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islation will submit a plan for developing information on cellular costs and financial performance. Phase II of the investigation will focus on more specific questions related to the wholesale and retail markets and connection to local exchange carriers.

Customer-Owned Pay Telephone (COPT). In a November 23 order, the Commission awarded non-utility payphone providers six cents for every coinless call made from COPT payphones. The local exchange carriers (LECs) were ordered to work out a plan for reimbursement by mid-February. Additionally, COPT companies will be able to collect a ten-cent fee for credit card calls which the PUC had previously granted. In the past, COPT providers had been unable to collect this charge from the LECs.

This decision provides interim relief until the Commission issues a final order in its current investigation into COPT services and payphone operations. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 3 (Summer 1988) p. 125 and Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring 1988) p. 98 for background information on COPTs.)

Hearings on Trucking Regulation. On November 7, the PUC began formal hearings in its review of the regulation of California’s general freight industry, entitled In the Matter of the Regulation of General Freight Transportation by Truck. The proceeding stems from a PUC en banc informational hearing on trucking regulations which occurred last March in San Francisco. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring 1988) p. 120-21 for background information.)

Traditionally, the PUC applied minimum rate tariff regulation to all regulated carriers. During the 1970s, it modified its regulatory approach in many trucking sectors either by deregulating them or by requiring carriers to file their own cost-based tariffs with the Commission. However, in 1980, the PUC reversed course and instead has imposed over the subsequent eight years a complex system of “reregulation.” Some areas of trucking were subject to increased competition while others maintained the entry barriers and minimum rate structures. The PUC now has a minimum rate regulation system in the traditional mode for dump trucks, livestock carriers, household goods carriers, and substantially for cement carriers; while general freight carriers operate under an “IFT” system (individually filed tariffs). Under that system, each carrier is allowed to file its own tariffs and contracts with the PUC based on cost of service, which may be changed only where the carrier can justify changes as profitable.

Proponents of continued freight regulation include the California Trucking Association and the Teamsters, as well as several ad hoc groups of small associations which are part of the freight industry. These proponents of trucking regulation, who are predominantly within or under contract to the trucking industry, justify price regulation by citing their fear of “destructive competition.” They further argue that trucking is particularly amenable to “price wars”; that is, the predatory tactics of some entrepreneurs to drive others out of business by going below cost. The resultant competitive struggle at price levels at or below marginal costs usually means service diminution, a refusal to serve rural areas, and cutbacks on safety. In addition, proponents of trucking regulation believe that destructive rate competition creates a disruptive pattern of quick entry and exit from the marketplace, which adversely affects shipper ability to plan for their transportation needs.

Opponents of the existing freight regulatory scheme include the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, the Center for Public Interest Law, Ralph Nader’s Public Citizen organization, the California Coalition for Trucking Deregulation, the California Manufacturing Association, a coalition of shippers which includes corporations such as Long’s Drugs, and several small trucking firms. These opponents contend that the current regulatory scheme, including industry rate proposals, minimum price floors, and PUC review, is conceptually flawed. They believe there is little nexus between safety, service, or other external cost concerns and the imposition of minimum rates. The PUC could fully enforce rules to ameliorate any such harms by means other than intervention into the market to artificially increase rates. Opponents of the current system favor targeted regulation, an end to minimum price floors, and deregulation of rates and entry, while continuing to impose safety regulations. They argue that the existing regulatory structure of the general freight industry serves merely to benefit the trucking industry’s profit margin, while having little regard for consumer welfare.

At this writing, hearings on the regulation of general freight transportation by truck are being held on a daily basis with nonstop testimony. The hearings were targeted to end in the latter half of January. The administrative law judge presiding over the proceeding will then submit a recommended decision, upon which a thirty-day public comment period will commence. After the public comment period ends, the opinion will be considered by the Commission, which may adopt, amend, or reject the ALJ’s recommendation.

LEGISLATION:

SB 52 (Rosenthal) was introduced on December 5, and would amend Public Utilities Code section 854 to prohibit any person or corporation from taking any significant action to acquire control, either directly or indirectly, of any public utility without first securing approval from the PUC. The bill would also require the PUC to consider ten specific factors before granting approval, including the effect on ratepayers, shareholders, and public utility employees, as well as the effect on state and local economies. The bill would also require the PUC to request an Attorney General’s opinion regarding the effect of an acquisition on competition.

SB 52 is an urgency bill prompted by Southern California Edison’s attempt to acquire SDG&E. The utilities filed an application with the PUC on December 16 for approval of the acquisition. At this writing, SB 52 is pending in the Senate Committee on Energy and Public Utilities.

SB 53 (Rosenthal) would amend sections 852 and 853 of, and add section 856 to, the Public Utilities Code. Existing law prohibits a public utility from purchasing or acquiring the capital stock of any other public utility in California without PUC authorization. This bill would extend that prohibition to any subsidiary or affiliate of, or corporation holding a controlling interest in, a public utility. This bill is also pending in the Senate Committee on Energy and Public Utilities.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

The full Commission usually meets every other Wednesday in San Francisco.
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The State Bar of California was created by legislative act in 1927 and codified in the California Constitution by Article VI, section 9. The State Bar was established as a public corporation within the judicial branch of government, and membership is a requirement for all attorneys practicing law in California.
Today, the State Bar has over 110,000 members, more than one-seventh of the nation's population of lawyers.

The State Bar Act designates the Board of Governors to run the State Bar. The Board President is elected by the Board of Governors at its June meeting and serves a one-year term beginning in September. Only governors who have served on the Board for three years are eligible to run for President.

The Board consists of 23 members: fifteen licensed attorneys elected by lawyers in nine geographic districts; six public members variously appointed by the Governor, Assembly Speaker, and Senate Rules Committee and confirmed by the state Senate; a representative of the California Young Lawyers Association (CYLA) appointed by that organization's Board of Directors; and the State Bar President. With the exception of the CYLA representative, who serves for one year, and the State Bar president, who serves an extra fourth year upon election to the presidency, each Board member serves a three-year term. The terms are staggered to provide for the selection of five attorneys and two public members each year.

The State Bar includes 22 standing committees, 16 sections in 14 substantive areas of law, Bar service programs, and the Conference of Delegates, which gives a representative voice to 127 local bar associations throughout the state.

The State Bar and its subdivisions perform a myriad of functions which fall into six major categories: (1) testing State Bar applicants and accrediting law schools; (2) enforcing professional standards and enhancing competence; (3) supporting legal services delivery and access; (4) educating the public; (5) improving the administration of justice; and (6) providing member services.

**MAJOR PROJECTS:**

**State Bar Court Judges.** The selection of a presiding judge for the State Bar Court has been given top priority by the Board of Governors. Eight attorneys and one non-attorney are needed to serve as full-time judges for the Bar's revamped discipline system. All of the judges will be appointed by the California Supreme Court to six-year terms. The application deadline for interested individuals was December 31.

As a result of SB 1498 (Presley) (Chapter 1159, Statutes of 1988), which was drafted by State Bar Discipline Monitor Robert C. Fellmeth in conjunction with Senator Presley's staff, beginning in July 1989, full-time judges will hear and review most of the disciplinary and other regulatory proceedings conducted by the State Bar Court as the administrative arm of the Supreme Court. At present, discipline cases are heard before and reviewed by volunteer attorneys, retired judges, and non-lawyers. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 4 (Fall 1988) pp. 123-24; Vol. 8, No. 3 (Summer 1988) p. 130; and Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring 1988) pp. 126-27 for detailed background information on the provisions of SB 1498.)

The Board of Governors will screen and rate all applicants and submit to the Supreme Court at least three nominations for each vacant position. The Board will hold hearings and allow public comment on nominations for each vacant position. The first nominations will be submitted to the Supreme Court no later than April 1.

**Registration of Legal Technicians.** At its October 22 meeting, the Board of Governors authorized the release for public comment of a report about the provision of law-related services by non-lawyers. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 4 (Fall 1988) p. 123 and Vol. 8, No. 3 (Summer 1988) pp. 129-30 for background information.) The majority of the Board does not approve the contents of the report. Following the November 19 meeting, the report of the State Bar's Public Protection Committee dated April 22, 1988, was distributed for a ninety-day comment period. The report includes a statement that the Board has not approved its contents. Appearing at the October meeting to urge the Board to send the report out for comment were representatives of HALT, a national legal reform organization, and CalJustice, a statewide group advocating legal reform.

On November 19, the Board also authorized two public hearings concerning the report, which were scheduled for January 10 in San Francisco and January 26 in Los Angeles. Written comments were due by March 13. The Bar seeks comment on both the report and alternative solutions to the concerns raised in the report.

**Attorney Advertising: Use of the Term “Specialist.”** On November 19, the Board of Governors voted to send out for a ninety-day public comment period two proposed rules that would regulate the use of the term “specialist” in attorney advertising. The Board did not voice its approval of either option.

Approved as a pilot project by the California Supreme Court in 1971 and made permanent in 1985, the State Bar's Program for Certifying Legal Specialists identifies lawyers who have satisfied certain standards in specialty areas of legal practice. Lawyers must meet specific standards for certification in their specialty areas. Currently, such standards and certifications have been approved in the following specialty areas: criminal law: family law: immigration and nationality law: probate, estate planning, and trust law: taxation law: and workers' compensation law.

The draft proposals were the result of a request from the Board's Committee on Professional Standards to the Bar's Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct for a proposed Rule of Professional Conduct that would create a greater distinction between certified and non-certified attorneys with respect to advertising a specialty.

The two options that will be sent out for comment are adaptations of the rules of South Carolina and Texas. The modified South Carolina rule would require attorneys holding themselves out as specialists in a field regulated by the California Board of Legal Specialization but not holding a current certificate issued by the Board to include in their communication the disclaimer: “Not certified by the California Board of Legal Specialization.”

The modified Texas rule would permit attorneys who have been awarded a Certificate of Specialization by the Board to include in their communication, “Certified Specialist, [area of specialization]—California Board of Legal Specialization.” Attorneys who have not been awarded a certificate but whose communication contains a reference to their practice area, which is a Board-regulated specialty, would be required to state with respect to that field, “Not certified by the California Board of Legal Specialization.” If the attorney's practice area has not been designated an area in which a specialty certificate may be awarded, the attorney could also state, “No designation has been made by the California Board of Legal Specialization for a Certificate of Specialization in this area.”

Regardless of the final decision of the Board of Governors concerning these two options, the new rule would be in addition to a rule recently approved by the California Supreme Court. Rule 1-400(D)(6) provides that an attorney shall not state that he/she is a certified specialist unless the member holds a current certificate as a specialist issued by the California Board of Legal Specialization pursuant to a plan for specialization approved by the Supreme Court.

**Efforts to Increase Minority Participation in the Legal Profession.** At its
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October meeting, the Committee on Professional Standards unanimously adopted a report submitted by the Committee of Bar Examiners which proposes the creation of a task force to "undertake an aggressive and extensive outreach program" to increase the participation of minorities in the legal profession. The goal is to raise the number of minority attorneys to achieve "population parity." Of more than 100,000 attorneys practicing in California today, fewer than 10,000 are minorities. In addition, the Bar exam passage rate for blacks is reported to be at least half that of whites, and scores for Asian-Americans and Hispanic-Americans are reported to be "much lower" than for whites.

The report, authored by Judy Johnson from the Committee of Bar Examiners, calls for "aggressive recruitment and retention programs" to be implemented at elementary school, high school, and undergraduate school levels, and during and after law school, in order to maximize minority students to excel, and encourage them to choose a career in law and to become members of the profession. Kathy Neal, who is heading a special three-person committee of the Board of Governors to address the issue, hopes that the State Bar, major law firms, and private foundations will cooperate in these efforts and that some combination of these groups will provide money to help attain the goals of the report. Under the committee's plan, the State Bar task force would include law school deans, other educators, local bar representatives, and minority bar representatives. The task force will attempt to meet its goals by:

- Identifying talented minority students and developing programs to encourage them to consider law as a career;
- Setting up an effort in conjunction with the American Bar Association's Section on Legal Education and Admissions and California law schools to develop programs to increase the number of minority applicants to law schools;
- Supporting a mentor program in cooperation with local bar associations to motivate minority students already enrolled in law school to stay there and to do better on the Bar exam;
- Encouraging minority college students who may have decided on another career to rethink their career goals by publishing alternate paths to a legal career, such as law office and judges' chamber studies and part-time law school study; and
- Exploring ways to provide State Bar-funded scholarships to law schools for minority students and programs to increase their academic preparation for entry into law school.

The report was approved in principle so that the Committee on Professional Standards could study how to specifically recommend its implementation. The study was scheduled to be completed in time for the January Board meeting.

Emeritus Attorney Pro Bono Participation Program. On November 9, the Bar's Office of Legal Services began an Emeritus Attorney Pro Bono Participation Program, which will encourage and seek inactive and retired lawyers to represent low-income residents through existing pro bono (volunteer) programs. The Bar hopes the program will increase the opportunities for low-income Californians to receive legal representation.

Beginning with the 1989 membership fee billing period, the State Bar will waive fees to allow inactive members to become active participating attorneys, or active members to remain on active status solely to provide pro bono legal advice and representation through specified legal services providers (those programs which are State Bar Legal Services Trust Fund recipients). (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 3 (Summer 1988) p. 123 for information on the Trust Fund.) The emeritus attorneys, who are either retired or inactive State Bar members, must have practiced law in California for at least five out of the ten years immediately preceding an application to participate in the emeritus program; must have been members in good standing without a public discipline record for professional misconduct imposed within the last fifteen years and without resigning or retiring with disciplinary charges pending; and must neither request nor receive compensation for the legal services to be rendered in the Program.

Creation of Bench/Bar Consortium on Trial Court Delay Reduction (Fastrack Consortium). In November, the Board of Governors authorized the State Bar's participation, in conjunction with the Judicial Council, in a Bench/Bar Consortium on Trial Court Delay Reduction in accordance with AB 3300, the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act of 1988. AB 3300 required judges in delay reduction pilot projects to consult with local bar associations to the maximum extent feasible in developing and publishing procedures, standards, and policies used in the projects, and to meet on a regular basis with the county bar. Twenty-two State Bar members will be appointed by the State Bar President as representatives to attend such meetings, which were previously sponsored by the Judicial Council with judges and other court personnel in attendance. The Bench/Bar Consortium on Trial Delay Reduction (also known as the Fastrack Consortium) will meet approximately three times a year for the duration of the pilot projects.

Supreme Court Adopts Revised Rules of Professional Conduct. In December, the State Supreme Court adopted all of the revisions to the Rules of Professional Conduct approved by the Board of Governors in August. Changes to the following rules become effective on May 27, 1989: new Rule 2-300 permits lawyers to sell or buy the law practice of another lawyer, including "good will" value; Rule 3-500 requires attorneys to keep their clients "reasonably informed" about significant developments in their case and to promptly comply with reasonable client requests for information; Rule 2-100 allows attorneys to communicate with employees of a corporation about litigation against the corporation, provided that the employees do not belong to the group of company officials whose acts can legally bind the corporation; Rule 5-210 prohibits an attorney from testifying as a witness before a jury unless the client consents, the testimony relates to an uncontested matter, or the testimony deals with the nature and value of legal services; Rule 1-120 prohibits lawyers from assisting, soliciting, or inducing another lawyer to violate any ethics rule; Rule 3-320 requires attorneys to inform their clients if another party's lawyer is a spouse, parent, child, sibling, roommate, or lover so that the client has the option of firing the lawyer; and Rule 4-400 would prohibit a lawyer from inducing a client to make gifts to the lawyer unless and client and the lawyer are related. Proposed Rule 3-100, permitting a lawyer to reveal a client's secrets when ordered to do so by a judge or when necessary to prevent a crime likely to result in death or serious bodily injury, was withdrawn entirely. The rule will be studied further before its future is finally determined.

The Supreme Court did not, however, decide on the controversial proposed Rule 2-400, providing that a member of the California Bar "shall not make or present a settlement offer in any case involving a request by the opposing party for attorney's fees pursuant to private attorney general statutes which is conditioned on opposing counsel waiving all or substantially all fees." (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 4 (Fall 1988) p. 123 for details.) The Court will be presented with that rule in December for its approval.
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During January, the State Bar mailed a copy of the revised Rules of Professional Conduct to all members. 

Open/Closed Meeting Policy. At the November 18 meeting, State Bar Discipline Monitor Robert C. Fellmeth strongly encouraged the Discipline Committee to approve proposed amendments to the Bar's Administrative Manual regarding open and closed meetings of its standing and special committees. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 4 (Fall 1988) p. 123 and CRLR Vol. 8, No. 3 (Summer 1988) p. 130 for background information.) Citing past proposed legislation concerning this matter, which was withdrawn at the request of the State Bar after promising to establish its own rule concerning open meetings, Fellmeth assured the committee that if the amendments are not adopted, legislation will be introduced to apply the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act to all State Bar proceedings.

The Discipline Committee voted unanimously to present the proposed amendments to the Board of Governors for approval, along with a suggestion to include the contents of the Bagley-Keene Act in the proposed amendments.

Bar Exam Results. Of the 7,166 students taking the California State Bar Exam in July 1988, 52.5% passed, up from the 50.3% pass rate for July 1987. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 1 (Winter 1988) p. 109.) First-time applicants passed at rates of 73.5% for applicants who attended California law schools approved by the American Bar Association (ABA), and 47.6% for those who attended California accredited, non-ABA-approved schools. Of those first-timers attending unaccredited, non-ABA-approved schools, 27.7% passed. Repeating applicants passed at the rates of 33.7%, 18.4%, and 9.2%, respectively.

Task Force on Substance Abuse. This lengthy report on substance abuse and proposals to create a State Bar diversion and/or intervention program for alcohol- or drug-impaired attorneys, prepared by David Long and Heather Anderson of the Bar's Office of Research, is now being considered by the Discipline Committee. The report was scheduled for discussion at the January 20 meeting. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 4 (Fall 1988) p. 122 and CRLR Vol. 8, No. 3 (Summer 1988) pp. 128-29 for detailed background information.)

Redrawing the Board of Governors' Election Districts. In October and November, the public had an opportunity to comment on proposals for redistricting the State Bar districts from which members of the Board of Governors are elected. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 4 (Fall 1988) pp. 122-23 for details on the proposals.) Deadline for receipt of the comments was December 8. The legislature must approve the chosen redistricting plan.

LEGISLATION:
The Board of Governors has approved much of the legislation proposed by the Conference of Delegates for the Bar's 1989 legislative program. At its November 18 meeting, the Board approved for direct sponsorship the following proposed legislation:

Law Libraries: Support from Filing Fees. Business and Professions Code section 6322.1 would be amended to increase compensation to law libraries paid from first paper filing fees and to permit increase of $1 per year for such support.

Oral Depositions: Stay on Ex Parte Application. Code of Civil Procedure section 2025 would be amended to allow stay of oral deposition on ex parte application by any party or deponent pending hearing motion for protective order.

Spousal and Family Support: Exemption from Levy. Section 706.053 would be added to the Code of Civil Procedure to exempt from levy amounts received by a judgment debtor for spousal or family support unless such support is in excess of that which is required for necessities of life.

Juvenile Mental Health Commitments: Procedural Requirements. Welfare and Institutions Code section 357 would be amended to require that when a juvenile is to be involuntarily committed to a mental health facility, the court must follow the procedures set forth in Welfare and Institutions Code section 5000 et seq.

Notice of Motion: Required Statutory Notice. Code of Civil Procedure section 1005 would be amended to state that statutory exceptions to the fifteen-day period for noticing a motion shall supersede section 1005.

Service and Filing of Legal Documents: Facsimile Transmission. Section 1012(a) would be added to the Code of Civil Procedure and Code of Civil Procedure sections 1013 and 1013(a) would be amended to provide for service and/or filing of legal documents by telecopy.

Writs: Standardized Time Limits. Code of Civil Procedure sections 400, 404.6, 409.4, 418.10, 437(c), and 877.6 would be amended to provide standardized time limits for filing writ petitions.

Business Records: Admissibility of Copy Pursuant to Declaration. Evidence Code section 1562 would be amended to restate existing law regarding the introduction of business records without requiring a personal appearance by the custodian.

LITIGATION:
In Alderman v. Hamilton, 88 D.A.R. 14280, No. B022203 (Nov. 8, 1988), the Second District Court of Appeal found an attorney contingency fee agreement did not comply with Business and Professions Code section 6147, and affirmed the lower court's reduction of the fee payable.

Alderman was hired to protect the Hamiltons' interests regarding an anticipated will contest and to perform services regarding ownership rights in property the Hamiltons held in joint tenancy with a deceased party. The disputed fee arrangement called for a fixed hourly rate plus 25% of any settlement or judgment, to a maximum fee of 40% of the funds received.

Section 6147 requires all contingency fee agreements to be in writing and mandates all of the following be included: a statement of the rate, a statement of how disbursements and costs will affect the contingency fee and the client's recovery, a statement regarding related matters, and a statement that the fee is not set by law but is negotiable. If a contingency fee agreement does not comply with these requirements, it is voidable at the option of the client, and the attorney is then entitled to a reasonable fee for services performed.

After trial, the lower court found that the agreement was incomplete. It did not include a statement of how disbursements would affect the contingency fee; it did not discuss related matters; and it did not state that the fee was negotiable. The court decreased the fee payable from $27,750 to $11,361. The Second District affirmed.

In Shapero v. Kentucky Bar Ass'n, ___U.S.____, 108 S.Ct. 1916 (1988), the U.S. Supreme Court held that a state may not categorically prohibit lawyers from soliciting legal business for pecuniary gain by sending truthful and nondeceptive letters to potential clients known to face particular legal problems without violating the first and fourteenth amendments.

Shapero, a member of Kentucky's integrated bar association, applied to the Kentucky Attorneys Advertising Commission for approval of a letter that he proposed to send to "potential clients who have had a foreclosure suit filed against them." The Commission denied Shapero's proposal based on a then-
existing Kentucky Supreme Court rule prohibiting the mailing or delivery of written advertisements "precipitated by a specific event or occurrence involving or relating to the addressee or addressees as distinct from the general public." While denying Shapero's proposal, the Commission also voiced the opinion that the rule in question violated the first amendment and asked the Kentucky Supreme Court to amend its rule.

On the Commission's suggestion, the Kentucky Supreme Court reviewed the rule in relation to its recent decisions and decided to replace the rule with ABA Rule 7.3, which "like its predecessor, prohibits targeted, direct-mail solicitation by lawyers for pecuniary gain, without a particularized finding that the solicitation is false or misleading."

On review by the U.S. Supreme Court, the application of Rule 7.3 to Shapero's advertisement was deemed unconstitutional. The Court also found that the letter, like print advertising, "poses much less risk of overreaching or undue influence" than does in-person solicitation, citing Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel of Supreme Court of Ohio, 471 U.S. 626 (1985). The Court noted that a letter may be so misleading as to warrant restriction if it unduly emphasizes trivial or relatively uninformative facts or offers overblown assurances of client satisfaction. However, no one contended that Shapero's letter fell into this category.

RECENT MEETINGS:

At the October meeting, the Committee on State Bar Real Property submitted a plan to expend funds to study alternatives in developing the State Bar's Los Angeles and San Francisco properties. In 1987, the Long Range Planning Committee Regarding State Bar Properties proposed, after a ten-year study, to build an office building on the State Bar site on Third Street in Los Angeles. Two events, however, led the Executive Director to suspend the project. First, because of unanticipated large increases in staffing for the discipline process, the augmentation of the Offices of Investigation and Trial Counsel, and the creation of full-time paid judges, the Executive Director decided that the planned building was too small. Projections for property development in San Francisco were also said to be rendered obsolete. Second, increases in property value and publicly announced plans for massive development in the Los Angeles area reportedly necessitate a reexamination of the prior studies.

The Real Property Committee sought authorization to select consultants to provide an economic feasibility study, strategic plan, facility program, and development analysis on the issue. Also sought was authorization for the Administration and Finance Committee to approve necessary and reasonable payments for the consultant services from the Building Fund. The Real Property Committee states that no general fund monies will need to be allocated for the project. Results of the study and its recommendations with respect to the best alternative are to be forwarded to the Board Committee on Administration and Finance and the Board of Governors for approval.

In addition, the Professional Standards Committee voted unanimously to urge the Board to continue to press for either legislation or a state Supreme Court rule that would require attorneys to fulfill mandatory continuing education requirements, after AB 2618 (Harris), a bill which would have imposed such a requirement, died in the Senate Appropriations Committee last session. (See CRLR Vol. 8, No. 4 (Fall 1988) p. 124 for background information.) The Committee also approved the appointment of a task force by Board President Colin Wied to work on the issue. Representatives of the Bar Association of San Francisco and the Los Angeles County Bar Association both testified in favor of reviving the proposal.

During its November 19 meeting in San Francisco, the Board approved a survey by the Committee on Women in the Law and its mailing to a random sample of California women lawyers to learn about the concerns of this population so the Committee may address their needs. The Board also authorized the Committee to seek donations from outside sources for funding of the survey.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

April 14-15 in Los Angeles.
May 12-13 in San Francisco.
June 16-17 in San Francisco.
July 21-22 in Los Angeles.
August 25-26 in San Francisco.