

Faulk, Camilla

From: Michael/Claudia Donnelly [thedonnelys@oo.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 10:46 AM
To: Faulk, Camilla
Cc: Bondon, Shirley
Subject: Court Rule 31A and the Professional Guardian Board

Dear Ms. Faulk:

I would like to submit these comments for Court Rule 31A and the Professional Guardian Board. I would like the Court to keep the Profession Guardian Board from benefiting from this rule.

Since knowing about the Guardian Board in 2006, I have seen a government agency that refuses to provide transparency in how it operates. I saw my mother's guardian lie, break state law by forcing her into a care facility and not be neutral in their decision-making process. I submitted a complaint to the board and was told "they did nothing wrong". When I asked to see the response of the guardian in my complaint against them, I was told that "I could have a copy of what I submitted but not what the guardian submitted". This is how the Board protect guardians.

Last January, a bill was filed that would have created a database of complaints filed against professional guardians so that the public could see a guardian's history. That bill died in committee. There is a possibility that this bill will come up again for action. There is no transparency in how the Board or guardians are disciplined.

This rule will make it harder for the public to see how the Guardian Board operates. The Guardian Board already is a "silent board" when it comes to the public. A few weeks ago, the Board held a public meeting to take testimony. When asked if the Board would announce this hearing to the public, Deborah Jameson said no. The Board eventually announced the hearing at the Justice meeting in King County. Nothing was mentioned at the Senior Lobby Day meeting in Tacoma. There was no announcement in the newspapers about this hearing. How can you have a public hearing when it isn't even announced to the public?

The Professional Guardian Board is a public Board. It operates with public funding -- and yet it wants to further close itself from public scrutiny by utilizing this Rule. The Board should be more open -- and should allow the public to speak at its meeting. Instead they want to close things up even more. How is that going to promote trust in what the Board does?

Thank you, in advance, for letting me comment on this issue.

Claudia Donnelly
Renton, WA