

The Demise of Trustee Discretion and
Ascertainable Standards as Effective Controls on
Dysfunctional and
Underperforming Beneficiaries

Solutions for Trustees

William F. Messinger, JD, LADC
Samuel Dresser, MBA, LADC

Addiction Recovery Professionals, Inc.
Wealth and Addiction Specialists
325 Cedar Street, Suite 700
St. Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651-209-7670
www.ARPrecovery.com

Addiction **Recovery** Professionals

The Demise of Trustee Discretion and
Ascertainable Standards as Effective Controls on
Dysfunctional and
Underperforming Beneficiaries

Solutions for Trustees

William F. Messinger, JD, LADC
Samuel Dresser, MBA, LADC

Addiction Recovery Professionals, Inc.
Wealth and Addiction Specialists
325 Cedar Street, Suite 700
St. Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651-209-7670
www.ARPrecovery.com

Addiction**Recovery**Professionals

Table of Contents

The Demise of Trustee Discretion and Ascertainable Standards as Effective Controls on Dysfunctional and Underperforming Beneficiaries: Solutions for Trustees

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
1. OVERVIEW: DISCRETIONARY TRUSTS, TRUSTEE’S DISCRETION AND DISPLEASED BENEFICIARIES	1
2. OUR EXPERIENCE ADVISING AND COUNSELING FAMILIES AND TRUSTEES	2
3. USE PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
4. DISTINGUISH BETWEEN DYSFUNCTIONAL AND UNDERPERFORMING BENEFICIARIES	4
A. STORMING THE DISCRETIONARY GATES	6
1. CONTINGENT BENEFICIARIES UNITE	6
2. INDIRECT LITIGATION OR COLLATERAL CLAIM	8
3. PRESSURE ON FAMILY MEMBER TRUSTEE	9
4. GOOD BENEFICIARY/BAD BENEFICIARY	9
5. FAILURE TO SET CONDITIONS ON DISTRIBUTION.	10
B. ASCERTAINABLE STANDARDS AND DEFINED PURPOSES, PROHIBITIONS AND SPECIAL PURPOSE TRUSTEES	13
1. ASCERTAINABLE STANDARDS AND DEFINED PURPOSES	13
2. PROHIBITED BEHAVIOR	13
3. SPECIAL PURPOSE TRUSTEES	16
C. POTENTIAL TRUSTEE LIABILITY FOR DISTRIBUTIONS TO DYSFUNCTIONAL BENEFICIARIES	18
1. FOR WASTE OR DISSIPATION OF TRUST ASSETS CONTRARY TO THE INTENTION OF THE GRANTOR	18
2. CONTRADICTION BETWEEN STANDARDS FOR SUPPORT AND ADDICTIVE BEHAVIOR	19
3. HARM TO CONTINGENT BENEFICIARIES	19
D. PROVISIONS FOR ALCOHOLISM, DRUG ADDICTION, OTHER ADDICTIONS, AND MENTAL HEALTH CONCERNS IN A BENEFICIARY	20
1. REASONS WHY WE FAVOR DETAILED PROVISIONS	20
2. SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS:	21
CONCLUSION	22
APPENDIX	23
A. SUGGESTED LANGUAGE RESTRICTING ACCESS TO ASSETS AND INCOME WHEN A BENEFICIARY OR FAMILY MEMBER MAY HAVE PROBLEMS WITH ALCOHOL, DRUGS, OTHER ADDICTIONS OR MENTAL HEALTH CONCERNS.	23
B. FAMILY WEALTH – KEEPING IT IN THE FAMILY (JAMES E, HUGHES, JR.)	25
C. CASE MANAGEMENT AND PERSONAL RECOVERY SUPPORT SERVICES	26

William F. Messinger, JD, LADC

Bill is a lawyer and licensed addiction counselor based in St. Paul, Minnesota. He is the founder and president of Addiction Recovery Professionals, which focuses on assisting families of wealth and prominence facing addiction issues. For more information see www.ARPRecovery.com. Bill may be reached at bill@ARPRecovery.com, or by phone at (651) 209-7670.

Samuel Dresser, MBA, LADC

Sam is an expert on helping family businesses and related entities address addiction concerns in family members. He is the chief operating officer for Addiction Recovery Professionals. Prior to joining ARP, he worked for 13 years as a counselor, clinical supervisor and clinical director at the Hazelden Foundation. Sam may be reached at sam@ARPRecovery.com, or by phone at (651) 209-7670.

The Demise of Trustee Discretion and Ascertainable Standards as Effective Controls on Dysfunctional and Underperforming Beneficiaries: Solutions for Trustees

William F. Messinger, JD, LADC

Samuel Dresser, MBA, LADC

Introduction and Summary

While many in the Probate and Trust field continue to rely on discretionary trust clauses as an effective means of assuring proper behavior on the part of beneficiaries, we find that trustee discretion is no longer an effective tool in limiting access to trust income or principal by aggressive or dysfunctional contingent and discretionary beneficiaries.

This article will first provide an overview and summary of our experiences and advice in managing addicted or underperforming beneficiaries. We then discuss the vulnerabilities of discretionary, ascertainable, prohibition and special purpose trustee clauses. In the third section, we address the question of trustee liability for distributions to addicted beneficiaries. We end with a review of our recommendations as to the process to use to better manage these beneficiaries, including suggested language to insert in trust, estate and other family governance documents.

1. Overview: Discretionary Trusts, Trustee's Discretion and Displeased Beneficiaries

Many trusts are created so that the trustee is not required to pay out the income or principal of the trust but is empowered by the trust document to use his or her discretion in making such decisions. The trustee in such a "discretionary trust" is given the responsibility to distribute income earned and often any principal (assets) of the trust in accordance with the provisions of the trust agreement.¹

When the trust agreement provides for the trustee to exercise discretion in distributing income and/or principal to beneficiaries (as in the above example), problems can arise between the two parties. As Jay Hughes notes:

(Trustee's discretion)... is the issue that provides the greatest possibility for disagreement between the trustee and the beneficiaries. ...

.... Friction between the trustee and beneficiary often arises when the beneficiary makes a request for a discretionary distribution and the trustee determines that such an exercise of discretion is either not permitted by the terms of the trust or is not in the beneficiary's best interest. Necessarily the beneficiary will be upset when his or her request is turned down.²

¹ The authors assume the reader is familiar with trusts. Therefore we have omitted discussions and examples of specific trust language. A longer version of this article with such language will be available on our website.

² James E Hughes, J. (2004). *Family Wealth Keeping It in the Family*. New York: Bloomberg Press. p 119

Indeed, the refusal by the trustee to make a discretionary distribution can lead to much more than “friction.” It can be a source of extreme frustration and anger for the beneficiary.

Historically, however, the absolute discretion provision in a trust document has granted the trustee the right to withhold or distribute income (and principal) as deemed appropriate by the trustee. Such discretion has been an inviolate standard, upheld uniformly in Probate Court decisions, when litigated by beneficiaries. Now beneficiaries are turning to methods other than direct litigation to tap into trust funds. These methods include group efforts, indirect attacks, and personal pressure, as we describe in detail in:

- Section A, *Storming the Discretionary Gates*
- Section B, *Vulnerabilities of Ascertainable Standards and Defined Purposes, Prohibitions and Special Purpose Trustees.*

Prior to a detailed discussion of these methods, we summarize the primary themes of our article, including our recommended solutions.

2. Our Experience Advising and Counseling Families and Trustees

In our work with clients, we are often called in to advise regarding one or more family members who appear to have problems with drugs, alcohol, over-spending, eating disorders, gambling, internet or other seemingly addictive behavior. In the course of assessing the problem and making recommendations for treatment and post-treatment follow-up, we also find there are others in the family who are underperforming or non-productive (economically, socially and personally).

These two groups, the dysfunctional and underperforming, are almost always sustained by some form of family money – direct payments, subsidized living, trust distributions or employment in a family business. This article reflects our experience regarding how both groups access discretionary trusts to support their lifestyles and our ideas about how to respond so that problems underlying their dysfunctions and underperformances can be addressed effectively by trustees.³

a) The Dysfunctional Beneficiary

Few trustees understand the thinking and emotional drivers of the addictive or dysfunctional beneficiary. These beneficiaries can be very clever at hiding or explaining away negative behavior, often in a cloud of rationalizations or distractions. Because trustees are not experts on addiction, they often wait until the evidence of dependence is overwhelming before taking action. By then it can be too late for the beneficiary to recover. Our suggested provisions permit the trustee to initiate a process for evaluating questionable behavior exhibited by a beneficiary through the use of experts. In this way, trustees can take into account circumstantial evidence and assist the beneficiary before problems develop into permanent impairments, with the attendant harm to finances and relationships.

³ However many of the same principles we discuss here apply to other types of family support both direct, such as gifting or employment in a family business, or indirect, such as living off of family resources.

b) The Underperforming Beneficiary

Similarly, trustees are apt to accede to requests rather than keep encouraging the underemployed or non-employed beneficiary to get his or her act together and become a productive member of society. As Dennis Jaffe, Ph.D. and James A. Grubman, Ph.D., point out in their article, *Acquirers' and Inheritors' Dilemma: Discovering Life Purpose and Building Personal Identity in the Presence of Wealth*⁴, growing up and living with money can be a disincentive to many beneficiaries to engage in the hard work of learning productive skills. In cases where apparent difficulties do not rise to the level of addiction or severe dysfunction, appointing a professional to assess, advise and coach the beneficiary is a much better option than simply providing support for a do-nothing lifestyle.

c) Beneficiary Challenges to Discretionary Trusts

Beneficiaries facing the seemingly unassailable power of discretionary clauses are countering by seeking out their own sources of power or influence. One common approach is to put the trustee on the defensive by engaging in debates about the merits of discretionary decisions. A second approach is to include the trust as part of an asserted claim involving non-trust family matters. Another is to find allies or advocates among family members or advisors who use their influence to persuade trustees to approve distributions. As explained below in more detail, current trust provisions are inadequate to these challenges. We advocate adopting new provisions that preserve the trustee's historic exercise of discretion and return the decision making power to the trustee (as intended by the grantee).

3. Use Professional Assessments and Recommendations

We view our recommendations in the context of two recent trends in the trust and disability fields:

- First, as embodied in the writings of James (Jay) Hughes Jr., that wealth preservation in families results from shared expectations regarding behavior, is a dynamic process and is dependent on the human and intellectual capital of its members.⁵
- Second, that adverse decisions regarding suspected addictive or non-functional behavior be grounded in the recommendations of qualified experts.⁶

⁴ Dennis Jaffe, P., & James A. Grubman, P. (2007). *Acquirers' and Inheritors' Dilemma: Discovering Life Purpose and Building Personal Identity in the Presence of Wealth*. *Journal of Wealth Management*.

⁵ James E Hughes, Jr (2004). *Family Wealth Keeping It in the Family* New York: Bloomberg Pr.. P 14-23

⁶ *Kozisek v County of Seward*, 07-3692 (Eight Circuit Court 08 27, 2008). In this Eight Circuit case the Court upheld the firing of county worker who claimed a disability due to alcoholism but refused inpatient treatment, stating:

The fact remains that the county based its decision about Kozisek's "restriction" – complete inpatient treatment before returning to his important public job of assisting veterans – upon the recommendation of a professional substance abuse counselor.

It is the recommendation of the professional counselor that persuaded the Court to uphold the dismissal of the worker by the County. (*Kozisek v County of Seward*, 8th Cir., 8/27/08). Note that in the Chemical Dependency field many people offering help to families neither hold degrees from accredited institutions nor are licensed by State or local agencies. These "helpers" would not qualify as expert witnesses in Court and are vulnerable to attack by opposing counsel. Also, some therapists do not believe addiction is a disease and do not believe in abstinence from mood altering chemicals.

In our view, these two trends now support a more active role of the trustee in addressing dysfunctional and under performing beneficiaries. Simply saying “no” is not a solution in today’s world, as we have found in our practice. Rather, trustees must come up with creative solutions – not solely through their own efforts or devises– but by aligning with professionals with the skill sets to assess and make recommendations so as to identify and address the presenting problems underling the requests for funds.

The beneficiary may reject these assessment and recommendations, but then the trustee can rely on the advice of a professional expert to support the denial of distributions. One benefit is that in the “Court” of family opinion (or, if it comes to it, law), the burden of compliance is on the beneficiary to follow recommendations. A second benefit is that reliance on experts takes the focus off of money as the solution to the problem and puts the focus on the core issues leading to the request for funds. Furthermore, because the expert works for the family, the expert is also a source of on-going advice and support for the family and advisors.

4. Distinguish Between Dysfunctional and Underperforming Beneficiaries

Keep in mind throughout this article the distinction between beneficiaries who seem to have serious dysfunctions or active addictions of some kind versus those that are underperforming. We help families and their advisors with the former group by performing assessments, making recommendations for treatment, locating good treatment centers and managing the treatment and recovery process. We have written two articles on this topic, discussing how to improve recovery rates for the affluent, wealthy and prominent by following highly successful models of recovery for pilots and health care professionals and finding treatment resources that honor and respect the clinical needs of this group:

*Solutions for Dealing with Alcohol and Drug Addiction in Affluent Families: What Advisors, Account Mangers and Family Offices Need to Know*⁷

and,

*Practical Advice on Achieving High Recovery Rates for Affluent/Prominent Alcoholics and Addicts: What Every Family and Family Advisor Needs to Know*⁸,

We mention these articles because we find that trustees will say their previous efforts in encouraging beneficiaries to recover or become productive have failed and they don’t know what to do or have given up hope for change and improvement. Our proposal at the end of this paper is to set out a process to follow and to use professionals. This is based on our positive experiences in helping clients find solutions for their dysfunctional and/or addicted family members.

For the underperforming or non-productive beneficiary, we suggest the trustee take the lead in changing the expectations around the receipt of disbursements. For a specific reference, Jay Hughes discusses the role of the trustee, the role of the beneficiary and the trustee as “mentor” to the beneficiary in chapters ten, eleven and nineteen in his *Family Wealth* book. His summary of the roles and responsibilities of trustees and beneficiaries

⁷ See the Family Office Exchange website or our website for a copy of this article.

⁸ See our website, www.ARPrecoverly.com for a copy of this article.

Messinger & Dresser

is included in the Appendix to this article. Some families are now requiring minimum qualifications, job descriptions and training in order to serve on boards or be employed in the family business. Why not use a similar approach for beneficiaries? The “job description” (the conditions for receiving distributions) could be developed by looking at the intent of the grantor in the trust and any related writings.

In concluding this summary, our goal in writing this article is to urge trustees, their advisors and family offices to be more pro-active rather than reactive, in relating to beneficiaries – particularly those that are addictive, dysfunctional or non-performing.

A. Storming the Discretionary Gates

In this section, we describe four different scenarios where distributions occurred either contrary to long-standing policy or to the trustee's initial decision. We then discuss how such acquiescence led to future problems, rather than resolving the underlying causes of the initial claims for additional funds.

In theory, absolute discretion is available to trustees as a defense against requests for distributions by contingent beneficiaries. This remains the case if the matter is fully litigated. However, as a practical matter, such discretion is not effective against concerted pressure by next generation family members, particularly when represented by hostile and inventive attorneys. In most cases, families prefer to settle rather than risk the publicity and discovery (the thought of undergoing depositions is particularly horrifying) attendant to litigation. The expense of litigation is also a concern, as family entities bear the entire cost of litigation regardless of who wins at trial.

1. Contingent Beneficiaries Unite

In families where wealth was created some years ago, it is common for the second or third generations to be primary beneficiaries of a trust created by the founder, receiving income distributions from the trust. The offspring of this generation usually will not receive the income (or principal) until a parent dies and are considered to be contingent beneficiaries of the trust.

For a specific example, let's look at the situation where a parent is the primary beneficiary, is now seventy years old, with children in their forties and grandchildren in high school or beginning college. This parent may have provided for minority or other trusts assets for the children, but as these children become adults and have their own offspring, they perceive themselves as unable to maintain their expected standard of living. This may be because they are under-employed, not employed, or have psychological or other problems that prevent them from earning meaningful incomes. They also may have chosen to follow the lifestyle of their parents, though do not have the means to do so. There can be other pressures as well, such as divorce, poor investments or diminished asset value due to inflation.

Rather than focus on their own inability to generate income, the children can perceive their parent(s), who is living an accustomed life-style, as spending money extravagantly – money that these children could use to maintain their own standard of living. Perhaps the parent is donating a significant portion of his or her annual income to favorite charities and the children begin to wonder why they, who carry the founder's genes, are not more worthy recipients. Or if the parent is divorced from the children's biological parent and in a series of subsequent relationships or marriages, resentments build over expenditures related to these new friends or spouses.

On the other hand, the parent may expect his or her children to wait their "turn" to receive the benefits of the trust until the parent passes on, just as the parent waited for the previous generation to die. However, with longer life spans and the increasing demands of the upper class lifestyle, the children decide that despite occasional additional gifts for emergencies or tuition, they need more money and they need it now – not when they are

senior citizens. These young adult children may band together and put pressure on the parents, trustees or family advisors to distribute funds they are not currently entitled to in order to increase their annual income or for asset purchases.

In our experience three different types of arguments are pursued:

a) Unanticipated Economic Changes in Circumstances.

Although there are several variations, the argument in a nutshell is this: Estate and gifting plans established when the children were born failed to take into account the dramatic increase in the cost of living, particularly on the East and West coasts. Now the children are unable to meet their living costs, and the trustees must divert funds from the parent to the children in order to rectify the disparity between the economic status of the parents and children. The children will point to what they regard as excessive or unneeded expenditures by their parent to support their argument for additional income or asset distributions.

b) Parenting Failures.

Socrates said, “The unexamined life is not worth living,” and that is particularly true for the third and fourth generations of wealthy families. Joanie Bronfman, in her outline of her Dissertation, *The Experience of Inherited Wealth: As Social-Psychological Perspective*, writes in the conclusion:

The concept of psychological injury explains patterns of behavior of the wealthy that previously have been misunderstood.⁹

These injuries, inflicted on children growing up in wealthy families, are well documented in the outline and are examples of the basis for claims by children that defective parenting has prevented them from reaching full employment potential, particularly in our competitive economic environment.

c) Unstable Parental Relationships.

While this may fall under the heading of “parenting failures,” it deserves a category of its own because the multiple marriages and relationships by a parent creates its own dynamic resulting from disruptive transfers to and from households and the appearance/disappearance of adult figures (and their offspring) in the life of the children. This is particularly true if the children view their parent as continually placing his or her interests over those of children when pursuing these relationships.

As mentioned, the arguments discussed above will not be successful if ultimately litigated in court, however, it is the threat of litigation that brings the parents and trustees to the table. There may also be the not so subtle warning of cutting off or limiting access to the grandchildren (dropping the bomb) if the grandparents do not agree to or otherwise facilitate access to additional funds from the trust. The children may adopt a “good cop – bad cop” approach, with one saying to mom or dad,

“My brother is so angry he is thinking you shouldn’t be seeing his children for the holidays, but I would never do that because I know you are so reasonable.”

⁹ Bronfman, J. (1987). *The Experience of Inherited Wealth: As Social-Psychological Perspective*. UMI Dissertation Services, 353. p. 20

This kind of conversation only needs to take place once or twice to be effective, particularly for those grandparents who dote on their grandchildren.

2. Indirect Litigation or Collateral Claim

The second area where the trustee's discretion has been successfully overcome is when a family member asserts a claim against the trust as a defendant either directly or on a collateral or related matter in threatened or actual litigation. The family member making the claim may not even be a contingent or current trust beneficiary, and if so, may only have the right to limited distributions of income and the discretionary right to principal. However, under these circumstances, the trust is made a party to the litigation regardless of a colorable legal basis for doing so.

One scenario that illustrates this situation is where the claiming family member is in a family business, partnership, or owns family property in common with other family members. He or she may make claims regarding the business or other common economic interests and bring in the trust and the trustees as defendants. It may be apparent that the claims against the trust and trustees are made because the trust is the "deep pocket" and thus a source of payment for the settlement. However, few families are willing to conduct discovery so as to develop the facts sufficiently to support a motion for summary judgment for the trust. Instead, the impetus is to settle the case, rather than spend time, energy and money defending the trust separately from other defendants.

Again, as in the first example, if the matter were tried in court, there would be no legal liability. However, the dynamic here is different from the first section. Instead of the younger generation uniting against their parents, in this scenario there is usually a rogue, dysfunctional or dissenting family member (or small branch) that feels wronged or disaffected. The primary family group may want the claimant(s) to leave the family or to limit or contain the damage if the rogue element must remain part of the family economic structure.

While there is the same impetus to settle to avoid publicity about the family or the dysfunctional family member, the trust can be seen by the parties as a source of funds to buy out the individual or minority claimants. Distributions can be restructured to take into account (and attempt to limit) dysfunctional lifestyles. In this example, the trustees and senior family members may cooperate to facilitate funding the buy out or place conditions on distributions so as to limit or contain dysfunctional behavior.

The blow back on using trust funds to resolve such claims or litigation is that the other beneficiaries will often ask why they should not be entitled to the same economic or other benefits as the settling or disgruntled family member(s). The simple answer is that these other beneficiaries are different - not dysfunctional or disgruntled - and it is in their long-term economic interests to remain in the trust. In reality, settlements are made at a significantly discounted value because the lawyers representing the claimants know their chances of winning in court are slim. They must negotiate a settlement to be paid their fee and are therefore, eager to agree to cash outs that are much lower than current valuations. Is this a form of "blackmail?" You bet it is! And it takes a cool hand to keep the defendants focused on settlement rather than proving themselves right in court.

3. Pressure on Family Member Trustee

In this scenario, the pressure is personal in nature – the family member requesting additional income or principal is usually the close relative of one of the trustees – perhaps a son, daughter, or grandchild. In the first two examples, the beneficiaries or claimants rely on aggressive and inventive attorneys to push the boundaries of law. Usually there are two contradictory depictions by the plaintiffs and defendants of family history and current reality.

In this scenario, the reality is generally shared and lawyers are not involved. Rather, the beneficiary uses personal influence and persistence to persuade one trustee to agree to his or her request for distributions. The beneficiary may be hostile and demanding one day and self-destructive and begging for help the next. As the trustee in question is usually a parent or grandparent, this technique can be successful over time. The trustee is worn down or so worried about the child, he/she gives into the demands.

One might think appointing non-family members or institutions as co-trustees can solve the problem. This is not the case, as the relative who is trustee (mom, dad, grandma), will talk to co-trustees in an attempt to convince them to agree to the request. The non-family trustees will turn to distribution policies, set formulas and precedent as reasons for denying the request for extra funds. However, in our experience, relationships are often stronger than policies. The trustees and their attorneys who are recommending against the request may be viewed by the family trustee as “anti-family” and “unreasonable.” This may harm their reputation for getting along well with clients. Additionally, if the trustee making the request is in a powerful position or has other business with the non-family trustee, often times these two considerations will turn a principled “no” into a practical “yes.”

4. Good Beneficiary/Bad Beneficiary¹⁰

This situation is the reverse of the first three in that it is the *non-distribution* of funds that creates the problem. Let’s look at the “good child – bad child” in the context of trusts:

- Good Beneficiary (GB)
One or more of the beneficiaries are responsible adults. He/she may have a family and need additional money for lifestyle support, particularly as the children get older, housing prices increase and the cost of education at private school or college become more and more expensive. The good beneficiary may have done well in school, have an intact marriage, on a positive career path and be a concerned parent.
- Bad Beneficiary (BB)
This beneficiary may have struggled in school, had difficulty with relationships, over spending and stable employment. He or she may have an addiction issue, a gambling issue, or some other significant problem. This BB may also have a

¹⁰ The terms “Good Beneficiary” and “Bad Beneficiary” are used because that is the way family members often perceive and talk about these two groups. One of our goals as counselors is to suggest ways of reframing perceptions and past experiences to moderate “all or nothing” views of these beneficiaries. Beneficiaries struggling or engaging in negative behavior are often wounded or addicted and they can make major positive changes if trustees and family leaders follow the suggestions in this article.

history of financial difficulties and making poor investment choices, needing help from parents to avoid claims over debts owed to banks or investors.

In this situation, the trust may provide for discretionary distributions, but the trustee decides to make only limited distributions in order to curtail the BB's spending and decrease the opportunity for unwise investments. In the interests of fairness, each child is treated equally as to amounts paid out.

While it is literally "fair" in that each beneficiary (child) receives equal amounts, the net result is that the GB becomes frustrated and angry by the limited distributions. This child rightly perceives this parsimony as a direct result of his/her sibling's behavior and feels that he or she is being wrongly punished because of the trustees' fear regarding what the BB will do with large sums of money. These bad feelings can result in the GB becoming alienated from those family members who have influence over the trusts, particularly if one of the trustees is a parent or other close relative. This result is likely the very opposite of the one hoped for by the trustees, but they believe "their hands are tied" as distributions must be equitable and in this instance, limited because of proven concerns regarding the bad beneficiary.

As in the other three scenarios, the GB cannot expect to successfully litigate a case for additional distributions from the trust. However, the GB can make life very difficult for the trustees and involved relatives. As a competent family member, he or she may be the heir apparent to important family positions and otherwise influence family financial or organizational decisions. The GB may decide to withdraw from family activities and instead concentrate on his or her own career, thereby depriving the larger family of a needed skill set. In some families, many active family members are the BBs, as the GBs are not rewarded for their positive behaviors and have little reason to participate in gatherings with the BBs. The BBs have little to do and enjoy the status of participating in family committees and related activities. The end result is ineffective leadership and deterioration in common family enterprises and overall family well-being.

At some point, family leaders or trustees may realize that a lock-step, one size fits all approach to distributions geared at controlling the BB is rewarding negative activity and punishing positive behavior by the GB. These leaders and trustees may decide to make distributions and access to other family resources based on the individualized situations and needs of each beneficiary. To do so, the trustee – beneficiary relationship will become more personal along the lines advocated for by James Hughes Jr. in *Family Wealth*. Distributions to a beneficiary with behavioral or other problems can be conditioned on the beneficiary following specified protocols or conditions (more on this topic below). In this way, beneficiaries following a positive path will not be punished due to the improper conduct of the BB. Discretionary distributions will indeed be "discreet" in that they are well-judged and fit the needs of the individual beneficiary.

5. Failure to Set Conditions on Distribution.

In our experience, in each of first three instances, distributions were made without any effective quid pro quo or expectation as to use of funds. Once the decision was made to give in to the distribution request, the decision makers seemed to lack the energy or will to discuss restrictions on the use of funds. To us, if a beneficiary argued that he or she had insufficient resources or income to live on (or for other needs), the beneficiary might

expect that when the request was granted, it would be subject to specific conditions so as to prevent or reduce the need for such requests in the future. However, this was not the case. Once the decision makers acquiesced to additional distributions, money was forthcoming without meaningful restrictions.

As one might expect, simply making additional distributions does not solve the underlying problem of a beneficiary's chronic over spending and under working. Indeed, it is not uncommon for beneficiaries to return several years later and renew demands for additional distributions. They generally provide little evidence as to what they've done with the funds to become more independent, gainfully employed or how they modified their lifestyle. Many are offended when questioned and ask why the trustees don't hold the primary beneficiaries similarly accountable for their use of funds. The scenario that comes to mind are young birds in the nest simply opening up their mouths and requesting to be fed worms from their parents without ever being required to learn how to fly.

a) Place Restrictions on Extraordinary Distributions

We advocate placing restrictions and conditions on extraordinary distributions made under the circumstances described in this paper. This is one area where independent trustee can play an important role in standing firm and opposing "carte blanche" extraordinary distributions. In the fourth scenario, trustees may dole out small amounts of money in fixed payments, say monthly, with the hope that the BB would not too much damage with incremental funding. Again, this type of approach is not a long-term solution and rarely solves the concern regarding the BB. As mentioned, we do favor restricted or conditional distributions, such as paying bills incurred directly to vendors rather than relying on the beneficiary to do so, and other similar measures.

We also advocate that the trustees hire a professional to assist the beneficiaries in developing a plan to improve their financial situation. The trustees would hire this professional who would report to them. The beneficiaries would be required to cooperate with this person as condition of receiving future funding from the trust. In the event more serious underlying problems become evident, such as lack of employable skills or dysfunctional behavior, experts would then be hired by the trustees to advise them as to what to do.

b) Trust Disputes Reflect Underlying Intergenerational Disharmony

For those of you wondering why extraordinary or "pressured" distributions are sent to a current or contingent beneficiary with no conditions, in our view it is because the relationship between generations has become more negative than positive. Trusts and money reflect this intergenerational disharmony. In one situation where an adult child was clearly addicted to alcohol and drugs, the suggestion that the monthly payment be terminated was met with the response, "We can't do that." Although it was clear that the money was going to support the addiction and related lifestyle, family trustees were unwilling to take action for fear of a negative response by the beneficiary.

If a family has a history of not talking about core life concerns, then requests for extraordinary funds provide the opportunity to do so. The senior generation may prefer to grant the request rather than open up a discussion where their own conduct may be subject to scrutiny or criticism. However, the failure to engage in a meaningful dialogue at the time funds are requested only allows the problems underlying and prompting the

request to snowball. The end result is often much worse because money fuels dysfunctional behavior, just as gasoline fuels a fire; the longer it continues, the more likely it is for an unpredictable disaster to occur.

This is another instance where outside advisors and independent trustees must stand firm despite the personal pressure brought to bear on them to accede to such distributions. Rather than simply saying “no,” an alternative is to suggest the family seek the advice of a qualified therapist with experience in helping wealthy families discuss these issues and the goal of resolving conflicts.

Sometimes trustees meet with beneficiaries regarding distributions, but these meetings are “pro forma” with little meaningful inquiry made regarding the status of the beneficiary and no follow-up. We are believers in Jay Hughes’ recommendations regarding the trustee – beneficiary relationship, and suggest trustees refer beneficiaries to the sections in his book on the topic as a way to let them know the relationship is going to change in the near future.

B. Ascertainable Standards and Defined Purposes, Prohibitions and Special Purpose Trustees

These trust provisions reflect the grantor's desire to direct the trustee in the exercise of discretion and limit the beneficiary's access to distributions under defined conditions.

1. Ascertainable Standards and Defined Purposes

Many grantors specify that distributions are to be made for defined purposes, such as for "health, education, support and maintenance," subject to the trustee's discretion. While words such as "proper health, education and welfare," "unusual or emergency response" or "purchase a home" seem to be clear on their face, problems arise regarding their implementation in practice.

First, as we discussed under general discretion clauses, such discretion is subject to the same limitations and pressures regardless of whether it is a general discretion or precedes ascertainable standards or defined purposes language.

Second, prescriptive language opens the door for an additional argument by the beneficiary as to whether he/she is in compliance with the language and therefore entitled to the requested distribution. Trustees and beneficiaries often disagree as to what constitutes adequate funding for "proper health, education and welfare," an "unusual or emergency response" or to "purchase a home." These beneficiaries use such language to leverage arguments as to their entitlement to more money, sometimes buttressed by supporting documents from therapists, financial planners and lawyers.

Also, by carefully playing parents or other influential family members, beneficiaries often find allies to support their requests to trustees. As in our discussion about the exercise of a general discretionary power, trustees like to be seen as "cooperative" and "reasonable." They can be persuaded to make distributions or other financial arrangements against their judgment if asked to by senior family members, particularly when the issue concerns the meaning of an ascertainable standard, such as a house.

The undereducated, non working or dysfunctional beneficiary exhibits an amazingly sophisticated level of ingenuity and persistence in formulating requests for distributions based on specific trust language. Again, we reiterate our advice that the trustees hire a professional to assist the beneficiaries in developing a plan to improve their financial situation or identify and address dysfunctional behavior.

2. Prohibited Behavior

In many families with a history of addiction or other dysfunctional behavior, trusts and similar family control documents often contain provisions prohibiting distributions of assets and principles to beneficiaries engaging in specific behavior identified in the document.

a) Four Examples

The first example describes a long list of behaviors allowing the trustee to exercise discretion in withholding income and principle:

.... physical, emotional or mental disability (or for any other reason, including, without limitation, involvement in major litigation, matrimonial difficulties, bankruptcy, or destructive financial improvidence).

The second example addresses only alcohol and drug dependency. (Dependency is the term used in the DSM IV and means addiction.):

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the manager, in his/her sole discretion, shall withhold distributions of assets, income or other withdrawals from any member who has an active drug and or alcohol dependency. Such assets, income or withdrawals shall be retained and held by the manager until such time as the manager determines, in his or her sole discretion, that the member is in recovery from such drug and or alcohol dependency.

The third example is of a more general clause addressing financial mismanagement, moral conduct and criminal behavior.

If at any time a Beneficiary eligible to receive net income or principal distributions, in the sole judgment of the Trustees, is deemed to be incapable of properly managing his or her financial affairs, or should the Trustees become reasonably concerned regarding the moral conduct or affairs of any Beneficiary hereunder to such a degree as to be concerned for such Beneficiary's health or welfare, or should any Beneficiary be convicted of a crime, or be the subject of a criminal investigation.

The final clause focuses on physical and mental condition and best interests:

It is my wish that my Independent Trustees consider (my child's) mental and physical condition and (my child's) best interests before making such distribution.

As the examples demonstrate, families chose a wide variety of approaches to address concerns about beneficiaries receiving distributions when engaging in behavior that may be harmful or wasteful to self, family and community. Similar language is often inserted in limited liability corporations, family partnerships or other legal documents regarding shared family assets or other estate planning.

b) Discussion Among Family Members/Beneficiaries

When working with families who are creating documents with prohibitions, we often suggest that the family members themselves define the behaviors that would limit or prohibit distributions. Such discussions result in a good understanding of what the family's expectations are regarding appropriate conduct and behaviors among the family members.

In the situation where trust documents omit such language, an opportune time to engage in this conversation is when a family member is about to turn eighteen or twenty-one and receive a distribution. Many times these recipients will be considering reinvesting funds in a grantor trust (revocable or not) or a family LLC. Most young adults who do not have a problem with alcohol or drugs see the wisdom in restricting future distributions if they are abusing or dependent on alcohol or drugs. Their experience in seeing friends and acquaintances waste money usually creates sufficient awareness so they are willing to put such clauses into their trust documents.

c) Vulnerabilities of Prohibitions

Despite the language in each of the four examples defining behavior that results in the withholding of the income or principle, we find that beneficiaries are still able to access funds. Those of you who are unfortunate enough to have a personal relationship with an alcoholic or addict or under performer know that cutting off their funds often leads to nasty and debilitating arguments. When there is a trust provision interpretation that gets in the way of funding, we find that several common themes emerge:

Fact Dispute

The beneficiary argues that he or she is actually not engaging in the prohibitive behavior. For example, if there is a concern that beneficiary has a physical, emotional or mental disability or an alcohol or drug addiction, the beneficiary will argue that he or she is not disabled or not actually addicted to alcohol or drugs. Beneficiaries, like any dysfunctional person, have an unlimited number of defenses or excuses to explain away questionable behavior.

“Look At Me Now”

A common tactic is for a beneficiary to meet with the trustees or family or attend meetings and look perfectly fine. Such appearances are then used to prove that the beneficiary has no problems whatsoever.

Hiding Out

Family members engaging in the prohibitive behaviors will simply refuse to show up at meetings or otherwise participate meaningfully in family activities. Their communication with trustees may be through financial advisors or account managers. These managers and advisors are protective of their clients and are usually extremely reluctant to inform trustees or important family members as to any concerns about the beneficiaries for fear of losing their job.

Hire Experts and Lawyers

The dysfunctional family member will hire experts to testify or write letters on his or her behalf asserting that the family member is not addicted or dysfunctional, or if so, is in full recovery. Treatment centers, psychiatrists and a whole range of other “addiction experts” who believe addiction is not a disease, moderate use is permissible or benzodiazepines are non-addictive are available (for a price). Lawyers can also be employed to deny or discount facts or argue that their client is entitled to be funded.

Control of Information

Privacy laws permit the beneficiary to limit or prohibit communication to trustees and their advisors. We have seen many instances in which the dysfunctional family member is able to control information sent to advisors, lawyers and senior family members. In doing so, significant negative facts and recommendations are often withheld so as to make the beneficiary appear to be successfully completing treatment and ready to return home.

“I’m Cured”

Another approach is for the dysfunctional family member to assert that he or she is now cured and is no longer a problem. In this scenario a family member may go to treatment or engage in other activities to address the behavior of concern. The time

frame may be one to three months or even longer. When this time is over, the beneficiary will assert that he or she is cured and should be restored to full access to trust distributions and other family resources. “I’ve done my time, give me my dime.”

“I Have Suffered Enough”

Another version of this “I’m cured” argument is for the beneficiary to make the case that he or she has suffered enough, has been working really hard, deserves a lot of credit, is being discounted, and is not being appreciated for all his or her treatment time and the difficulty of abstaining. In other words, badgering key decision makers within the family, including trustees and their advisors, into agreeing with the beneficiary that the beneficiary deserves the money as a reward for effort expended and the emotional pain endured.

“They’re Too Hard On Me – Those Meany’s”

This argument centers on the complaint that the professionals involved are being too hard on the beneficiary; they are asking too much and being unreasonable. “I’ve done everything they have asked, and they still won’t let me go!” This effort to split the family and the professionals may be transparent to the outsider. However, within the family the emotional ties between the key family member and the addict are often stronger than the relationship between the professional and this family member.

Parents are very susceptible to this argument, particularly when their loved one is signing limited releases to withhold key information to the parent and professionals about the need for further treatment or the severity of addiction.

Beneficiaries mix and match these tactics as dictated by the situation they are in and the stances of the trustees, family members and experts regarding the beneficiaries’ behavior and requested corrective actions.

d) Lack of Evaluation Process

The problem with all prohibited language is that it does not occur in the context of an evaluative process that provides meaning to the language. In addition, stand-alone wording is no longer sufficient as an effective tool because the clever beneficiary and his/her advocates too easily manipulate such wording. It used to be that a trustee, exercising discretion, was the sole interpreter of language in the trust document as to meaning and compliance. As mentioned throughout this article, practical experience demonstrates that is no longer the case. A new approach is now needed in order to achieve the goals of prohibitive trust provisions.

3. Special Purpose Trustees

Another way families deal with disabilities, particularly addiction, is to name a special purpose trustee who has the power to negate or approve trust distributions. This trustee may be an expert who knows the beneficiary and is an expert in the particular condition that the family is concerned about. The following is an example of a special purpose trustee clause:

Power to Pay Income and Principal

...my Trustees may make payments of such income and principal to (my child), as my Independent Trustees determine with the consent of the Special Purpose Trust, if a Special Purpose Trustee is acting.

Special Purpose Trustee

Whenever my Trustees would be making a distribution (whether of income or principal) to child, my Trustees shall notify the Special Purpose Trustee. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Agreement to the contrary, the Special Purpose Trustee will have thirty (30) days in which to veto the proposed distribution. In making the determination as to whether to veto the proposed distribution, it is my wish that the Special Purpose Trustee consider (my child's) mental and physical condition and (my child's) best interests at that time. The determination of the Special Purpose Trustee shall be final and not subject to review by any other Trustee or beneficiary.

Designation of Trustee

I designate XXX, therapist and long time family advisor as Special Purpose Trustee.

We have encountered at least four major problems with special purpose trustee trust provisions when a specific individual is name as the trustee.

First, this language is susceptible to the same vulnerabilities as discussed in previous sections, namely that the beneficiary can contest the meaning of “mental or physical condition”, compliance and employ end run tactics around the special purpose trustee.

Second, an even greater problem is that if the special trustee is a mental health or chemical dependency specialist or professional, his/her view of addiction, professional standing, ethics and attitudes towards the wealthy may be detrimental to the beneficiary or may change over time. For example, the appointed person may come to believe alcoholism is not a disease or that an addict can be prescribed addictive anti-anxiety medications.

Third, many therapists and chemical dependency practitioners are not healthy people themselves. Many also harbor resentments towards those with money. Designating a specific person to be “Special Purpose Trustee” is too risky and has led to many bad outcomes, including sexual and economic exploitation. It is far better to provide for the appointment of a professional expert (or experts) by the trustees who can be replaced or whose status can be reviewed from time to time.

Fourth, generally speaking, we believe that trustees, special purpose or otherwise, should be subject to provisions for removal. In our experience, abuse of power and self-seeking by trustees is a far too common problem. We have seen instances where trustees, rather than supporting recovery efforts by family members and advisors, have helped beneficiaries avoid treatment and continue in their addictions. This article is not the place to discuss such replacement provisions, such as Trust Protectors, but we encourage grantors to set forth mechanisms to replace trustees in their trust documents.

C. Potential Trustee Liability for Distributions to Dysfunctional Beneficiaries

An increasingly thorny predicament for trustees and their counsel concerns primary beneficiaries engaging in significant dysfunctional behavior such as repeated treatments for alcoholism and drug addiction and other addiction related behavior. This issue arises in two contexts:

The first context is where the trustees become concerned about a beneficiaries behavior. In this instance, the trustees often believe they are mandated to distribute funds or it is not their role to pass judgment on the life style of the beneficiary. While this view is common among trustees, it reflects an outmoded approach to trust administration. Contemporary commentators (Hughes, Jaffe & Grubman), advocate for a more interactive and evaluative role by the trustee regarding beneficiary behavior. However, in our experience, lawyers commonly question the basis for withholding distributions and are generally unwilling to support activist trustees. Is there a counter argument to be made by trustees who do want to act?

The second context is where family members alarmed about the behavior of a beneficiary contact the trustee and request that distributions be withheld. Assuming these family members have standing as contingent beneficiaries or remaindermen, could the trustee be forced through litigation to withhold distributions to a dysfunctional beneficiary? As mentioned below, the beneficiary of concern may have minor children who are negatively affected by the behaviors of their dysfunctional parent(s), increasing the stress and stakes for both family and trustees.

Several theories have been propounded to support such a claim:

1. For Waste or Dissipation of Trust Assets Contrary to the Intention of the Grantor

If the grantor's intention in establishing the trust can be determined from the language of the trust, such as "for the benefit of" or "health, education, support and welfare," one could argue that distributions to an active alcoholic or addict are inconsistent and contrary to the grantor's intent. The claim would then be for waste of trust assets or income:

Although there are authorities holding that a beneficiary cannot maintain a suit against a trustee where his interest is dependent upon a remote contingency – one which is unlikely ever to occur – we believe it to be the better rule that such a beneficiary may upon reasonable cause apply to the court to have his interest properly secured. This rule has substantial support in the authorities. Although a contingent remainderman can have no action for damages for waste, he may, under the rule as borne out by the great weight of authority, have equitable relief to prevent waste or dissipation of the trust estate or to prevent a disposition of the property contrary to the intention of the trustor.¹¹

¹¹ See *In Re Trust Under Will of Albert Schultz*, 9 N.W.2d 313 (Minn. 1943, citations omitted).

Under this argument, it is literally a “waste” to distribute money to a chronic alcoholic or addict who is living a life of “dissipation” eventually leading to death.

2. Contradiction Between Standards for Support and Addictive Behavior

A related argument is that the standards “for the benefit of” or “health, education, support and welfare” refer to positive behaviors, not negative behaviors, such as alcoholism. In this context, “health” and “welfare” are terms that by definition could not incorporate “alcoholic, addict, eating disorder, gambling, et al.” In short, it is a contradiction in terms to say that a distribution is for the benefit or health of a beneficiary when that beneficiary has a chronic drinking problem. Therefore distributions can be halted because the trust language does not authorize them.

3. Harm to Contingent Beneficiaries

In instances where the alcoholic/addict primary beneficiary has minor children who are also remaindermen or contingent beneficiaries, can a claim be asserted that the trustees must take action to prevent harm to these children? A relative could say, “Our grandfather, the grantor, never intended that his money be used in ways that would hurt his minor off-spring. Therefore, cut off the funds to the addicted parent.” This position has compelling merit, particularly given all the stories from third and fourth family members about the damage done by alcoholic and addicted parents.

Fact Development

As advocates for a pro-active stance by trustees regarding addicted beneficiaries who are also parents of minor children, we urge trustees to consider the harm done by allowing the status quo to be the norm in trust administration. Being active in the recovery community, we know of situations where friends and family members have urged trustees to take action to cut off support to beneficiaries who are in the final phases of their disease. The trustees refused to do so and the beneficiaries subsequently died. They sometimes left children, who wounded by inadequate parenting and now the recipients of the parent’s funds, began their own addictive downward path.

Needless to say, these relatives who asked the trustees to take action, now deeply regret failing to be more assertive in their requests. Again, in our view, this is a situation where both family members and the trustees would benefit from the help of an addiction professional to assess the situation, educate the trustees (if need be) and advance the discussion to a more successful resolution. Trustees and lawyers can be persuaded by factual information and expert opinion, as marshaled by a professional, working together with concerned family members.

D. Provisions For Alcoholism, Drug Addiction, Other Addictions, and Mental Health Concerns in a Beneficiary

1. Reasons Why We Favor Detailed Provisions

Current practice commonly addresses addiction and/or mental health concerns with a general clause permitting the trustee to withhold distributions in the event the beneficiary suffers from addiction. We find this type of language too broad and easily manipulated or avoided by beneficiaries. We prefer that trust agreements address dysfunctions by granting trustees detailed authority to identify and manage the chronic diseases of addiction and mental illness over the long term.

A summary of our reasoning follows:

- The trustee is unlikely to know much about addiction or mental health and thus requires the direction and the assistance of professionals.
- Qualified, licensed professionals plan and manage the recovery process on behalf of the trustee (and family) over the time needed to achieve stable recovery – at least six months and many times longer.
- Detailed provisions help the beneficiary understand what he/she needs to do to resume receiving funds from the trust and the standards regarding non-use of alcohol and drugs.
- The language regarding recovery or recovery related activities is directed at avoiding the dry drunk syndrome – where the alcoholic or addict has stopped using but still exhibits all the emotions and behaviors as if actively using – as well as to prevent relapse.

A similar approach can also be used for family businesses and other family related economic, philanthropic, recreational enterprises, ventures etc.

a) Recovery Takes Much More than Twenty-Eight Days

Many people view addiction as episodic and resolvable in 28-day in-patient treatment programs. That is not the case. A recent article in one of our professional addiction journals discussed the developmental approach to recovery and the six stages to achieving stable remission¹²:

- Transition *Recognition of Addiction*
- Stabilization *Recuperation*
- Early Recovery *Changing Addictive Thoughts, Feelings and Behaviors*
- Middle Recovery *Lifestyle Balance*
- Late Recovery *Family of Origin Issues*
- Maintenance *Growth and Development*

Lawyers and others advising families or serving as trustees do not have the time or skills to oversee these stages. Nor do family members, no matter how dedicated or devoted to their addicted loved one. In working with clients and reviewing circumstances leading to relapse, failure to recognize these limitations is often a major contributor to post-treatment failures.

¹² Recovery From Addiction, A Developmental Model, Part One, *It's All in the Journey*, Sept. 2008, p 8.

b) Stabilization

Treatment can be a mystery to outsiders, but there are recognized tasks to be accomplished in a 28 day program and the weeks following. The referenced article discusses Stage Two – Stabilization – as including five tasks¹³:

- Recovery From Withdrawal
- Interrupting Active Preoccupation
- Short-Term Social Stabilization
- Learning Non-chemical Stress Management
- Developing Hope and Motivation

It is no wonder that in-patient treatment is insufficient to assure abstinence from use because the stabilization process – Stage Two – takes much longer than 28 days. For some drugs, it takes two to three weeks just complete active withdrawal. Learning new ways of socializing and healthy responses to stress takes months for most people.

We discuss this information in the hope that the reader better understands the value of collaborating with addiction professionals in managing beneficiaries with what is a chronic disease. The services provided by this professional are time intensive and require much more availability than an office visit each week. (For a more extensive discussion of this program, look for the article: *Achieving High Recovery Rates for the Affluent and Prominent* on our website at www.ARPRecovery.com.) Also see the Appendix to this article for an example of the specific services that constitute “case management” on behalf of the family and “support services” for patients after completing in-patient treatment.

2. Summary of Provisions:

a) Sole Discretion of Trustee to Withhold Income or Assets, Notwithstanding any other Provision of The Trust Agreement

Applicable under circumstances where the Beneficiary is or may be actively dependent on and/or abusing drugs or alcohol or may have other addictions, compulsive behaviors or mental health concerns (as defined below).

- Withheld until the beneficiary is in recovery (as defined in 2 below).

b) Recovery - Two-Year Minimum

Minimum of two years of continuous sobriety (including abstinence from addictive prescription medicine, drugs, alcohol or other addictive or compulsive behaviors). Recovery includes, but is not limited to, on-going participation in activities addressing issues relating to addiction, alcoholism or other compulsive behavior, and any co-existing mental health problems (a “recovery program”).

- Two-year minimum may be extended if relapse occurs
- Trustee can spend money for recovery services and programs
- Trustee is authorized to hire experts

c) Date when Recovery Begins

Begins after the beneficiary leaves treatment, halfway house, sober house or other in-patient environment.

¹³ Ibid, p 12

d) Authorization to Receive Reports/Beneficiary's Consent to Release Information

Allows trustee to receive reports and requires beneficiary to sign information releases so trustee (or professional hired on trustee's behalf) has access to treatment records and can speak directly with counseling staff.

e) Authorization to Hire and Rely on Professional Expertise for Implementation

Describes the type of experts, the general area of expertise and indemnifies experts.

f) Authorization Regarding Intervention, Evaluation, Treatment and Recovery

Trustee (or trustee's designee) had the full scope of authority to take action to initiate and promote recovery.

g) Alcohol and Drug Testing – Observed Tests

Observed drug tests by a reliable testing service to verify being drug free. (Preferred choice is the testing services of pilots or health care professionals.

h) Distribution to Spouse, Children or Other Family Members

Authorization to make distributions for support to the Beneficiary's spouse, children or other family members dependent on the beneficiary.

i) Definition of Alcohol/Drug Dependence or Abuse

DSM-IV-TR (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition) defining alcohol and drug dependence and abuse (and other mental health or behavioral concerns).

CONCLUSION

Through our professional, recovery and personal lives we know many beneficiaries who struggle(d) to abstain and find meaningful lives without alcohol and drugs. You, as trustee, have the power to collaborate with professionals and insist your beneficiaries start down the path to recovery. You can make a difference. We have seen it happen

APPENDIX

A. Suggested Language Restricting Access To Assets And Income When A Beneficiary Or Family Member May Have Problems With Alcohol, Drugs, Other Addictions Or Mental Health Concerns.

Trustee's Authority Regarding Alcoholism, Drug Addiction, Other Addictions, and/or Mental Health Concerns in a Beneficiary

1. Sole Discretion of Trustee to Withhold Income or Assets, Notwithstanding any other Provision of The Trust Agreement

Notwithstanding the foregoing as to distributions of income and assets, the (Trustee, Manager, Owner etc.) in his/her sole discretion, shall withhold distributions of assets, income or other withdrawals from any Beneficiary who is or may be actively dependent on and/or abusing drugs or alcohol or may have other addictions, compulsive behaviors or mental health concerns (as defined below).

Such assets, income or specified withdrawals shall be retained and held by the Trustee until such time as the Trustee determines, in his or her sole discretion, that the Beneficiary is in recovery (as defined below) from such drug and or alcohol addiction other addictions, compulsive behaviors or mental health concerns, or any combination of above mentioned disorders. Any amounts so withheld and accumulated may be retained in the Trust rather than distributed, at the Trustee's sole discretion.

2. Recovery - Two-Year Minimum

"Recovery," as used herein, is defined as no less than a minimum of two years of continuous sobriety (including abstention from addictive prescription medicine, drugs, alcohol or other addictive or compulsive behaviors). Recovery includes, but is not limited to, on-going participation in activities addressing issues relating to addiction, alcoholism or other compulsive behavior, and any co-existing mental health problems (a "recovery program"). The two-year minimum shall be extended if the Beneficiary has a history of relapse or is not engaged in a recovery program, with such time extension(s) determined at the sole discretion of the Trustee.

In the event the Beneficiary has not completed the two-year minimum of recovery or extensions thereof, the Trustee has the discretion to disburse income and/or assets to the Beneficiary in amounts that support the Beneficiary's recovery program. Conversely, the Trustee shall not disburse funds for activities that might lead to relapse. The Trustee is authorized to rely on the advice of experts, as specified in paragraph 5, below, in implementing this Section and exercising discretion.

3. Date when Recovery Begins

The commencement of any time period of recovery begins after the Beneficiary has successfully completed chemical dependency in-patient primary treatment (or other addiction or mental health related treatment) and/or any long-term, halfway or sober house. (Such time does not commence upon entering treatment.)

4. Authorization to Receive Reports/Beneficiary's Consent to Release Information

In making determinations as to whether the Beneficiary has successfully completed an approved and applicable treatment program and is engaged in an active recovery program, the Trustee is authorized to receive reports from counselors and staff from treatment programs of any kind, sponsors and other related health care professionals.

In addition, the Beneficiary must fully comply with all recommendations of any treatment centers and related health care professionals. The Beneficiary must sign consents for full release of information to the Trustee (and/or his/her designee) in order to be in compliance with this paragraph (4). Failure to sign all requested authorizations means the Beneficiary is not in "recovery" as that term is used in paragraph 2.

5. Authorization to Hire and Rely on Professional Expertise to Implement this Section

The Trustee is authorized to utilize and rely on the professional judgment of a reputable treatment center, utilizing an abstinence based chemical dependency treatment model and recognized by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations for evaluations and recommendations regarding the Beneficiary's alcohol/drug dependence and abuse. The Trustee is similarly authorized regarding any other suspected or actual addictions, compulsive or destructive behaviors, and/or mental health concerns.

The Trustee is further authorized to employ and retain experts on alcohol and drug addiction, other addictions or mental health issues to advise him/her regarding any matters, issues or determinations in this Section. The Trustee may designate such experts to receive information or perform tasks on his/her behalf in order to implement this section. Further, the Trustee may employ experts to recommend a comprehensive treatment and post-treatment recovery program and to oversee and implement such program. The Trustee is also authorized to use the recovery programs for addicted pilots and physicians as part of an oversight program for the Beneficiary (or similar programs in the event the pilot or physician program is unavailable.)

The Trustee has sole discretion regarding the employ and use of any such experts, treatment centers or other resources, as needed (however, all such experts shall be licensed or credentialed as per applicable state guidelines). Experts providing advice to the trustee shall be indemnified by the Trust for any adverse claims arising from such advice.

6. Authorization Regarding Intervention, Treatment and Recovery Activities

The Trustee has full authority and discretion to expend funds for advice regarding implementation of this Section, to develop and implement plans for intervention in the event the Beneficiary may be dependent on or abusing alcohol or drugs or may be actively using alcohol or drugs after treatment (relapse). Such authority includes expending funds for evaluations, treatment and all related costs, for post-treatment recovery programs, and any and all related matters deemed appropriate by the Trustee in his/her sole discretion. This paragraph (6) is fully applicable to other addictions, compulsive behaviors or mental health concerns regarding the beneficiary.

7. Alcohol and Drug Testing – Pilot's/Physician's Program

The Trustee shall utilize the services of a reliable and licensed drug testing company to randomly drug test the Beneficiary during the first year of recovery (as defined in paragraph 3, above), and/or if the Beneficiary may be disputing whether he/she is using alcohol or drugs. The Trustee is authorized to require continued drug testing for so long as the Trustee deems such testing to be advisable, regardless of any other provision in this Section. Such tests must be conducted under the observation of personnel from the drug testing service or their designee.

8. Distribution to Spouse, Children or Other Family Members

In the event the termination or restriction of distributions may result in harm or significant diminution of lifestyle to the Beneficiary's spouse, children or other family members, the Trustee is authorized to make arrangements for the support of such individuals through distributions by alternative means, as the Trustee determines in his/her sole discretion. In no event shall any such distributions be made to anyone who may be dependent on or abusing alcohol or drugs, as defined herein.

9. Definition of Alcohol/Drug Dependence or Abuse

The phrase, **actively dependent on and/or abusing drugs or alcohol**, has the meaning set forth in DSM-IV-TR (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition) defining alcohol and drug dependence and abuse. Other addictions, compulsive behaviors or mental health concerns shall be identified as defined in the DSM-IV-TR and as updated by current medical information and/ or research on addictive behaviors.

B. Family Wealth – Keeping It in the Family (James E, Hughes, Jr.)¹⁴

1. Roles and Responsibilities of Beneficiaries (page 108)

Each beneficiary has an obligation to educate himself or herself about the duties of a beneficiary, as well as the duties of the family trustees. Here are specific responsibilities of beneficiaries:

- To gain a clear comprehension of each trust in which the beneficiary has an interest and a specific understanding of the mission statement for each trust as prepared by the trustee
- To educate himself or herself about all trustee responsibilities
- To understand the trustee's responsibility to maintain the purchasing power of the trust's capital while maintaining a reasonable distribution rate for the income beneficiaries
- To have a general understanding of modern portfolio theory and the formation and process of asset allocation
- To recognize and look for proof that each trustee represents all beneficiaries
- To meet with each trustee once each year to discuss his or her personal financial circumstances and personal goals and to advise the trustee of his or her assessment of the trustee's performance of the trustee roles and responsibilities to the trust, to the beneficiary, and to the family governance
- To become knowledgeable about the functions and importance of each element of the family's trust governance structure
- To attend the annual family business meeting and to accept responsible roles within the family governance structure, based on his or her qualifications for such roles
- To develop a general capacity to understand fiduciary accounting
- To demonstrate a willingness to participate in educational sessions and to become financially literate (through family seminars and family-funded educational programs)
- To know how and in what amount trustees and other professionals are compensated and to obtain a general understanding of the budgets for the trust and investment entities in which the trust will be invested

2. Roles and Responsibilities of Trustees (page 134)

Each trustee has an obligation to educate himself or herself on the duties of a trustee, as well as on the duties of the trust beneficiaries. The trustee's specific duties are as follows:

- To be fully aware of the grantor's original purposes in creating the trust and the current purposes of the trust, if these have changed over time
- To guide his or her decisions by these purposes
- To act so that the actual operation of the trust is empowering to the beneficiaries, within the provisions of the trust
- To put mechanisms in place to increase the level of financial awareness of the beneficiaries, and to see that such financial education of the beneficiaries is carried out effectively
- To meet at least annually with each beneficiary in order to renew the beneficiary's understanding of the trust, as well as to obtain from each beneficiary full information, financial and otherwise, about his or her personal situation
- To educate himself or herself about all beneficiary responsibilities
- To evaluate and advise each beneficiary on how well he or she is meeting the roles and responsibilities of a beneficiary
- To implement effectively the trust's general policies and procedures as they relate to the following:
 - 1) The trust's investment goals and acceptable risks
 - 2) The selection and/or provision of investment advice and management to accomplish such investment goals within the given risks
 - 3) The trust's tax position and the selection of tax services
 - 4) The trust's legal position and the selection of legal services

¹⁴ James E, Hughes, Jr. Family Wealth – Keeping It in the Family www.bloombergbooks.com

C. Case Management and Personal Recovery Support Services

1. Case management services

Case Management services are provided on behalf of the family by an addiction professional who oversees the post-treatment recovery program of the addicted family member. The professional works for the family and not the addict (avoiding conflict of interest and confidentiality problems). However, the professional does meet with the addict, checking on progress and helping communication with the family on various topics that may be hurdles and challenges of early recovery.

These Services Include:

- Coordination of ongoing care
- Communication with providers
- Weekly progress meetings
- Aid in returning to work and family
- Ongoing program monitoring
- Referral as needed
- Monitoring/Observed Drug Testing
- Advice to client
- Family meetings

These services are modeled after successful programs, which emphasize the importance of following post-treatment recommendations and addressing secondary problems. The goal is to help families heal, communicate more effectively and make the most of their new recovery journey.

2. Personal counseling and recovery support

This service is for the individual in early recovery. It is also called “mentoring” or “coaching,” but it is much more than those activities because it involves the skills set of licensed alcohol and drug counselors and similarly trained licensed professionals.

Learning new skills to handle emotions and relationships takes time and encouragement.

The counselor may interact with the family, but does so on behalf of the addict in early recovery, as the addict is the client. These services include:

- Post-Treatment Counseling and Support Services
- Individual Counseling and Mentoring: *Promoting positive change and healthier relationships within appropriate boundaries.*
- Family Meetings: *Improving interpersonal relationships, communication, and family dynamics, particularly affected by the addicts drug or alcohol use.*
- Life Management Skills: *Smoothing transitions to home, work or school.*
- Relapse Prevention: *Sound relapse prevention plans and skills.*
- Clinical Transportation: *Supervised by trained addictions counselors.*

These services are coordinated with post-treatment and continuing care recommendations.