

Faulk, Camilla

From: Lynne Fulp [lfn@ohanafc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2008 11:18 AM
To: Faulk, Camilla
Subject: Comment on GR 23 Proposed Changes
Attachments: Proposed Changes LMF.doc

Please see my comments attached, in the form of a word document. Please let me know if you cannot open it.

Thank you,
Lynne

*Lynne M. Fulp, President
Ohana Fiduciary Corporation
Suite 207
5343 Tallman Avenue NW
Seattle, WA 98107
Voice: 206 782-1189 x 25
Fax: 206 782-1434
Web: www.ohanafc.com*

Proposed Changes

Position – L. M. Fulp, CPG

<p>Limiting the Percentage of CPGs on CPG Board to 1/3 maximum</p>	<p>A more pressing issue is the lack of contribution from CPGs currently in place, but there are many factors to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People in a position to discipline CPGs do not have a real understanding of the work and the requirements. I would like to see training and testing for board members on basic issues such as what surrogate decision making actually is; what statute allows a guardian to do and not to do; etc. There is much misconception in the community about the parameters of a guardian's role, and I worry that board members wield their authority over CPGs perhaps based in part on such misconceptions. • There <u>should be a minimum number for actual CPGs serving on the board, in addition to a maximum.</u> There would be less likelihood of five or six CPGs unifying in sympathy for/support of a fellow CPG who has clearly done wrong, than there would be with one or two. • On the other hand, there is a certain amount of discomfort in the idea of CPGs, as board members, being in a position to judge a competitor, and perhaps contribute to shutting a competitor down. Five or six CPGs would be less likely to zero in on a competitor in that way, than one or two. • An attorney or other professional who also is a certified guardian should not count in the tally of CPGs on the board.
<p>Increasing the Formal Education Requirements for CPGs</p>	<p>Educational standards definitely need to be increased, to avoid the travesty of the court system causing the ruin of an IP's financial affairs. The <u>absolute minimum</u> should be a bachelor's degree, and no one should be grandfathered in with less than 10 years experience, without discipline.</p>
<p>Requiring CPG applicants to submit personal credit reports to the Board</p> <p>Expanding Bankruptcy Disclosures by CPGs</p> <p>Expanding Disclosure for Crimes</p>	<p>Absolutely essential.</p> <p>As an aside, if insurance companies can determine a consumer's premium rates based on a review of a credit report, a board that governs the people who manage vulnerable people's financial affairs should definitely have access to at least the same information.</p>
<p>Denial for Lack of Moral Character</p>	<p>Very dangerous to have a board taking on the role of sifting through hearsay and innuendo with a person's professional reputation at risk. In this day of internet access to information, such things do not get lost in the records anymore. A simple entry in the Minutes could come up in an internet search for years, and if not worded extremely thoughtfully could give the reader a damaging impression.</p> <p>Many people would be offended to know that this is linked to the standards for attorneys, because many people have experienced attorneys who lie and manipulate the truth in order to <i>win</i>, and get away with it. Attorneys are the brunt of mean jokes because of the reputations of more than a few bad ones. There are standards of morality in place for them, but it does not seem to have improved their reputation in the community. <u>Why saddle CPGs with such a connection?</u></p>