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Introduction

In February 2002, the Advisory Committee to the Joint Editorial Board for Uniform Trusts and Estates Acts presented its report on a comparative review of state durable power of attorney legislation. This study was conducted to ascertain: a) how many jurisdictions have adopted the Uniform Durable Power of Attorney Act (Uniform Act) in whole or in part; b) whether the legislative enactments of adopting states include significant departures from the Uniform Act; c) whether states that are not official adopters have integrated, in language or spirit, components of the Uniform Act; and d) the emergence of state legislative trends that are not embodied in the Uniform Act.

The study found that while twenty-nine (29) jurisdictions (27 states, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands) are official adopters of the Uniform Act, seventeen (17) of the twenty-three (23) states who are not official adopters have incorporated into their statutes provisions substantially similar to those of the Uniform Act. However, despite this “core” uniformity, the study further revealed significant areas of developing divergence. Conflicts and potential conflicts between states appear in two contexts—subject areas in which a growing number of states have enacted statutory provisions, but the provisions diverge in approach, and subject areas where the Uniform Act is silent and states are “filling in the blanks.”

Areas of divergent state legislative provisions include:

- Authority of a later-appointed fiduciary or guardian vis-à-vis the attorney-in-fact

Twenty-three (23) jurisdictions follow the Uniform Act approach which provides that once there is a court-appointed guardian or fiduciary, the attorney-in-fact is then accountable to both the fiduciary and the principal; seventeen (17) provide that after court appointment of a fiduciary the attorney-in-fact is accountable only to that fiduciary; five (5) terminate the attorney-in-fact’s authority upon court appointment of a fiduciary; and four (4) specify that the attorney-in-fact’s authority actually supersedes that of a later-appointed fiduciary. Regarding a fiduciary’s authority to revoke a DPA, thirty-four (34) jurisdictions follow the Uniform Act approach that the fiduciary has the same power the principal would have had to revoke the agent’s authority
and six (6) require that a Court find sufficient basis for revoking the attorney-in-fact’s authority.

- **Springing powers**

Thirty-eight (38) jurisdictions follow the Uniform Act approach that a durable power of attorney can be designated to become effective upon the “disability or incapacity” of the principal. Nine (9) jurisdictions provide for other variations on springing powers, and four (4) are silent on the topic. Seven (7) require a confirming affidavit by the agent that the power has sprung.

- **Authority to make gifts**

Twenty (20) jurisdictions specifically address agent authority to make gifts, and all but two (2) of these jurisdictions provide for statutory default limitations on the authority. Statutory limitations vary considerably, but in general, states are divided into two divergent groups—one that requires the DPA to include specific authorization of gift making authority, and the other that implies gift making authority if the agent is given broad authority without specific limitations.

- **Authority of multiple agents**

Sixteen (16) jurisdictions address the issue of multiple agents. Two (2) prohibit co-agents; one (1) requires that multiple agents act jointly; nine (9) provide that the instrument can specify joint or several authority for multiple agents, but that in the absence of specification the multiple agents must act jointly; three (3) provide that multiple agents may act independently in the absence of specification to the contrary; and one (1) does not provide a default rule but states that the instrument can specify joint or several authority.

- **Impact of divorce on authority of spouse-agent**

Twelve (12) states provide for revocation of a spouse-agent’s authority upon divorce, and four (4) actually provide for revocation upon the filing of the petition. Five (5) also revoke authority upon legal separation.

- **Fiduciary standards of care**

Nineteen (19) statutes address fiduciary standards of care for agents, but the substance of the statutes varies considerably—from minimal treatment which merely identifies the attorney-in-fact as a fiduciary to those requiring the same level of care as a trustee and specifying a list of duties. With respect to remedies for breach of the agent’s duties, the statutory provisions range from silence to rather extreme civil and criminal penalties.
Common areas that are not covered by the Uniform Act, but which are addressed in an increasing number of state statutes include:

- Execution requirements (27 jurisdictions)
- Successor agents (16 jurisdictions)
- Portability provisions (12 jurisdictions)
- Sanctions for third party refusal to accept DPA (8 jurisdictions)

Although some variation exists in the foregoing provisions, the spirit of the provisions is similar.

To further assess developing trends and issues in durable power of attorney legislative reform, the Advisory Committee prepared a survey which was distributed to all probate and elder law sections of state bar associations, to the leadership of the American College of Trust and Estate Counsel, the National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys, and the ABA Section of Real Property, Probate and Trust Law, as well as to special interest listserves of the ABA Commission on Law and Aging. The following report summarizes and analyzes the results of this survey.

**Survey Respondents**

It was not possible to formulate a statistical response rate due to the variety of methods by which the survey was distributed; however, forty-four (44) jurisdictions were represented in the 371 surveys that were returned. In an effort to gauge whether the type of state statute influenced the nature of the responses, results were analyzed by state groupings as well as in the aggregate. States were grouped according to their degree of similarity to or divergence from the Uniform Act. States in the “General” category are those whose statutes are basically the same as the Uniform Act. The thirteen (13) states which comprise this group (AL, DE, HI, ID, IA, KS, MA, MI, MS, NV, OR, RI, WV) represent 26% of total jurisdictions. Thirty-five percent (35%) of the survey respondents were from the General category. The "Modified General" category is comprised of states which basically follow the Uniform Act but which have added a few additional specific provisions. This group includes eighteen (18) states (AZ, DC, KY, LA, MD, MT, NE, NH, ND, NM, OH, OK, SC, SD, UT, VA, WI, WY), which represent 35% of total jurisdictions, and 23% of the respondents to this survey. The last category, labeled the “Specific” group, includes the largest number of states—twenty (20)—and represents those states which have enacted very specific, detailed provisions either in addition to or instead of the provisions of the Uniform Act. This group represents 39% of all jurisdictions and 42% of the survey respondents. The following chart summarizes participation by state and state groupings:
Durable Power of Attorney Survey – Participation by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General States</th>
<th>Modified General</th>
<th>Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 states 131 35% of total responses 18 states 86 23% of total responses 20 states 154 42% of total responses

GRAND TOTAL – 371

* Responses were received from all but seven jurisdictions (AK, MT, NC, ND, OK, SC, SD)
Overview of Survey Responses

What is most striking about the survey responses is that the percentage of respondents who selected each option was nearly identical without regard to state grouping affiliation. In other words, the type of statute in effect in a particular jurisdiction appeared to have little or no relationship to the preferences and opinions expressed by survey respondents. Furthermore, there was significant consensus demonstrated with respect to a number of areas identified in the Committee’s first report as areas of growing statutory divergence or enactment (e.g., authority of later-appointed fiduciaries, springing powers, authority to make gifts, impact of divorce on authority of spouse-agent, fiduciary standards of care, portability provisions, and sanctions for third party refusal to accept a DPA).

The following summarizes survey results by topic, reporting only the aggregate results of the entire response pool unless there was significant variation in the response percentages by state grouping. Where questions asked respondents to indicate multiple answers if they desired, percentages are based on the number of respondents answering that specific question.

General Questions about Durable Power of Attorney Practice

Number of POA documents prepared annually?

- Fewer than 25: 25%
- 25 - 50: 23%
- 51 - 100: 29%
- Greater than 100: 23%

Majority of POA documents are?

- General durable powers: 93%
- Special limited powers: 2%
- Approx. equal numbers: 5%

Client preference for when POA effective?

- Immediately: 61%
- Springing: 23%
- No trend: 16%

Are you in favor of statutory short forms?
Springing Powers

Should DPA statute authorize springing powers?

Yes  89%
No   11%

Should statute require a confirming affidavit to activate springing powers?

Yes  74%
No   26%

Should statute permit an affidavit to provide assurance to 3rd parties?

Yes  81%
No   19%

Who should be the affiant?*

Health Care Professional  63%
Person designated in POA  58%
Agent                 27%

*Although not directed to, a number of respondents circled multiple answers.

Authority to Make Gifts

Which should be the default rule for making gifts?

No authority unless specifically authorized  73%
Implied authority unless expressly limited  27%

Should statute specify default limitations on gift making authority?

Yes  67%
No   33%

Should statute limit permissible recipients of gifts?

Yes  50%
No   50%
Should the statute limit the types of organizations that are permissible recipients?

Yes, organizations to which principal has made gifts or pledges 45%
No 33%*
Yes, only to IRS charitable organizations 19%*
Yes, to organizations charitable or otherwise 3%

*More of the respondents in the Modified General grouping selected the response, “Yes, only to IRS charitable organizations” than the “No” response to limitations.

Should the statute limit the classes of persons who are permissible recipients?

No 47%
Yes, limit to principal’s spouse, committed partner, descendants, spouses of descendants, descendants of partner, and parents 21%*
Yes, limit to principal’s spouse, descendants, spouses of descendants, and parents 15%*
Yes, limit to principal’s spouse and descendants 9%*
Yes, limit to principal’s spouse, descendants and parents 8%*

*There was a slight preference in the Modified General grouping for the response which included spouses of descendants, but omitted references to committed partners, and a slight preference in the General grouping for the option which included parents over the option limited to only the principal’s spouse and descendants.

Should the statute specify a maximum amount for gifts?

No maximum 47%
Limit to $10,000 or current annual gift tax exclusion 29%*
Limit gifts to agent to $10,000 or current annual gift tax exclusion 24%*

*Respondents in the General grouping had a slight preference for capping only gifts to agents at the annual gift tax exclusion amount as opposed to a default limitation on all gifts at the annual exclusion amount.

Should the statute provide other guidance for making gifts?

Agent can make gifts on principal’s behalf as determined to be in principal’s best interest, estate’s best interest, or that will reduce the estate tax payable on the principal’s death and also be in accordance with the principal’s history of making or joining in the making of lifetime gifts 51%
Nothing more is needed 36%
Agent can make gifts on principal’s behalf as the agent shall determine to be in accord with the principal’s personal history 13%
Authority to Create, Revoke, or Modify Revocable Trusts

If the POA gives the agent broad authority, which should be the default rule for revocable trusts?

Agent can exercise principal’s powers only to the extent expressly authorized by the terms of the trust document or the POA 51%
Agent can exercise principal’s powers unless limited in the POA, but only to make revisions as the circumstances and facts reveal the principal would have made 32%
Agent can exercise principal’s powers unless authority is limited in the POA 17%

The Agent as Fiduciary

Should the statute set forth a default standard of care for the agent?

Yes 89%
No 11%

Which of the following should be the default standard of care?

Same fiduciary standard as Trustees 63%
Good faith 19%*
Due care/ordinary negligence 18%*

*There was a slight preference for the due care/ordinary negligence standard over the good faith standard in the General grouping.

Should the statute permit the principal to alter the default standard of care to provide exoneration?

Yes 73%
No 27%

Choose all of the following that you would favor for inclusion in statutory exoneration:

Agent not liable solely because the agent also benefits from the act 84%
Agent not liable for loss due to another person’s error of judgment or action 81%
At the principal’s election, agent will only be liable for action undertaken in bad faith 73%
Agent not liable solely because the agent has conflicting interests 71%
Agent not liable solely because the agent acts in a different manner with respect to the principal's and the agent’s individual interests 50%
None of the above 16%

Should the statute require notice by agent when no longer willing or able to act?

Yes 75%
No 25%

If yes, indicate inclusions favored for a notice provision:

Notice to principal, and if principal is incapacitated, then to guardian, legal representative, or caretaker 91%
Notice to all 3rd parties with whom agent has transacted on behalf of the principal 41%
Notice to principal only 20%

Third Party Liability and Sanctions for Refusal to Accept Agent’s Authority

Ever experience difficulty obtaining third party acceptance of an agent’s authority?

Yes, occasionally 63%
No 20%*
Yes, frequently 17%*

*Respondents in the Specific grouping rated “Yes, frequently” slightly higher than “No.”

Would you favor inclusion of a remedies or sanctions provision in all durable power of attorney statutes?

Yes 74%
No 26%

If yes, indicate all recommended provisions for inclusion in a remedies or sanctions provision:

Attorney’s fees and court costs 87%
Civil penalty not to exceed $1000, plus damages, costs and fees 53%
Prejudgment interest on actual damages 45%
Treble damages 18%
Would you favor protecting third party reliance with a statutory presumption of validity?

Yes  92%
No     8%

**Authority of Later-Appointed Fiduciary or Guardian**

If court appoints a guardian, conservator, or other fiduciary for the principal, to whom should an agent under a previously-executed power of attorney be accountable?

The fiduciary and the principal  58%
The fiduciary only    30%
The principal only    12%

Should a court-appointed fiduciary have authority to revoke or amend the POA?

Only if court specifically grants authority  61%
Yes            31%
No             8%

Should court appointment of a fiduciary automatically revoke a previously executed POA?

No  64%
Yes  36%

Should the agent’s authority under a POA supersede that of a later-appointed fiduciary?

No  68%
Yes  32%

**Impact of Divorce or Legal Separation on Authority of Spouse-Agent**

Indicate all of the following that should cause revocation of the spouse’s agency:

Divorce or annulment  84%
Filing a petition for divorce  73%
Legal separation    69%
None of the above  7%
If the principal appointed a spouse’s relative as agent, who is not related to the principal except by marriage, should divorce revoke the agency?

- No 62%
- Yes 38%

**Portability**

In your own practice, have you ever experienced difficulty obtaining POA acceptance in another jurisdiction?

- No 65%
- Yes 35%

*Would you favor a portability provision in all POA statutes?*

- Yes 97%
- No 3%

*If yes, which of the following would you prefer?*

- POA is valid in this State if validly executed under the laws of another state, but shall not authorize actions that are in contravention of laws of this State 62%
- POA is valid in this State if validly executed under the laws of another state 38%

**Abuse**

Have you, in your own practice, encountered POA abuse by an agent?

- Yes 64%
- No 36%

*If yes, which best describes the total number of instances?*

- Fewer than 5 53%
- Greater than 10 24%*
- 5 to 10 23%*

*Both the General and Modified General groupings rated the category “5 to 10” slightly higher than “Greater than 10.”*
Are you aware of instances of power of attorney abuse by an agent outside the experience of your own practice or work?

Yes 78%
No 22%

If yes, which best describes the total number of instances?

Fewer than 5 45%
5 to 10 28%
Greater than 10 27%

Should POA statute provide remedies and sanctions for agent abuse in addition to those available under common or criminal law?

Yes 75%
No 25%

If yes, indicate all you would include in a remedies or sanctions provision:

Agent to pay attorney’s fees and costs 91%
Prejudgment interest 70%
Civil penalty not to exceed $1000, plus damages and costs 61%
Treble damages 40%
Disinheritance from principal’s estate 37%

Should the POA statute include safeguards against abuse by agent?

Yes 81%
No 19%

If yes, indicate all of the following that you would include:

Certain classes of interested parties have standing to seek court review of the agent’s actions when the principal is incapacitated 89%
POA must be recorded when the principal becomes incapacitated 41%
Agent must account to a 3rd party when the principal becomes incapacitated 33%
**Conclusion**

Despite the initial success of the Uniform Durable Power of Attorney Act (forty-five (45) out of fifty-one (51) jurisdictions adopted in large part the core provisions of the Act, whether officially or unofficially), currently only thirteen (13) states have durable power of attorney statutes that are completely faithful to the original Act. Eighteen (18) states retain many of the Act's provisions, but with varying degrees of additions and modifications, and twenty (20) states have enacted very subject specific durable power of attorney provisions. Despite the divergence in state law that presently exists, results of a national durable power of attorney survey indicate a high degree of consensus in areas where statutes conflict or are silent. For example, there is over 70% consensus on the following subjects which are not addressed by the Uniform Act:

- Statute should require a confirming affidavit to activate springing powers
- Gift making authority should be expressly stated rather than implied
- Statute should set forth a default standard for agent's fiduciary duties
- Principal should be permitted to alter the default fiduciary standard
- Statute should require notice by agent when no longer willing or able to act
- Statute should include a remedies or sanctions provision for third party's refusal to honor a DPA
- Third party reliance should be protected by a statutory presumption that DPA is valid
- Divorce, annulment, or the filing of a petition for divorce should revoke spouse-agent's authority
- Statute should include a portability provision
- Statute should include a remedies and sanctions provision for abuse by agent
- Statute should include safeguards against abuse by the agent

Given the legislative movement in twenty (20) states toward durable power of attorney statutes that are more specific and detailed, this may be an opportune time to revisit the Uniform Durable Power of Attorney Act. Based on the Committee’s research, the environment appears conducive for revising the Act to address specific concerns that are common across jurisdictions and to incorporate general principles about which there appears to be consensus. Absent revision of the Act, it is likely that there will be further disintegration of uniformity if the remaining thirty-one (31) jurisdictions independently engage in statutory reform.