

February 24, 2022

Honorable Charles W. Johnson, Co-Chair Honorable Mary I. Yu, Co-Chair Washington State Supreme Court Rules Committee Temple of Justice P.O. Box 40929 Olympia, WA 98504-0929 VIA EMAIL ONLY

VIA EMAIL ONLY TO: supreme@courts.wa.gov

Re: Proposed Amendment to GR 23 Certification of Professional Guardians

Dear Justices Johnson and Yu:

I write to supplement my earlier letter supporting the amendment to GR 23, which in part, would limit the CPGC Board practice of "closed-door" Executive Session meetings.

The CPGC Board met this morning to discuss the GR 23 proposal in a "closed-door" Executive Session meeting. The Board justified their closed-door discussion explaining they received a letter from their AAG, who was not present and did not participate in today's discussion. The Board then moved and voted to oppose the GR 23 proposal without discussion, in public.

Clearly, the Board needs closed meetings for some matters, such as discussions about the private affairs of CPGC applicants, proposed disciplinary matters and with their AAG about litigation. The GR 23 proposal accounts for these needs. Public trust in public agencies erode when discussions amongst board members occur in private. Unlike the WSBA¹, the CPGC Board was created by statute², is a public agency and should be subject to the OPMA.

Very truly yours

CHRISTOPHER E. NEIL

Director

Enc: GR23 History

<sup>1</sup> <u>Beauregard v. WSBA</u>, 197 Wn.2d 67, 2021

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Washington Laws of 1997, Chapter 312 ESHB 1771

## **GR 23 HISTORY**

In 2008 the CPG Board asked the Supreme Court to limit the number of guardians on the board. This request was included with other technical changes to GR 23. In the 7  $\frac{1}{2}$  page request there was just one sentence addressing the  $\frac{1}{3}$  restriction:

The proposed amendment also provides that no more than one-third of the Board membership shall be practicing professional guardians so that Board members are drawn from wide areas of expertise related to the work of the Board and the Board avoids the appearance of guardians having undue influence over the regulatory process.

https://www.courts.wa.gov/court\_rules/?fa=court\_rules.proposedRuleDisplay&ruleId=126

In 2008, the Supreme Court received comments from 22 people about the CPG Board's request. Of the comments received: 20 people specifically *opposed* the  $1/3^{rd}$  restriction, one person *supported* the  $1/3^{rd}$  restriction, and one person commented on other matters not mentioning the  $1/3^{rd}$  restriction.

From: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

To: <u>Linford, Tera</u>

**Subject:** FW: GR 23 Amendment

**Date:** Thursday, February 24, 2022 1:14:26 PM

Attachments: GR 23 L to WSSC C NEIL.pdf

image001.png

**From:** Christopher Neil [mailto:chris.neil@neillaw.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2022 12:26 PM

To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK < SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>

**Subject:** GR 23 Amendment

**External Email Warning!** This email has originated from outside of the Washington State Courts Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, are expecting the email, and know the content is safe. If a link sends you to a website where you are asked to validate using your Account and Password, **DO NOT DO SO!** Instead, report the incident.

February 24, 2022

Attached please find comments in support of the proposed amendment to GR 23.

**Chris Neil** | Director 253-475-8700 | f:253-473-5746 | 5306 Pacific Ave, Tacoma WA 98408



Just so you know: This email address is not monitored at all times. So, if your matter is urgent please phone my office. Also, this message in not encrypted, therefore it may not be secure or protected by attorney-client privilege. This email and attachments may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, notify the sender at once and delete this message completely from your information system. Further use, disclosure, or copying of information contained in this email is not authorized, and any such action should not be construed as a waiver of privilege or other confidentiality protections. Thank you.