

PROBATE & ESTATE PLANNING SECTION

OFFICERS

CHAIR

Thomas F. Sweeney
Clark Hill PLC
151 S Old Woodward Ave Ste 200
Birmingham, MI 48009-6103

CHAIR-ELECT

Amy N. Morrissey, Ann Arbor

VICE CHAIR

Shaheen I. Imami, Bloomfield Hills

SECRETARY

James B. Steward, Ishpeming

TREASURER

Marlaine C. Teahan, Lansing

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Susan M. Allan, Bloomfield Hills
William J. Ard, Williamston
Christopher A. Ballard, Ann Arbor
George F. Bearup, Traverse City
Constance L. Brigman, Wyoming
Rhonda M. Clark-Kreuer, Saint
Louis
J. David Kerr, Mount Pleasant
Marguerite Munson Lentz, Detroit
David P. Lucas, Battle Creek
Michelle C. Marquardt, Kalamazoo
Hon. David M. Murkowski, Grand
Rapids
Lorraine F. New, Troy
Patricia M. Ouellette, Lansing
David L.J.M. Skidmore, Grand
Rapids
James P. Spica, Detroit
Robert M. Taylor, Kalamazoo
Geoffrey R. Vernon, Saint Clair
Shores

COMMISSIONER LIAISON

Richard J. Siriani, Troy

July 18, 2014

Honorable Robert P. Young, Jr., Chief Justice
And Justices of the Michigan Supreme Court
Office of Administrative Counsel
P.O. Box 30052
Lansing, MI 48915

Submitted by email to ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov

Re: Response of the Council of the Probate and Estate Planning
Section of the State Bar of Michigan to the Supreme Court Task
Force Report on the Role of the State Bar of Michigan ("Report")

Dear Chief Justice and Justices of the Michigan Supreme Court:

As the current chair and chair-elect, and on behalf of the
elected Council of the Probate & Estate Planning Section
("Section") of the State Bar of Michigan ("SBM"), we appreciate
the opportunity to respond with respect to two of the five major
recommendations in the Report including:

Recommendation 1: Continue the State Bar as a
Mandatory Bar,¹ and

Recommendation 2: Section Advocacy recommendations 1
through 8.²

With respect to Recommendation 1, our Council supports
the continuation of the mandatory bar. On February 15, 2014, the
Council approved a public policy statement opposing SB 0743 that
would eliminate the mandatory bar.

With respect to the Section Advocacy recommendations
numbered 1 through 8 under Recommendation 2, we believe the
premise underlying recommendations 1 and 2 is faulty. While the
Task Force acknowledges that the sections are "...voluntarily-
funded entities..." and "...are not subject to the same constraints
as the State Bar itself..."³, it expresses a concern about section

¹ Report, pp. 5-7.

² Report, pp. 13-14.

³ Report, p. 13.

advocacy "...because of the risk that [s]ections' advocacy will be mistaken for the advocacy of the State Bar itself..."⁴ First, the public policy statements reflecting the majority opinion of the 23-member Council are published on the Section's website and clearly identified as Section statements only. Second, one of the two principal functions of this Section is to analyze and comment on issues unique to the Section's expertise. There are less intrusive ways to make it abundantly clear that any published statement is not that of the SBM membership as a whole. Unfortunately, there are no recitations in the Report of occasions when section statements were misconstrued as SBM statements. It is difficult to address a speculative problem.

Also, the assumption that section advocacy abridges a section member's First Amendment right is flawed. As the Task Force acknowledges, sections are voluntary organizations under the umbrella of the State Bar. State Bar members are not compelled to join any particular section. Every section member receives notice and an opportunity to be heard at monthly Council meetings.

Clearly, the Council performs a valuable public service that is not available otherwise. The Section's mission statement is clear that the Section's purpose "...is to enhance and improve the practice and administration of law pertaining to probate and estate planning..."⁵ Therefore, in the last two years, the Section through its Council and its committees actively involved itself in the drafting, introduction and passage of nine separate bills. The Section retains a lobbyist to communicate with the Legislature. Five years ago, the Legislature approved a massive codification of Michigan trust law following six years of drafting by the Section involving thousands of hours of volunteer time. In addition to the foregoing efforts, each year the Council reviews numerous other bills related to probate and estate planning and often offers suggestions to the bill sponsors. The Council is also asked from time to time to file amicus curiae briefs by counsel or the appellate courts on important legal issues before the judiciary. The Council also regularly reviews and suggests changes to court rules and court forms to improve the administration of probate and estate planning law. Our advocacy puts our words into observable actions that enhance and improve the practice and administration of Michigan law. The voluntary dues of the Section members support our Section's mission statement that we will advocate for

⁴ Report, p. 14.

⁵ Probate and Estate Planning Mission Statement contained in its Bylaws

improvements in the laws, court rules and court forms that impact probate and estate planning in Michigan.

The Michigan Legislature does not have the time, expertise or focus to benefit Michigan probate and estate planning in the manner that we do. The Council calls upon attorneys in the Section, many of whom are highly experienced and have specialized knowledge to assist in its drafting and advocacy functions. These efforts serve a critical function for legislators who lack our specialized knowledge or experience. Our work is credible, reliable and informed. It is a valuable service to the public good.

Turning to Section Advocacy recommendation 2 under Recommendation 2, the Task Force proposes that sections create "...a separate entity not identified in any way with the State Bar." In fact, a separate entity would create greater confusion and misunderstanding about what such an entity is and whom it represents.

Under recommendation 3 of Recommendation 2, the Task Force suggests treating such a separate entity as a quasi-SBM entity to ensure compliance with SBM rules and bylaws. However, compliance with SBM rules and regulations is the same role now filled by the sections. It is confusing as to what type of *legal* entity this quasi-SBM entity would be. What are the tax and regulatory reporting requirements of such an organization? The current identification of a public policy statement of a section is actually *more* transparent and *less* confusing than the proposed solution of using a quasi-SBM entity to make public policy statements for a section. For clarity reasons alone, we believe sections should retain the ability to advocate public policy positions as is presently done.

With respect to recommendations 3 through 8 of Recommendation 2 regarding Section Advocacy, we have the following comments:

We do not find the reporting requirement of AO 2004-1 burdensome, but do not oppose efforts to improve them as long as the sections can continue their legislative advocacy. (3)

We do not oppose any efforts to eliminate any subsidy for non-Keller permissible activities of sections. (4)

We do not oppose having the State Bar collect voluntary section dues and the charging of the sections for the cost of collecting such dues. (5)


We do not believe that access to advocacy-related information on section websites should be restricted to section members as long as there is a disclaimer that the advocacy is by the section and not the State Bar. (6)

We do not oppose reimbursing the State Bar for special services while using the State Bar building and facilities that may support non-Keller permissible activities. (7)

We do not oppose annual mandatory training for section officers on compliance with reasonable requirements implementing the concerns expressed in recommendations 3 through 8 above. (8)

We believe that the present advocacy practices of this Section are compliant with Keller, since our membership is voluntary, all members are free to attend our monthly meetings, our public policy statements are published on our website, are identified as issued by this Section, and are available to all Section members. We are supportive of public disclosure of our public policy statements and a disclaimer that those statements are not the position of the State Bar. Our efforts to improve the laws and administration of justice of probate and estate planning matters are an important public service and should be permitted to continue.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas F. Sweeney, Chair



Amy N. Morrissey, Chair-Elect

“A problem well put is half solved.”

-- John Dewey

cc: Brian D. Einhorn, President, State Bar of Michigan
Council Members of the Probate and Estate Planning Section