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What is a Captive?
An Insurance Company formed by a business owner to insure the risks of related or affiliated businesses.
(Over 50% of the Fortune 1500 have Captives)
Why Consider a Captive?

- Access to reinsurance market
- Allows flexibility over claims management
- Provides limited tax benefits
- Establishes “best practice” risk management procedures
- Provides coverage for uninsured or hard-to-insure risks
- Potential estate planning opportunity

Types of Insurable Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insured Risks</th>
<th>Retained Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker’s Comp</td>
<td>Deductibles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Liability</td>
<td>Construction Defect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance</td>
<td>Loss of Key Customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>Loss of Key Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision</td>
<td>Administrative Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Liab.</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; O</td>
<td>Some D &amp; O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; O</td>
<td>Excess E &amp; O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder’s Risk</td>
<td>Policy Exclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malpractice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earthquake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Captives

- Pure Captive
- Association Captive
- Group Captive
- Agency Captive
- Rent-a-Captive
- Protected Cell Captive

Every Captive structure is unique and requires operational and feasibility analysis to determine the optimal structure.
Pure Captive Design

A Pure Captive insures the risks of related entities.

Association Owned Captive Design

An Association Captive is formed by a pre-existing association to provide insurance coverage for members.

Group Captive Design

A Group Captive is owned by unrelated owners typically similar by industry or size.
Agency Captive Design

An Agency Captive is typically a reinsurance company owned by an agent or group of agents.

Protected Cell Captive Design

Protected Cell Companies are essentially Rent-a-captives which allow renters to shield their capital and surplus from other renters in the captive as long as the owner remains solvent.

Tax Advantages of a Captive Insurance Company

Deduction of premiums by Insureds

Generally, the loss reserves are deductible by a captive which shelters Premium Income to the captive

831(b) election allows Captive with 1.2 million or less Premium Income to elect to be tax exempt from Premium Income
**Tax Treatment of “Small” Captives**

- **831(b) Captive**
  - If premiums are less than $1.2 Million per year, no tax on premium income
  - Tax is paid on investment income at corporate rates
  - C-Corporations do not have the preferential individual capital gains income tax rate, so real estate may be a bad investment
  - High cash value or private placement life insurance may be an appropriate vehicle to defer corporate taxation
    - Also need to watch out for corporate AMT on death benefit paid to a C-Corporation
    - Not a panacea, and should only be used as part of an overall plan
    - CAVEAT: Beware of promoters “selling” captives as a way to buy “tax deductible life insurance”

---

**831(b) - Simple Example.**

Captive pays **NO** income tax on 1.2mm of premium income

Wealth Transfer of underwriting net profit

Qualified dividend or capital gain to shareholder(s)

---

**Federal Income Taxation as an Insurance Company**

Requirements:
- Bona-fide Business Purpose
- Risk Transfer
- Risk Distribution
- Operates as an insurance company
- Reasonable premiums
- Adequate capitalization
Federal Income Taxation as an Insurance Company

What is insurance?
Helvering v. Le Gierse, 312 U.S. 531 (1941)

- Risk Shifting
- Risk Distribution

Uninsurable 80-year-old woman purchased a life policy and an annuity policy from the same insurance company one month before death

Executor did not report death benefit on estate tax return

Supreme Court found no risk shifted because of offsetting positions; this was just an attempted tax dodge

First case to set forth the standard for true insurance as required to have both risk shifting and risk distribution

---

Federal Income Taxation

Risk Distribution and Shifting

Case law developed two theories.

- **Theory 1 (Third Party Theory):**
  - Sufficient third party premium with related premiums
  - Courts say 30% third-party insurance is adequate

- **Theory 2 (Balance Sheet Theory):**
  - Sufficient related party entities insured to create risk distribution and shifting

---

Federal Income Taxation

Risk Distribution

**Third Party Theory**

Courts have ruled that, if the captive writes sufficient unrelated premiums, related business is also deductible.

- Courts allowed 30% unrelated premiums (Sears, AMERCO, Harper Group, Ocean Drilling).

- Courts never established a floor (Gulf Oil – 2% insufficient).

Rev. Rul. 93-92 for employees benefits seems to recognize employees benefits as third party insurance.
Third Party Case
The Harper Group, Inc. v. Commissioner (1992)

The Harper Group

Sister Co.
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Insurance Premiums

Insurance Premiums

Federal Income Taxation
Risk Shifting

Some History
Revenue Ruling 77-316, 1977-2 C.B. 53
Service creates the “economic family doctrine”
Risk must be transferred outside of the economic family to be true insurance
Key focus was on a lack of risk shifting, therefore not insurance and premiums not deductible

More History
Adequate risk shifting with 31 unrelated companies
This was a group captive, not a pure captive, so this was not terribly helpful to closely held business owners
Service noted that no single member had a controlling interest
Federal Income Taxation
Risk Shifting

More History
Court Rejection of Economic Family Doctrine
Carnation Company v. Commissioner, 640 F.2d 1010 (9th Cir. 1981)
(taxpayer loss – largely on other grounds)
Clougherty Packing Co. v. Commissioner, 84 T.C. 948 (T.C. 1985)
(taxpayer loss – largely on other grounds)
Humana, Inc. v. Commissioner, 881 F.2d 247 (6th Cir. 1989) (taxpayer victory – mostly)
Particularly explicit rejection of economic family doctrine. After a
detailed discussion of prior courts rejecting the Service’s theory, the
court concluded that “under no circumstances do we adopt the
economic family argument advanced by the government.”

Federal Income Taxation
Risk Shifting

Explicit Rejection of Economic Family Doctrine
Harper Group v. Commissioner, 979 F.2d 1341 (9th Cir. 1992) (taxpayer victory)
Affirmed tax court opinion, which stated, in part: “We have
repeatedly rejected respondent's economic family theory.”

Federal Income Taxation
Risk Shifting

The Service won in most cases where the captive insured
the parent (still problematic today), but lost in cases
where the captive insured affiliates owned by a common
parent
The taxpayer losses were never on the basis of the
economic family doctrine, as the courts consistently
refused to apply this bright-line test as too overly
inclusive and instead applied a facts & circumstances
test
Federal Income Taxation
Risk Shifting

The Balance Sheet Theory
Allows deduction of premiums paid to a brother-sister captive
without unrelated business.

Originally had favorable decisions only in the Sixth Circuit (Humana, Hospital Corporation of America); subsequently expanded to all taxpayers (Kiddie).

BALANCE SHEET CASE
Humana, Inc. v. Commissioner (1998)

Federal Income Taxation
Risk Shifting/Distribution

Important Issues in Brother-Sister Structures

Brother-sister risk is not unrelated risk for purposes of insulating parent risk. Will not provide a deduction for parent’s premiums.

How many brother-sister insureds do you need?

Is the correct measure the number of insureds or number of risks?
Federal Income Taxation as an Insurance Company

Revenue Ruling 2001-31, 2001-1 C.B. 1348

Service determines it will no longer raise the economic family theory
Explicitly acknowledged that no court had fully adopted the economic family theory set forth in Rev. Rul. 77-316
Analysis is now a case-by-case analysis
Service promised more challenges based on facts and circumstances
Focus is on risk shifting, risk distribution, inadequate capitalization, and parental guarantees

Other Significant IRS Rulings

Rev. Rul. 2002-90 – Balance Sheet Theory
Rev. Rul. 2008-8 – Cell Captive
Rev. Rul. 2009-26 – Reinsurance and Risk Distribution

Safe Harbor Rulings

Rev Rul 2002-89 – Third Party Risk
Rev Rul 2002-90 – Balance Sheet Theory
Rev Rul 2005-40 – Disregarded Entities and More
Third Party Revenue Ruling
Rev. Rul. 2002-89 - ruled on deductibility of parent's premiums where captive had 10% unrelated business (unfavorable ruling) and 50% unrelated business (favorable ruling).

- Note Harper’s 30% decision is in the middle.
- Gulf Case – 2% third party business was insufficient.
- Unrelated premium percentage was determined on both gross and net basis; gross should not be relevant.
- Requirement for homogeneous risks does not make sense from an actuarial approach or from case law.
- Captive was licensed in multiple U.S. States; captives are traditionally not licensed in multiple U.S. States.
- The risks were from different States.
- Risk must be spread.

Balance Sheet Revenue Ruling
Rev. Rul. 2002-90 - ruled on premiums paid by sister companies to a captive owned by their parent, with 12 subsidiaries, none with more than 15% or less than 5% of the total risk insured on a net and gross basis.

Postulates 12 fairly equal-sized subsidiaries.
Note none less than 5% requirement.
Requires that risks be homogeneous.
Requires that risks be from different States.
Requires that captive be licensed in all 12 States.

Disregarded Entities Ruling
Treatment of disregarded entities (i.e., LLC’s) – Rev. Rul. 2005-40 says they are disregarded, risk of a single member LLC is risk of the parent.

Inconsistent with the Balance Sheet theory.
Inconsistent with treatment IRS wants for partnerships.
Single member LLC’s are respected by the IRS in other contexts.
Section 965 repatriation of profits; separate entities for liability for taxes.

Most importantly, disregarded entities are respected for liability and legal purposes, and that is what is being transferred in insurance transactions. They have separate balance sheets.
**Relationship between Insured and Captive Owner Ruling**

Rev. Rul. 2005-40 says that, even if the insurer is adequately capitalized and completely unrelated, if there are an insufficient number of insureds, you may not have risk distribution, and thus no insurance.

If not insurance, what is it? - Insured has paid an adequately capitalized, unrelated entity for goods or services.

What is the rationale? - If an insurer insures 10,000 buildings in 500 cities against fire, does the law of large numbers work differently, from the insurer’s perspective, if one entity owns them all?

- 12 or more insured can ensure risk distribution
- Related parties that are separate taxpayers are considered separate premium payers
- 50% third party risk is adequate

**Other IRS Guidance**

TAM 200816629 Service will not count limited partnerships with a common general partner as separate entities.

No logic to the Service’s argument that the common general partner bears all risk of loss.

Rev. Rul. 2008-8 Protected Cell Captives - Service requires risk distribution within each cell, not just within the overall organization, as cells are segregated from each other for liability purposes.


**Domicile Choice**

- On Shore vs. Off Shore
- Local Taxes
- Federal Taxes
- Capitalization
- Reserve Investment
- Favorable Environment
- Loan Backs
Implementation Process

- Feasibility study prepared by actuary
- Choice of domicile
- Corporate formation
- Underwriting process
- Policies written
- Regulatory application/license received
- Ongoing management costs

Implementation Process

- First year costs: $75,000+
- Annual costs: $36,000+ for management fees, plus about $20,000+ more for audit, tax, licensing fees, actuarial fees
- Third party risk costs for clients without 12+ insureds
  2.5%-4% cost for risk pool insurance purchases plus loss of use of funds while held by risk pool (4-14 months)

Identifying Prospects

- Ideally $2 Million or more of business taxable income
- Group captives may allow companies with as little as $500,000 in taxable income to take advantage of this structure
- Business must face substantial risks that are not entirely within its control (fortuity)
- Estate planning motivation may help clients get over the complexity hurdle
Business Planning Opportunities

- S-Corp. Owners
  - Captive is a C-Corporation, so it is possible to create multiple classes of stock, vesting schedule, liquidation preferences, etc.
- Key Employee Incentives
  - May be used to help indirectly fund nonqualified deferred comp
  - Ownership by key employees can be used to incentivize better risk management/create more of an owner mentality for key employees

Estate Planning Opportunities

- Captive can be owned by children or trust for their benefit
  - GSTT efficient
  - Equity buildup can be used to provide seed money to defective grantor trust for future purchase of estate assets
- Captive can be initially capitalized inside of children’s trust or gifted/sold later
- Captive profits could potentially be used to fund life insurance more tax-efficiently, either as a direct investment of the captive or by taking dividends and paying premium

CASE STUDY: HEALTH CARE PRODUCT DISTRIBUTOR

Scenario: Single entity distributor with rapid growth and brand recognition challenged with expanding insurance coverage needs mechanism to insulate the companies brand name product from competition.

Solution: Formation of a pure (single) captive, to be paid 57% of the direct insurance premium, aligned with an insurance pool which receives the remaining 43% of the premiums. By pooling a portion of the insurance premiums, Synergy is able to satisfy revenue ruling 2002-89 and there by be considered an insurance company for tax purposes. An Estate Trust was established for the benefit of the ownerships heirs.

Result: Captive provided access to cost effective coverage of; Unfair Competition, Independent Distributor's Liability and Product Recall.
CASE STUDY: SERVICES COMPANY

Scenario:
Kerlan & Jobe Orthopedic
Administration Action – Illegal – Medicare
Was not covered – Insurance broker advised client had coverage.

Judgment $2.5 M
LA Times - February, 2004

Solution:
If Kerlan & Jobe had a captive they would have had the money set aside on a tax efficient basis to cover the judgment, excluded by its commercial insurance.

CASE STUDY: CONDO CONVERTER AND REAL ESTATE DEVELOPER

Scenario:
Wrap Insurance: 2mm /1mm
Premiums: $1.4 million
Coverage for Construction Defect

Solution:
Form Captive to cover construction defect liability, invest premium, and when the 10 year statute of limitations is up, they will have > $2 million available to pay claims on this policy.

Result: Approximately $15mm in assets in captive since 2003, claims low, tax advantaged.

CASE STUDY: NURSING HOME

Scenario: Louisiana Client has 2000 beds, commercial quote of $4,000 per bed for Professional Liability.

Solution: Instead of self insuring, Client formed a Captive to cover these risks with custom policy drafting and controlled claims management.
Property Insurance – Flood & Wind
Workers Compensation – Deductible Reimbursement

Result: Cost per bed was reduced to $1,400. With a tax advantage position, Client increased investment savings and saw a decrease in the number of claims.
CASE STUDY: EMERGENCY ROOM DOCTORS

Scenario: $1.8mm quote for Professional Liability coverage. Claims run approximately $500,000 per year.

Solution: Obtain new quote with $250,000 deductible. Captive formed and owned by trust for Children to cover the $250,000 deductible, with premiums of $900,000 per year.

Result: $900,000 Premium to Captive, underwriting profit of $400,000 in Captive with tax advantage, and wealth transfer to next generation.

CASE STUDY: ESTATE PLANNING

Scenario: Real estate owner with a 21 year old son, and estate planning concerns. Real Estate not covered by commercial insurance for mold and earthquake.

Solution: Formed Captive owned by son. Captive provided coverage for depreciated property, mold and low level earthquake.

Result: Tax deductible premiums for owner with wealth transfer to son.

831b Captive Insurance Company - $1.2mm Premiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash at end of year WITH captive ($)</td>
<td>1,389,921</td>
<td>2,629,502</td>
<td>3,906,889</td>
<td>5,223,237</td>
<td>6,579,733</td>
<td>14,059,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at end of year WITHOUT captive ($)</td>
<td>1,063,475</td>
<td>1,903,388</td>
<td>2,770,598</td>
<td>3,665,992</td>
<td>4,590,487</td>
<td>9,683,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Benefit of Captive Investment ($)</td>
<td>326,446</td>
<td>726,114</td>
<td>1,136,291</td>
<td>1,557,245</td>
<td>1,989,246</td>
<td>4,375,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at end of year 5 and year 10 with captive ($)</td>
<td>6,579,733</td>
<td>14,059,544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on Liquidation of Captive in year 5 and year 10: 15%</td>
<td>949,460</td>
<td>2,071,432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash to Shareholders of Captive upon Liquidation ($)</td>
<td>5,630,273</td>
<td>11,988,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash to Investors without Captive at end of Year 5 and Year 10 ($)</td>
<td>4,590,487</td>
<td>9,683,664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Benefit of Captive with Liquidation ($)</td>
<td>1,039,786</td>
<td>2,304,448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Planning Considerations: With Estate Planning and Captive owner is an Irrevocable Trust, then heirs receive</td>
<td>5,630,273</td>
<td>11,988,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental value in estate without Captive at end of Year 5 and Year 10 ($)</td>
<td>4,590,487</td>
<td>9,683,664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Estate Taxes 45%</td>
<td>(2,065,719)</td>
<td>(4,357,649)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net to Heirs without a Captive ($)</td>
<td>2,524,768</td>
<td>5,326,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to heirs of Captive where Captive is owned by heirs’ trust v. doing nothing ($)</td>
<td>3,105,505</td>
<td>6,662,097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust for gift of $250k to fund the capital that increases the tax liability at death ($)</td>
<td>(112,500)</td>
<td>(112,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Benefit to Heirs ($)</td>
<td>2,993,005</td>
<td>6,549,597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Improvement</td>
<td>119%</td>
<td>123%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Problem Areas

- Thinly capitalized
- Related party loan-backs
- Investment in life insurance
  - Can be a signal to the Service that this was a sham transaction lacking in economic substance
  - Let the captive mature before buying life insurance, and be sure there is a substantial, nontax purpose (estate planning, buy-sell purpose may be helpful)
- Service has issued summonses for Aviva Life, AmerUs (now Aviva), and Indianapolis Life (now Aviva) related to ongoing scrutiny of captive promoters maintaining alliances with life insurance companies
- Inadequate third party risk
  - Less than 12 insureds
  - Risk pools that pay no claims
  - Protected cell companies (Rev. Rul. 2008-8)
- Heavy investment in the activities of affiliate companies (Service could use this as evidence in a sham transaction)
- Heavy investment in illiquid assets (not “acting like” an insurance company)
Potential Problem Areas

- Accessing captives through any sort of “alliance”, “institute” or other title used to notate a consortium of individuals banded together to sell tons of life insurance through the aggressive marketing and inappropriate use of tax-advantaged structures.
- This is a sure way to get a target painted on your back or your client’s back.
  - No attorney-client privilege
  - The Service can and does get customer lists from these groups
  - These groups tend to be more reckless in their marketing materials since they need the “sizzle” to attract the attention of life insurance producers
  - The Service can and does use reckless marketing materials to hang taxpayers
    - Such as materials marketing captives as a way to deduct life insurance premiums and never pay tax on the proceeds
- Like any advanced planning tool, captives should be accessed through an attorney as part of a comprehensive approach in arranging a client’s affairs
  - Attorney-client privilege will apply

Do It Right

- Like any advanced planning tool, captives should be accessed through an attorney as part of a comprehensive approach in arranging a client’s affairs

Captive Services To Expect

- **Captive Design**
  - Insurance coverage and risk analysis
  - Business entity
  - Feasibility study and financial Proforma
  - Coverage premium assessment with actuary and broker
  - Domicile selection

- **Licensing and Formation**
  - Insurance license application assistance
  - Incorporation and legal advice
  - Selection of Actuary, Auditor and Accounting
  - Insurance jurisdiction approval

- **Captive Regulatory Compliance**
  - Regulatory filing
  - Quarterly financials
  - Annual Captive efficiency review
  - Liaison with Investment Manager
  - Liaison with Tax Preparer
  - Liaison with Audit
  - Liaison with Regulatory Body

- **Insurance Management**
  - Draft and publish insurance policies
  - Annual risk coverage analysis
  - Ongoing coverage assessment
  - Annual Meetings
  - Domicile Presence
IRS Circular 230 Notice: Any information pertaining to tax related matters contained in this presentation is not intended or written to be used, and it cannot be used, by any person or entity for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax penalties imposed by any governmental taxing authority or agency, or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matters addressed herein.

BNY Mellon Financial Corporation, as a matter of policy, does not give tax, accounting, regulatory or legal advice. The effectiveness of the strategies presented in this document will depend on unique characteristics and on a number of complex factors. Rules in the areas of law, tax, and accounting are subject to change and open to varying interpretations. Consult with professional advisors on the tax, accounting and legal implications of these possible strategies before implementation.
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Next, let's discuss the ways in which some advisors, accountants, insurance agents and financial planners. In October 2001, Scot co-authored with Robert L. Frank an article entitled "Estate Tax Reform: Highlights of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2001: Today's CPA," September/October, 40-46, 2001. The article discusses the estate, gift and generation-skipping tax changes in the 2001 tax bill and the opportunities this new tax code offers. The article has been reprinted by the American Bar Association's Taxation Section Newsletter, "Tax Planning in the Wake of Reform," was published in the Fall 2001 edition. Scot is a member of the American Bar Association and the State Bar of Georgia. Additionally, he is a member of the sections of taxation and real property, probate and trust of the American Bar Association, as well as a member of the fiduciary and taxation sections of the State Bar of Georgia. Scot is also a member of the Atlanta Estate Planning Council. In 2005, Scot was named a member of Georgia's Legal Elite.
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Geoff Seaman is a wealth planning strategist with more than 30 years of experience delivering customized solutions to wealthy individuals, families and businesses. He specializes in the coordination of estate and income tax planning, charitable planned giving, business succession, and investment management consulting.

Prior to joining the firm in 2004, Geoff was with City National Bank of Beverly Hills, California. He held the position of vice president and senior financial and estate planning advisor.

Geoff received his Bachelor's degree from Indiana University, his master of business administration from the University of Chicago, and his law degree from Northwestern School of Law. As a Member of the Society of Trust and Estate Practitioners (STEP), he has the designation of Registered Trust and Estate Practitioner (TEP). Geoff currently holds FINRA series 7, 24, 65, and 63 licenses. He has been an active participant in the Los Angeles community.
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President, Active Captive Management whose subsidiaries and affiliates are licensed captive managers in Utah, Kentucky, Delaware, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Nevis and Anguilla. B.S. Economics, California State University, Long Beach, 1977; J.D., Loyola Law School, 1980; admitted to practice, California, 1980. Admitted to practice in United States Supreme Court, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, United States District Court, Central District of California, and Southern District of California. Member of the State Bar of California, Orange County Bar Association, and Los Angeles County Bar Association. Rated by Martindale Hubbell as “AV,” the highest rating for competence and ethics for an attorney. Actively involved in alternative risk solutions since 1986. Board of Directors, Utah Captive Owners Association.