tion, upon payment of the applicable fees and satisfaction of continuing education requirements; SB 722 (Stirling), regarding the issuance of permits for the disposition of human remains; and AB 2271 (Farr), which would permit a trustor in a preneed funeral trust to elect, for any reason, that the trust is irrevocable.

LITIGATION:
In *Quesada v. Oak Hill Improvement Co.*, No. F015995 (Aug. 28, 1989), the Fifth District Court of Appeal held that entities responsible for handling a corpse owe a duty of care to the deceased's close family members because it is foreseeable that mishandling may result in severe emotional distress.

In the case, the body of Lupe Quesada was delivered to the Santa Clara County Coroner's Office for an autopsy. Quesada's widow made funeral arrangements with Oak Hill Memorial Park. Two days later the family members visited the funeral home. They were shown the body of a stranger that the funeral home insisted was Quesada's. Over strong family objections that the funeral home had the wrong body, Oak Hill conducted the funeral ceremony and burial. Five days later the stranger's body was exhumed and replaced with the body of Quesada.

Plaintiffs in the case, Quesada's sister and niece, brought a suit for negligent infliction of emotional distress. The trial court held that no cause of action existed since plaintiffs were not a party to the funeral contract with Oak Hill. The appellate court reversed, holding that liability may be established irrespective of the contractual relationship and is determined by the extent to which the defendant could foresee that emotional harm would result to the plaintiffs. As a result of the ruling, entities owe a duty of care to the deceased's close family members in the handling of corpses. Whether a party is a "close family member" is a question of fact to be determined by a judge or jury.

RECENT MEETINGS:
At the Board's August 3 meeting, the Publications Committee presented a draft of the proposed consumer information guide. The Board was favorably impressed with the draft and approved it as submitted. The Board instructed the Committee to seek further comments from consumer and industry groups. The Publications Committee was scheduled to report back to the Board at the November 30 meeting regarding any comments received.

FUTURE MEETINGS:
To be announced.

---

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR GEOLOGISTS AND GEOPHYSICISTS**

Executive Officer: John E. Wolfe
(916) 445-1920

The Board of Registration for Geologists and Geophysicists (BRGG) was created by statute in 1969. This eight-member Board licenses geologists and geophysicists and certifies engineering geologists. In addition to successfully passing the Board's written examination, an applicant must have fulfilled specified educational requirements and have the equivalent of seven years of professional experience in his/her field. This requirement may be satisfied with a combination of education from a school with a Board-approved program in geology or geophysical science, and qualifying field experience.

The Board has the power to discipline licensees who act in violation of the Board's licensing statutes. The Board may issue a citation to licensees or unlicensed persons for violations of Board rules. These citations may be accompanied by an administrative fine of up to $2,500.

The Board is composed of five public members and three professional members. BRGG's staff consists of two full-time employees (Executive Officer John Wolfe and his secretary) and two part-time personnel. The Board's committees include the Professional Practices, Legislative, and Examination Committees. BRGG is funded by the fees it generates.

The Governor recently appointed Karen L. Melikian to the Board as a public member. Ms. Melikian received her undergraduate degree in education from Fresno State University and completed her master's degree at the University of Southern California. She is currently employed by the Fresno Unified School District. Governor Deukmejian also reappointed Board members Tom Slaven, Howard Spellman, and Wayne Bartholomew to a second four-year term.

**MAJOR PROJECTS:**

Examinations. Over the summer and early fall, Board staff processed applications for the September 15 examinations. Candidates with deficiencies in their applications were notified in time to remedy these defects before the application process was closed, pursuant to the Board's new Application Notification Program. The Board recently developed a new postcard system to notify each candidate whether his/her application packet is complete. (See CRLR Vol. 9, No. 3 (Summer 1989) p. 52 for background information.)

Budget. The Board recently filed a number of budget change proposals, all of which are still pending at this writing. If granted, the additional funds will be used to alleviate BRGG's understaffing problem and to publish information pamphlets and guidelines for groundwater investigations, engineering geologic reports, geophysical studies, and geological reports.

**LEGISLATION:**

The following is a status update on bills reported in detail in CRLR Vol. 9, No. 3 (Summer 1989) at page 52:

*AB 459 (Friszelle)*, which would provide that a previously licensed individual may renew his/her license at any time after license expiration upon payment of the applicable fees and upon satisfaction of continuing education requirements, is a two-year bill pending in the Assembly Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Consumer Protection.

**FUTURE MEETINGS:**

To be announced.

**BOARD OF GUIDE DOGS FOR THE BLIND**

Executive Officer: Manuel Urena
(916) 445-9040

The Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind has three primary functions. The Board protects the blind guide dog user by licensing instructors and schools to ensure that they possess certain minimum qualifications. The Board also enforces standards of performance and conduct of these licensees as established by law. Finally, the Board polices unlicensed practice.

There are three guide dog schools in California. These schools train the blind in the use of guide dogs. Each school also trains its own dogs. Each blind person is then matched with a dog using factors such as size and temperament.

---
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