

Pioneers and Pathfinders: Keith Maziarek and Justin Ergler, Part I

(This transcript was generated through AI technology.)

Steve Poor

This week, on Pioneers and Pathfinders, we're doing something a little different with a special two-part conversation featuring Justin Ergler and Keith Maziarek, co-hosts of the Off The Clock podcast and board members of the Legal Value Network. Now, you may remember Keith from a previous episode. He's the director of pricing and legal project management at Katten. Justin, a veteran of GlaxoSmithKline, now leads his own consulting practice focused on alternative fee arrangements and innovative legal service delivery.

In part one of our wide-ranging discussion, we talked about why this is a great time to enter the legal profession, the ongoing frustrations with the pace of change, and how law firms and legal departments are rethinking billing structures. Keith and Justin, take it away.

Keith Maziarek

Okay, everybody, we are excited to bring you this episode of Off The Clock, the Legal Value Network podcast. Keith Maziarek here, and as always, or as usual, I'm joined by Justin Ergler. Today, we have a very special honor and privilege to have as our guest, Steve Poor, who's the Chair Emeritus from Seyfarth Shaw. There are a number of reasons I feel very honored and privileged for having Steve on, which I'll jump into in a minute, but really quickly, Steve, if you want to do a quick intro, and then we can sort of jump into it and kind of get in the conversation from there. But I want to make sure you can introduce yourself as well.

Steve Poor

Thanks, Keith, and Thanks, Justin. I appreciate you having on and I look forward to our conversation. My name is Steve Poor. I'm Chair Emeritus of Seyfarth, as you said, Keith, I was chair and managing partner for 15 years. We did a bunch of weird things at the firm to try to think about how to deliver services differently. And that's carried forward to today. And today I work with our tech R&D department, our Seyfarth labs, to try to figure out what the impact of emerging technology is on the practice and our client service.

Keith Maziarek

There's a lot going on with that, right? That occupies a lot of our minds and a lot of our a lot of our time these days. I think.

Steve Poor

I think that's right. And I think there's a law that says every podcast has to talk about generative AI, so we've checked that box, and hopefully we don't have to come back to it. But you know, you stand at an interesting moment in the profession right, where you don't quite know what the impact of this technology is going to be. You don't know what impact it has on pricing, delivery of services to clients,

and you know it's going to change, but you don't know how or how quickly it's going to change. It's a fascinating moment to be. If I were a young person, I'd really want to be moving into the legal profession right now, because it's going to be so different.

Keith Maziarek

It seems like a little bit more credible of an inflection point or sort of transformation, I would say moment. But I think I always say that any change is usually evolution, not revolution, and particularly in legal industry. But there really is sort of a sense of what's materializing now is going to have some sort of meaningful impact on how not only operations are done, but also, you know, obviously legal service delivery, so it feels more relevant now.

Justin Ergler

And Steve, it's actually, it's funny how you intro there, because right prior to when we started recording, we were talking about, you know, some different things and different hiring practices, and, you know, kind of different disciplines that are being hired now and brought into the legal industry. And then you opened and you said it'd be a very interesting time if you were a young professional to join the legal industry. So could you maybe just give me some thoughts, as far as your thoughts, opine on what different disciplines maybe are law firms and corporate legals looking at now that maybe they wouldn't have in the past. I'm thinking this to my head like data scientists, but that's an obvious one. What are different disciplines that you think maybe law firms are or should be looking at?

Steve Poor

Data scientists is an obvious one, of course, and that's not particularly new. Technologists, of course. That's not particularly new. We were talking about, before we got started, the folks at Reed Smith hiring an anthropologist to come in and help work their change management program. I find that fascinating, if you think about it, it's a great skill set, because you're talking about the law firm is a community. In one sense, it functions as a community. It functions as an organization. And so the skills and education of someone as an anthropologist fits that unique need. Now, how that person adapts to dealing with a bunch of lawyers would be fascinating to find out, because I think that would be very unique, but I think that we have to get beyond the mindset, as you guys said, that lawyers can do everything better than everybody else, because there are professions out there, technologists, data scientists, anthropologists, who can bring skills to the table that lawyers don't have and shouldn't have and shouldn't try to do and at the end of the day, deliver better services for our clients.

Keith Maziarek

It's funny you said that. There are people who can do things better than lawyers can do. I think the audience that thinks it's only lawyers that can do everything better is probably mostly lawyers. I say that jokingly, but like when you think about, you know, transformation wise, and this is sort of one of the things that I think is fascinating about your perspective. And I don't mean to be like, embarrass you with my compliments, but like, you really were a visionary early on in sort of looking at the way things can be done differently, right? And then as a lawyer, but then also shifting that perspective, or broadening that perspective to go, "Hey, from a business standpoint, from a process standpoint, there's more to this than just the legal services that we deliver." I think, to me, that's a fascinating thing. I'm always curious about what your inspirations were back then, or what sort of got you started?

Steve Poor

Well, it's interesting. I can remember back in it was like, '04, '05, when we started our project management office. And there really wasn't any function like that in the legal industry at the time. And I remember thinking two things. One, people thought we were crazy, that they thought lawyers can be their own project managers, and I'm sitting there thinking, there's actually an educational path for people to be trained to be project managers. It's not law school, right? And I didn't understand why that wouldn't be of service to our clients, but it took an enormous amount of time to help lawyers understand the same dynamic plays itself over and over with technologists, with data, people and everything else, for lawyers to understand how to collaborate with other professionals. I think the industry's gotten beyond that than it was 21 years ago, but the inspiration just was, it seemed to make common sense. I'd like to tell you that there was some great, you know, light bulb that went off, you know, while you're riding your bike. But it was like, Okay, if we're going to actually focus on process, if we're actually going to focus on how we get from point A to point B to point C, and eliminate as many deviations from that process as possible. We need people who are skilled at running process. So that seems like a project manager to me, and we had a person in the firm named Carla Goldstein who had been the COO firm. Carla's great, yeah. Carl had been Dan Cohen Flom's COO. We were struggling to find a role with her. She went back. She had her MBA. She went back and got a PMP, and next thing you know, she's establishing the office of project management, and her skill sets were perfect because she understood it substantively, but she'd been with lawyers long enough to understand the interpretation challenges and need to build relationships, and I think there's a learning curve for the allied professionals in that respect as well. Lawyers are a different breed. They're smart, they're competitive, they're skeptical. Words matter to lawyers, and that's not something people are usually accustomed to dealing with in the professional world. It's a learned skill. I think it's

Keith Maziarek

Funny you say that because I, I got started in the legal industry at the American Bar Association, and I was there for four and a half years, and I worked with lawyers from different firms, different geographies, different, you know, substantive alignments across the board. And at first I'm like, This is ridiculous. Like, why has this got to be so hard? But once I learned, I felt like I learned how to navigate that sort of landscape, somewhat effectively, I started to realize not everybody can do this. Is there? Did I learn a commercially valuable skill, or did I just do something that was difficult, that I can't that was putting myself through challenges I didn't need to be put through? Right? But it's there, is there is something to that once you learn how to do it. So I agree.

Justin Ergler

Something you said, it kind of made me chuckle. And for those listening that don't know, we do these, Steve and Keith and I can all see each other on video. So when I say, "It made me chuckle." Or if I say, "You know, hey, Keith, I saw you smile," then that's why. So just get a little bit behind the scenes of off the clock. But Steve, something you said that did make me laugh was that people thought I was crazy, right? I started out, you know, I'm a proud non-lawyer, and I started out in the legal...

Steve Poor

Allied professional, my friend, Allied professional.

Justin Ergler

There you go. There you go. But from a procurement standpoint, and I was told everything, and I kid you not, I was asked by someone at an outside third party if I smoked crack, right? So that's how important it was back in 2009 and no, I do not smoke crack, just to clarify for everyone. So, a question I had for you, because you're obviously one of the OGs, one of the one of the guys that had that vision, as Keith said, Is it frustrating for you because you had the vision for an LPM function right back and I believe said 2005 Is it frustrating for you that ideas and thoughts you had in 2005 right are still considered cutting-edge in the industry, because Keith and I speak a lot, we speak together unfortunately for me, I'd speak with Keith at conferences, and sometimes he and I, you know, laugh. We're like, we need to spice this up. We talked about some of the same stuff 6, 7, 8 years ago. We needed to be fresh, if not for everybody else, just for us. Has it gotten frustrating for you since you had these ideas so long ago?

Steve Poor

It's a great question, and I'm going to ask you guys to answer the same question for yourselves, because you've been at the forefront, particularly the alternative pricing structures, for a long time as well. And it is frustrating because the pace of change in the industry is so slow, it's glacial, for God's sake. And you go to conferences and people are talking about ideas that have been talking, I mean, the death of the bill of our Oh, for God's sake. I mean...

Justin Ergler

For over 20 years.

Keith Maziarek

He nailed it.

Steve Poor

Oh, more than 20. My friend. More than 20.

Justin Ergler

No. I mean, it's for me, just for me. My former company, we did it. Oh God, probably 10 years ago, a decade ago, and it's still, there's still a is the billable hour dead?

Keith Maziarek

Provocative, real, provocative. Yeah.

Justin Ergler

Hold on here. It's sacred.

Steve Poor

Right? If I go to one more conference where they talk about that, I may I may not go again. But I guess it's something you just have to accept. It's frustrating. But the the industry only moves so quickly. I think what's interesting about the current technological revolution we're in is that there's a lot of parallels to

eDiscovery, a lot of parallels to technology augmented review back in the turn of the century. But the difference is the technology is moving and changing so swiftly now, as opposed to back then, that the adaptation time to get used to the technology is much, much thinner now than it was then. So you don't have, you know, this time for the industry to get used to it and attack it and be skeptical and talk about accuracy rates and everything else. It's coming for us in a tidal wave. It's quite interesting whether that changes this dynamic you're talking about, where 20 years later, we're still talking about things we thought were novel 20 years ago.

Justin Ergler

That's what we talked to David Cunningham about at our last podcast, and it's so fresh because you just did it on Tuesday. So was a question I had for Dave was, and kind of you just alluded to, we're seeing step changes now in technology. My question was something around, you know, are you seeing that, it's almost there's technology that was taboo and foreign, that was from as recent as three years ago that now it's maybe a bit more acceptable, because it's not the new scary thing. It's like, Hey, we've had this on the shelf for three years because everybody was afraid to go with it and use it.

Steve Poor

Like document automation?

Keith Maziarek

Yeah, that's a great example.

Justin Ergler

Whereas stuff like that, it's like, you know, things are changing so fast, and as you said, lawyers are risk adverse, and the pace of change is very slow that perhaps technology from, you know, 18 months ago, two years ago, is now considered perhaps more established and less scary. So what's your take on that?

Steve Poor

You know, it's great observation, and we're seeing that over as I said, one of the things I work with is Seyfarth Labs that deals with emerging technologies. And what's been interesting about the ChatGPT sonic boom is that it has increased the interest in people in having technology solve problems. Oh, can't the robots do this? Well, you don't need a robot to do this. We've got document automation that we've been working with for 15 years that you haven't been willing to work with. Guess what? It does this. And they'll go, oh, okay, let's do that.

Justin Ergler

Yeah, but as far as all of a sudden, that's not scary and that's not foreign. When just 18 months ago, that was like, whoa, whoa. Guys, calm down here.

Steve Poor

That's exactly right. And I credit that to generative AI, because it's become so omnipresent in our conversation and our thinking about it, that people it's driven interest in the way technology can solve problems in a way that wasn't happening before, at least in our world.

Justin Ergler

It's funny that you said as far as the billable hour, right? That conversation has been going on for what, 40, 50, however, long, right? And now, law firms always reluctant, unless you're, you know, my former company, big company, and you say, Hey, we're going off the billable hour. You're a big fish. You kind of have that power to help make that happen. But now law firms are saying, Keep. You can talk about this, law firms are saying, Oh, geez, we're going to invest in this AI, our model of compensation is working hours, and this investment we're going to make is going to reduce the number of hours it takes us. Geez, we better get off this hourly system, because we have two choices, either we add kind of a tax on every invoice for it to recoup our investment, or we figure out a way to get off which is not going to be palatable for a lot of clients, or we get off of that model and we go to a more value-based, nonhourly-based, alternative flat fee model. So I completely agree with you, as far as the AI is really forcing a lot of the changes that perhaps some of us have been thinking about for years and years. Keith, can you maybe touch on that from your work now in a law firm, as far as how that's maybe the compensation discussion?

Keith Maziarek

A lot of things have to go right, technology or not, to move off of hours wholesale onto something that's not hours-based, right? Because in a human capital business, you got to measure productivity on something, and that's, you know, been a convenient metric. And when I say a whole lot of things, best laid plans are always the ones that are first to be cast aside by somebody, right? So, on the law firm side, there are a number of things that we can do and have done over the last two decades, you know, of which 15 of those years I've been, you know, focusing in this stuff that are best laid plans. And when you go to try and engage with a client, and you know, Justin, you are an exception on the client side too, for a number of reasons, but specifically for...

Justin Ergler

Why do you always give a compliment you have to take a cut right after? I don't know why.

Keith Maziarek

I would ask you the same question, but so what I'm saying is, very often, as much as law firms are criticized, I think, often unfairly for going you guys in your hours, that's not value. Very often, when you approach a client to try and modernize or pivot the way that you engage with them to deliver services, they can't figure out heads or tails on what the right number is if it's not our so you end up getting back to that, and it creates more friction rather than streamlining. So there is a lot of, you know, I've said this. This is one of the things I've been saying for 15 years as well. There's a lot of blaming and finger pointing about this is all inefficient, and it's sub optimal, and law firms, you guys, are so slow to change. Really, what we are is surprisingly, I would say, and this is going to be maybe a little bit controversial or provocative, a thing to say, we're actually relatively decent at responding to the market. I mean, look at if you see decent, relatively strong financial results in challenging years from law firms. It's not because we can't respond to the market. Actually, there's some level of ability, given that there are allied professionals now that are contributing to that exercise, for law firms to be much more resilient and much more, I would say, agile in responding to the market, there would be more movement if it was an easier thing to do. And there's It takes two to tango. I would raise the challenge to clients if you want to

see change, this is, this is like, I don't know who coined this. I feel like it's like a like, something that came from a Pixar movie or something. But like, if you want to see change, be that change first.

Justin Ergler

But being reactive and proactive are two different things. And I'm saying that what I'm seeing at least from the market, and this change is for a long time or ever, law firms have been like, hey, the hourly model is not broke for me. Why am I going to let me fix it? But now

Keith Maziarek

I don't agree with that.

Justin Ergler

It's broken. So there are law firms trying to figure out how to proactively fix it, as opposed she said, being reactive and the client forcing the change.

Keith Maziarek

I don't agree with that, and here's why, but I love to get Steve's thoughts

Justin Ergler

Everybody's wrong sometimes.

Keith Maziarek

Here's why I don't agree with that. I don't feel and maybe I live in a bubble, which I realize sometimes when I see how little progress is made in other firms. You know that I hear about things and I'm like, people are still talking about this, like I'm surprised that's the challenge that's being voiced. But I have never sat in on a meeting or heard a side conversation with anybody that said, "By God, let's just make sure we don't have to move off the billable hour, because this is absolutely the dominant force for us, and we are crushing it. There is no other way for us to be successful." I've never been a party to any of those conversations or heard it. I've really been more a party. This is maybe just a by virtue of perspective. I deal with a lot of different clients, and hear a lot of what different clients perspectives are, or demands or concerns or sensitivities are. So I hear a lot of these conversations. When we hear those, we go back and we go, how can we reconcile what they're asking for with what they need and what we can provide to them? And never is part of that conversation. Just don't touch my hours. That never comes up. I don't know. And Steve, I'd be curious over the years, what your perspective and what you're, what you've heard, or what you've been sort of a party to in that regard.

Steve Poor

A couple things. First, let me give you a perspective of mine, which may not be right, but it's but it's my perspective, which is when you talk about hours, to me, I agree with you. I've never heard anybody say or our only way of making money is a is to build by the hour with the pro forma and all that kind of stuff. However, historically, most alternative fee arrangements have been repackaged hourly billing. It's a cost plus pricing structure, and to me, that isn't getting away from hourly billing, it's just repackaging. It may be putting certainty around it. It may be putting a cap or something, a cap or bonuses. There may be stuff you put around it. And I had this conversation, you know, back with Susan Hackett, back when

she was at the ACC and they started talking about the value challenge. But the point I made then, and the point I make now is, if you're not looking at pricing on the basis of, what is this matter worth to me, as opposed to, what does it cost? You're not getting in something truly alternative. But because I think the focus is on cost, I'm curious as to and Justin, you're right. I mean, I think law firms are struggling with this is going to reduce the cost. We'd better get on a on an alternative fee proposal now based on an antiquated cost structure, I'm curious as to what you're hearing from the buyer side, because, like Keith, I agree with your point that most of the dynamic for change comes from the buyer side, and I think that take shadow billing, for example. You go in and you get an alternative billing, and they want shadow billing. And I would say, you've just told us it's our responsibility to manage this. You're prepared to pay X. What difference does it make to you, whether we would make money or lose money? They go, well, we don't want you getting a windfall.

Keith Maziarek

Yeah.

Justin Ergler

But why? And that's one of the things you know, Steve, I'm not sure if you know a guy called Dan Troy, who was a former general counsel of GSK, former Sidley, former GC of the FDA, that was his thought and his model, and he was the impetus. He's the reason why the company was so gung ho, ongoing. Because he, you know, he had practiced at large law firm, teams, partner, all this stuff. And he said it, you know, I deliver value. I don't deliver time. And these are my words, not Dan's. But he said, If I'm able to do something, and it doesn't take me a lot of time, but just based on my expertise, in my experience, why should I get paid less for it, right? So as a company, when I was at GSK, we were willing to reward that, and we did not do shadow bills. Because I call if you have anything hourly, you have shadow bills, whatever, and you call it an AFA, I call it a buyer's remorse. AFA, right? You're giving yourself the chance to say, oh, geez, look how much money they made on this. If you're going to do true value and pay for and espouse, we pay for value, we pay for results and things like that, he should be willing to do it right. And that's kind of what I'm saying, though, from the proactive piece at law firms. And to your question, Steve, that law firms are trying to think about this, and how do we change this model, and to your question, Steve, what do clients think about it? I mean, it kind of makes me laugh a little bit, because I was obviously a flat fee client, right? No shadows. I didn't care about your hourly rate. Couldn't care less. One of the beauties of being on flat fees is that you don't have to do hourly rate increase discussions. Every year you'll pour out of your life. It's beautiful, right? I hear the horror stories from, you know, the folks in the law firm side, the first in the client side. You don't have to do any of that stuff. It's wonderful. But if I was an hourly client, I would almost be saying, Geez, you're doing all this AI stuff. You're cutting your hours. You know, all the things were used to take 30 hours now takes 30 minutes. Yeah, maybe I'm good with this cool hourly billing model, and then I'm going to negotiate, and I'm going to complain about that tax that you try to put on my bill for the investment that you made.

Steve Poor

Yeah, I think that's exactly right. I remember getting a question a couple of years ago about impact of AI, and is this going to be the death of of the hours. Of course, that made me chuckle, but I made the same point.

Justin Ergler

Now it's clients saying, Whoa. Work is an hourly thing.

Steve Poor

Right? But you, but you think about it, and that makes complete sense.

Justin Ergler

It does.

Steve Poor

You say what ought to happen is cost ought to go down, but billable hour rate ought to go up. If you think about it, the mix of work should be changing. And if I were a client and if I were already on fixed fees, that would be great, but this isn't the moment I would move to fixed fees, I don't think.

Justin Ergler

No.

Steve Poor

If you're thinking about it as a cost structure, as opposed to what the matter is worth to you. And if you believe the cost structure is going to come down, why wouldn't you have that conversation? What's the impact of AI going to be on your performance of work for us?

Keith Maziarek

I feel like it's a little bit of a cop out on the client side. And here's why. Because if for years, you're touting that we buy value, we don't buy time. Time is in value to me. I want results, right? I'm not paying for your time, and now I spend less time, and you go, don't bill me for more hour, you know, don't bill me fixed fee. I still don't know what this you know, I want to pay for the hours. Now, it's a little disingenuous, I think number one, but number two, it still kind of points back to the inability of corporate legal departments at large, I'm not saying all of them, to really understand what drives value for them in the legal services that they're buying and assign sort of what the price is and align that with what the value is. And here's why I say that, because it shouldn't matter how much time it takes, there should be a measure of what did we yield as a benefit, whether that's economic or strategic or operational or something else, as a benefit of this that would decouple the cost question from what the value question is, and when you can isolate what the value question is, you can much better come up with a number from a price standpoint that doesn't hold one hostage for the sake of the other. You know what I mean? So as a firm, if I can learn how to do something in three hours, that used to be 30 hours, but by doing it faster, it actually has more value to the client, I shouldn't be charging them less for that. And to do it faster, to do it faster, or to do it at scale, actually is harder, and usually you don't get good at doing more complicated things and get paid less for it. It's hard to be a PhD and an MD and a JD. It's not as hard to just be a JD, right? If you know all those things, and you can somehow deploy the synthesis of those skills on something that has a value to somebody that should be more than just if you were only one of them, right? So different analogy to be made, but I don't think it's a fair criticism to go, Oh, it's so much faster. Now it's cheaper. You know, it should be cheaper for us. I don't think that's right.

Justin Ergler

But on the flip side, though, clients are going to say, well, then, you know, how am I not paying too much?

Keith Maziarek

I know.

Justin Ergler

I'm not saying I agree with that? I'm just saying that's, you know, I'm playing the role here, but that's my role on the podcast. But what I would say is, so how do clients combat that? If I'm a client, listen to this podcast, competition, competition. If I'm looking at price and fees and things like that, I look at different quotes from different firms, because if I'm charging under a flat fee, right, and I don't care about hours and everything, those firms that have invested in the tech to get them to do something that used to take 30 hours, now it's three hours, right, they're going to be able to come in at perhaps a lower cost, but have a bigger margin and have higher profitability, but those firms that have it are not going to be able to. I mean, this is going to be a competition thing.

Keith Maziarek

But by competition, all you've done is determine, from a cost plus basis what the value is to the competitors. You still haven't defined what the value is to you as a client or a consumer of that service, or what you're going to benefit from the results of what that service is. All you've done is gone, You guys all decide how little you'll do this for, and I'll pick the lowest one that I think best fits what I need to have done and still doesn't have any correlation with what it means is value to the client. It's outsourcing that discussion.

Justin Ergler

Nope. Disagree. In what industry does that happen? What you just described, where a client says, this is the value to me. I'm going to pay. I'm going to pay this value no matter what, as far as no matter what.

Keith Maziarek

If I go to the grocery store, I can decide if I want to buy organic or it's not worth it, I'm going to buy regular stuff, right? I decide that.

Justin Ergler

But what if there are four organic avocados in there?

Keith Maziarek

Then I'll just decide which of those best matches my needs, and I'll pay the price that's being charged. I won't pay the lowest price necessarily. Steve, go ahead. Sorry.

Justin Ergler

We've been like an old married couple. I'm sorry.

Steve Poor

Yeah, it's all right. It's fascinating to listen to you guys go back and forth. I think it's more nuanced than we're making it here, because there are certain kinds of work where they don't have particular value, their routine run of the business kind of work where it's just a portfolio of thousands of particular similar kind of matters. The portfolio needs to be handled well. Any one case is not going to make or break the company. That's so-called commodity work. There, I think, Justin, your dynamic plays out extremely well. I think what's going to be more interesting is to see, for those bigger matters, where clients, where they are viewing it as value, the big deal where, you know, it's a significant potential revenue source for the company, and they want, it's worth a million bucks to me, to close this \$1 billion deal or something. The question is going to be to me, because Justin it happens now where other firms would come in with lower billing rates and come in and say, "We can do Kirkland's work for less money." Kirkland doesn't seem to be hurting for work, right? And so you're paying extra for the value they bring. And I'm not sure that dynamic changes.

Justin Ergler

I agree, but I will say, and I'm not going to speak about any one firm here based on previous experience, but I will say, I'll tell you who's really freaking good at nonhourly flat fees, flag bank firms, firms at that tier of the firm you just said, you know why? Because they know they have worked really hard to get the best talent. They've worked really hard to retain that talent, and they know that they can deliver more efficiently, but just as effectively as some of their competitors. If you give a firm of that tier a flat fee, guess what? They're able to hit it, and they're able to have high profitability because their people are that good. And that's kind of, as I said earlier, the impetus of what had my former company go to flat fees in our former general counsel was, if you've got great people, you've got brilliant minds, right? They should be compensated based on the work that they do. So if you're a firm of that tier and you've paid them, well, you've retained them and all that stuff, those are the firms that I found. And it wasn't, you know, a flip of the switch overnight, but as they kind of got used to it, it was, hey, you know what? We can really have an upside on deals like this, and that includes putting your best people on it, which, that's always the concern. People say, "Oh, well, if I do an alternative fee, I'm not going to get their best people." Well, if you do a flat fee, you put your best people, you're going to make hell a lot of profit.

Steve Poor

Thanks for listening to Pioneers and Pathfinders. Be sure to visit thepioneerpodcast.com for show notes and more episodes, and don't forget to subscribe to our podcast on your favorite platform.