

MARCH 2008 MOC III E
Appendix D

Summary of Public Comment Received to Date

Copies of actual comment are available by contacting Laila Bartlett at laila.bartlett@calbar.ca.gov

Person	Affiliation	Email	Comment Summary
Adrienne Scher	State of the Art Seminars Legal Division	ascher@saslegaldivision.com	<p>The Proposed MLP revisions will not stop the growth in The Proposed MLP revisions will not stop the growth in members choosing to "Opt-Out"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Members should be allowed to opt-in to specific mailings. · Official State Bar Mail should state that they are official State Bar mailings · Allow requestors to request segments of the member list by State Bar Section. · Increase fee per member record · The amount of records requested by MCLE and non-MCLE providers is less than 22% · Request is not defined in the agenda item · The ED's discretion needs to be delineated. · Public Policy requires that MCLE providers be allowed to market MLE programs to the members
Cathy Flores Hallina	Member	challinanmod@aol.com	<p>Member mistook membership list as member search option on the CalBar Website. Member suggested that the member search option not be limited to twice a year. Laila Bartlett responded to the member and clarified that the member list has no relation to the member search option. Upon clarification, member responded that "the proposed changes are reasonable and appropriate"</p>
Mark A. Anderson	Member	maanderwson@aya.yale.edu	<p>Member supports proposed revisions to the MLP. Member is "In favor of restricting the amount of spam/junk email...received"</p>

Elizabeth Post	Executives of California Lawyers' Associations (President)	epost@sfvba.org	Responded on behalf of ECLA's membership- they unanimously oppose the proposed revisions to the MLP. Local Bar requests of the Member list comprise of 22% of total list requests- the associations use the list to contact new admittees, offer cost effective MCLE and referral services, and distribute free directories and periodicals. The State Bar's member list enables the associations to reach out to potential members in their jurisdiction.
Person	Affiliation	Email	Comment Summary

Christine Burdick	Santa Clara County Bar Association	chris@sccba.com	Responded on behalf of the Santa Clara County Bar Association Board of Trustees- they unanimously oppose the proposed revisions to the MLP. While they understand the need to limit access of the list to profit vendors, the local bar associations are non-profit and purchases portions of the list up to six times a year. Limited access would impact the ability to solicit new admittees and inform them of the associations activities, information and benefits which "compliment the work of the State Bar".
Steve Henderson	Ventura County Bar Association	steve@vcba.org	Responded on behalf of the Ventura County Bar Association and agrees with the public comment submitted by the Santa Clara County Bar Association
Lisa Reep	Contra Costa County Bar Association	LGRReep@CCCBA.org	Responded on behalf of the Contra Costa County Bar Association and agrees with the public comment submitted by the Santa Clara County Bar Association
Bobbie Lee	Fresno County Bar Association	BobbieLee@fresnocountybar.org	Responded on behalf of the Fresno County Bar Association- the bar associations should be exempt from limited access of the member list. The bar associations have not abused the Membership List and should not be penalized.
James Brock	Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara	jbrock@sbcourts.org	The Court uses the member list to populate their Case Management System and to send out CA Supreme Court Special Oral Arguments to members in Ventura, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties. The Court agrees with the changes since they do not impact the ability of the Court to gain access of the list twice annually as needed.