GENERAL LEGISLATION

The 1993–94 legislative session began on December 7, 1992. The two-year session will continue until August 31, 1994. The first year of the session will continue until midnight, September 10, 1993, with the legislature scheduled to take a one-month recess between July 16 and August 16. The last day for bills to be introduced in 1993 was March 5. Constitutional amendments, urgency measures (requiring a two-thirds vote), tax bills, and resolutions may be introduced beyond the March 5 deadline.

Following are some of the general public interest, regulatory, and governmental structure proposals introduced in the first months of the current session.

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

AB 15 (Klehs), as amended April 13, would abolish the Franchise Tax Board and provide for the transfer of its powers and duties to the State Board of Equalization, operative January 1, 1995. *[A. Rev&Tax]*

SB 87 (Kopp), as amended April 28, would abolish the Franchise Tax Board and, except as provided by the California Constitution, the administrative authority of the State Board of Equalization; it would provide for the transfer of their respective powers and duties to the Department of Revenue, which this bill would create. *[S. Appr]*

SCA 5 (Kopp), as amended April 28, would abolish the State Board of Equalization and would make necessary conforming changes in various other constitutional provisions. *[S. CA]*

AB 2051 (Frazee). Existing law imposes various requirements on the State Board of Control with respect to the purchase of state-owned motor vehicles, certain reports affecting bids on state contracts, and hearings before the State Board of Equalization. As introduced March 5, this bill would repeal these duties, as specified, and would declare the intent of the Legislature with respect to the State Board of Control's reduced budgetary resources and duties.

Existing law entitles every taxpayer to be reimbursed for any reasonable fees and expenses related to a hearing before the State Board of Equalization if certain conditions are met. This bill would require that the Board's proposed award for fees and expenses be available as a public record for at least 10 days prior to the effective date of the award. *[A. Floor]*

AB 1487 (Gotch), as introduced March 4, would provide that if an officer or employee position that is funded by the general fund within a state agency remains continuously vacant for a period of one fiscal year, that state agency's budget for the next fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount of funds previously allocated to support that position. *[A. Floor]*

SB 82 (Thompson), as amended March 22, would limit the amount of annual salary paid to certain chairs and members of various state boards and commissions to an amount no greater than the annual salary of members of the legislature, except where at least 90% of the annual salary paid to these persons is paid, reimbursed, or otherwise funded by the federal government. This bill would also provide that if the position of certain chairs and members of various state boards and commissions have been continuously vacant for more than one year prior to June 30 of each year, funds appropriated for the salary of the position shall revert to the fund from which these funds were appropriated, and no further appropriations or expenditures may be made for this salary until the position is filled. *[A. CPGE&ED]*

AB 173 (V. Brown), as amended April 28, would limit the amount of salary paid to a chair or member of specified state boards or commissions to an amount no greater than the annual salary of members of the legislature, excluding the Speaker of the Assembly, President pro Tempore of the Senate, Assembly majority and minority floor leaders, and Senate majority and minority floor leaders.

Existing law requires that the annual state budget contain itemized statements for state expenditures. These expenditures include amounts for salaries or wages, and benefits of various state officer and employee classifications within state government. This bill would prohibit state funds from being expended on or after January 1, 1994, for any salary or wages, and benefits for certain employment classifications relating to public information, communications, and public affairs.

This bill would also provide that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, commencing January 1, 1994, the total amount expended for travel by state employees for any fiscal year shall not exceed 50% of the total amount budgeted for travel by state employees for the 1992–93 fiscal year. It would also prohibit out-of-state travel unless the travel is related to activities mandated by federal, state, or local law or the generation of revenues, as defined. Further, this bill would disallow reimbursement for travel, meals, and lodging costs related to in-state travel for attendance at, or participation in, information conferences or seminars unless the cost is from other than state sources. First-class air passage would also be prohibited, except for health reasons. *[A. Floor]*

SB 99 (Roberti), as amended March 30, would require any state board or commission that is required to prepare and distribute a report to the Governor, the legislature, or the public to print it upon approval by the board or commission. The bill would further require the board or commission to simultaneously notify the Governor, the legislature, and the public that copies of the report are available. *[A. W&M]*

SB 2 (Kopp). Existing law does not authorize the imposition of limitations on the number of terms that persons may serve on governing bodies of local governmental entities. As amended March 23, this bill would expressly authorize the governing bodies of county boards of education, school districts, community college districts, or other districts, any board of supervisors or city council, or the residents of those respective entities, to submit a proposal to the electors to limit the number of terms a member of the governing body, board of supervisors, or city council may serve. *[S. Appr]*

AB 354 (Cortese). Existing law requires the Governor and every other appointing authority, in making appointments to state boards and commissions, to be responsible for nominating a variety of persons of different backgrounds, abilities, interests, and opinions in compliance with specified public policy. As amended May 4, this bill would require every appointing authority, in making appointments to state and regional boards and commissions, to nominate a variety of persons with different backgrounds, abilities, interests, and opinions in compliance with the policy that the composition of state and regional boards and commissions shall be broadly reflective of the general public, including ethnic minorities and women, and to take into account geographical considerations. *[A. W&M]*

AB 1287 (Moore), as amended May 4, would, until January 1, 1997, enact a comprehensive scheme for the regulation and registration of self-help legal services providers, as defined, under the jurisdiction of the Department of Consumer Affairs. The bill would establish a registration and renewal fee, and create a Self-Help Legal Services Provider Registration Fund. *[A. Jud]*

BUDGET PROCESS

AB 22 (Speier), as introduced December 7, would provide for the withholding of the payment of legislators' salaries for that period following July 1 of the fiscal year during which the annual Budget Bill

is not passed by the legislature, but would provide for the payment of their salaries for that period after the Budget Bill is passed; prohibit the reimbursement of living and traveling expenses for legislators for that period following July 1 of the fiscal year during which the annual Budget Bill is not passed by the legislature; and prohibit the Controller from drawing any warrant for the payment of reimbursement to legislators for travel and living expenses for that period. *[A. Rules]*

ACA 2 (Hannigan). Existing provisions of the California Constitution provide that statutes calling elections, statutes providing for tax levies or appropriations for the usual current expenses of the state, and urgency statutes shall go into effect immediately upon their enactment. As introduced December 7, this measure would also provide that statutes enacting budget bills shall go into effect immediately upon their enactment.

Existing provisions of the California Constitution provide that appropriations from the general fund, except appropriations for the public schools, are void unless passed in each house by two-thirds of the membership. This measure would eliminate the two-thirds vote requirement. *[A. Floor]*

SB 16 (Killea), as introduced December 7, would create the California Constitution Revision Commission, prescribe its membership, and specify its powers and duties. The measure would require the Commission to submit a report to the Governor and the legislature no later than November 1, 1993, that sets forth its findings with respect to the formulation and enactment of a state budget and recommendations for the improvement of that process. The Commission would also be required to report on specified issues relating to the structure of state governance. The bill would provide that the commission shall cease to exist as of January 1, 1995. *[S. Rules]*

ACA 21 (Areias), as introduced March 5, would provide that if the Governor fails to sign a budget bill on or before June 30, then on July 1, an annual budget that is the same amount as that which was enacted for the immediately preceding fiscal year shall become the state's interim budget for the new fiscal year and the balance of each item of that interim budget shall be reduced 10% each month, commencing August 1, until a new budget bill has been signed by the Governor. *[A. Rules]*

CIVIL RIGHTS

AJR 1 (Speier), as introduced December 7, memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to propose the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution. *[A. Floor]*

ACR 2 (Lee), as introduced December 7, establishes the 21-member Commission on African-American Males, to be appointed and composed of members of the Assembly and Senate and professionals in specified fields. The measure sets forth the duties of the commission, including a requirement that the commission report its findings and policy recommendations to the legislature on January 31, 1994, and annually thereafter. The measure, which also provide for the termination of the commission on January 31, 1995, was chaptered on February 16 (Chapter 3, Resolutions of 1993).

AB 2199 (W. Brown). The Unruh Civil Rights Act provides that all persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, or disability are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever. That provision also states that it shall not be construed to confer any right or privilege on a person which is conditioned or limited by law or which is applicable alike to persons of every sex, color, race, religion, ancestry, national origin, or disability. As introduced March 5, this bill would delete the latter restriction on the construction of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, specify that the identification of particular bases of discrimination in the Act is illustrative rather than restrictive, provide that the Act prohibits all arbitrary discrimination by business establishments, and state that the rights afforded by the Act are enjoyed by all persons as individuals.

Existing law establishes a cause of action for violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act and a related provision entitling the plaintiff to damages of at least $250. This bill would increase the minimum damages for such a cause of action to $1,000, and provide that certain nonprofit organizations shall be deemed persons entitled to bring such a cause of action under specified circumstances.

Existing law provides that it is the intent of the legislature to occupy the field of regulation of discrimination in employment and housing encompassed by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, exclusive of local laws on the subject. This bill would delete that provision and state, instead, that a local political subdivision of the state may establish greater protections against discrimination than those set forth in that Act, but may not require or permit any action constituting a discriminatory practice under that Act. *[A. Floor]*

CONSUMER PROTECTION

SB 47 (Lockyer). Existing law requires specified retailers who sell merchandise which will be delivered to the consumer at a later date to specify, either at the time of the sale or at a later date, a 4-hour period within which delivery shall be made if the consumer's presence is required. Existing law also sets forth similar requirements for these retailers with regard to service and repair of merchandise. Chapter 693 of the Statutes of 1992, effective January 1, 1993, requires these retailers to specify the 4-hour period for delivery either at the time of the sale or at a later date prior to the delivery date. As introduced December 17, this bill would also require these retailers to specify the 4-hour period for commencement of service or repair of merchandise prior to the date of service or repair. *[A. Floor]*

AB 465 (Peace). Existing law requires every owner of a defined check casher's business to register his/her name, business name, social security number, and address with the Department of Justice (DOJ). Existing law requires DOJ to establish a reasonable fee for registration. As amended May 6, this bill would instead require every owner of a check casher's business to obtain a permit from DOJ to conduct a check casher's business. The bill would specify the requirements of the application for such a permit, and require each applicant to be fingerprinted and pay a specified fee. The bill would require each applicant to renew the permit annually, and require the payment of a renewal fee. Under the bill, an application for a permit or for renewal of a permit would be denied if the applicant has a felony conviction involving dishonesty, fraud, or deceit, provided the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a person engaged in the business of check cashing. The bill would require DOJ to adopt regulations to implement the provisions of the bill, determine the amount of the fees required by the bill, and prescribe forms for the applications and permit required by the bill. *[S. Jud]*

COURTS

SB 10 (Lockyer), as amended May 12, would authorize additional superior and municipal court judges and commissioners in various counties, upon the adoption of specified resolutions by the board of

supervisors; delete certain commissioner positions; and authorize additional traffic referee positions in San Diego County, upon the adoption of specified resolutions by the board of supervisors. *[S. Appr]*

SCA 3 (Lockyer). The California Constitution currently provides for superior, municipal, and justice courts, provides for the establishment and jurisdiction thereof, and provides for the qualification and election of judges thereof. As amended April 13, this measure would eliminate the provisions for superior, municipal, and justice courts, and instead provide for district courts, their establishment and jurisdiction, and the qualification and election of judges thereof. The measure would become operative on July 1, 1995. The measure would also specify its purposes, and make related, conforming changes. *[S. CA]*

SB 728 (Presley), Existing law provides, with respect to specified proceedings or investigations regarding felony offenses, that if a person refuses to answer a question or produce evidence on the ground that he or she may be incriminated and if the person is ordered to comply but would have been privileged to withhold the answer given or the evidence produced except for the order, the person shall not be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for, or on account of, any fact or act concerning which he/she was required to answer or produce evidence except as specified. Existing law provides, with respect to misdemeanor proceedings in which a person refuses to answer a question or produce evidence of any other kind on the ground that he/she may be incriminated, and if after court approval of an agreement between the district attorney and the defendant, the defendant answers or produces the evidence that would have been privileged, that person shall not be prosecuted or subjected to penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any fact or act concerning which, in accordance with the agreement, the person answered or produced evidence. As introduced March 3, this bill would delete these separate provisions governing immunity in misdemeanor proceedings and would instead provide the same type of immunity for misdemeanor proceedings as is provided in felony proceedings. The bill would expressly provide that these provisions do not prohibit the district attorney from requesting an order granting use immunity or transactional immunity to a witness compelled to give testimony or produce evidence.

Under existing court doctrine known as the exclusionary rule, evidence obtained as a result of the violation of the constitutional rights of a criminal defendant may not be introduced against that defendant. This bill would require the admission of such evidence, if otherwise admissible, and provide instead for the protection of the constitutional rights of criminal defendants by civil action if those rights are violated by state or local public agencies, as specified. The bill also would authorize trial courts to impose specified sanctions on law enforcement agencies found to have violated constitutional principles in a criminal proceeding. *[S. Jud]*

SB 1242 (Boatwright), as introduced March 18, would provide that in any action to which a local public entity is a party, no confidentiality agreement, settlement agreement, or protective order that bars public disclosure of a writing, as defined, shall be valid. The bill would further provide that any elected officer of a local public entity who authorizes or approves any agreement in violation of the above provision would forfeit his/her office and would be guilty of a public offense punishable as a misdemeanor or a felony. *[S. Jud]*

ELECTIONS

SCA 13 (Lockyer), as amended April 12, would direct the legislature to provide a system of campaign finance reform on or before December 31, 1994, by a two-thirds vote of each house, that: (1) imposes limitations on the amount of each contribution that may be made to candidates for legislative office at both primary and general elections, (2) establishes a Legislative Election Fund from which a candidate for legislative office will be allocated public funds for qualified campaign expenditures, provided that the candidate has received a threshold amount of private campaign contributions, (3) imposes limitations on expenditures by all candidates for legislative office in primary and general elections as a condition of the receipt of state matching funds, (4) establishes requirements on candidates for legislative office with respect to the establishment of a campaign expense account, and allows each member of the legislature to create a separate, distinct noncampaign officeholder expense account, and (5) imposes contribution limitations on candidates for local offices. *[S. CA]*

SB 588 (Lockyer), as amended April 28, would enact the Campaign Financing Reform Act of 1993. Specifically, it would impose various limitations on contributions and expenditures which may be made to candidates for legislative office at both primary and general elections. It would also establish a Legislative Election Fund. Eligible nominees, as defined, for legislative office would be allowed to obtain public funds from the fund for qualified campaign expenditures, provided certain thresholds are obtained. It would also impose certain limitations on expenditures by all candidates under certain conditions. This bill would, additionally, establish various requirements on candidates for legislative office with respect to the establishment of campaign funds, and allow members of the legislature to create a separate, distinct noncampaign expense account; impose contribution limitations on candidates for local offices; and provide for the enforcement, and set forth remedies and sanctions regarding violations, of the provisions of this bill. It would impose specified responsibility for the administration of the provisions of the bill on the Fair Political Practices Commission and the Attorney General.

Under existing California Personal Income Tax Law, there is no provision allowing taxpayers to transfer part of their income taxes to political campaigns for candidates seeking election to legislative offices. This bill would, for taxable years commencing on or after January 1, 1995, allow taxpayers to specify that up to $5, or up to $10 in the case of married individuals filing a joint return, shall be transferred to the Legislative Election Fund, as created, to be distributed among the eligible nominees, as defined. This bill would provide that the moneys contained in the fund are available, when appropriated in the Budget Act commencing with the 1995–96 fiscal year, to make grants to eligible nominees and to fund all administrative costs of the bill. The bill would provide that if, on July 1, 1996, the Controller determines that the amount in the Legislative Election Fund is less than $20 million, the provisions of this bill shall be suspended until the end of each succeeding election cycle at which time another determination would be made.

This bill would become operative only if SCA 14 of the 1993–94 Regular Session is submitted to, and approved by, the voters at a statewide election. *[S. Appr]*

SCA 14 (Marks), as introduced March 2, would direct the legislature, on or before December 31, 1995, by majority vote of each house, to provide a system of campaign finance reform for elective state offices that limits the amount of financial contributions that may be made by specified entities and persons to a candidate or committee; limits the amounts of campaign expenditures that may be made by candidates who accept public financing; restricts the transfer of campaign funds from a candidate for, or incumbent of, an

elective state office, as defined, or a committee controlled by any of those persons, to a candidate for, or incumbent of, an elective state office, or a committee controlled by any of those persons; and provides partial public financing of elections for legislative office in a manner that satisfies the requirements of the U.S. Constitution. The measure would specify that none of its provisions prohibit a local government agency from enacting an ordinance or ordinances providing for campaign reform, public financing, or both, for candidates for local elective office. *[A. ER&CA]*

SB 427 (Beverly). Under the existing Political Reform Act of 1974, various prohibitions govern the use and reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures, the disclosure of a public official's investments, interests in real property, sources of income, and receipt of gifts, the registration and reporting of lobbyists and their employers, and the making of gifts by specified persons. The existing provisions generally establish these prohibitions based upon the amount of campaign contribution and expenditure made, the fair market value of the public official's investments, interests in real property, and sources of income, and the value of the gift received, among other things. As amended April 28, this bill would increase the otherwise allowable amount of campaign contribution and expenditure that may be made, the fair market value of the public official's investments, interests in real property, and sources of income that are required to be disclosed, and the value of gifts that may be received, among other things. *[S. Appr]*

ACA 12 (Sher), as introduced March 3, would direct the legislature, on or before December 31, 1994, by majority vote of each house, to provide a system of campaign finance reform for elective state offices that: (1) limits the amount of financial contributions that may be made by specified entities and persons to a candidate or committee, (2) limits the amounts of campaign expenditures that may be made by candidates who accept public financing, (3) restricts the transfer of campaign funds from a candidate for, or incumbent of, an elective state office, as defined, or a committee, to a candidate for, or incumbent of, an elective state office, or a committee, and (4) includes a plan for voluntary public participation in campaign financing that satisfies the requirements of the United States Constitution. The measure would specify that none of its provisions prohibit a local government agency from enacting an ordinance or ordinances providing for campaign reform, public financing, or both, for candidates for local elective office. *[A. ER&CA]*

SB 599 (Marks), as amended April 27, would require that any advertisement broadcast by radio or television that is authorized and paid for by a specified committee and that supports or opposes the adoption or qualification of a ballot measure disclose the name of the committee or contributors, as prescribed, that authorized and paid for the advertisement. It would also require that any disclosure statement required by this bill be spoken so as to be clearly audible and understood by the intended public. *[S. Floor]*

ACA 14 (Alpert). The California Constitution limits Senators to two four-year terms, and limits members of the Assembly to three two-year terms. As amended May 6, this measure instead would limit Senators to two six-year terms and would limit members of the Assembly to two four-year terms, except as specified, with respect to legislative terms of office commencing on and after December 2, 1996. The measure would provide for the staggering of those terms in a specified manner.

The California Constitution requires the legislature to statutorily prohibit members from engaging in activities or having interests that conflict with the proper discharge of their duties and responsibilities, but does not prohibit members of the legislature from receiving contributions or loans for the purpose of candidacy for public office. This measure would prohibit a person elected to the office of Senator or member of the Assembly, or a campaign treasurer for that person, from soliciting or accepting, for a period of one year after the date upon which that term of office commences, any contribution or loan, as specified, for the purpose of candidacy for any public office. *[A. ER&CA]*

ACA 7 (Peace), as amended May 4, would limit Senators to two six-year terms and members of the Assembly to three four-year terms, except as specified, with respect to terms beginning on and after the 1994 general election. The measure would provide for the staggering of Assembly terms and would eliminate the constitutional requirement that the Senate terms be staggered. This measure would also permit a member of the legislature to become a candidate for a state elective office, as defined, the term of office of which would commence prior to the expiration of his/her current term of office, only if that individual first resigns his/her current office. *[S. CA]*

AB 1025 (Peace). Under existing law, as set forth in the California Constitution, the term of office of a Senator is four years and the term of office of a member of the Assembly is two years; the terms of office of Senators are staggered, such that two years separates the election of Senators in each odd-numbered senatorial district from the election of Senators in each even-numbered senatorial district. As amended May 12, this bill would change the term of office of a member of the Assembly to three years, commencing with the general election in 2000. In addition, the bill would specify that, on or after November 7, 2000, a person may be elected to the Assembly only if his/her total past service in the Assembly does not exceed three years.

Under existing law, the qualifications of members of the legislature are governed by various provisions of the California Constitution. This bill would specify that a member of the legislature may become a candidate for a state elective office, as defined, whose term would commence prior to the expiration of his or her current term of office as a member of the legislature, only if that individual first resigns his/her current office.

The above provisions of this bill would become operative only if ACA 7 is approved by the voters at the June 7, 1994, general election or at any statewide special election held prior thereto.

Existing law imposes certain restrictions upon the amount of campaign contributions or loans that may be solicited or accepted by a candidate for elective office during a special election cycle or special runoff election cycle. This bill would appropriate $30,000 to the Fair Political Practices Commission to prepare a report on the impact and constitutionality of a prohibition upon the solicitation or acceptance, by an incumbent Senator or member of the Assembly who is a candidate for reelection, of a campaign contribution or loan other than in the calendar year in which the election for that office is to occur. The bill would require that the report be submitted to the legislature no later than January 1, 1995. *[A. W&M]*

AB 859 (Moore). Existing law provides generally that the county clerk shall accept affidavits of registration at all times except during the 28 days immediately preceding an election, when registration shall cease for that election. It does not provide for registration on election day. As introduced February 25, this bill would provide that, at any statewide direct primary or statewide general election, a voter may register to vote on election day and vote at the polling place of his/her precinct. It would require the Secretary of State to issue regulations for that registration, including the form of identification

required of a voter. The bill would specify that identification, under oath made under penalty of perjury by another voter who is registered at the precinct, constitutes identification for this purpose. *[A. W&M]*

HEALTH AND SAFETY

SB 38 (Torres), as amended May 13, and **AB 16 (Margolin)**, as amended May 13, would each create the California Health Plan Commission, with specified powers and duties, which would establish and maintain a program of universal health coverage to be known as the California Health Plan. The bill would require that, under the plan, all California residents would be eligible for the same federally required package of comprehensive health care services, and all California residents would be eligible to participate without regard to employment status or place of employment in accordance with applicable federal requirements. *[S. Appr; A. W&M]*

AB 2268 (Caldera). Existing law prohibits a person operating a bicycle upon a highway from allowing a person who is four years of age or younger, or weighs 40 pounds or less, to ride as a passenger on a bicycle unless that passenger is wearing a helmet meeting specified standards. As amended May 4, this bill would, instead, prohibit a person under 18 years of age from operating, or riding upon a bicycle as a passenger, upon a street, bikeway, or other public bicycle path or trail unless the person is wearing a helmet meeting specified standards. Commencing in 1995, this bill would provide for fines to be imposed for violations of this prohibition. The bill would require any safety helmet sold or offered for sale to be conspicuously labeled in accordance with the specified standards and prohibit the sale or offer for sale of any bicycle safety helmet which is not of a type meeting the safety standards. *[A. W&M]*

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

AB 1624 (Bowen). Under existing law, all meetings of a house of the legislature or a committee thereof are required to be open and public, unless specifically exempted, and any meeting that is required to be open and public, including specified closed sessions, may be held only after full and timely notice to the public as provided by the Joint Rules of the Assembly and Senate. As amended May 18, this bill would make legislative findings and declarations that the public should be informed to the fullest extent possible as to the time, place, and agenda for each meeting. This bill would require the Legislative Counsel, with the advice of the Joint Rules Committee of the Senate and Assembly, to make available to the public by means of access by way of computer modem specified information concerning bills, the proceedings of the houses and committees of the legislature, statutory enactments, and the California Constitution. This bill would authorize the imposition of a fee or other charge for any republication or duplication of information accessed pursuant to the bill under specified circumstances. *[A. Rules]*

SB 682 (Green). Existing law requires the appropriate legislative ethics committees of the legislature to conduct at least annually an orientation course on the relevant ethical issues and laws relating to lobbying, in consultation with the Fair Political Practices Commission; it requires the committees to impose fees on lobbyists for attending this course, at an amount that will enable the lobbyists' participation in the course to be funded from those fees to the fullest extent possible. As amended May 4, this bill would delete these provisions and would instead require the Secretary of State to conduct at least annually an orientation course on the relevant ethical issues and laws relating to lobbying, in consultation with the Fair Political Practices Commission and the appropriate legislative ethics committees. It would require the Secretary of State to impose fees on lobbyists for attending the course, not to exceed $35 per person.

Existing provisions of the Political Reform Act of 1974 require individual lobbyists to submit a lobbyist certification containing specified items of information as part of the required registration with the Secretary of State. The certification must include a statement, beginning with the 1991–92 Regular Session, that the lobbyist has completed a required ethics and lobbying course within the previous 24 months. This bill would instead require completion of the course within the previous two-year legislative session.

Existing law requires that, in the case of a new lobbyist certification, if the lobbyist has not completed the course within the specified time period, the lobbyist certification must state that the lobbyist will complete a scheduled course within a reasonable time period. It requires the lobbyist certification to be accepted on a conditional basis. This bill would delete the reference to a new lobbyist certification and require, for purposes of this provision, that the reasonable period of time be determined by the Secretary of State. *[S. Floor]*

LOTTERY

AB 994 (Tucker). The California State Lottery Act of 1984 prohibits cash payment by Lottery game retailers to the Lottery for tickets or shares, and requires that all payments shall be in the form of a check, bank draft, electronic fund transfer, or other recorded financial instrument as determined by the Director of the California State Lottery. As introduced March 1, this bill would permit the Lottery to pay to Lottery game retailers, by electronic fund transfer, subject to approval by the Controller's office, any credit balances that may result from Lottery activities. *[S. GO]*

AB 1203 (Tucker). The California State Lottery Act of 1984 requires that proceeds from the sale of Lottery tickets or shares be paid into the State Lottery Fund. As introduced March 2, this bill would provide that commencing with the Budget Act of 1993, moneys for the administration and expenses of the Lottery shall be appropriated by the legislature in the annual Budget Act. *[S. GO]*

SB 884 (Leslie), as amended May 19, would prohibit changes, on and after January 1, 1994, in the types of Lottery games or method of delivery of these games that incorporate technologies or mediums that did not exist, were not widely available, or were not commercially feasible at the time of the enactment of the Lottery Act from being made unless certain conditions are met. *[S. Floor]*

OPEN MEETINGS

SB 36 (Kopp). The Ralph M. Brown Act generally requires that the meetings of the legislative bodies of local agencies, as those terms are defined, be conducted openly, with specified exceptions. Among other things, the Act provides for certain notice requirements concerning public meetings and makes it a misdemeanor for a member of a legislative body to attend a meeting where a violation occurs with knowledge of the fact that the meeting violates the Act. The Brown Act defines the term "legislative body" as any multimember body which exercises any authority of a legislative body of a local agency delegated to it by that legislative body. This bill would specify that such a body that exercises any material authority of a legislative body of a local agency delegated to it is a legislative body, whether it is organized and operated by a local agency or by a private corporation specifically created to exercise the delegated authority with a specified exception.

The Brown Act defines the term "legislative body" to include an advisory body

of a local agency. This bill would require an advisory body to post an agenda for its meetings in the manner required of the body it advises. The bill would exclude a limited duration ad hoc committee from the definition of legislative body but would include any standing committee, as defined, of a governing body irrespective of its composition. This bill would also define "member of a legislative body of a local agency" to include any person elected to serve as a member of a legislative body and who has not yet assumed the duties of office.

The Brown Act generally requires all meetings of the legislative body of a local agency to be open and public. This bill would define "meeting," with exceptions, as any congregation of a majority of the members of a legislative body in the same time and place to hear, discuss, or deliberate upon any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body or its local agency, and any use of direct communication, personal intermediaries, or technological devices employed by a majority of the members to develop a collective concurrence as to action to be taken on an item. This bill would also prohibit a legislative body from taking action by secret ballot.

The Brown Act permits recording of open and public meetings by any person. This bill would make any recording made at the direction of a local agency a public record under the California Public Records Act. The bill would also provide that no legislative body shall prohibit or otherwise restrict the broadcast of its proceedings in the absence of a reasonable finding that the broadcast cannot be accomplished without disruption.

Under the Brown Act, meetings of the legislative body of a local agency need not be held within the boundaries of the territory over which the agency exercises jurisdiction. If an emergency makes the designated meeting place unsafe, the presiding officer may designate a meeting place for the duration of the emergency. This bill would require meetings to be held within the boundaries of the territory of the agency, with limited exceptions and with additional exceptions for the governing board of a school district, and would permit the presiding officer's designee to designate an emergency meeting place.

The Brown Act requires the posting of an agenda at least 72 hours before a regular meeting of a legislative body briefly describing each item of business, and restricts action or discussion of the meeting to these items on the agenda unless, by at least a two-thirds vote, the legislative body decides there is a need for action on a nonagenda item. This bill would revise the contents of the required description, permit members of a legislative body to respond to certain questions not relating to agenda items, and impose further restrictions on the discussion or action on nonagenda items.

The Brown Act requires the agenda for a regular meeting to provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body. This bill would require the agenda for a special meeting at which action is proposed to be taken on an item to provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body prior to action on the item. The bill would further require the legislative body not to abridge or prohibit constitutionally protected speech, including but not limited to public criticism of the agency. This bill would also prescribe agency disclosure of the nature of closed sessions according to a specified format.

Existing law specifies the circumstances requiring a notice of the adjournment or continuance of a meeting to be made and posted. This bill would further require that the notice of adjournment or continuance be given to the news media.

The Brown Act authorizes closed sessions of a legislative body to confer with, or receive advice from, its legal counsel regarding pending litigation when discussion in open session would prejudice the position of the local agency in the litigation, and describes the facts and circumstances that constitute pending litigation. Existing law states that this authority is the exclusive expression of the lawyer-client privilege for purposes of conducting closed sessions pursuant to the Act. The Act requires the legal counsel to prepare a memorandum concerning the reasons and legal authority for the closed session. This bill would state that this authority for closed sessions for the legislative body to confer with or receive advice from its legal counsel does not limit or otherwise affect the lawyer-client privilege as it may apply to written or other communications outside meetings between the legislative body and its legal counsel. The bill would specify additional facts and circumstances for determining what is pending litigation, and delete the memorandum requirement.

Under the Brown Act, closed sessions may be held for various reasons, including matters relating to employees. This bill would revise the definition of "employee" to exclude any elected official, member of a legislative body, or person providing services to the local agency as an independent contractor or the employee of an independent contractor, and would require that, as a condition of holding a closed session on complaints against an employee, charges to consider disciplinary action, or to consider dismissal, the employee be given written notice of his/her right to a public hearing. Failure to give the notice would nullify any action taken in the closed session against the employee.

The Brown Act requires the legislative body to publicly report closed session actions taken and roll call votes to appoint, employ, or dismiss a public employee. This bill would instead require the legislative body to publicly report any action taken in closed session and the vote or abstention of every member present on real estate negotiations, litigation, and pending litigation issues (with specified exceptions), claims for various liability losses, various personnel actions, and certain collective bargaining matters. The bill would prohibit any action for injury to reputation or other personal interest by an employee with respect to whom a disclosure is made by a legislative body in compliance with these provisions. The bill would prescribe how the reports are to be made and would require a brief statement of the information to be posted.

The Brown Act permits legislative bodies of local agencies to designate a clerk, officer, or employee to attend each closed session and enter in a minute book a record of the topics discussed and decisions made at the meeting. This bill would require legislative bodies to appoint a person for that purpose.

Under the Brown Act, agendas and writings distributed to members of the legislative body by persons connected with the body for discussion or consideration at a public meeting of the body are public records unless specifically exempt from public disclosure. This bill would specify that writings intended for distribution to members by any person in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at a public meeting are public records, and specify that writings intended for distribution prior to commencement of a public meeting are public records, whether or not actually distributed to, or received by, the legislative body at the time of request for copying. The bill would require that writings that are made public records under this provision and are distributed during a public meeting be made available for public inspection immediately, or after the meeting.

The Brown Act requires the legislative body to state the general reason or reasons for holding any closed session prior to or after holding the closed session. This bill would require the reasons to be stated prior to holding the closed session and specify the format for the statement.

The Brown Act makes it a misdemeanor for a member of a legislative body to attend or participate in a meeting of the legislative body where action is taken in violation of the Act with knowledge of the fact that the meeting is in violation of the Act. This bill would instead make it a misdemeanor if the member attends or participates with intent to deprive the public of information to which it is entitled under the Act.

The Brown Act permits any interested person to commence an action by mandamus or injunction to obtain a judicial determination that an action taken by a legislative body in violation of specified provisions of the Act is null and void, unless any of specified conditions exist. However, a prior demand must first be made of the legislative body to cure or correct the alleged violation within 30 days from the date the action was taken. This bill would expressly permit the district attorney or any interested person to commence an action as described, and would also permit an action to determine the validity of any rule or action by the legislative body to limit the expression of its members or to compel the legislative body to tape record its closed sessions. The bill would also require the written demand to be made within 90 days if the alleged violation occurred in a closed meeting.

The bill would prohibit the conduct of meetings or functions in facilities inaccessible to disabled persons or that require members of the public to make a payment or purchase. *[S. Appr]*

SB 1140 (Calderon). Under the Ralph M. Brown Act, a legislative body of a local agency may require that a copy of the Act be given to each member of the legislative body. As amended May 10, this bill would additionally permit the legislative body to require that a copy of the Act be given to any person elected to serve as a member of the legislative body who has not yet assumed office. This bill would also prohibit a local legislative body from taking action by secret ballot.

The Brown Act defines "legislative body" as any commission, committee, or any board or commission thereof which is supported in whole or part by funds provided by that agency. This bill would expand that definition to include those permanent commissions and boards which exercise authority delegated to it and are appointed by the elected body as well as boards, commissions, committees, or other multimember bodies which govern a private corporation created by the elected body, except as specified. The definition of "legislative body" would also include advisory commissions, committees, or other multimember bodies where decisionmaking authority has not been delegated by its legislative body creators if that body was created by any formal action, unless the advisory body consists solely of less than a quorum of the creating legislative body.

The Brown Act requires the legislative body to state the general reason or reasons for holding any closed session prior to or after holding the closed session. This bill would require the reasons to be stated prior to holding the closed session and would specify the format for the statements.

The Brown Act provides that any writing distributed to a legislative body prior to or during a public hearing for discussion or consideration during that hearing shall be deemed a public record. This bill would require that the document become a public record only in the event that it is prepared by or at the direction of a member of the legislative body or a copy of the writing is provided to the clerk or secretary of the legislative body.

The Brown Act allows any interested person to commence legal actions for the purpose of preventing violations of the Act. This bill would include the district attorney among those capable of discretionary legal action to enforce the provisions of the Act.

Finally, this bill would amend the Brown Act to prohibit meetings in facilities inaccessible to disabled persons or where members of the public may not be present without making a payment or purchase. *[S. LGov]*

AB 1426 (Burton). A local agency, for purposes of the Brown Act, includes any nonprofit corporation created by one or more local agencies having members on its board of directors with the purpose of making or operating any public work project. As introduced March 3, this bill would define the term "public work project" to include any structure or infrastructure improvement, and its associated services and activities intended for public rather than private benefit.

The Brown Act defines legislative body as any multimember body which exercises any authority of a legislative body of a local agency delegated to it by that legislative body. This bill would specify that such a body that exercises any material authority of a legislative body of a local agency delegated to it is a legislative body whether it is organized and operated by a local agency or by a private corporation specifically created to exercise the delegated authority with a specified exception.

The Brown Act defines legislative body to include an advisory body of a local agency. This bill would require an advisory body to post an agenda for its meetings in the manner required of the body it advises. The bill would exclude a limited duration ad hoc committee from the definition of legislative body but would include any standing committee, as defined, of a governing body irrespective of its composition. This bill would also define "member of a legislative body of a local agency" to include any person elected to serve as a member of a legislative body and who has not yet assumed the duties of office.

The Brown Act generally requires all meetings of the legislative body of a local agency to be open and public. This bill would define "meeting," with exceptions, as any congregation of a majority of the members of a legislative body in the same time and place to hear, discuss, or deliberate upon any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body or its local agency, and any use of direct communication, personal intermediaries, or technological devices employed by a majority of the members to develop a collective concurrence as to action to be taken on an item. This bill would also prohibit a legislative body from taking action by secret ballot.

The Brown Act permits recording of open and public meetings by any person. This bill would make any recording made at the direction of a local agency a public record under the California Public Records Act, as specified. The bill would also provide that no legislative body shall prohibit or otherwise restrict the broadcast of its proceedings in the absence of a reasonable finding that the broadcast cannot be accomplished without disruption.

This bill would require Brown Act meetings to be held within the boundaries of the territory of the agency, with limited exceptions and with additional exceptions for the governing board of a school district, and would permit the presiding officer's designee to designate an emergency meeting place.

The Brown Act requires the posting of an agenda at least 72 hours before a regular meeting of a legislative body briefly describing each item of business and restricts action or discussion of the meeting to these items on the agenda, unless, by at least a two-thirds vote, as specified, the legislative body decides there is a need for action on a nonagenda item. This bill would revise the content of that description and would permit members of a legislative body to respond to certain questions not relating to agenda items. This bill would make further restrictions on the discussion or action on nonagenda items.

The Brown Act requires the agenda for a regular meeting to provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body. This bill would require the agenda for a special meeting at which action is proposed to be taken on an item to provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body prior to action on the item. The bill would further require the legislative body not to abridge or prohibit constitutionally protected speech, including, but not limited to, public criticism of the agency. This bill would also prescribe disclosures of the nature of closed sessions according to a specified format.

The Brown Act specifies the circumstances requiring a notice of the adjournment or continuance of a meeting to be made and posted. This bill would further require that the notice of adjournment or continuance be given to the news media, as specified.

The Brown Act authorizes closed sessions of a legislative body to confer with, or receive advice from, its legal counsel regarding pending litigation when discussion in open session would prejudice the position of the local agency in the litigation and describes the facts and circumstances that constitute pending litigation. Existing law states that this authority is the exclusive expression of the lawyer-client privilege for purposes of conducting closed sessions pursuant to the Act. The Act requires the legal counsel to prepare a memorandum concerning the reasons and legal authority for the closed session. This bill would state that this authority for closed sessions for the legislative body to confer with or receive advice from its legal counsel does not limit or otherwise affect the lawyer-client privilege as it may apply to written or other communications outside meetings between the legislative body and its legal counsel. The bill would specify additional facts and circumstances for determining what is pending litigation. The bill would delete the memorandum requirement.

Under the Brown Act, closed sessions may be held for various reasons, including matters relating to employees. This bill would revise the definition of employee to exclude any elected official, member of a legislative body, or person providing services to the local agency as an independent contractor or the employee of an independent contractor and would require that, as a condition of holding a closed session on complaints against an employee, charges to consider disciplinary action, or to consider dismissal, the employee be given written notice of his/her right to a public hearing. The failure to give the notice would nullify any action taken in the closed session against the employee.

The Brown Act requires the legislative body to publicly report closed session actions taken and roll call votes to appoint, employ, or dismiss a public employee. This bill would instead require the legislative body to publicly report any action taken in closed session and the vote or abstention of every member present on real estate negotiations, litigation and pending litigation issues with specified exceptions, claims for various liability losses, various personnel actions, and certain collective bargaining matters. The bill would prohibit any action for injury to reputation or other personal interest by an employee with respect to whom a disclosure is made by a legislative body in compliance with these provisions. The bill would prescribe how the reports are to be made and would require a brief statement of the information to be posted, as specified.

The Brown Act permits legislative bodies of local agencies to designate a clerk, officer, or employee to attend each closed session and enter in a minute book a record of the topics discussed and decisions made at the meeting. This bill would require the legislative bodies to appoint a person for that purpose.

Under the Brown Act, agendas and writings distributed to members of the legislative body by persons connected with the body for discussion or consideration at a public meeting of the body are public records unless specifically exempt from public disclosure. This bill would specify that writings intended for distribution to members by any person in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at a public meeting are public records, and would specify that writings intended for distribution prior to commencement of a public meeting are public records, whether or not actually distributed to, or received by, the legislative body at the time of request for copying. The bill would require that writings that are made public records under this provision and are distributed during a public meeting shall be made available for public inspection immediately, or after the meeting, as specified.

The Brown Act requires the legislative body to state the general reason or reasons for holding any closed session prior to or after holding the closed session. This bill would require the reasons to be stated prior to holding the closed session and would specify the format for the statements.

The Brown Act makes it a misdemeanor for a member of a legislative body to attend or participate in a meeting of the legislative body where action is taken in violation of the act with knowledge of the fact that the meeting is in violation of the act. This bill would instead make it a misdemeanor if the member attends or participates with intent to deprive the public of information to which it is entitled under the Act.

The Brown Act permits any interested person to commence an action by mandamus or injunction to obtain a judicial determination that an action taken by a legislative body in violation of specified provisions of the act is null and void, unless any of specified conditions exist. However, a prior demand must first be made of the legislative body to cure or correct the alleged violation within 30 days from the date the action was taken. This bill would expressly permit the district attorney or any interested person to commence an action as described and would also permit an action to determine the validity of any rule or action by the legislative body to limit the expression of its members or to compel the legislative body to tape record its closed sessions, as specified. The bill would also require the written demand to be made within 30 days from the date the action was taken unless the alleged violation occurred in a closed meeting in which case written demand shall be made within 90 days from the date the action was taken.

The bill would prohibit the conduct of meetings or functions in facilities inaccessible to disabled persons or that require members of the public to make a payment or purchase. *[A. W&M]*

SB 504 (Hayden). Existing law authorizes the Regents of the University of California to conduct closed sessions when meeting to consider or discuss, among other things, matters concerning the appointment, employment, performance, compensation, or dismissal of university officers or employees. As amended April 28, this bill would delete the authority of the Regents to conduct closed sessions when they meet to consider the compensation of university officers or employees. The bill also would specify that matters concerning the appointment, employment, performance, or dismissal of a university officer, for purposes of this provision, shall not include salary, benefits, perquisites, severance payments, retirement benefits, or any other form of compensation. The bill also would express the intent of the legislature that no proposal relating to the salary, benefits, perquisites, severance payments, or retirement benefits, or any other form of compensation paid to an officer of the University shall become effective unless disclosure is made to each

Regent and the public, and the Regents approve the proposal by a majority vote of the membership of the Regents. *[S. Appr]*

SB 367 (Kopp). Existing law requires the Regents of the University of California to hold meetings that are open to the public and to give notice prior to those meetings. Existing law requires this notice to be given by means of a notice hand delivered or mailed to any newspaper of general circulation, or any television or radio station, so that notice may be published or broadcast at least 72 hours before the time of the meeting. As amended April 1, this bill would require that notice be delivered or mailed to each newspaper of general circulation and television or radio station that has requested notice in writing.

Existing law requires each state body, as defined, to give specified notice of its meetings, including a specified agenda; however no action may be taken by the state body at the same meeting on matters brought before the body by members of the public. This bill would require that the state body shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the state body on each agenda item before or during the state body's discussion or consideration of the items as specified. *[S. Floor]*

PUBLIC RECORDS

SB 175 (Kelley). Under existing law, public records of state and local agencies are required to be open for inspection, with various exceptions. As introduced February 3, this bill would provide that insurers and their agents, while they are investigating suspected fraud claims, shall have access to all relevant public records that are required to be open for inspection. *[A. F&I]*

SB 95 (Kopp). Existing provisions of the California Public Records Act require each state and local agency to make its records open to public inspection at all times during office hours, except as specifically exempted from disclosure by law. Existing provisions also allow a state or local agency to adopt requirements for itself which allow for greater access to records than prescribed by the minimum standards set forth in the Act. As amended April 12, this bill would allow a state or local agency to adopt requirements for itself which allow for faster, more efficient access to records than the minimum currently prescribed by law. *[S. Floor]*

AB 1553 (Tucker), as introduced March 4, would add specified state agencies to the list of government agencies subject to the California Public Records Act, thereby requiring those state agencies to establish guidelines for accessibility of records. The bill would state that any increased costs resulting from the bill be absorbed by the agencies affected as ordinary and usual operating expenses. *[S. GO]*

POLITICAL REFORM ACT

AB 2052 (Margolin). Under the existing Political Reform Act of 1974, all committees are required to file campaign statements each year by a specified deadline if they have made contributions or independent expenditures during the six-month period before the closing date of the statement. As amended April 12, this bill would include payments to a slate mailer organization during the six-month period before the closing date of the statement within the contributions or independent expenditures for which campaign statements must be filed. *[S. E&R]*

AB 2221 (Martinez). Under the existing Political Reform Act of 1974, when a report or statement or copies thereof required to be filed with any officer under the Act have been sent by first-class mail addressed to the officer, it is deemed to have been received by the officer on the date of the deposit in the mail. As introduced March 5, this bill would grant the same operative effect to any report or statement of copies thereof sent by any guaranteed overnight delivery service. This bill would permit any report or statement or copies thereof to be faxed by the applicable deadline, provided that the originals or paper copies are sent by first class mail or by any other guaranteed overnight delivery service within 24 hours of the applicable deadline. *[S. E&R]*

AB 1116 (Bornstein). Existing provisions of the Political Reform Act of 1974 prohibit a slate mailer organization from sending a slate mailer, as defined, unless the mailer includes, among other things, a notice to the voters that indicates the document was prepared by the slate mailer organization and that it is not an official party organization. The notice is required to contain a statement that appearance in the mailer does not necessarily imply endorsement of others appearing in the mailer, nor does it imply endorsement of or opposition to any issues set forth in the mailer. As introduced March 2, this bill would require the top of every page of the slate mailer to contain a notice in at least ten-point Roman boldface type stating that "This is not an official political party document." *[A. Floor]*

SB 879 (Hayden). The Political Reform Act of 1974, as amended by Proposition 73, requires an individual who intends to be a candidate for elective office, prior to soliciting or receiving any contribution or loan, to establish one campaign contribution account in a financial institution in this state. It requires that all contributions or loans made to the candidate, to a person on behalf of the candidate, or to the candidate's controlled committee, be deposited into the account. As amended April 27, this bill would provide that no contribution shall be deposited into the account unless information including the name, address, occupation, and employer of the contributor is on file in the records of the recipient of the contribution or loan.

Also under the Political Reform Act, certain public officials and designated employees of public agencies are required to file annual statements disclosing their economic interests. Existing law requires investments, interests in real property, and sources of income of those persons to be disclosed on their statements if the investments, interests in real property, and sources of income exceed specified minimum dollar values. This bill would revise the minimum dollar values for this purpose. *[S. Floor]*

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

AB 1127 (Speier). The Reporting of Improper Governmental Activities Act prohibits an employee from directly or indirectly using or attempting to use his/her official authority or influence for the purpose of intimidating, threatening, coercing, commanding, or attempting to intimidate, threaten, coerce, or command any person for the purpose of interfering with the right of that person to disclose improper governmental activity to certain entities pursuant to the Act. As amended May 3, this bill would include a member of the legislature among those entities to whom a person may disclose improper governmental activity.

Existing law permits a state employee or applicant for state employment to file a complaint with his/her supervisor, manager, the appointing authority, or the State Personnel Board alleging actual or attempted acts of reprisal, retaliation, threats, coercion, or similar improper acts relating to the reporting of improper governmental activity. This bill would permit a state employee or applicant for state employment to also provide to a member of the legislature information alleging actual or attempted acts of reprisal, retaliation, threats, coercion, or similar prohibited improper acts. The bill would also provide that the protections afforded by the Act to state employees or applicants

for state employment shall commence when the state employee or applicant for state employment initially provides information regarding the improper governmental activity to the member or his/her representative.

This bill would also require a state agency, if the agency determines that an employee is responsible for improper governmental activity involving the loss of $1,000 or more in state funds or fees, or involving the improper use of resources valued in excess of $1,000, to take certain actions. The bill would also require a state agency, upon request of a member of the legislature, to provide to that member all improper government activity files retained by the state agency whose file date is within three years of the date of the member's request. *[A. W&M]*

SB 194 (Hughes). Existing law prohibits a local agency officer, manager, or supervisor from taking a reprisal action through any act of intimidation, restraint, coercion, or discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment who files a complaint with a local agency that discloses information regarding gross mismanagement or a significant waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety. Existing law defines "reprisal action" to mean any act of intimidation, restraint, coercion, or discrimination against any employee, or applicant for employment, who files a complaint pursuant to these provisions. As amended April 22, this bill would include the firing of an employee within the definition of reprisal action for purposes of these provisions. *[A. PERet&SS]*