

**REPORTER’S MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE  
DRAFTING COMMITTEE TO REVISE THE UNIFORM  
GUARDIANSHIP AND PROTECTIVE PROCEEDINGS ACT (“UGPPA”)**

**HYATT REGENCY  
WASHINGTON, DC  
OCTOBER 9-10, 2015**

**IN ATTENDANCE  
(for all or part of the meeting)**

David English (Chair)	Paul Kurtz
Nina Kohn (Reporter)	Sharon Mark
William (“Bill”) Barrett	Anita Ramasastry
Ginny Casazza	Catherine Seal
Richard Cassidy	Lowry Snow
Cheryl Cessario	Michael Sconyers
Robert (“Bob”) Dinerstein	Deborah (“Debbie”) Tedford
William Scott (“Scott”) Donaldson	William (“Bill”) Quinlin
Marc Feinstein	Scott Donaldson
Marty Ford	Janice (“Jan”) Pauls
Kristin (“Kris”) Booth Glen	Benjamin (“Ben”) Orzeske
Charles Golbert	Nora Winkelman
Sally Hurme	Karen Washington
David Hutt	Linda Whitton
A. Frank Johns	Erica Wood
Linda Kincaid	

**SUMMARY OF MEETING**

The Chair introduced the task before the Committee for this meeting. Participants then launched into a thoughtful discussion of the issues. This summary outlines the issues discussed and identifies how the draft revised Act will be further revised in light of the discussion.

1. Discussed terminology.

The new terminology in the draft revised Act was discussed. There was much discussion as to the best term to use for a person for whom a guardian or conservator has been appointed. There continued to be general agreement to replace the terms “incapacitated person” and “ward.” The terms “protected person,” “assisted person,” “person subject to guardianship/conservatorship,” and “person needing decision-making intervention,” among others, were discussed. Concerns were expressed about all terms, including that the term “protected person” might have negative connotations, that the term “assisted person” confused such persons with persons in supported decision-making relationships and inaccurately described the relationship, and that the terms “person subject to guardianship/conservatorship” had problematic abbreviations (“PUG”/“PUC”)

and were grammatically and logistically problematic. All present were invited to continue to brainstorm as to alternative terminology and to send suggestions to the Chair and Reporter.

It was agreed that in the next draft, the Reporter would make the following changes:

- In the definition of “person needing protection” in Section 102, switch the ordering of decision-making support and technological assistance.
- Consider replacing the term “legal representative” with a different term.
- Provide a sample portion of the draft revised Act using the “person under guardianship” and “person under conservatorship” language to show the Committee what that approach might involve.

## 2. Discussed incorporation of person-centered planning.

The Committee discussed the changes in the draft revised Act that were aimed at incorporating person-centered planning.

There was also a discussion of whether to explicitly add the term “person-centered plan” to the Act, and, if so, where it could be added. Suggestions including adding it to the duties sections in Articles 3 and 4, and to require reporting as to compliance with such plans as part of the guardian or conservator’s annual report. Consistent with this discussion, for the next revision the Reporter will:

- Add provisions to Article 3 requiring guardians for adults to create a person-centered plan for the protected person, and to report as to their compliance with that plan as part of the annual report.

It was further agreed that, in the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Correct a typo in Section 312(a)(1).
- Add “social worker” to the list of individuals who can perform a professional evaluation in both Article 3 and Article 4.
- In Section 305(b)(1), reverse the order of the words “abilities” and “limitations.”

## 3. Discussed the decision-making standard for guardians and conservators.

Observer Linda Whitton provided an overview of her article (co-authored with Larry Frolik) which considered the decision-making standard to which a guardian or conservator should be held and proposed a revision to the UGPAA that provided a basis for the revisions in this draft.

There was significant discussion of the decision-making standard. There was general support for a substituted judgement standard, and discussion of the best way to implement that standard especially in light of situations in which the person’s preferences may not be reasonably ascertainable. Consistent with this discussion, it was agreed that in the next revision the Reporter will:

- Replace the term “expressed interests” to spell-out what is required with more descriptive language.

There was also discussion as to whether Section 312 and Section 418 should set forth different decision-making standards in light of the conservator's need to prudently manage money. There was recognition that people can express their values through how they manage or spend their money, but also recognition that there is a need to ensure that protected persons have the resources needed to meet their needs. Specifically, there was sentiment that conservators should be able to deviate from a substituted judgment approach to prevent the estate from being unreasonably dissipated, to maintain the person's lifestyle, and to protect the person from unnecessary financial risk (e.g., by diversifying the person's investments). Therefore, in the next draft, the Reporter will:

- Add language to Section 418 to permit conservators to deviate from a substituted judgement approach to preserve needed resources for the protected person.

4. Discussed the draft revised Act's recognition of supported decision-making.

Participants examined the provisions of the draft revised Act that recognized a role for supported decision-making. Consistent with this discussion, as part of the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Eliminate the words "for protection" in Section 302(b)(9) and the parallel section in Article 4 to make it clear that the person's need may not actually be a need for protection.
- Modify the wording of Section 302(b)(9) to eliminate the words "if any" and replace them with something along the lines of "if no alternatives have been tried the reason why they have not."
- Modify Section 309 to require a court appointing a guardian to find that less restrictive means are inadequate and to state why less restrictive means are inadequate, bringing that Section in line with Section 301. The sample order might then be revised to reflect this change.
- Explore the possibility of defining limited/full guardianships.
- Consider adding language to make it clearer that a less restrictive alternative is using a previously appointed surrogate decision-maker by, for example, adding a requirement that no appointment should be made unless the court finds that the existing surrogate is not able to meet the person's needs or by requiring the petitioner to state why a previous surrogate is not able to do so. The Reporter will consider the Connecticut statute when determining how to proceed.
- Revisit the title of Section 301 with the aim of increasing the extent to which it properly describes the Section.
- Consider adding a requirement that the petition address supports.

5. Discussed promotion of limited guardianship and conservatorships.

Participants discussed changes in the draft revised Act designed to encourage the use of limited, rather than full, guardianships and conservatorships. As a result of that discussion, in the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Eliminate the words "whenever feasible" in Section 301(b) to make it clear that the court can only grant necessary powers.
- Consider eliminating the categories of full and limited guardianship.

- Determine whether Section 301(c) is consistent with UGPPJA or if there is a need to add language to make it consistent (e.g., “once jurisdiction is obtained pursuant to . . .”).
- Make sure that it is clear that Section 301(c) is just about continuing jurisdiction.

6. Discussed professional evaluation.

Participants discussed the changes in the revised draft Act designed to make professional evaluation a default option. Consistent with that discussion, for the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Add “social worker” in Section 305 and Section 406 to the list of people who can be chosen as professional evaluators.
- Consider requiring that the professional evaluator not have an interest in the petition.
- In Section 305(a) replace “needs and abilities” with “cognitive and functional abilities and limitations.”
- In Section 305(b) replace “cognitive and functional limitations and abilities” with “cognitive and functional abilities and limitations.”

7. Discussed provisions pertaining to the presence of and participation by the respondent at the hearing.

Participants discussed the changes in the draft revised Act designed to facilitate participation by respondent in the hearing and narrow the circumstances under which a guardian or conservator can be appointed without the respondent present. As part of this discussion, there was discussion as to whether the visitor should explain the right to attend the hearing and the impact of failing to do so. In the next draft, the Reporter will therefore:

- Make refusal to attend the hearing a grounds for non-presence only where the person has been fully informed of their right to attend the hearing and the consequences of doing so and where the person has consistently or repeatedly refused to attend.
- Clarify that there needs to be clear and convincing evidence that notice was given to the person before an appointment may be made.
- Add language stating that this burden may be satisfied by affidavits under oath.

In addition, per the discussion, in the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Require the petitioner to notify the court of the need for an interpreter or translator.
- Consider adding the term “interpreter” wherever the term “translator” is used.
- Eliminate the word “offsite” in Section 307.
- Place the requirement that the guardian be present after the requirement that the respondent be present.
- Under Section 307(f) will replace the word “may” with “shall” to require the court be closed where there is a request and good cause. There was some discussion of whether there was a need for the good cause to close court, but this provision will be retained in the next revision.

8. Discussed legal representation for respondents.

Participants discussed provisions in the revised draft Act that clarify the role of the attorney for the respondent. There was some discussion of the value of distinguishing the fees for an attorney for the respondent. There was also discussion about the importance of the right of respondents to choose their own counsel, in part because of concerns about the quality of attorneys on some court appointment lists. It was also noted that sometimes the person claiming to represent the respondent is actually representing some third party. Per the discussion, in the next draft, the Reporter will:

- Clarify that the person has the right to be represented by an attorney of the person’s own choosing.
- Consider replacing the term “lawyer” with “attorney.”
- Clarify how the attorney for a respondent should proceed if the attorney is unable to ascertain what the person wants. In considering what language to add, the Reporter will look to existing approaches including those in Rhode Island and the District of Columbia, as well as the approach in Section 312.
- Break Section 304 into two sections—one governing the visitor and one governing the attorney.

9. Discussed bond requirements for conservators.

Participants discussed the provisions in the draft revised draft Act that made bond a default—but not a requirement—for conservators. There was general agreement as to this revision, and a suggestion that the comments clarify that waiver of bond requirements should be rare. There was also a discussion of the difficulty of bonding some family members who would otherwise be preferred as conservators. Per the discussion, in the next draft, the Reporter will:

- Add language requiring bond for paid, professional guardians. That is, the court will not be able to waive the bond or asset protection arrangement.

10. Discussed provisions relating to fees for guardians and conservators.

There was discussion of the draft revised Act’s new language incorporating the Third National Guardianship Summit (NGS) recommendations about fees. There was a discussion of whether the revision provides sufficient guidance as to what constitutes reasonable fees. The Reporter invited participants who were concerned that there should be more development of this to share ideas with the Reporter, with the goal of adequately capturing the recommendations of the NGS without making the fees provisions unwieldy.

There was also discussion of whether there should be some upfront information about fees provided as part of the conservatorship plan. There was general sentiment that transparency is desirable, and likely to reduce subsequent conflict. There was also discussion of the value of court approval of fees.

Per this discussion, in the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Revise Section 418 (which pertains to the conservatorship plan) to require the conservator to provide information about the fees the conservator expects to charge and expenses anticipated.
- Make fees for the lawyer for the respondent subject to court approval.
- Consider making payment for and court approval of expenses as an additional issue in Section 117.
- Consider eliminating guardians and conservators from Section 117 to have that provision focus on non-appointees.

11. Discussed monitoring of guardians and conservators.

Participants discussed changes to the draft revised Act designed to enhance monitoring of guardians and conservators. There was some significant discussion of the grounds for removing a guardian. For the next draft, the Reporter will therefore:

- Revisit Section 111 on removal to address the circumstances under which a court should remove a guardian.
- Look into incorporating language that allows guardians to be removed for not performing their duties.

A number of drafting suggestions were also made with regard to Section 316. In the next draft, the Reporter will:

- Modify Section 316(e)(2) to read: “require additional information from the guardian, the protected person, or other interested parties.”
- Modify Section 316(e)(2) to specify the purpose of the hearing.
- Revise Section 316(a)(3) to add supports to the list.
- Expand Section 316(a)(7) or create a new section to require a guardian to submit a plan within 60-90 days, which the court then has to approve.
- Include as part of annual reporting requirements for guardians a reference to the guardian’s plan – e.g., a provision that the court should review the plan to determine whether the guardian’s actions were consistent with the plan.
- Divide Section 316(a)(5) into two sections, one for activities and one for decision-making.
- Revisit Section 316(a)(6) in light of the decision-making standard in Section 312.
- Expand Section 316(a)(6) to look at supported living arrangements that fall short of institutionalization.
- Include in Section 316(e) a provision to send a visitor to investigate where the court finds there is reason to believe that the guardian has not complied with the guardian’s duties.
- Include in Section 316(e) language regarding the modification of guardianship or removal of guardian.

There was a significant discussion of the relationship between a guardian’s own plans and other plans for the protected person. For the next version, the Reporter will:

- Add as a duty that the guardian has a duty to review and to further, where appropriate, existing person-centered plans for the person.

There was also discussion as to whether there are certain categories of persons who should be considered, as a default, to be entitled to notice of particular things (e.g., reports) post-appointment. In the next version, the Reporter will:

- Add a provision giving spouses and adult children a presumptive right to notice of certain post-appointment events.

Significant discussion was had as to conflicts of interest into which guardians may enter. Per this discussion, the Reporter will:

- Add a requirement that guardians report commissions/gifts/kickbacks/other compensation received as a result of the actions taken on behalf of a protected person.
- In a future draft, add comment about best practice being not to accept such things.

## 12. Discussed health care decisions.

Participants discussed revisions designed to incorporate the NGS recommendations related to health care decisions into the draft revised Act. There was substantial discussion about the factors the guardian should consider in making health care decisions set forth in Section 314. There was substantial discussion about whether some of the listed factors should be given priority, and the relationship between the considerations. The general sentiment was that all three were important. Per the discussion, in the next version, the Reporter will:

- In Section 314(a)(4)(A), replace the language “take into consideration” with “shall take into account” to indicate that all three factors listed must be considered by the guardian.
- Reorder Section 314(a)(4)(A) and Section 314(a)(4)(B), to put the later (which speaks to the person’s involvement) first.
- Add the word “and” after Section 314(a)(4)(A)(ii) to make it clear that the guardian should consider all three considerations.
- Revisit whether Section 313(a)(4)(A) should list three factors or whether the risks/benefits portion should be separated out from the “wishes” portion.

There was discussion of the importance of making it clear that guardians do not necessarily replace appointed health care agents. In the next version, the Reporter will therefore:

- Revisit the relationship between Section 314(a)(4) and Section 315(c) to clarify that the guardian does not trump the health care agent.

There was discussion as to whether involvement of the person should be a separate point or blended into the general decision-making rule. Per this discussion, for the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Consider blending Sections 314(a)(4)(A) and 314(a)(4)(B).
- Consider the viability of including more descriptive language along the lines of the NGA standards that suggest the guardian “encourage and support the individual in understanding the risks and the benefits.”

There was also a discussion about the relationship between the general decision-making rule in Section 312 and the specific health care decision-making rule in Section 314. A suggestion was made that the Act might consider separating health care decisions into a separate section so that it won't be governed by Section 312, with the appropriate cross-references to make it clear that these are different decision-making standards.

13. Discussed residential decisions.

Participants discussed revisions to the Act focused on how a guardian is to make decisions about where the protected persons lives.

There was concern expressed that the revised provisions did not require court approval of potentially problematic moves, especially to secure facilities ("locked wards"). For next version, the Reporter will:

- Draft language that requires court approval prior to a move to a significantly higher level of care absent an emergency situation or other exigent circumstances.

There was also discussion about the adequacy of the notice provisions in the draft revised Act. The general sentiment was to require notification of moves to significantly different units within a facility. In the next version, the Reporter will:

- Add to Section 313(a)(2)(B) a provision indicating that that the notification must not simply state the change in address but also provide some description of the nature of the new dwelling so that the persons receiving notice have some understanding of the nature of the move.
- Considering adding a short timeframe for when the notice must be provided.
- Consider adding a provision in Section 313 for the protected person, the court, or an interested party to request a hearing on a problematic move.
- Add a provision that notice must state whether the move is with the consent of the protected person.

In addition, in the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Replace the term "custodial dwelling" with a clearer term.
- Revisit the title of Section 313 due to concerns that the section is not simply about powers, but also duties, obligations, and limitations.
- Consider adding, in text or in the comments, a provision that the guardian shall consider the closeness and proximity of the setting to those persons and individuals who are important to the person.

14. Discussed attorney representation of protected person seeking termination or modification of a guardianship or conservatorship.

Participants discussed provisions in the draft revised Act governing legal representation of protected persons. A suggestion was made that it is important that protected persons be able to choose who represents them. There was discussion as to whether the language "benefited the

protected person” or “reasonably necessary to protect the person’s interests” was the proper limitation. For example, should there be a limit based on the estate’s ability to pay? A suggestion was made that the right to counsel should extend to removal situations. Per the discussion, in the next version, the Reporter will:

- Add removal to Section 317(g) to make it clear that protected persons are entitled to representation for removal of the guardian, not merely termination or modification.
- State that protected persons are entitled to be represented by counsel of their choosing.
- Draft comments to Section 317 for the Committee’s consideration.
- Correct a typo in the ordering of Section 317.

15. Discussed the standard for termination of a guardianship or conservatorship.

In addition to discussion of attorney representation for termination, there was some discussion of the standard for termination of guardianship and whether the standard currently in Section 317 is the correct one. As part of this discussion, there was discussion of whether a guardian should be prohibited, as is now the case in Colorado, from opposing a petition for restoration of rights in the role of the guardian. In light of interest in the Colorado approach, the Reporter will:

- Draft a bracketed section that limits the ability of the guardian to oppose a petition for modification, termination, or removal for the Committee’s consideration.

There was also significant discussion about who has the burden to establish grounds for termination, and what triggers such reexamination. In the next version, the Reporter will:

- Revisit the question of who has the burden to establish grounds for termination, including whether the burden should be placed on the petitioner in Section 317.

There was discussion of the importance of providing for modification. In the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Revise Section 317(e) to indicate that changes in abilities, supports, or other circumstances” could justify a modification, and that modification could lead to an increase in powers not just a decrease in powers.
- Replace the word “capacity” with “abilities and limitations” consistent with the draft revised Act’s overall move away from discussion of capacity.

16. Discussed the age of involvement for minors.

The draft revised Act reduced the age of notice to and involvement of minors from 14 to 12. There were no objection to this approach and it will be maintained in the next revision.

17. Discussed appointment of guardian for an adult by will or other writing, and standby and successor guardians.

The draft revised Act eliminated sections permitting appointments of a guardian of an adult by will or other writing. There was no objection to this change and it will be maintained in the next version.

There was discussion as to whether there was adequate provision for a standby guardian, and whether the provisions of Section 110 are adequate to deal with a situation in which the guardian is no longer able to serve. Specifically, there was discussion as to whether any additional vetting of the standby guardian is needed beyond what is in Section 110 currently or whether a follow-up hearing or some form of court confirmation upon the filing of acceptance. Per the discussion, for the next version, the Reporter will:

- Add a provision requiring the court to confirm or approve the appointment within a set period of time (perhaps 90 days). In doing so, the Reporter will look to the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (“UAGPPJA”) provisions regarding confirmation of an appointment.
- Add to the annual reporting requirements that the guardian or conservator indicate whether an already selected successor appointee is alive and able to serve.
- Add language to Section 110 specifying that the successor guardian can be appointed at the time of the initial order. This is not a substitutive change to the Act as the Act currently says the successor can be appointed at any time, but merely a clarification.

18. Discussed delegation of powers by conservators and guardians.

There was discussion of the delegation provisions in Section 314. Rather than discussing the revised Section 314 and the parallel provision in Article 4, the Chair suggested that the Committee revisit Section 105 of the 1997 Act and discuss what changes, if any, are most appropriate to it.

One key point of discussion was whether a guardian of an adult ever be allowed to delegate. As a general matter, there seemed to be greater level of comfort with conservators delegating and with guardians of minors delegating (the “summer camp provision”). It was noted that Illinois has potentially helpful law on this point for minors.

There was general agreement to take delegation out of Section 105 (as was done in the draft revised Act) and put delegation sections, to the extent they will exist, in the later Articles.

Discussion was had as to Section 209, a draft provision governing guardianship for minors. The first point of discussion was whether Section 209(a) should be kept in. After some discussion, there was agreement to keep it in. The second point of discussion was of Section 209(b). There was agreement to limit the delegation in part (b) to six months, thus not giving the guardian powers that a parent would lack. There was also general sense that the current provisions in Section 209(b) were not the best fit for guardians of the persons, because these provisions are more focused on financial issues which are addressed in Article 4. There was also a general

sense that delegation should be fairly limited. Specific suggested changes to Section 209(b) included removal of the words “protected person” “or property” except the power to consent to marriage or adoption” and “conservator.”

In the next version, the Reporter will:

- Add a limited delegation provision to Section 209.
- Revisit delegation in conservatorship in Article 4.
- Add a very limited provision on delegation for Article 3. To do so, the Reporter will look to Florida’s approach on this issue per a suggestion made at the meeting.
- Add language to delegation provisions in all three articles that delegations are always revocable by the guardian and/or conservator.

There was also a suggestion that at future points the group discuss whether conservatorship for minors and conservatorship for adults should be in separate Articles.

19. Discussed expanded and modified notice requirements.

Participants discussed the expanded and modified notice requirements in the draft revised Act. There was a discussion about how broad notice should be. A suggestion was made to require notification of adult grandchildren. Per the discussion, the Reporter will:

- Add to Sections 303(b) and 403(b) (between the first and second sentences) a new sentence stating that the court may require that notice be provided to other persons interested or involved in the respondent’s life.

20. Briefly discussed the powers and duties of conservators.

It was noted that since the Act was last revised, a number of other fiduciary statutes have been adopted or revised and that the NGS standards include a variety of provisions related to standards for financial decision-making. The Chair agreed to work with the American College of Trust and Estate Counsel (“ACTEC”) to see what provisions in the Act might be amended to reflect such new developments.

21. Discussed visitation with protected persons.

The Chair noted that the Scope and Program Committee has asked this Committee to look into issues related to visitation, and the Chair provided background on some of the concerns related to visitation. Anita Ramasastry further explained this charge. It was noted that Texas and Iowa have enacted legislation on this issue. It was reported that Iowa recognizes an express right of protected person to visitation, but permits court to deny visitation. It was noted that the right to visitation might be phrased to include communication, as both are central to human relationships. Per this discussion, in the next version, the Reporter will:

- Incorporate, as part of the requirement of the guardian’s plan, a requirement that plans for visitation be included in that plan.

There seemed to be general support for creating a presumption in favor of visitation with friends and family members such that visitation could not be permanently prevented without court approval, but perhaps with a provision allowing the guardian to temporarily restrict visitation. There was also recognition of the need for protected persons to be able to have their preferences and values respected in this regard. Per this discussion, in the next version, the Reporter will:

- Add language reflecting the NGA recommendations as to the duty to maintain/preserve relationships, reflecting the fact that visitation is about the person's rights, not the rights of friends and family.

22. Discussed whether a guardian may consent to marriage or divorce of protected person.

There was a discussion about the value of allowing a guardian to agree to a marriage or divorce on behalf a protected person. There was also a suggestion that a guardian should not be allowed to deny consent to marriage or divorce without court approval, because some individuals with developmental disabilities or intellectual disabilities will be unreasonably prevented from entering into such relationships. Per this discussion, in the next revision the Reporter will:

- Add a provision stating that the guardian must seek court approval to consent to marriage, deny consent to marriage, consent to divorce or petition for divorce, or deny consent to divorce.
- Attempt to align this new provision with the decision-making standard in Section 312.
- Bracket the resulting section in recognition that this issue is morally charged and could impede adoption.

23. Discussed voting rights of protected persons.

Participants discussed whether the court should have the power to remove a protected person's right to vote and, if so, what findings are necessary to do so. Per that discussion, in the next revision, the Reporter will:

- Include a provision stating that the person shall retain voting rights absent an explicit judicial determination to the contrary.
- Provide the group with links to the literature on this issue so that the group is informed as to key concerns in considering this provision at future meetings.

24. Discussed whether the Act should continue to include minors.

While there was some disagreement about whether minors should be included, it was noted that separating the two might be outside the scope of this Committee's charge. Provisions devoted to guardianship for minors will therefore be maintained in the next revision.

25. Discussed the possibility of including a “Bill of Rights” for protected persons.

The Chair noted that several states have created a “Bill of Rights” for protected persons. There was discussion as to whether such a Bill or Rights is desirable or whether this would be duplicative. There was a sense that this type of language might encourage adoption by making it clear the ways in which this law represents an advance in policy. On the other hand, there were concerns raised about, among other things, enforceability, liability, making rights seem absolute when they are qualified, and making an apparently exhaustive list that it not actually exhaustive.

Per the discussion, in the next version, the Reporter will:

- Add a provision requiring that the protected person be provided with a statement of their rights and language that must be present in that statement.
- Draft a prefatory note that highlights the rights of protected persons and highlights sections of the Act providing such rights.

26. Briefly discussed the organization of the draft revised Act.

The Reporter explained how the revision attempted to streamline the organization of the Act in order to make the Act more readily understandable to users. There were no objections to the basic approach.

27. Discussed the model order.

Participants discussed the model order drafted by the Reporter. There was general agreement that this was a helpful addition. For the next meeting the Reporter will, as discussed:

- Draft a sample petition.

28. Identified additional issues for further conversation.

Participants identified several topics for future discussion. These include:

- How to support transition planning for persons with intellectual disabilities and developmental disabilities as they transition from childhood to adulthood.
- Whether a respondent has a right to a jury trial.