STATE ADULT GUARDIANSHIP LEGISLATION: DIRECTIONS OF REFORM – 2012

Commission on Law and Aging
American Bar Association

In 2012, at least 24 states passed a total of 32 adult guardianship bills – as compared with 24 states and 35 bills passed in 2011. Six states passed the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act. Michigan enacted a far-reaching measure strengthening rights and promoting limited orders. Other states amended provisions concerning the appointment and authority of guardians, rights of individuals, monitoring and accountability, and public guardianship. Thanks to Roxanne Chang and Brad Geller for contributing to the Michigan portion of this summary. If you know of additional state adult guardianship legislation enacted in 2012 but not described below, please contact Erica Wood, ABA Commission on Law and Aging, erica.wood@americanbar.org , 202-662-8693.

This update includes the following sections:

A. Michigan Reforms – Protecting Rights & Promoting Limited Orders

Several years ago, the Michigan governor convened a task force on elder abuse that led to a panoply of legislative proposals, including changes in the adult guardianship law. *SB 461 (Public Act 173)* represents "perhaps the most significant improvement in [the state's] guardianship system since the Michigan Guardianship Reform Act of 1988" (Geller, Michigan Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program). Michigan also enacted two other procedural bills that strengthen the state's guardianship system, as described under Sec. B and G below. The following overview of SB 461 is by Roxanne Chang and Brad Geller.

- Protecting Rights of Incapacitated Individuals. SB 461 includes a new provision summarizing the rights of individuals for whom a guardian is sought or who have a guardian appointed, that exist within the current guardianship provisions. SB 461 also requires a guardian ad litem to inform the individual of such rights in writing. These rights include procedural and hearing rights (e.g., legal counsel, jury trial), evidentiary requirements to prove capacity and the need for guardianship, and limits on guardianship powers and the period of time. The intent of reiterating the rights within a single section of the law is to increase awareness in hopes of reducing the number of inappropriate guardianships and the number of full (vs. limited) guardianship.

- Reinforcing Policy of Promoting Limited Guardianship. SB 461 "represents a 180 degree shift in how court orders are fashioned" (Geller). It requires the court to specify the powers of a guardian in its guardianship orders. When the guardianship order (and Letters of Guardianship) enumerates the particular powers of the guardian, all other rights and powers are preserved for the individual, including the most basic and fundamental human and civil rights. This fortifies the bias of existing guardianship provisions toward limited guardianships rather than full guardianship. Moreover, this provision ensures powers of the guardian are tailored to the specific needs of the individual, by necessitating a determination by the court regarding an individual's decision-making ability in determining where to live, authorizing and refusing medical treatment, obtaining services, and handling assets and income.

- Protecting Property. SB 461 also includes several key provisions to protect the individual's property:

    - It allows the court to order a guardian to *file a petition for the appointment of a conservator or protective order* regarding an individual's estate. A guardian is also required to update the court if any additional cash or property that is readily convertible to cash has been received, beyond what was estimated by the guardian ad litem.

    - While the court previously had discretion to order a bond, now the court must order a conservator to *furnish bond* if the amount of cash or property easily convertible to cash exceeds the limit for administering a decedent's small estate, unless at least one of the identified exceptions apply (e.g., cash is in a restricted account).

- In addition to the current prohibition of the sale and disposition of property without a court order, SB 461 prohibits a conservator from mortgaging, pledging or causing a lien to be placed on such property without a court order. Conservators are now required to record a court order allowing the sale, disposal, mortgage or pledge or placement of a lien on real property. A conservator cannot be presumed to have the power to sell or otherwise dispose, mortgage or pledge or place a lien on real property unless the conservator provides a copy of the order.

B. Procedural Revisions/Capacity Evaluation

- Petition Information; Costs. *Tennessee SB 2519/ HB 2648* requires guardianship petitions (called "conservatorship") to include: (1) a statement of the relationship of the petitioner and of the proposed conservator to the respondent; and (2) a statement of any felony or misdemeanor convictions of the petitioner and of the proposed conservator. Additionally, if the proposed conservator is not the petitioner, the petition must include a statement signed by the proposed conservator that acknowledges awareness of the petition and willingness to serve.

  The new Tennessee measure also makes a change in the allocation of costs for the conservatorship proceeding. Previously, if a conservator was appointed, all costs were to be charged against the property of the respondent to the extent the property exceeded the SSI income eligibility limit. The new language makes such a charge discretionary with the court.

- Costs; Legal Representation. *Utah HB 116* clarifies that if the court appoints the petitioner or the petitioner's nominee as guardian, the petitioner is entitled to receive attorney fees and court costs from the estate of the individual under guardianship or conservatorship. The bill also specifies that legal representation of the individual is "terminated upon the appointment of a guardian" unless there are separate conservatorship proceedings pending, the guardian elects to continue the legal representation of the individual, there is an appeal filed, or the court orders continuation.

  Additionally, Utah HB 116 states that "the court is not required to appoint an attorney to represent the ward if the case is uncontested and the ward's incapacity is not at issue." This raises the question of who then will protect the rights of the

individual, including ensuring that the procedures comply with the law, and that decision-making options less restrictive than guardianship have been examined and exhausted.

- Guardian ad Litem Duties. *Michigan HB 5441* expands the duties of a guardian ad litem to include:

    - Asking the individual and the petitioner about the amount of cash and property readily convertible into cash that is in the estate, and reporting an estimate of this amount to the court; and

    - Determining not only whether there are appropriate alternatives to the appointment of a full guardian, as current law has provided, but also whether one or more actions should be taken in addition to the appointment of guardian, and informing the court of these actions.

- Selection of Guardian. *Michigan SB 539* addresses priority for appointment of individuals to serve as guardian. The amendment makes the first priority an individual previously appointed, qualified and serving in good standing as guardian in another state; second an individual the person subject to the petition chooses; third, an individual nominated as guardian in a durable power of attorney or other writing by the person; and fourth, an individual named by the person as a patient advocate or attorney in fact in a durable power of attorney. Only if none of these are available, or are suitable or willing to serve, may the court select named relatives in a hierarchical order, or if none, "any competent person" including a professional guardian.

- Veterans' Guardianship. Some 30 states have veterans' guardianship laws, originally based in the 1942 Uniform Veterans Guardianship Act developed to protect veterans in guardianship proceedings – but well before the thrust of reform in the past 25 years (See Thakker, "The State of Veterans' Fiduciary Programs," ABA Commission, *Bifocal*, Dec. 2006). *Florida SB 520* repeals a statutory construction provision in Florida law concerning the state's Veterans' Guardianship Law. Prior language stated that when there is a conflict between the Veterans' Guardianship Law and the general guardianship statute, the Veterans' Guardianship Law should be given effect. The bill repeals this language, thus extending general guardianship law to incapacitated veterans.

- Assessment/Evaluation. Critical to a judge's determination on capacity is evaluation by qualified clinicians that really highlight the individual's areas of strength, areas in which assistance is needed, prognosis for improvement, situational factors to consider, and supports required. State laws vary widely on required clinical evaluations (see Mayhew, "Survey of State Guardianship laws: Statutory Provisions for Clinical Evaluations, ABA Commission on Law and Aging, *Bifocal* Vol. 27, No. 1 (October 2005), at: http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/aging/publications/bifocal/05/oct2005.authcheckdam.pdf).

  Massachusetts S.2128 expanded the professionals that can sign a medical certificate beyond a physician or licensed psychologist to include a certified psychiatric nurse clinical specialist or a nurse practitioner. The new measure also adds language that the "court may require additional medical or psychological testimony as to the mental and physical condition of the person . . . and may require that such person submit to examination. The court also may appoint one or more persons, expert in incapacity or disability, to examine such person and report the conclusions thereof to the court." Finally, the bill specified that for appointment of a conservator, as already required for appointment of a guardian, any clinical examination must have taken place within 180 days before the filing of the petition.

C. Rights of Individuals

- Limited Orders and Restoration of Rights. In recent years, states have strengthened provisions for limited orders, which rights only in those areas in which an individual is unable to make decisions – thereby preserving rights and self-determination. *Illinois SB 3592* places a greater emphasis on limited orders by reversing the order of provisions for limited and plenary orders, appearing to make plenary orders a default only if a limited order is not possible. A limited order is to "specify the duties and powers of the guardian and the legal disabilities to which the respondent is subject." Hopefully this will encourage the use of limited orders in practice.

  Illinois SB 3592 also modifies provisions relating to termination of guardianships and restoration of rights. It provides that a court may terminate the guardianship if the evaluation report states that the person no longer needs a guardian (or the guardianship should be modified), the individual no longer wishes to be under

guardianship (or wants the scope of the order changed), and the guardian states that it is in the best interest of the person to end the guardianship and restore rights (or make a modification) – unless it is demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that the person is not capable of caring for self or managing his or her estate. This may make the historically uphill battle of restoration somewhat easier, at least in cases in which the guardian and the person agree that restoration is needed.

- Right to Vote. With the 2012 Presidential election and growing number of older Americans, recent attention has focused on voting by aging citizens with some level of cognitive impairment. See "Symposium Facilitating Voting As People Age: Implications of Cognitive Impairment, 38(4) *McGeorge Law Review*, University of the Pacific (2007). Policy resulting from the 2007 Symposium and endorsed by the American Bar Association urges that state enactments explicitly provide that the right to vote is retained, except by court order in a proceeding with due process protections, in which the court finds by clear and convincing evidence that the person cannot communicate, with or without accommodations, "a specific desire to participate in the voting process."

  Arizona HB 2377 does *not* assume retention of the right to vote for people under guardianship, but provides instead that a person for whom a limited guardian is appointed retains the right to vote *only if* the person files a petition, has a hearing and the judge determines by clear and convincing evidence that the person retains "sufficient understanding to exercise the right to vote" – in essence turning the Symposium recommendation on its head and severely limiting the right.

- Person-Centered Planning. The last few years have seen an increasing recognition that guardians should adopt a "person-centered planning" approach in relating to the individual. The Standards and Recommendations from the National Guardianship Network's 2011 *Third National Guardianship Summit* provide that "The guardian shall develop and implement a plan [that] shall emphasize a 'person-centered philosophy'" (Standard #1.1). In addition, the guardian "shall seek ongoing education concerning. . . person-centered planning" (Standard #2.1). Finally, "a template should be created for developing a person-centered plan" (Recommendation #1.6). *Virginia HB 270* requires the Department for the Aging (currently the Department for Aging and Rehabilitative Services) to adopt, as part of its Public Guardianship and Conservator Program, person-centered practice procedures "that shall (i) focus on the preferences and needs of the individual receiving public guardianship services; and (ii) empower and support the

individual receiving public guardianship services, to the extent feasible, in defining the direction for [his or her] life and promoting self-determination and community involvement."

- Changes in Terminology. Four states made changes in language to reflect preferred terminology more in line with individual self-determination and rights:

    - *Iowa SF 2247* replaces the term "mental retardation" with "intellectual disability."
    - *Kentucky HB 485* replaces the term "mental retardation" with "intellectual disability."
    - *Maine SP 640/LD 1845* replaces the term "mental retardation" with "intellectual disability."
    - *Virginia SB 387/HB 552* replaces the terms "mental retardation" and "mental deficiency" with "intellectual disability when referring to a diagnosis, and the term "developmental" when referring to services for individuals with intellectual disabilities.

D. Scope of Guardianship; Guardian Powers and Duties

- Transition of Minor. The transition of a minor who is approaching age 18 to adult status raises compelling guardianship questions. If a minor has an intellectual disability, perhaps there are other less restrictive decision-making options that can assist the person without the need for adult guardianship. The need for adult guardianship *should not be an assumption*, and means of supported decision-making should be examined. Yet under many current policies, without guardianship, such a minor may lose important services and benefits. Clearly, this is a topic that merits further attention.

  Indiana SB 32 appears to be concerned with ensuring the continuation of services if needed. It provides first that if a minor is a protected person who either has been adjudicated an incapacitated person or is a recipient or beneficiary of financial assistance through the Department of Child Services, the court may not terminate the guardianship when the person reaches the age of 18. Second, if a minor under guardianship has not been adjudicated as incapacitated, on reaching 17, the minor and the guardian may jointly petition the court to extend the duration of the guardianship beyond the date on which the person becomes 18;

and the court may extend the guardianship if it is in the best interests of the individual.

- Guardian Mental Health Powers
    - *Arizona HB 2532* addresses mental health powers of a guardian. Existing Arizona law has allowed the court to grant authority to a guardian to consent to inpatient mental health care and treatment in a licensed mental health facility. HB 2532 focuses on a patient's release from such a facility. It provides that the examiner making recommendations to the court about a proposed release should also make a determination as to whether mental health powers should be granted to an existing guardian without such powers. The court may order an investigation into the need for guardianship or conservatorship if none exists; or may impose mental health powers on an existing guardian.

    - *Massachusetts S.2128* addresses approval by the court of an antipsychotic medication treatment plan, providing that the court must consider the testimony or affidavit of a licensed physician or certified psychiatric nurse clinical specialist concerning the plan.

- Guardian Authority for Nursing Home Admission. Massachusetts law has provided that for the guardian to place an individual in a nursing home, the court must find that admission is in the person's best interest. Provisions in S.2128 provide an exception, allowing placement without such a court finding if: (1) the admission does not exceed 60 days; (2) any person authorized to sign a medical certificate recommends admission; (3) neither the person nor any interested party objects; (4) the guardian has filed a written notice of intent to admit for short-term services; and (5) the individual is represented by counsel.

- Guardian Health Care Powers for Offenders. *Mississippi SB 2854* provides that a chancery court may appoint a guardian to make health care decisions for an offender serving a prison term. The health care guardianship ends when the term of imprisonment ends or the offender dies. A guardian must make and file annual reports on the health care decisions made.

- Inventory. *Utah HB 116* clarifies that the estate of an individual under conservatorship does not include the assets of a trust.

- Guardian Powers After Individual's Death. While the powers of a guardian or conservator end upon the death of the individual and release from duties by the court, state legislation increasingly specifies post-death duties.

    - *Arizona SB 1141* addresses the duty of county public fiduciaries concerning burial of deceased incapacitated persons. Existing law provides that if there are no family members or others named in a statutory hierarchy to bury the body, the person who was acting as guardian at the time of death has the duty for burial. SB 1141 allows the public fiduciary to conduct investigations to determine whether such persons exist.

    - *Utah HB 116* states that a conservator may continue to pay "obligations due against the estate and to protect the estate from waste, injury or damages that might reasonably be foreseeable;" and may apply to be a personal representative if at least 40 days from the death no other person has been appointed and no application is pending.

    - *Virginia SB 8* allows a guardian to make arrangement for the funeral and disposition of remains if the guardian is not aware of any person that has been otherwise designated to make arrangements, and if the guardian has made a good faith effort to locate next of kin to determine if they wish to make arrangements. Previously such authority was allowed only for public guardian or conservator programs.

E. Guardian Accountability and Court Oversight

During the past 15 years, many states have sought to strengthen the court's tools for oversight of guardians (See *Guarding the Guardians: Promising Practices for Court Monitoring,* http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/il/2007_21_guardians.pdf . Several 2012 bills addressed court oversight tools.

- Contact Information. *Colorado HB 1074* allows a court to access data maintained by state agencies in order to contact guardians and conservators who have failed to file reports or failed to respond to a court show cause order, as long as the courts keep the personal information private. The aim is to allow the court to locate the guardian for oversight of the case.

- Request for Information Needed for Oversight. *New Mexico House Memorial No. 61* requests the Administrative Office of the Courts to provide basic information on guardianship and elder abuse cases, to require criminal background checks of guardians and conservators to promulgate procedures to track annual reporting by guardians and conservators. Specifically, the memorial asks that the Administrative Office of the Courts: (1) identify resources needed for a census of open guardianship and conservatorship cases; (2) make provisions to track elder abuse cases; (3) identify resources and actions needed for criminal background and credit checks of prospective guardians and conservators; (4) identify existing training programs for guardians and conservators, and resources for additional training needed; (5) address rules needed concerning required guardian training and failure to file annual reports; and (6) identify rules and procedures needed to track annual reporting;

- Annual Status Report. *Rhode Island S 2655* provides that the probate court may waive the requirement of an annual status report by the guardian "for good cause shown."

- Criminal Background Information. An increasing number of states have begun to enact criminal background checks for prospective guardians. In 2012, three states passed provisions relating to the criminal background of prospective guardians:

    - Short of a background check, *Tennessee SB 2519* simply requires that the petition include a statement of any felony or misdemeanor convictions of the petitioner and of the proposed guardian ("conservator") if not the petitioner.

    - *New York S 07587B (A10608-A)* clarifies court authority to obtain and consider criminal history information when evaluating the fitness of prospective guardians – including a criminal history record check, reports from the offender registry, reports from the statewide central register of child abuse and maltreatment; reports from the statewide computerized registry of orders of protection, and related decisions in child protective proceedings. Upon considering such data, the court may appoint, refuse to appoint or revoke an appointment as guardian.

- As referenced above, *New Mexico HB 136/SB 110* requests information on resources and procedures that would be needed to implement background checks on guardians and conservators.

F. Public Guardianship

The 2008 national public guardianship study found that 44 states have statutory provisions on public guardianship or guardianship of last resort. Of these, 27 states have "explicit schemes" that refer specifically to public guardianship and frequently establish a public guardianship program or office; while 18 states have "implicit schemes" (some state have more than one system) that address the role of guardian of last resort – for instance designating a governmental agency to serve if no one else is available. Additional states have public guardianship functions in practice. (See Teaster et al, *Public Guardianship: In the Best Interest of Incapacitated People?* Preager, 2010). This year several states made changes in their public guardianship statutes.

- *Arizona SB 1141* addresses the duty of county public fiduciaries concerning burial of deceased incapacitated persons (see Sec. D on Guardian Powers above).

- Idaho law specifies that the county boards of commissioners may create a board of community guardian, which can provide for guardian services, generally through volunteers. Some counties have established such boards, but others have not. *Idaho HB 484* removes term limits for persons appointed to such boards, providing that a member will continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

- Illinois has a system of county public guardians for individuals with estates at or above $25,000. Current provisions require the public guardian to prepare an inventory and maintain insurance on the individual's real and personal property. *Illinois SB 3593* makes an exception to this requirement if the court determines that the property lacks sufficient equity, the estate lacks sufficient funds to pay for insurance or the property is otherwise uninsurable.

- *Illinois SB 3592* creates filing fees in probate cases which are then assigned to a fund to be used by the Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Thus the fees are intended to offset the costs of providing public guardianship services. (Thanks to John Wank at the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission for guidance on this bill.)

- *Virginia HB 270* requires that the Public Guardianship and Conservator Program use person-centered practice procedures to focus on the preferences and needs of the individual, and to empower and support the person (see Sec. C on Rights above).

G. Drive Toward Uniform Guardianship Jurisdiction

In our increasingly mobile society, adult guardianships often involve more than one state, raising complex jurisdictional issues. For example, many older people own property in different states. Family members may be scattered across the country. Frail, at-risk individuals may need to be moved for medical or financial reasons. Thus, judges, guardians, and lawyers frequently are faced with problems about which state should have initial jurisdiction, how to transfer a guardianship to another state, and whether a guardianship in one state will be recognized in another.

Such jurisdictional quandaries can take up vast amounts of time for courts and lawyers, cause cumbersome delays and financial burdens for family members, and exacerbate family conflict -- aggravating sibling rivalry as each side must hire lawyers to battle over which state will hear a case and where a final order will be lodged. Moreover, lack of clear jurisdictional guideposts can facilitate "granny snatching" and other abusive actions.

To address these challenging problems, the Uniform Law Commission in 2007 approved the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (UAGPPJA). The UAGPPJA seeks to clarify jurisdiction and provide a procedural roadmap for addressing dilemmas where more than one state is involved, and to enhance communication between courts in different states. Key features include:

- Determination of initial jurisdiction. The Act provides procedures to resolve controversies concerning initial guardianship jurisdiction by designating one state – and one state only – as the proper forum. It sets out a schema for determining a person's "home state" and if none then a "significant jurisdiction state" in which a proceeding should be heard.

- Transfer. The Act specifies a two-state procedure for transferring a guardianship or conservatorship to another state, helping to reduce expenses and save time while protecting persons and their property from potential abuse.

- Recognition and enforcement of a guardianship or protective proceeding order. UAGPPJA helps to facilitate enforcement of guardianship and protective orders in other states by authorizing a guardian or conservator to register orders in the second state.

- Communication and cooperation. The Act permits communication between courts and parties of other states, records of the communications, and jurisdiction to respond to requests for assistance from courts in other states.

- Emergency situations and other special cases. A court in the state where the individual is physically present can appoint a guardian in the case of an emergency. Also, if the individual has real or tangible property located in a certain state, the court in that jurisdiction can appoint a conservator for that property.

As it is jurisdictional in nature, the UAGPPJA cannot work as intended -- providing uniformity and reducing conflict -- unless all or most states adopt it. See "Why States Should Adopt the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act," http://www.nccusl.org/Update/uniformact_why/uniformacts-why-agppja.asp. In 2008, five states (Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Utah and the District of Columbia) quickly adopted the Act. In 2009, the eight states adopting the Act include Illinois, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, Washington, and West Virginia. In 2010, seven states adopted the Act, including Alabama, Arizona, Iowa, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina and Tennessee. Finally, in 2011 another ten states enacted the UAGPPJA, including Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Dakota, Vermont and Virginia. In 2012, the following six states passed the Uniform Act, bringing the total to 35 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico:

- Connecticut – HB 5150
- Hawaii – SB 2318
- Maine -- LD 1377
- New Jersey – AB 2628
- Ohio – HB 27
- Pennsylvania – HB 1720

In addition to the states enacting the UAGPPJA, *Michigan HB 539* focused on one of the Act's key features – recognition and enforcement of a guardianship order from another state. In HB 539, a guardian appointed in another state may be appointed

immediately as a temporary guardian in Michigan for 28 days on filing with the court an application for appointment, an authenticated copy of the appointment in the other state, and an acceptance of appointment. Within 14 days, the temporary guardian must give notice to all interested persons and the right to object. On filing proof of service of notice, the temporary guardian is appointment as full guardian.

Table: State Adult Guardianship Legislation at a Glance: 2012

State	Legislation	Provisions
AZ	HB 2532	Addresses assessments for an individual subject to a guardianship proceeding; concerns mental health powers of a guardian.
AZ	HB 2377	Concerns right of people under guardianship to vote.
AZ	SB 1141	Addresses duty of public fiduciaries re burial.
CO	HB 1074	Concerns data maintained by state agencies on guardians and conservators.
CT	HB 5150	Enacts UAGPPJA.
FL	SB 520	Repeals provision concerning veterans' guardianship law.
HI	SB 2318	Enacts UAGPPJA.
ID	HB 484	Removes term limits for members of boards of community guardian.
IL	SB 3592	Creates probate filing fees to offset costs of public guardianship; enhances provisions for limited guardianship and termination or modification of orders where both a guardian and individual seek restoration.
IL	SB 3593	Makes exceptions to requirement for public guardians to prepare inventory and maintain insurance.
IN	SB 32	Concerns transition of a minor.
IA	SF 2247	Changes terminology.
KY	HB 485	Changes terminology.
MA	S.2128	Revises guardian authority for nursing home admissions; revises capacity evaluation expert qualifications.
ME	SP 460/LD 1845	Changes terminology.
ME	LD 1377	Enacts UAGPPJA.
MI	SB 461	Protects rights of individuals for whom a guardian is sought and promotes limits on scope of guardianship; protects individual's property.
MI	HB 5441	Expands duties of guardian ad litem.

MI	SB 539	Concerns guardians appointed in another state; priority order of selection for guardians.
MS	SB 2854	Concerns guardian health care powers for offenders.
NJ	AB 2628	Enacts UAGPPJA.
NM	H Memorial 61	Requests information needed for court oversight.
NY	S 07587B/A10608-A	Concerns court authority to obtain and consider criminal and other background information on prospective guardians.
OH	HB 27	Enacts UAGPPJA.
PA	HB 1720	Enacts UAGPPJA.
RI	S 2655	Concerns waiver of requirement for annual status report.
TN	SB 2519/HB 2648	Expands information about petitioner, including criminal convictions.
UT	HB 116	Concerns, legal representation, costs, and authority of conservator after death of individual.
VA	HB 270	Requires person-centered practice for public guardianship and conservatorship program.
VA	SB 387/HB 552	Changes terminology.
VA	SB 8	Concerns guardian authority for arrangements after death.
VI		Repeals the Virgin Islands Uniform Probate Code and Fiduciary Relations statute (including the Uniform Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Act) and reinstates probate code as it existed prior to enactment of the Uniform Probate Code.