providing that the weight given to the existence of a protection order as to domestic violence is within the discretion of the court is removed. New definitions are added for "domestic abuse," "limitation," "protective actions," "sex offense against a child," and "willful abandonment."

Domestic Abuse Factors.
Specific provisions are established addressing cases that involve allegations of domestic abuse, which means child abuse or domestic violence. A court must first consider domestic abuse factors before considering the best interest of the child factors when making decisions relating to custody and parenting time. These factors include: the nature and context of domestic violence and any abuse experienced by the child from the abusive parent; evidence of acts of domestic abuse, an order for protection involving the child or parent, or previous court or administrative findings on domestic abuse; evidence of current or future risk of harm to the child or parent who is abused; and the historical and present parenting behaviors of each parent. Regardless of the outcome of this analysis, the court must consider the best interest of the child factors before making decisions related to custody and parenting time.

Any neutral professional appointed by a court to express an opinion relating to abuse, trauma, or the behavior of victims and perpetrators of abuse must demonstrate expertise and substantial experience working with victims of domestic violence or child abuse that is not

primarily forensic in nature.

Matters Not to Be Considered as Evidence Against a Parent Who is Abused.
In determining a child's best interest, the court must not consider the following evidence against an abused parent:

- actions that are not prohibited by law;
- actions taken by the abused parent to protect the parent's own or the parent's child's physical safety may not be considered as evidence of unwillingness to facilitate contact or a positive relationship between the parent who is abusive and the child; and
- evidence that the abused parent suffers from the effects of abuse by the other parent may not be the basis for denying a parent who is abused custody or parenting time.

A court may not restrict contact with or remove a child from a parent who is competent, protective, and not physically or sexually abusive, and with whom the child is bonded, solely to improve a deficient relationship with the other parent or solely on the basis of protective actions taken by a competent, protective, and not physically abusive parent.

Mutual Allegations of Domestic Abuse.
In cases where there are mutual allegations of domestic abuse, the court must hold an evidentiary hearing. If the court finds both parents have engaged in abuse, the court must determine which parent poses the lesser risk to the child and is less likely to commit acts of domestic abuse in the future by assessing and making findings regarding specified factors, including: the nature and effects of the abuse on either parent; whether any physical act was in response to domestic abuse by the other parent; the impact of the domestic abuse on the child and on parenting behaviors and attributes; and the likelihood of future acts of domestic abuse by either parent.

Limitations Based on Conduct Other Than Sex Offenses or Sexual Abuse of a Child.
Provisions governing required limitations based on conduct of a parent are revised. Limitations are required if a parent has engaged in any sexual assault, not just those that result in grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm or that result in pregnancy. The required limitation based on an assault that causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm is limited to those committed against the child or parent. Willful abandonment and substantial refusal to perform parenting functions are removed from mandatory limitation requirements. These changes also apply with respect to mandatory limitations on residential time where a parent resides with a person who has engaged in the specified conduct.

Mandatory Residential Time Limitations. There is a rebuttable presumption that the parenting plan must not order joint residential time with or sole residential time to the abusive parent. If the court grants parenting time to a parent who perpetrated domestic abuse or child abuse, the court must: grant majority custody to the parent who is not abusive, unless the parties agree otherwise and the court deems it safe; and make detailed

findings regarding how the parenting time ordered by the court adequately protects the child and the abused parent.

Mandatory Dispute Resolution Limitations. The parenting plan may not designate a dispute resolution process other than court action. The court may not require face to face mediation, arbitration, or interventions that require the parties to share the same physical or virtual space if there has been a finding of domestic violence.

Mandatory Decision Making Limitations. The parenting plan may not require mutual decision making. Where there is a finding of domestic violence by a parent, sole decision making must be awarded to the other parent.

Discretionary Limitations. Provisions addressing conduct that may result in limitations on residential time, decision making, and dispute resolution are deleted and the specified conduct is moved to another statute that governs establishment of residential provisions where limitations are not dispositive of the child's residential schedule.

Limitations on Residential Time Based on Sex Offenses or Sexual Abuse of a Child.
Child Sexual Abuse by Parent. A court must restrain a parent from all contact with a child if the parent has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense against any child. Provisions establishing a rebuttable presumption of no contact with a child where a parent has been convicted of specified sex offenses against a child, and standards for rebutting the presumption and allowing contact, are removed.

A court must not allow a parent to have any contact with the parent's child if the parent has been found by a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency or family law action to have sexually abused any child of the parents. The ability of the court to allow such contact upon recommendation by an evaluator or therapist for the child is eliminated.

Child Sexual Abuse by Person Residing With Parent. The rebuttable presumption that applies when a parent resides with a person convicted of a sex offense against a child is retained. With respect to a parent who resides with a juvenile adjudicated of a sex offense, the presumption applies only if the juvenile was at least eight years older than the victim of the offense. The presumption may be rebutted only where the child was not the victim of the sex offense committed by the person who resides with the parent requesting residential time. Standards for rebutting the presumption where the child was the victim of the offense are eliminated.

Standards for rebutting the presumption are revised by: requiring a clear and convincing evidence standard; removing the requirement that there must be a written finding that the child was not conceived and born as a result of a sexual assault committed by the parent; and removing the requirement that the person's treatment provider believes contact between the parent and child is appropriate and poses minimal risk.

Provisions addressing cases where a parent resides with a person who has been found in a civil action or dependency action to have sexually abused a child are revised. The standard of proof required for the finding of sexual abuse is a preponderance of the evidence. A court may allow a parent to have contact with the child in the offender's presence if, in addition to current requirements, a neutral professional expresses an opinion relating to abuse, trauma, or the behavior of victims and perpetrators of abuse and trauma. The professional must demonstrate expertise and experience that is not primarily forensic in nature.

If a court orders supervised residential time because the parent resides with a person who has been convicted as an adult or adjudicated as a juvenile of a sex offense against a child, the supervisor may be the parent if the court finds the parent is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. Provisions governing when a court may allow unsupervised contact between a parent and child in the presence of a juvenile adjudicated of a sex offense who resides with the parent are removed.

Restricted Decision Making and Dispute Resolution. The parenting plan must not require mutual decision making or dispute resolution other than court action if a parent has been found by a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency or family law action to have sexually abused any child of the parents.

Limitations That May Be Imposed.
More specific requirements are established governing supervised visitation and court orders for evaluation and treatment.

Supervised Visitation. If a court orders supervised visitation, there is a presumption of supervision by a professional supervisor. The presumption is overcome if the court finds: there is a lay person who has demonstrated through sworn testimony and evidence of past interactions with children that the lay person is capable of and committed to protecting the child, and the parent is unable to access professional supervision due to geographic isolation or other factors, or due to financial indigency.

The court must include clear written guidelines and prohibitions to be followed by the supervised party. Supervised visits may not occur until the parties have signed an acknowledgment confirming that they have read and agree to follow the court orders and the guidelines and prohibitions regarding visitation. The court may only permit supervision by an individual or program that is committed to protecting the child from physical or emotional abuse or harm and is willing and capable of intervening in behaviors inconsistent with the court orders and guidelines.

A parent may seek an emergency ex parte order temporarily suspending residential time in certain circumstances. The court must set a review hearing to take place within 14 days of entering an ex parte order. The ex parte order may be requested if: the supervised parent repeatedly violates the court order or guidelines; the supervised parent threatens the

supervisor or child with physical harm, commits an act of domestic violence, or materially violates a treatment condition; or the supervisor is unable or unwilling to protect the child and/or the protected parent, or no longer willing to provide service to the supervised parent.

Evaluation or treatment. A parent's residential time may be conditioned upon completion of court-ordered evaluation or treatment. The court may condition residential time on successful completion of a program of intervention for parents who abuse their partners or children, including programs focused on the impact of domestic violence on children and ways to promote safe and positive parenting. The court must determine whether a parent has successfully completed such a program based on information from the program director and with collateral input provided by the other parent. Reasons for any lack of collateral input from the other parent must be documented in the evaluation report. The court may refer, but may not order, a parent who is abused to receive services relating to the impact of current or past domestic violence on the parent who is abused and the child.

Determination Not to Impose Limitations.
Provisions are deleted that allow a court to not impose limitations if the court finds that contact will not cause abuse or harm to the child and the probability that the abusive conduct will recur is so remote that limitations would not be in the child's best interests, or that the parent's conduct did not have an impact on the child.

The court must assess and make written findings on a number of specified factors when determining whether an abusive parent has rebutted a statutory presumption against residential time, including: current risk posed by the parent to the well-being of the child or other parent; whether the parent who engaged in domestic abuse has demonstrated that they can and will prioritize the child's well-being; whether the parent has adhered to and is likely to adhere to court orders; and whether the parent who is abusive has genuinely acknowledged past harm and is committed to avoiding harm in the future.

If the court grants residential time to an abusive parent, the court must make specific written findings regarding the factors that rebut the presumption and how the order will promote the child's well-being and protect the other parent from harm. The court must order residential time provisions that promote the safety and well-being of the child and abused parent. The court may order supervised parenting time, or order supervision of exchanges without ordering supervised parenting time.

Whether or not the court imposes a supervision requirement, the court must order conditions necessary to promote and enhance the safety and well-being of the child and abused parent and ensure that the conditions are met for the duration of the order. The types of prohibitions and requirements the court may impose are specified.

Establishment of Residential Provisions of Parenting Plans.
New provisions are added to the statute that addresses the factors a court considers when establishing residential provisions of a parenting plan when required limitations are not

dispositive.

When there is a history of domestic violence, the court must address the identified effects of the domestic abuse or child abuse on the child and on the parenting of the parent who is abused. Provisions to promote the safety, recovery, and resilience of the child and the parent who is abused are provided.

When establishing residential provisions the court must consider, in addition to current factors, whether a parent's involvement or conduct has had an adverse impact on the child's best interests due to:

- willful abandonment or substantial nonperformance of parenting functions;
- a serious mental illness or physical impairment that interferes with parenting functions. A parent's disability may not serve as the sole basis for limiting residential time, and a parent's mental health condition arising from being abused must not be a basis for limiting residential time;
- a long-term substance use impairment that interferes with parenting functions;
- the absence or substantial impairment of emotional ties between the parent and the child within the parent's control; and
- withholding of access to the child by a parent for a protracted period. Withholding does not include protective actions taken in good faith for the legitimate and lawful purpose of protecting the parent or parent's child.

Judicial Education and Training.
The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is requested to develop training curricula for judicial officers regarding trauma-informed resolution in family law proceedings involving contested parenting plans as well as online continuing education curricula for judicial officers providing guidance on best practices for adjudicating contested parenting plans in the best interest of the child.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Effective Date: The bill takes effect 90 days after adjournment of the session in which the bill is passed.

Staff Summary of Public Testimony:

(In Support) Current law is convoluted and hard to read for attorneys and judges, let alone unrepresented parties. House Bill 1620 reorganizes and simplifies the statute to the benefit of everyone, especially unrepresented litigants. The current statute lacks clear guidance and clarity, which creates a likelihood of individual bias showing up in cases. This results in survivors, especially those from marginalized communities, receiving inconsistent rulings.

The bill provides clear definitions, stronger guidelines for courts, and consistency, so that justice is not determined by where a person lives or the judge a person appears before. It defines critical terms like abusive use of conflict, willful abandonment, and protective actions, reducing inconsistencies in application, and helping judges make informed decisions.

Parenting plans historically have not taken the impacts of domestic violence or abuse into account, undermining a parent's ability to protect their children. Survivors have been forced by the court to interact with their rapists, or have had limitations imposed against them just for trying to protect their children and themselves. There are also cases where judges ignore specific evidence of sexual assault and domestic violence by an abuser and impose limitations on the other parent for parenting concerns that are not as severe.

The false presumption that it is always in the child's best interest to have equal time with each parent exposes children to abusive behaviors in the non-protective parent's home and during visitation exchanges, which present an opportunity for abusers to continue coercive and threatening behavior. The bill gives standards for quality supervision that will help protect a child's safety and well-being. The bill ensures that custody decisions are transparent and based on evidence by requiring judges to support their decisions with specific findings. Discretion is needed in these complex cases to provide good outcomes for families. The bill gives more guidance for judges when exercising that discretion.

The bill offers a clear structure for cases where both parents have limitations by prioritizing mandatory restrictions over discretionary restrictions, ensuring that the child is the focus. It also creates a presumption allowing for sole decision-making. The court must go through a multifactor analysis before deciding not to impose limitations. The current law does not allow survivors to choose mutual decision-making even where they are able to communicate and co-parent well with the other parent.

The bill will help protect vulnerable families, including sex workers who are stigmatized for their labor, and who are often people of color. It is too easy for a judge to unfairly rule against members of this community by viewing their occupation or skin color as being just as condemnable as their abusive ex-partner. As a result, they have to weigh the risks of staying with an abuser over potentially losing their children and experiencing more trauma.

(Opposed) There are many cases where courts have abused their discretion and not imposed limitations where there was clear evidence of domestic violence or sexual abuse. Judges already violate the law with impunity. What will happen if they are given even more discretion? The bill introduces vague and misleading terms, like abusive use of conflict and protective actions, making it easier for courts to ignore domestic violence and abuse. Washington needs accountability in family courts, not unchecked power for judges.

The bill contains no guiding analysis for judges on the nature, context, or effect of abuse on protective parents or their children. It continues to treat cases with abuse in the same

manner as those with other parenting concerns. Put this bill on hold and craft legislation that is survivor-based, such as the model code, which focuses on the impact of abuse on the parent and children.

This bill strengthens the ability of abusers to weaponize alienation claims by allowing a court to impose restrictions on protective parents that should only be used for abusive parents. It would allow a parent who has raped a child and who is provided a treatment plan with the ability to bring the mother and child back to court after treatment and force them to relive their experience, creating a dangerous pathway for a child's mental stability.

House Bill 1620 may appear to serve the interests of children and survivors, but could inadvertently enable abusers to use custody and litigation as a tool of coercion. It removes critical protections that limit abusers' access to children and introduces the concepts of abusive use of conflict and protective actions, which could allow abusers to continue weaponizing the court system with endless litigation.

Family court is sometimes more abusive than the abuser a survivor is leaving. Listen to survivors, not the nonprofits that are funded from different sources and whose jobs depend on supporting bills like this. Instead invest in reforms that prioritize child safety, including enforcing existing limiting factors rather than weakening them.

Stronger oversight of judicial decisions is needed to ensure courts recognize coercive control and abusive litigation. Mandatory trauma-informed training should be required for all judicial officers so they are equipped to assess patterns of abuse and manipulation. Judges and commissioners in family court make decisions about what happens to families and children and people's livelihoods without substantive due process. Commissioners are attorneys and guardians ad litem who are appointed by judges, which is per se nepotism.

(Other) It is critical to pass this bill to address longstanding issues with the current law, particularly with respect to situations where both parents have limiting factors. A clear and convincing standard of proof should be required for rebutting a presumption of mandatory limitations based on sex offenses against a child.

Survivors deserve a process that is fair and consistent, no matter where they live or who is on the bench. Judges often delay protection orders until parenting plans are finalized, which can leave survivors without protections for long periods of time. The bill gives judges clear direction and helps make the process fair, timely, and predictable for survivors.

Persons Testifying: (In support) Representative Jamila Taylor, prime sponsor; Elizabeth Hendren, Sexual Violence Law Center; Commissioner Barbara McInvaille, Superior Court Judges' Association; Judge Alicia Burton, Superior Court Judges' Association; Mary Welch, Northwest Justice Project; Chandra Ifie, Survivor Parent; Madison Zack-Wu, Strippers Are Workers; Paula Sardinas, WBBA (WA Build Black Alliance); Karin White, Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence; Amarinthia Torres, Coalition Ending Gender-

Based Violence; and Kristina Peterson.

(Opposed) Evangeline Stratton; Tamara Emerson; Gina Bloom, Registered Lobbyist for The Dissolution Advocates NW, LLC; Dana Tingey; Shira Cole, PAYES; LaRae Lobdell; Shannon Draughon, Carnation Legal, LLC.

(Other) Patrick Rawnsley, WSBA Family Law Executive Committee; and Em Stone, Department of Commerce.

Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying: Gaston Shelton; Grace Amos, DV Survivor; Tina Swithin, One Mom's Battle; Kimberly Kerr; Christine Cocchiola; Melanie Kraintz; Sarah Hulteen; Emily Farris; Chelsi Eastwood; Rebecca Dunn; Melissa Strawn; and Melissa Strawn.