Study L-750 October 7, 2013

Second Supplement to Memorandum 2013-44

Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (Comments on Tentative Recommendation)

This supplement continues the process of presenting and analyzing the comments on the Tentative Recommendation on the *Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act* (June 2013) (hereafter, "Tentative Recommendation"). It focuses on Article 4 (Registration and Recognition of Orders from Other States) and Article 5 (Miscellaneous Provisions) of the proposed California Conservatorship Jurisdiction Act ("CCJA"), as well as the uncodified provision and the conforming revisions.

ARTICLE 4. REGISTRATION AND RECOGNITION OF ORDERS FROM OTHER STATES

Article 4 of the proposed CCJA corresponds to Article 4 of the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act ("UAGPPJA"). It addresses the problem of interstate recognition, enabling a conservator appointed in another state to take action in California subject to certain important limitations and conditions.

The article consists of the following provisions:

- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2011.** Registration of order appointing conservator of person [UAGPPJA § 401]
- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2012.** Registration of order appointing conservator of estate [UAGPPJA § 402]
- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2013.** Registration of order appointing conservator of person and estate
- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2014.** Effect of registration [UAGPPJA § 403]
- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2015.** Good faith reliance on registration
- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2016.** Recordation of registration documents

The Commission did not receive any comments that relate to proposed Probate Code Sections 2015 and 2016. The remaining provisions in Article 4 are closely interrelated, so it would not make sense to individually analyze the comments on each provision. Instead, the discussion below is organized according to the issues raised:

- Impact on the need for an ancillary proceeding in another state.
- Request for greater clarity regarding the effect of registration.
- Notice requirement for registration.
- Time limit for registration.

Each issue is discussed in order below.

Ancillary Proceeding in Another State

The California State Association of Public Administrators, Public Guardians, and Public Conservators ("CAPAPGPC") finds the concept of registration "an intriguing prospect because Public Guardians/Public Conservators are currently required to do ancillary estates to manage the real and personal property of conservatees that is located in another state." Memorandum 2013-44, Exhibit p. 32. CAPAPGPC seeks confirmation "that registration may be used as a substitute for ancillary proceedings in those states that have adopted UAGPPJA." *Id.* If so, CAPAPGPC says registration "would be beneficial to the conservatee estates." *Id.*

CAPAPGPC is correct that the proposed registration procedure is designed to eliminate the necessity of filing a second conservatorship proceeding in another state, simply for the purpose of handling a transaction or event that requires action beyond the borders of the state where a conservatorship has already been established. As the ULC observes, "[s]ometimes, guardianship or protective proceedings must be initiated in a second state because of the refusal of financial institutions, care facilities, and the courts to recognize a guardianship or protective order issued in another state." ULC, Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Act Summary, *available at* http://www.uniformlaws.org/ActSummary.aspx?title=Adult%20Guardianship%20and%20Protective%20Proceedings%20Jurisdiction%20Act. The ULC calls this the "Problem of

Recognition," *id.*, and explains that Article 4 of UAGPPJA is intended to eliminate it:

> Sometimes, these sorts of refusals necessitate that the proceeding be transferred to the other state or that an entirely new petition be filed, problems that could often be avoided if guardianship and protective orders were entitled to recognition in other states.
>
> *Article 4 provides for such recognition.*

UAGPPJA Article 4 General Comment (emphasis added).

CAPAPGPC's comments express support for the proposed approach**. No revisions are needed to address them.**

Request for Greater Clarity

The California Judges Association ("CJA") and the Executive Committee of the Trusts and Estates Section of the State Bar ("TEXCOM") urge the Commission to provide greater clarity regarding the effect of registering a conservatorship in California. Before describing and analyzing their comments, it may be helpful to briefly summarize the proposed statutory scheme for registration.

Proposed Statutory Scheme

Proposed Probate Code Section 2011 (corresponding to UAGPPJA § 401) would permit an out-of-state conservator of the person to register the conservatorship in California. Proposed Probate Code Section 2012 (corresponding to UAGPPJA § 402) and proposed Probate Code Section 2013 are similar provisions for a conservatorship of the estate and a conservatorship of the person and estate, respectively.

Proposed Probate Code Section 2014 (based in part on UAGPPJA § 403) would specify the effect of registering a conservatorship in California:

> 2014. (a) Upon registration of a conservatorship order from another state, *the conservator may, while the conservatee resides out of this state, exercise in any county of this state all powers authorized in the order of appointment except as prohibited under the laws of this state,* including maintaining actions and proceedings in this state and, if the conservator is not a resident of this state, subject to any conditions imposed upon nonresident parties.
>
> (b) Subdivision (a) applies only when the conservatee resides out of this state. When the conservatee resides in this

state, a conservator may not exercise any powers pursuant to a registration under this article.

(c) A court of this state may grant any relief available under this chapter and other law of this state to enforce a registered order.

(Emphasis added.)

Proposed Probate Code Section 2023 would require the Judicial Council to develop court rules and forms to implement the proposed CCJA, including in particular a cover sheet for registration of a conservatorship. The cover sheet would include a prominent warning that an out-of-state conservator must comply with California law while taking action pursuant to a registration:

2023. (a) On or before January 1, 2016, the Judicial Council shall develop court rules and forms as necessary for the implementation of this chapter.

(b) The materials developed pursuant to this section shall include, but not be limited to, both of the following:

(1) A cover sheet for registration of a conservatorship under Section 2011, 2012, or 2013. The cover sheet shall explain that a proceeding may not be registered under Section 2011, 2012, or 2013 if the proceeding relates to a minor. The cover sheet shall further explain that a proceeding in which a person is subjected to involuntary mental health care may not be registered under Section 2011, 2012, or 2013. The cover sheet shall require the conservator to initial each of these explanations. *The cover sheet shall also include a prominent statement that the conservator of a conservatorship registered under Section 2011, 2012, or 2013 is subject to the law of this state while acting in this state, is required to comply with that law in every respect, including, but not limited to, all applicable procedures, and is not authorized to take any action prohibited by the law of this state.* In addition, the cover sheet shall prominently state that the registration is effective only while the conservatee resides in another jurisdiction and does not authorize the conservator to take any action while the conservatee is residing in this state. Directly beneath these statements, the cover sheet shall include a signature box in which the conservator attests to these matters.

….

(Emphasis added.)

Concerns of CJA and TEXCOM Regarding Clarity

The proposed registration provisions "are of great concern to TEXCOM." Memorandum 2013-44, Exhibit p. 34. The group offers several suggestions about those provisions, including a suggestion that they should "more clearly state the duties of an out-of-state conservator who may be unfamiliar with California conservatorship laws …." *Id.* at Exhibit pp. 38. In particular, TEXCOM points out that an out-of-state conservator might not know about

- The restrictions and required procedures for selling a conservatee's personal residence under Probate Code Sections 2450(b), 2352.5, 2541, and 2591.5.
- The need to obtain authorization from a California court to sell personal property of a conservatee (Prob. Code §§ 2540(a), 2545).
- The possible need for a court determination under Probate Code Section 1880 regarding whether the conservatee lacks capacity to give informed consent for planned medical treatment.

Id. at 38-39.

TEXCOM "agrees with the emphasis added by new Section 2023 of the Tentative Recommendation." *Id.* at Exhibit p. 39. It urges the Commission to "provide additional clarity by: 1) including a reference in Section 2014 to the additional requirements in new Section 2023; and 2) listing specifically the actions for which an order by a California court must be obtained." *Id.*

CJA also suggests that the Commission "[c]larify the extent to which foreign conservators would be subject to the protections in California law regarding conservatorship transactions." *Id.* at Exhibit p. 12. It explains:

> The provisions for registration of a foreign conservatorship in California are not sufficiently clear as to the operative effect of that registration. For example, a common activity of a foreign conservator will be to sell California real estate that was formerly the home of the conservatee. We cannot tell from the recommendation whether the foreign conservator would be required to respect the carefully enacted procedures to protect conservatees from having their homes sold unnecessarily (Chapter 490, Statutes 2006). These California statutes reflect thoughtful public policy of the State of California.

> It should be made clear in the proposal whether requirements such as these are applicable to, or waived, as to sales by foreign conservators under a registered decree. If these requirements are waived for foreign conservators, some clear rationale for that should be expressed by the CLRC.

Id. at Exhibit p. 11.

Analysis

The staff agrees with CJA and TEXCOM that **additional clarity regarding the impact of registration would be useful.** We suggest **revising proposed Section 2014 along the following lines:**

> 2014. (a) Upon registration of a conservatorship order from another state, the conservator may, while the conservatee resides out of this state, exercise in any county of this state all powers authorized in the order of appointment except as prohibited under the laws of this state, including maintaining actions and proceedings in this state and, if the conservator is not a resident of this state, subject to any conditions imposed upon nonresident parties. The conservator is subject to the law of this state while acting in this state, is required to comply with that law in every respect, including, but not limited to, all applicable procedures, and is not authorized to take any action prohibited by the law of this state. If a law of this state, including, but not limited to, Section 2352, 2352.5, 2355, 2356.5, 2540, 2543, 2545, or 2591.5, or Article 2 (commencing with Section 1880) of Chapter 4 of Part 4, mandates compliance with special requirements to exercise a particular conservatorship power or take a particular step, the conservator of a registered conservatorship may not exercise that power or take that step without first complying with those special requirements.
>
> (b) Subdivision (a) applies only when the conservatee resides out of this state. When the conservatee resides in this state, a conservator may not exercise any powers pursuant to a registration under this article.
>
> (c) A court of this state may grant any relief available under this chapter and other law of this state to enforce a registered order.
>
> **Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 2014 is similar to Section 403(a) of the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (2007) ("UAGPPJA"). Revisions have been made to conform to California terminology for the proceedings in question. See

Section 1982 & Comment (definitions); see also Section 1980 Comment. Revisions have also been made to:

(1) Underscore that any conservatorship registered in California is fully subject to California law while the conservator is acting in the state. For example, if a conservatorship is registered in California and the conservator wishes to exercise the powers specified in Section 2356.5 (conservatee with dementia) within the state, the requirements of that section must be satisfied. Similarly, if the conservator of a registered conservatorship wishes to sell the conservatee's personal residence located in California, the transaction must comply with California's special requirements for such a sale (see, e.g., Sections 2352, 2352.5, 2540(b), 2543, 2591.5).

~~(1)~~ (2) Emphasize that registration of an out-of-state conservatorship in one county is sufficient; it is not necessary to register in every county in which the conservator seeks to act.

~~(2)~~ (3) Make clear that a registration is only effective while the conservatee resides in another jurisdiction. If the conservatee becomes a California resident, the conservator cannot act pursuant to a registration under Section 2011, 2012, or 2013, but can petition for transfer of the conservatorship to California under Article 2.

Subdivision (b) further underscores that a registration is only effective while the conservatee resides in another jurisdiction.

Subdivision (c) is the same as Section 403(b) of UAGPPJA.

For limitations on the scope of this chapter, see Section 1981 & Comment.

Does the Commission agree with this idea in concept? If so, Commissioners and others should **carefully review the language suggested above and determine whether it is satisfactory or could be improved in any way.**

Notice Requirement for Registration

Under proposed Sections 2011, 2012, and 2013, an out-of-state conservator would only have to notify "the court supervising the conservatorship" before registering the conservatorship in California. As explained below, both TEXCOM and CJA request expansion of that notice requirement.

Concerns of TEXCOM and CJA Relating to the Notice Requirement

TEXCOM maintains that requiring an out-of-state conservator to notify the supervising court of an intent to register the conservatorship in California will not provide enough protection for the conservatee. The group suggests that the conservator be required to provide additional notice, so as to ensure that registration is not used to circumvent the transfer process. Memorandum 2013-44, Exhibit p. 35.

TEXCOM recognizes that the Commission has already taken an important step to prevent such circumvention: making a registration ineffective while the conservatee resides in California. See proposed Section 2014(b). TEXCOM agrees with that limitation, but says that "effective enforcement of this protection is possible only with additional notice of the application for registration to the conservatee and other interested parties, with the opportunity to object." Memorandum 2013-44, Exhibit p. 35.

Specifically, TEXCOM proposes to require notice to all persons who would be entitled to notice of a conservatorship petition in California, as well as to all persons who would be entitled to notice of a conservatorship petition in the other state. *Id.* at 36. TEXCOM further proposes that (1) the notice should inform the recipient of the opportunity to "submit an objection to the conservator before the date shown on the notice, or before the registration, whichever is later," and (2) the statute should specify that "if an objection is received, the registration may proceed only with court authorization." *Id.*

TEXCOM says that "this minimal notice provision" will "giv[e] interested parties the opportunity to object when registration of an out-of-state order may be intended for a purpose not in the conservatee's best interest." *Id.* For example, TEXCOM explains that "if a family member objected to a care plan involving placement in a California facility, or to the sale of a conservatee's long-time residence in this state, the conservator would be required to obtain court authorization to proceed with registration." *Id.* According to TEXCOM, "[b]y requiring additional notice to those who may have concerns, there is a much greater likelihood of discovering those situations where a conservator is intending to use the registration procedure to avoid California's more restrictive protections for conservatees in this state." *Id.*

CJA voices similar concerns about the registration process. It explains:

> When California conservatorships were revised in 2006, a principle adopted was that mischief against conservatees can best be protected by having interested persons made aware of what is happening. Requirements were added so that interested persons receive copies of the Court Investigator's Report, the Inventory & Appraisal, etc. For that same reason, giving notice of the registration of a foreign conservatorship in California should be required. The potential for mischief by a foreign conservator acting in California is at least as great as that potential by a California conservator. For example, the registered conservatorship is not supposed to be effective if the conservatee's residence is in California. The court in California is not in a position to monitor that. *Giving notice to the people who are interested in the conservatee creates the best potential for awareness.*

Memorandum 2013-44, Exhibit p. 12 (emphasis added). Unlike TEXCOM, CJA does not attempt to specify whether an objection to registration should be permitted, where such an objection should be directed if it is permitted, or what the impact of an objection should be.

Analysis

The suggestion made by TEXCOM and CJA is not new. The TEXCOM subgroup already made the same suggestion earlier in this study. See Second Supplement to Memorandum 2013-36, Exhibit pp. 2-4. Upon considering that suggestion, the Commission decided to stick with UAGPPJA's approach on the point (i.e., the conservator must notify the court but not interested persons). Minutes (June 2013), p. 9. The Commission made clear, however, that it welcomed further input on the matter. *See id.*

In connection with the earlier suggestion, the staff wrote:

> The TEXCOM sub-committee wants to bolster the protections [already provided] by adding a notice requirement for registration of an out-of-state conservatorship, in hopes that additional notice will result in an objection and court intervention "where a conservator is intending to use the registration procedure to avoid California's more restrictive protections for conservatees in this state." In effect, the sub-committee is proposing to supplement existing enforcement mechanisms (e.g., a suit for damages for failure to comply with California's rules governing sale of a personal residence) with an additional,

preventive means of enforcement: an objection to registration, followed by court review of the proposed registration.

In determining whether to enact such a notice requirement, the Commission should weigh the potential benefits of this enforcement mechanism against any countervailing policy considerations. In particular, the proposed approach would make the registration procedure more burdensome on conservators, by requiring them to give notice of the proposed registration to multiple parties. This burden would be imposed in every case, even when the registration is unobjectionable and is done for some minor but significant purpose, like convincing a California company to mail bills to the conservator instead of the conservatee, or persuading a California credit union to allow the conservator to liquidate an account containing only a small sum.

In addition to giving notice to multiple parties, the out-of-state conservator would have to respond to any objections, and appear in court if an objection was raised.... This would impose substantial costs and give an objector a significant power to delay or block registration. While the requirement of court approval could be useful if there was a legitimate objection of the kind contemplated by the TEXCOM sub-committee, it would also present an opportunity for unwarranted obstruction by an uncooperative family member or other person entitled to notice.

The proposed approach would thus increase the burdens on an out-of-state conservator, and would often impose a burden on the conservatee as well: In many instances, the associated expenses would be paid from the conservatee's estate, reducing the conservatee's assets. By consuming judicial resources, the approach would also place new burdens on the state's court system, which is already strained due to budget cuts.

The imposition of such burdens would not only be a deviation from UAGPPJA, but would also be contrary to its spirit, because UAGPPJA seeks to streamline conservatorship processes and ease the task of conducting a conservatorship across state lines. According to the TEXCOM sub-committee, "[i]t is likely in the vast majority of cases that registration would proceed without objection." Consequently, the notice requirement would entail costs (albeit relatively minor costs) without affording any benefits "in the vast majority of cases." In still other cases, there might be an unmeritorious objection to registration, which could lead to substantial court costs as well as the minor costs of giving notice.

Second Supplement to Memorandum 2013-36, pp. 7-8 (citations omitted).

The staff urged the Commission to "**carefully weigh the pros and cons of the proposed notice requirement before deciding whether to incorporate that requirement into its proposal.**" *Id.* at 8 (boldface in original). At the time, the staff's inclination was to enact UAGPPJA in California without expanding the notice requirement, but to keep the idea in mind in case problems with the registration procedure surfaced in the future. *Id.* at 8-9.

The staff **appreciates the new input on the point and is slightly more supportive of the concept than we were before.** In particular, we agree with CJA that "[g]iving notice to the people who are interested in the conservatee creates the best potential for awareness."

A possible middle ground would be to provide more notice *without* affording the recipients an opportunity to object in a California court to registration. Under that approach, the notice would alert recipients to the registration and the possibility that the conservator will take action in California. But if a recipient has concerns about what the conservator might do in California (e.g., sell the personal residence of the conservatee), the recipient would either have to (1) object to the registration, or to the conservator's proposed action, in the out-of-state court supervising the conservatorship, or (2) object to *the conservator's proposed action* in a California court, rather than to *the registration itself*. That would help to give context and specificity to any objection.

If the Commission likes that approach, it could be implemented by revising proposed Section 2011 along the following lines:

> **§ 2011. Registration of order appointing conservator of person [UAGPPJA § 401]**
>
> 2011. If a conservator of the person has been appointed in another state and a petition for the appointment of a conservator of the person is not pending in this state, the conservator of the person appointed in the other state, after ~~notifying the court supervising the conservatorship of an intent to register~~ providing notice pursuant to subdivision (b), may register the conservatorship order in this state by filing certified copies of the order and letters of office, together with a cover sheet approved by the Judicial Council, in the superior court of any appropriate county of this state.

(b) At least fifteen (15) days before registering a conservatorship in this state, the conservator shall provide at notice of an intent to register to all of the following:

(1) The court supervising the conservatorship.

(2) Every person who would be entitled to notice of a petition for the appointment of a conservator in the state where the conservatorship is pending.

(3) Every person who would be entitled to notice of a petition for the appointment of a conservator in this state.

Comment. Subdivision (a) of Section 2011 is similar to Section 401 of the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (2007) ("UAGPPJA"). Revisions have been made to conform to California terminology for the proceedings in question. See Section 1982 & Comment (definitions); see also Section 1980 Comment. Revisions have also been made to expand and clarify the notice requirement (see subdivision (b)) and to clarify the proper filing procedure under California law. The reference to the "appointing court" has been replaced with a reference to the "court supervising the conservatorship," because the court currently supervising a conservatorship might not be the same court that originally appointed the conservator. See Article 3 (transfer of conservatorship).

Paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) is similar to the notice requirement in UAGPPJA Section 401. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of subdivision (b) provide for additional notice, so as to alert interested persons that the conservatorship is being registered in California and the conservator might take action in California. If a person has concerns about such action, the person can either challenge a proposed action directly in a California court, or seek redress in the court supervising the conservatorship.

For the effect of a registration under this section, see ….

Similar revisions would be necessary in proposed Sections 2012 and 2013.

Time Limit for Registration

TEXCOM also proposes a "120-day expiration for registered orders when California has jurisdiction as either a home state or a significant connection state." Memorandum 2013-44, Exhibit p. 37. It explains that such a time limit is desirable because these two situations "present the greatest likelihood of a conservatee returning back to California or having a personal residence in this state, with the conservator seeking to rely on

registration of the order obtained in another state rather than properly transferring the conservatorship proceeding back to this state." *Id.*

The TEXCOM subgroup made the same suggestion earlier in this study. See Second Supplement to Memorandum 2013-36, Exhibit pp. 4-5. After considering the matter, the Commission decided that the Tentative Recommendation should not include any time limit on the effectiveness of a conservatorship. Minutes (June 2013), p. 9.

At the time, the staff expressed serious concerns about the proposed 120-day time limit:

- The time limit would add complexity to the registration process and potentially increase the likelihood of ambiguities and disputes, such as disputes over whether a registration was timely renewed and whether an act occurred while a registration was effective or only after a registration expired.
- Registration for a period longer than 120 days might often be necessary, such as when an out-of-state conservator must repeatedly deal with a creditor or debtor located in California. Under the sub-committee's proposal, the 120-day time limit could only be extended with court approval. The requirement of seeking court approval would be burdensome on conservators, conservatees, and the court system.
- Under the Commission's proposal, a conservatorship registration would already be rendered ineffective if the conservatee becomes a California resident. There does not seem to be any need to render the registration doubly ineffective by imposing a time limit.
- Although the sub-committee warns that a conservatorship registration might be used "as a long term substitute for complying with California's conservatorship laws," that concern is misplaced and is not a valid justification for imposing a time limit. Under the UAGPPJA registration process, the conservator of a registered conservatorship cannot do anything that is prohibited under the law of the state of registration.

  ….
- Title companies and other parties relying on registration documents might be leery of having to watch out for expiration of a time limit.

Second Supplement to Memorandum 2013-36, pp. 12-13 (citations omitted). The staff **continues to believe that the suggested time limit would create more problems than it would solve.**

ARTICLE 5. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 5 of the proposed CCJA consists of the following miscellaneous provisions:

- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2021.** Uniformity of application and construction [UAGPPJA § 501]
- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2022.** Relationship to Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act [UAGPPJA § 502]
- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2023.** Court rules and forms
- **Proposed Prob. Code § 2024.** Transitional provision [UAGPPJA § 504]

Aside from the input on proposed Section 2023 discussed above (in connection with the article on registration), the Commission did not receive any comments on these provisions.

CONFORMING REVISIONS AND UNCODIFIED PROVISION

In addition to the proposed CCJA itself, the Tentative Recommendation includes the following conforming revisions:

- **Code Civ. Proc. § 1913 (amended).** Effect of judicial record of sister state
- **Gov't Code § 70662 (added).** Registration under California Conservatorship Jurisdiction Act
- **Prob. Code § 1834 (amended).** Conservator's acknowledgment of receipt
- **Prob. Code § 1851.1 (added).** Investigation and review of transferred conservatorship
- **Prob. Code § 2200 (amended).** Jurisdiction
- **Prob. Code § 2300 (amended).** Oath and Bond
- **Prob. Code § 2352 (amended).** Residence of ward or conservatee
- **Prob. Code § 2650 (amended).** Grounds for removal

Aside from the input on proposed Section 1851.1 discussed in the First Supplement to Memorandum 2013-44 (relating to the article on transfer),

the Commission did not receive any comments on these provisions. The staff is continuing to look for conforming revisions that will be needed, and will present further information on that for a future meeting.

The Tentative Recommendation also includes a proposed uncodified provision (corresponding to UAGPPJA § 505), which would specify the operative dates for the provisions in the proposed CCJA. The Commission did not receive any input on the uncodified provision. However, the operative dates in it will need adjustment if the proposed legislation is not introduced in 2014 as currently contemplated.

PRELIMINARY PART

The preliminary part of the Tentative Recommendation (pp. 1-30) provides a narrative explanation of the Commission's proposal. In preparing a draft of a final recommendation, the staff will **revise the preliminary part to conform to whatever changes the Commission decides to make in the proposed legislation and Comments.**

The staff is also inclined to add a new section to the preliminary part, which would briefly discuss the cost implications of the proposed legislation. In particular, the new section would emphasize that (1) the proposed legislation will not add significant new costs to the state budget, because the costs associated with transferring a conservatorship to California or registering a conservatorship in California are likely to be less than or equal to the costs of establishing a new conservatorship in California under existing law, and (2) the proposed legislation is likely to result in significant cost savings for the judiciary (as well as for conservatees and their families), because it will ease the process of resolving conservatorship issues that span state lines.

Does the Commission agree with this idea in concept? If so, the staff will include such a new section in its next draft of the proposal, and flag it for the Commissioners and interested persons to review.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Gaal
Chief Deputy Counsel