

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for enhancing the protection of the public and ensuring that protection of the public is the highest priority in the licensing, regulation, and discipline of attorneys." What do you understand "protection of the public" to mean in the context of governance of the State Bar?

	Response Count
	161
answered question	161
skipped question	11

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

	Response Count
	157
answered question	157
skipped question	15

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what criteria?

	Response Count
	153
answered question	153
skipped question	19

4. What qualifications should be required for each member of the board?	
	Response Count
	149
answered question	149
skipped question	23

5. What size should the board be?	
	Response Count
	151
answered question	151
skipped question	21

6. How long should the terms of the members (and of the president) be?	
	Response Count
	151
answered question	151
skipped question	21

7. How should the president and other officers be selected?	
	Response Count
	152
answered question	152
skipped question	20

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better serve the interest of public protection?

	Response Count
	145
answered question	145
skipped question	27

9. Would you like to speak at one of the public hearings the Governance Task Force is holding in January? (Please provide your contact information and state whether you would like to speak on January 20, 2011 in Los Angeles, or on January 27, 2011 in San Francisco.)

	Response Count
	140
answered question	140
skipped question	32

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

	Response Text	
1	The State Bar has a duty to come up with an effective and efficient admission and discipline system to protect the public from dishonest, unethical, and incompetent lawyers.	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	Keeping incompetent and/or immoral lawyers from being able to practice law.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	Disbarring attorneys who steal from or injure their clients.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	Avoidance of fraud, competence	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	Disciplining lawyers, including suspension and disbarment.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM
6	1) Protecting the public against unethical lawyers; 2) Protecting the public against nonlawyers who pose as lawyers; 3) Protecting the rule of law, including respect for the law on the part of members of society, including by means of assuring that those who practice law are deserving of their respect and trust.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	Ensuring that licensed members of the Bar uphold our ethical responsibilities, are appropriately punished when we fail to adhere to our responsibilities, and ensuring that the representational structure of the State Bar looks after members and non-members alike.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
8	making certain that we have competent and ethical lawyers providing competent legal services to the public	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

	Response Text	
9	Protection of the public w/r/t governance of the State Bar means ensuring the general public has a meaningful presence on the Board, i.e., several members who have voting priveleges.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
10	to protect clients from unethical lawyers or lawyers charging unconscionable fees.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
11	Qualified, ethical, professional	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	Protect the public from being taken advantage of, harrassed or otherwise exploited by members of the bar.	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	that Attorneys represent the and protect their clients within the rules of law of the State/Federal government	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	lawyers misusing their position as a fudiciary for monetary gain	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	Ensuring that individuals and businesses are not harmed through attorney misconduct or negligence. Thus, the State Bar should be ensuring that these protections are adequetely funded and implemented both the enforcement and support for attorneys in need of assistance	Dec 20, 2010 10:35 PM
16	Protection from attorney fraud or other conduct by attorneys that harms or may harm the public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM
17	"protection of the public" should mean protecting the rights of the common man to have legal representation. It's unlikely that the legislature really has that in mind.	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM
18	Ensuring that members of the legal profession are held to the highest ethical standard to maintain the integrity of the profession and insure that the public is receiving qualified legal services consistent with the rules of professional conduct.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	Protection of clients.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
20	Insuring that practitioners are qualified for the work they perform and that moneys etc. held in trust by practitioners are properly safeguarded.	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM
21	Providing oversight for attorney continuing education in topics of professional ethic s, and providing disciplinary procedures when those ethical parameters are not complied with.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	Making certain only ethical, competent attorneys are permitted to practice	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
23	1. Rules and procedures for admission to practice. 2. Rules and procedures for maintaining lawyer competence. 3. Rules and procedures for administering discipline for lawyer failures 4. Rules and procedures regulating lawyer advertising and 5. Rules and procedures for compensating individuals for attorney defalcations	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
24	Make sure attorneys are available, able and are ethical in their representation of aggreived members of the public	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
25	Protection from attorney malfeasance.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
26	I never thought of the Bar as an entity to protect the public, which is one of the basic functions of government (health, safety and welfare). If the essence of the Bar is public safety, then the Bar should be a government agency and I would see no reason for ONLY lawyers to join or mandated to join the Bar in order to practice law. I thought the function and purpose and function of the Bar was collegial and professional effort to promote integrity among lawyers and to elevate the overall quality of service by legal practitioners (this ultimately benefits the public but it is NOT equal to protecting the public). My understanding is that the Bar has morphed into a public service quasi governmental agency that takes money from lawyers to spend on non-lawyers. If the Bar was doing IT RIGHT, they would use Bar fees to develop CEB high quality programs that would be mandatory and free for member lawyers. I believe the Bar has become something it was not intended to be and not worth much to those who pay for it. Taxation is what is supposed to be used to protect the public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

	Response Text	
27	Disbarment of lawyers who commit a crime when their client is the crime victim, and referral of the attorney for prosecution by a district attorney.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
28	protecting the public against fraud and malpractice.	Dec 20, 2010 10:54 PM
29	That the State Bar will protect the public from unethical attorneys and from people not licensed to practice law.	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
30	To protect the public from lying attornreys which is rampant.	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
31	Protection of the public from lawyers.	Dec 20, 2010 11:02 PM
32	Protecting members of the public from financial, ethical or other abuses by members of the Bar and/or Judiciary.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
33	Review laws, regulations which affect the legal profession to ensure that public is not taken advantage of by attorneys as well as the public is represented by competent honest attorneys as qualified by our license exam and disciplinary actions.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
34	Competent representation of clients in all matters with substance being more important than form. Adequate and realistic public education as to what the law is and is not capable of doing. Ability to access competent legal services.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
35	Seeing that the public is protected from dishonest and inept attorneys by censoring and disbaring them - and making the results public knowledge.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
36	Efforts to insure that both clients and members of the general public who interact with attorneys are not mistreated by reason of the attorneys' superior knowledge of the law	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
37	Protecting the public from fraudulent attorneys	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM
38	Selection [admission] of new lawyers on the basis of both character and competence.	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM
39	I don't know and I don't want to speculate. Because decisions of discipline are published and if any person looks up that attorney's name in the calbar website, information related to discipline is readily available, I believe that the public already has good protection and access to information about attorneys and I don't see why "protection of the public" with regard to attorneys is such a high priority.	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
40	Preventing sharp lawyers from victimizing people without lawyers.	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
41	Ensuring that lawyers are competent and ethical.	Dec 20, 2010 11:28 PM
42	Disciplining lawyers	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
43	(1) protection of the public in general from unethical lawyers. (2) protection of the courts from lawyers lacking in civility. (3) protection of parties from incompetent lawyers.	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
44	Ensuring competence and honesty of lawyers	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
45	Ensure that members of the bar have a minimum level of competency in the fields which they practice, agressive prosecution of attorneys that violate ethical rules, especially of those involved in misrepresentations to the court and to their clients.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
46	Attorney discipline; educating the bar; and ensuring that the Rules of Professional Conduct are clear and understandable.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
47	That lawyers are qualified to practice and are ethical in their practice	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
48	Following up and disciplining lawyers who act unethically or in violation of the applicable B&P Codes e.g., plaintiff's bar that unfairly prosecute ADA cases simply to recoup statutory atty's. fees.	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
49	assuring attorneys continue to learn = CLE and are held to high ethical standards	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
50	The public is protected from unethical and incompetent lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM
51	Protection of the public from dishonest, unethical or criminal acts of lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

	Response Text	
52	Not being "ripped off" by incompetent or predatory lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
53	Protecting the public from incompetent and unethical lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
54	Those who serve in governance capacities for the State Bar should: (1) protect the structure and integrity of the judicial process as an officer of the court; (2) to protect the integrity of the legislative process through enforcement of proper elections and related processes; and protect of public from over-reaching members of the bar, especially those who hold public office and act in prosecutorial or public capacities and do so in ways which wield public power improperly.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
55	-ensuring lawyers are competent to practice -making sure State Bar licensing standards are upheld and rules of professional responsibility are enforced.	Dec 21, 2010 12:22 AM
56	Preserving the rights of non-licensed citizens under the State and federal constitutions.	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
57	I think it means protecting individuals and businesses from harm by lawyers - whether by theft of their funds, involvement in fraudulent prosecution of claims, overzealous representation, or incompetence.	Dec 21, 2010 12:29 AM
58	Make sure attorneys follow the professional responsibility rules	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM
59	Assurance of quality of representation/legal skill Investigation and enforcement against abuses committed by members of the Bar against clients, and violations of ethical prohibitions.	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
60	Protection from unethical and incompetent lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 12:45 AM
61	I understand it to mean the protection of non-lawyers from unscrupulous lawyers who might use their legal knowledge to prey on non-lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 12:46 AM
62	institutional safeguards against fraud, misfeasance and malfeasance	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
63	To ensure that non-attorneys do not become victims if attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 1:13 AM
64	In this context "protecton of the public" means two things; first, protection of the substantive and procedural rights of persons who are clients of attorneys from invasion by third parties; and, second, protection of the interests of persons who are clients of attorneys or non-clients from invasion by dishonest or unscrupulous attorneys. The first definition encompasses preservation of the means by which attorneys are best able to serve their clients, such as the confidentiality of the relationship.	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM
65	Making certain that attorneys licensed to practice law are competent, have a basic knowledge of ethical standards and hold by them.	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
66	I think it means value for dollar.	Dec 21, 2010 1:56 AM
67	Protection from bad, dishonest, incompetent lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
68	Protection of the public from unethical attorneys, incompetent attorneys by means of regulation,	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM
69	Written notice with full disclosure of all fees & costs & legal services to be rendered, in detail, at a 6th grade reading level.	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
70	Prevention of damage caused to clients by their attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
71	Promote public awareness of law	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM
72	This term equals protection of the Rights of the people in my mind. Ultimately this boils down to ensuring that Constitutional Rights are upheld, Of course within this context I also include a client's property rights honored by the attorney.	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
73	A. Provide recourse for clients against lawyers who cheat or take advantage of clients. B. Ensure a basic level of competency of all lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

Response Text		
74	Ensuring that lawyers are competent to practice, engage in the practice of law ethically, and are committed to serving not only those who can afford to hire a lawyer but those who cannot	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
75	Prohibiting the practice of law by (and protecting the public from) the incompetent, the greedy, the emotionally unprepared (depressed, etc.) attorney. Also protecting the wrongly accused defendant from the deprivations of the greedy plaintiff and their greedy, etc., attorney.	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
76	protecting the public from unethical attorneys	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
77	THE BAR MUST BE GOVERNED BY PEOPLE WITHOUT A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THEY MUST NOT DERIVE ANY DIRECT OR INDIRECT PECUNIARY BENEFIT FROM WHOM AND WHAT THEY GOVERN	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
78	Better enforcement of the existing rules, which includes the rules of professional conduct, statutes, and case law. The level of enforcement is disgraceful.	Dec 21, 2010 3:10 PM
79	Monitoring conduct & discipline is highest priority.	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
80	To ensure both competency and integrity of practicing attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
81	Removal of lawyers who are a danger to themselves and the public on account of their actions or inaction.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM
82	To be protected from non attorneys and also attorneys who may take advantage of their interests.	Dec 21, 2010 5:12 PM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

Response Text

83 It is axiomatic that if one does not ask the right questions one increase the odds one will never get the right answers and will never solve real problems. Dec 21, 2010 5:18 PM

My review of this series of 9 questions strongly suggests to me the entire senior leadership of the CA State Bar has not asked the right questions and, down deep, may be 100% clueless as to what are extremely pressing, serious, real problems, and what needs to be done to meaningfully promote "protection of the public", or, in the alternative, is not that clueless and really does not entertain a serious agenda to "protect the public".

Let me point you in the right direction. A small but highly intelligent, very perceptive, and dedicated group of CA licensed attorneys and lawyers and other professionals in CA and around the US are of this growing opinion, with good cause: A) Most, if not all, professional licensing groups, only give lip service to "protection of the public" and, overall, fail to do so; B) real, effective, meaningful, "protection of the public" begins when the licensing group strongly and unequivocally supports a bold, gutsy, dedicated, fearless, member who stands up to the Establishment's usurpations of power, so the licensed professional can use his/her skill set to force the Establishment to obey the US Constiution and other bedrock laws that are faithful to that Supreme Law of the Land; C) the record is replete, however, with real life, sad, tragic, facts where the CA State Bar and other professional licensing organizations, however, have turned against such a licensed professional; D) compare, for one example, how the CA State Bar handled attorney Richard I. Fine of the LA area and attorney Thomas Giarrdi. The dissimilar treatment is egregious. Some day, some one should erect an honorary statute to praise attorney Fine for his principled, courageous, stand to expose and to oppose apparent corruption that permeates the LA County civil justice system and the CA state govt, but, instead, the CA State Bar, instead of supporting him, which it should have, abandoned him and did nothing to support him, and now he is disbarred, with no protest by the State Bar; E) another example follows. The federal IRS and the federal Dept of Justice have this unified mindset when it comes to a license attorney or CPA who represents a taxpayer before the IRS or Tax Court: First, the licensed professional must limit all arguments exclusively to only how the IRS and DOJ interpret relevant laws and can never deviate from their official interpretation of same; second, the licensed professional must make only arguments for a client that, when limited to the official IRS/DOJ position have at least a one out of three chance of prevailing; third, if a licensed professional deviates from how the IRS/DOJ construe the law or makes an argument that they determine had less than a one out of three chance of prevailing, even if limited to how they construe the law, they automatically deem the licensed professional to be unethical and will demand that the licensed professional sign an agreement to that effect, including agreeing to be "disbarred" from appearing before them for X number of years, as determined by them, unilaterally. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO GIVE A CLIENT "ZEALOUS REPRESENTATION" AND "LOYALTY", AS REQUIRED BY APPLICABLE CA STATE BAR RULES, IF AND WHEN A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL YIELDS TO WHAT THE IRS AND/OR DOJ DEMAND. EVEN GOD CANNOT COMPLY WITH TWO MATERIALLY DIFFERENT STANDARDS OF CONDUCT FOR WHAT IS "ETHICAL" CONDUCT. WHEN A CA LICENSED ATTORNEY COMPLAINS ABOUT THIS TO A CA STATE BAR LICENSED ATTORNEY AND ASKS FOR HELP AND SUPPORT, THE CA STATE BAR LAWYERS OPINE AS FOLLOWS: YES, WE KNOW ABOUT THIS SITUATION. WE ARE WATCHING IT. IT IS A MATTER OF "FEDERAL PREEMPTION". YOU ARE ON YOUR OWN. BE CAREFUL. BULL FECAL MATTER. THIS IS NOT A MATTER OF "FEDERAL PREEMPTION". THIS IS A MATTER OF 1) FEDERAL USURPATION OF POWER AND 2) THE GUTLESS CA STATE BAR DOING ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO SUPPORT A CA LICESED LAWYER WHO HAS THE COURAGE TO REPRESENT A CLIENT "ZEALOUSLY" WITH "LOYALTY", WITH 100% COMPLIANCE WITH WHAT IS REQUIRED OF THE CA LICENSED LAWYER BY THE CA STATE BAR, THE CA LEGISLATURE, AND THE CA SUPREME COURT 3) BUT THE CA STATE BAR ALLOWS THE IRS AND THE DOJ TO FUNCTION AS AN INDEPENDENT DE FACTO SECONDARY BAR ASSOCIATION WITH MATERIALLY CONFLICTING STANDARDS FOR WHAT

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

Response Text

83

IS "ETHICAL" CONDUCT AND FAILS TO DO ANYTHING MATERIAL TO SUPPORT THE CA LICENSED ATTORNEY WHO PERFORMS "ETHICALLY" AND COMPETENTLY PER THE CA STATE BAR'S RULES.

Dec 21, 2010 5:18 PM

QUESTION: How can any competent, ethical, experienced, CA licensed attorney function ethically before the IRS when the IRS/DOJ and the CA State Bar have such materially conflicting standards and definitions for "ethical" and/or "competent" behavior?

Question: What kind of a track record does the CA State Bar have of supporting CA licensed lawyers in that kind of a situation? Of telling the IRS and DOJ--and its lawyers, in effect, to go to hell?

Question: What kind of record does the CA State Bar have of disciplining IRS/DOJ lawyers who stoop to such gross, egregious, unethical usurpations of the real controlling Constitutional Rule of Law?

Question: What kind of a record does the CA State Bar have of supporting CA licensed lawyers against bad judges? Bad govt lawyers? Bad sworn peace officers? Bad lawmakers?

Answer: For all of the above questions, the CA State Bar has a horrible record, an absolutely egregious, indefensible, abominable, embarrassing record.

Question: How can a CA licensed attorney perform to the best of his or her ability, at full throttle, when he or she knows that if he/she does that, the CA State Bar will discipline him/her for standing up to the Establishment's usurpations?

One bottom line is this: If the senior leadership of the CA State Bar is serious about wanting to "protect the public" [which I doubt], it should do all of the following: 1) Reinstatement attorney Richard I. Fine forthwith, with a public apology for abandoning him; 2) publicly tell the IRS/DOJ/ and State and Federal judges and lawmakers that the CA State BAR is 100% seriously committed to supporting all CA license attorneys who truly represent clients "zealously", even if those people disagree with their arguments or their style, etc.; 3) the CA State BAR should take a strong proactive public position against corrupt judges, unethical govt lawyers, and the entire system of "immunities" in the US.

Nothing in the real Constitutional Rule of Law supports the idea of "immunities" for judges, lawmakers, govt lawyers, sworn peace officers, etc. It is illogical to require these folks to swear to uphold and to support and to defend the US Constitution and to then allow them to hide behind their "immunities" when they fail to do so, including when they usurp power for reasons of personal malice. Immunities subsidize, encourage, and perpetuate incompetence and horrible governance, yet the State Bar has done nothing to end wide spread immunities, which allows the pinnacles of justice to function criminally without accountability, so that "Justice" means, for them, "just us" and to hell with the rest of us, which makes a mockery of "Due Process of Law" and "Equality for All" and "Equal Justice".

State Bar dues were used to pay for this survey, one that does not ask anywhere near the right questions. Thus, this survey is another manifestation of CA State Bar trite, crap, and window dressing, just something it can point to to justify, for the uninformed, its existence.

Until the State Bar starts to do as I suggested above it will continue to function as a trade group for the politically well connected and as a hell hole that will be used by insiders to crush people, including the best of the best of its membership, such as attorney Richard I. Fine.

This survey, coupled with how the CA State Bar fails to support its members who stand up to usurpations, is another splendid Exhibit One of how the CA State Bar excels at misleading the public when it proclaims that it wants to "protect the public".

If the CA State Bar really wanted to "protect the public" it would seriously and immediately address in a sustained, meaningful, no compromise, manner, the issues I raised above, and damn the consequences as to who gets a well deserved comeuppance and a well deserved, belated, "At-a-boy!".

I have no realistic expectation that the senior leadership of the CA State Bar will do anything positive or good in response to my unfettered, candid, constructive input.

I write this with the realistic expectation that I am wasting my time and I am

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

	Response Text	
83	<p>for daring to be candid, for daring to communicate concepts unflattering to the CA State Bar.</p> <p>I decline to answer yours Questions Nos. 2-9 because I deem them to be, in context, a waste of time and essentially irrelevant.</p> <p>Who protects CA licensed lawyers from the unduly politically correct CA State Bar? Answer: No one!</p> <p>What is one of the biggest threats to the CA public? Answer: The CA State Bar itself! Why? Because its construction [interpretation and application] of its rules to CA attorneys is grossly inequitable, penalizes the best of the membership, has an undue chilling effect on competent and ethical zealous representation--which seriously harms the public, and tolerates the worst of the worst who are politically well connected.</p> <p>-- Peter J. Mancus, CA State Bar No. 52606</p>	Dec 21, 2010 5:18 PM
84	Education of attorneys re bias, conflicts of interest, ethics. Investigation of complaints by public. Discipline of attorneys who betray the public trust.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
85	client relations only	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
86	Bureaucratic double-speak for making people feel good about what the State Bar does.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
87	<p>The public should have a place to go with any questions they may have about whether they are receiving adequate representation, and they should be able to receive candid feedback and advice. For the huge number of people who need occasional cost-prohibitive legal advice, perhaps the State Bar should sponsor a pool of attorneys who can be on "retainer" to answer questions and provide general advice to people, who perhaps can pay a token sum into the pool in exchange. There must be hundreds of attorneys who can spare a few minutes to help someone sort out a legal situation over the phone and point someone in the right direction. If legal representation is deemed necessary, perhaps there could be a State Bar-sponsored web portal where the attorney who has just sorted through the legal situation on the phone can post case details with a request for someone to volunteer their services at a reduced rate. Perhaps law firms with deep pockets, money placed into a fund from class action settlements, can provide partial payment of fees (or costs, expert fees) for these volunteer heroes. There should be a State Bar-sponsored program to mediate disputes, assist with domestic violence cases, etc. The State Bar should be a place of first resort for the public. Right now it is utterly, completely irrelevant to the public at large.</p>	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
88	Disciplinary oversight of professional conduct	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM
89	<p>The Bar should ensure that only qualified applicants are admitted. In addition, the Bar needs to properly police the members of the Bar to ensure all adhere to both the letter and spirit of ethical responsibilities. Finally, the Bar should not be in such an adversarial relationship to its members. If you call th Ethics Hotline the first thing you are told is that the advice you recieve will not protect you. The only time you hear from the Bar is in an adversarial or punitive way. The Bar should be a resource to its members rather than just a policing agency.</p>	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
90	Doing everything possible to disipline solo practioners and ignoring large firms	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM
91	Protection of the public means proper licensing of attorneys and quick and severe discipline and/or disbaring of unqualified/unethical attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM
92	The best way to protect the public would be to focus on controlling the criminals in the legislature and leave the bar as it is.	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
93	Make sure lawyers who act illegally cannot continue to practice	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
94	Regulating the admission of applicants to the practice of law and the conduct of lawyers with respect to clients and members of the public.	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
95	integrity	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

	Response Text	
96	Attorneys should be regulated to ensure that they provide the highest caliber legal advice and representation. This means that the State Bar MUST enforce disciplinary proceedings at the highest stds for misdeeds. It also means that the COURTS need to stop letting attorneys abuse the system without reporting them to the bar.	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
97	Prevent unqualified lawyers from harming the public through poor practices. "Unqualified" meaning dishonest or grossly incompetent.	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
98	Protection against broad-based scams like loan modification fraud, etc. Not the protection against attorney's who have trouble balancing their trust accounts!	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
99	It's a code word for imposing additional hassle and expense on lawyers (but only solo practitioners, not big-firm lawyers or prosecutors) in addition to the profound challenges of this economic depression.. It's politically easy to bash lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 10:59 PM
100	Protecting the public from unethical attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 11:38 PM
101	incompetence, fraud, stealing, narcotics or alcohol addiction.	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
102	In the context of governance of the State Bar, I understand "protection of the public" to encompass two distinct goals: identifying misfeasance/malfeasance by attorneys; and preventing further misfeasance/malfeasance	Dec 22, 2010 12:22 AM
103	Reducing or minimizing malpractice.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM
104	Protection against lawyers committing legal malpractice; protection of pro se litigants; increasing bar counsel actions; encouraging judges, other lawyers, and the public to report unethical behavior; educating the public on what they should expect from ethical, competent lawyers (e.g. keep informed about litigation, money issues, etc.); providing information in Spanish, Chinese, etc. so that a language barrier will not prevent clients from understanding their rights. No need to protect the wealthy public. Need to protect the needy public, so need to get members from walks of life that have direct contacts with these populations. Need to have a few "reality checks" among what I assume to be a room of wealthy lawyers with little understanding or compassion for those in need and those who are unable to navigate our complex legal system.	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM
105	Harrasment, meddling, scape-goating, and lawyer bashing. Unnecessary and excessive licensing fees. .	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM
106	Harsh discipline for those who break the rules	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
107	I understand "protection of the public" to mean that the interests of lawyers and law firms, as well as those of the State Bar, shall not come before the best interests of the public.	Dec 22, 2010 11:06 PM
108	Protect the public from negligent or dishonest lawyers	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
109	The words do not mean anything. Police, fire; earthquake protection? More specific please.	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
110	uphold quality and ethics and resist discourtesy and greed	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
111	Make sure that attorneys who represent them serve them competently.	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
112	Maintenance of high ethical standards among practicing attorneys, and discipline of those who fail to uphold those standards.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
113	Insuring, as much as possible, that no member of the public is harmed because of a lawyer's miscoduct, malpractice, or unethical actions.	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
114	No.	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
115	In this context, protection of the public should mean that licensed attorneys are competent and honest.	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM
116	It means that the public trust in the legal system is protected, through the rules of professional responsibility and through systems such as the ethics hotline where lawyers can "check themselves" in questionable situations.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

Response Text		
117	Protecting the public from unethical attorney behavior.	Dec 29, 2010 7:15 PM
118	To insure that members of the public receive competent legal services from attorneys who understand and submit to the high ethical standards set by the Bar.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
119	Lawyers generally make a lot of money for so little oversight into what they actually do to earn it. Corrupt ones need weeding out, not protecting. The State Bar seems to be more interested in protecting the ranks. Not enough complaints are even investigated. Corrupt persons that are members of the bench also need to be examined.	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM
120	policing for bad lawyers; a very limited scope. Public Interest should include promoting the use of ADR, but for 20 years the board has shot this down as a required course for the State Bar exam, as a required course in law school, as a standard of ethics for lawyers (encourage settlement, discuss ADR alternatives with client).	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
121	The bar board is responsible for recruiting, selecting, and evaluating certain management level employees of the bar who are responsible for licensing, regulation and discipline of attorneys. As such, the board of governors has ultimate responsibility for that function.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
122	Require all attorneys to have malpractice insurance; be less lenient in penalizing/sentencing attorneys who have been proven in the State Bar Court to have harmed a client; Create special bankruptcy court rules relating to attorneys that will preclude them from avoiding malpractice lawsuits by simply filing for bankruptcy.	Jan 4, 2011 12:51 AM
123	Enhancement of the legal process; protecting consumers from unethical lawyers.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
124	Protection of the public from lawyers who abuse their relationships with their clients, whether by acts of dishonesty, malpractice, trust account violations, etc.	Jan 4, 2011 1:34 AM
125	Elimination of incompetent and crooked lawyers and judges.	Jan 4, 2011 1:50 AM
126	Attorneys should be competent and ethical.	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
127	Ensure public confidence on the legal system.	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
128	Disciplining errant attorneys but never disciplining prosecutors no matter what they do. Ever.	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM
129	Reigning in attorneys and judges who abuse their power, delay the completion of litigation and/or act in a way which is harmful to the judicial process.	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM
130	Improving access to legal advice and representation. Assuring competence and dedication in attorneys. Providing clear guidance to attorneys as to their duties. Assuring legislation and regulations are logical, understandable, and workable. Dealing out appropriate discipline. Assisting attorneys with training, continuing education, and meeting issues they face in practice.	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
131	whatever is the passing fancy of the chair of the funding committee and her staff	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM
132	Keeping unscrupulous, unethical and incompetent lawyers out of the business of representing clients.	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
133	I fear that it means clamping down on plkaintiff's attorneys and is motivated by anti-attorney feelings that are fanned by conservatives seeking to undercut the protection of citizen and consumer protections and individual rights.	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM
134	Making sure Lawyers earn their fees, guard client confidences, and faithfully assist the Courts properly to administer justice under our State's and our Nation's Laws.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
135	Exactly what it says: That the CA State Bar Board of Governors shall license, regulate the activities of and discipline - if necessary - licensed attorneys practicing in the State of CA.	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
136	Protection of the public means that the State Bar will diligently review, investigate, and if appropriate, prosecute complaints against attorneys.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

Response Text		
137	That attorneys are held accountable to high standards of professional competence, integrity and professional ethics	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
138	Rules that protect the public as individuals	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
139	Ensuring access to justice is fair and affordable to the public; ensuring that the lawyers in our State are committed to ethical conduct in dealing with clients, court and opposing counsel.	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
140	Protecting the public from unscrupulous lawyers.	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM
141	Ensuring that active members of the bar (practicing lawyers) have the requisite minimum legal skills sufficient to provide legal services competently to their clients.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
142	discipline of attorneys who breach the public trust such as foreclosure fraud, theft of client funds, use of law to file many lawsuits the purpose of which is not protection of the public but generation of legal fess. Class action fees should not exceed 25 percent and where no cash benefit is given, the attorney fees should not exceed 10 percent. Class actions should benefit the class, not the attorney who files them.	Jan 8, 2011 10:29 PM
143	Fundamentally, the Board's purpose is to provide a means to ensure there is some entity that effectively "guards the Guardians". The Board is the internal means for the judicial branch of government to police itself. The Board should ensure that there are appropriate standards and review procedures for judges, lawyers, and other officers of the court and Bar; and that these standards and reviews are effective for all.	Jan 9, 2011 10:19 PM
144	Currently, "protection of the public" in context of the State Bar simply means attack defenseless sole practitioners or small firms to make it appear they are "protecting the public" while turning their back or actively assisting a variety of bad acts committed by members of large firms or the government.	Jan 10, 2011 4:27 AM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

Response Text		
145	<p>Protection of the Public involves the regulation of the legal profession in discipline and licensing; monitoring the relationship of lawyers with their clients, the courts, and the legal system.</p> <p>We believe that the Board has focused on public protection. In a number of significant policy decisions, the Board has recently acted to protect the public over the objections of voluntary bar associations and contrary to what may be viewed as the more parochial interests of lawyers.</p> <p>For example, the Bar wholeheartedly supported SB 94, which placed prohibitions on lawyers' accepting advanced fees for assistance to clients in obtaining loan modifications.</p> <p>A few years ago, the Board supported the posting of Notices of Disciplinary Charges on their website. Allegations are posted on the Internet prior to any determination of guilt or innocence. This was opposed by many local bar organizations.</p> <p>Further, the Board enacted a new Rule of Professional Conduct requiring that lawyers disclose the absence of legal malpractice coverage. This was opposed by many local bar organizations.</p> <p>Finally, the Board of Governors (September 22, 2010) adopted a revision to the Rules of Procedure that loosens the standards that apply to the admissibility of evidence at the State Bar Court, enacting standards similar to the Administrative Procedures Acts. Now evidence at the State Bar Court need only be "relevant and reliable," and can include hearsay.</p> <p>These recent actions by the Board were almost uniformly opposed by local bar organization, yet the Board determined that they fostered and promoted public protection.</p>	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM
146	<p>"Protection of the public" means keeping crooks and incompetents out of the profession. No enhancement is required. Lawyers already are the most heavily-regulated profession in the state.</p>	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
147	<p>The problem is that this is only half of what the State Bar does. Licensing, regulation and discipline is to make sure that the lawyer is qualified, and serves his or her client ethically, honestly and well.</p> <p>The other part of the State Bar's activities is to educate lawyers and legislators, provide input on necessary and appropriate changes to the law, and to be a trade association for lawyers in California. If this second part is not considered necessary by the legislature, then the legislature should allow this part to be split off and remain self regulated (it would then follow the structure in many states of having a separate, voluntary state bar association, controlled by the members, that is not connected with the admission, regulation and discipline of lawyers).</p>	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
148	<p>Protection of the public from unscrupulous lawyers and unscrupulous business practices by lawyers.</p>	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
149	<p>"Protection of the Public" means adequate representation of all of the geographic areas in California so that the State Bar can enact rules and regulations to make sure the attorneys representing the public provide services in a proper manner. To ensure this happens, the Board of Governors must be able to hear the various concerns of the public in all of the geographical areas of California. If one particular area is not represented, than the needs of the public, in that geographical area, will be overlooked. Thus to ensure the public is properly protected, each geographical area of California should have local representation on the Board.</p>	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM

1. The legislature is interested in receiving "recommendations for

Response Text		
150	Attorneys be required to work for their client to the best of their ability without deliberately delaying resolution or failing to provide all of the options available.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
151	A group of attorneys'/lawyers' protecting themselves from the violations of Laws Passed by State Legislature & "Acts of Congress", disregarding United States of America Public Citizens & others within its jurisdiction legal rights.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
152	To assure and maintian a high level of skill and ethical conduct in the profession	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
153	That the public can reliably expect that lawyers will fully and faithfully serve members of the public who need (or elect to) obtain the services of an attorney.	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM
154	A vigorous response to complaints about a lawyer's conduct or service. If complainants are going to be referred to county bar associations for assistance, there has to be meaningful monitoring of local bar association mediation services.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
155	Weed out incompetent & unsavory individuals who hold a license, and prosecute those who don't but still practice law.	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
156	Investigation of corrupt attorneys. When there is a complaint filed, you need to follow through instead of providing excuses in defense of the attorney.	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
157	Providing information, particularly consumer protection information. We can help people undersand their rights and responsibilities.	Jan 19, 2011 7:02 PM
158	Protection from unethical and/or criminal conduct in violation of public laws by Bar members, either directly from the member or from his/her clients, with the knowledge of the member.	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
159	it should include education of the bar	Jan 21, 2011 6:31 PM
160	To dicipline lawyers who have failed to live up to the standards of the profession AND to educate lawyers so tha they can practice to their fullest abilities	Jan 24, 2011 8:54 PM
161	1. An effective discipline system 2. Admissions, including moral character determinations. 3. Promulgating the Rules of Professional Conduct.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

Response Text		
1	Attorneys and non-attorneys.	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	Fifty percent members of the pulbic that have made substantial use of an attorney's services in the past five years and fifty percent members of the bar with at least one member having been subjected to State Bar's disciplinary process within the last five years.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	Retired Judges, Retired Attorneys, Citizens	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	no opinion	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	lawyers, judges, public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM
6	Mostly lawyers, but the presence of some lawyers on that board is not inconsistent with the function and goals.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	I believe that the Bar should consist of a roughly equal number of professional and non-professional members.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
8	lawyers with a minimum legal experience of 15 years practicing law; judges who have served on the bench for at least 10 years; three members at large who are non lawyers	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
9	Lawyers, judges, public interest lawyers, general public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

	Response Text	
10	lawyers, judges and members of the public	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
11	A minimum number of lawyers, some non-lawyers	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	Present make up appears appropriate	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	People who represent the constituency served and some must be attorneys who are engaged in the practice of law.	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	tenured attorney, those who are not members of the bar that are answerable to the public	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	Both attorneys and members of the public knowledgeable about attorney-client issues.	Dec 20, 2010 10:35 PM
16	Attorneys.	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM
17	Lawyers who believe in protecting the rights of the common person to hire attorneys of their choice. Non-attorneys should not serve on the board.	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM
18	Attorneys, paralegals and informed members of the public with relevant experience. While there is currently a focus on diversity of geography across the state in selecting members of the board, there should also be a focus on diversity of experience (i.e. large vs small firm, litigation vs transactional practice and age).	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	People knowledgeable about the practice of law and business regulations	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
20	Lawyers, judges and members of the public who have no ties to the legal field.	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM
21	Attorneys with experience in handling allegations of ethical infractions and public complaints of same.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	Current system seems balanced	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
23	Lawyers who understand the practice of law and some members of the public	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
24	Attorneys, retired attorneys, a few judges and very few political based personnel without a legal background.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
25	Attorneys without qualification to age.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
26	Anybody who does not have a "rice-bowl" or "empire-building" or bureaucratic mentality or who is a liberal with other people's money.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
27	Lawyers only, selected by the members of the State Bar.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
28	members of the bar	Dec 20, 2010 10:54 PM
29	Judges, attorneys, the public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
30	Both members of the public and members of the state bar.	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
31	Persons appointed by the governor and legislative leadership.	Dec 20, 2010 11:02 PM
32	The present composition seems adequate.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
33	Both attorneys and non-attorneys. Should be diverse (gender, race, disability, etc.)	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
34	I note that the current selection method is based on geographic boundaries which is of course fitting as agricultural areas most likely have differing need from urban areas. However it occurs to me that years in practice may just as well be a valid criteria. In that regard, the current make up is one attorney under 36 years of age or less than 5 years of practice. Seems to me that perhaps 8 members should be selected on geographic basis and 8 based on years of practice at least as far as the attorneys go. As far as the public members go there appears to be no guidelines set forth other than the number which leads me to suspect they are political appointments. I think that heads of political or social activists should be considered for these positions.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
35	Attorneys, judges and public members.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
36	Discipline and enforcement is skewed against smaller firms. There is a model that presumes that larger firms do not have discipline problems	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

	Response Text	
37	Current makeup is fine	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
38	Neutral attorneys who care about other attorneys.	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM
39	Both lawyers and members of the public, pretty much the way it is now. But a larger cross-section of public representation seems to be a good idea.	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM
40	Lawyers, judges and law professors should definitely be the majority of the members that serve on the bar. I can see why individuals that are not lawyers could be included but those individuals should be well-versed in issues relating to attorneys and to their work.	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
41	Non lawyers	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
42	Lawyers, members of the public, and an accountant knowledgeable regarding financial transactions.	Dec 20, 2010 11:28 PM
43	Current make up is OK	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
44	I do not accept the premise that the State Bar should exist. I believe lawyers should be regulated as New York does it, by the courts, and if California has a bar association it should be of lawyers and for lawyers and a purely private sector organization.	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
45	Attorneys who are known for being competent and highly ethical, with a minimum of 5 years practice with the state bar.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
46	Attorneys and members of the public.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
47	Only members of the State Bar. Members of the Public do not know enough to be of useful assistance and usually do not understand what lawyers need to do. The Public can make suggestions and submit complaints as noted below.	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
48	Lawyers recommended by the State Judicial Commission and receive the highest rating, business and community leaders.	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
49	only attorneys and judges as they would take pride in the calibre of fellow members as in the old Guilds	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
50	Lawyers. Some public members are appropriate, but public members candidly are like lay arbitrators -- it seems nice in concept, but you need to have actual familiarity with laws, procedures and practices.	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM
51	The same as now (mostly lawyers with 6 or 7 lay people.	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM
52	LAWYERS! ONLY!	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
53	Practicing lawyers and members of the public.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
54	The current structure is acceptable.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
55	The current mix of practicing attorneys and laymen is a good model. In house lawyers should be represented on the board if they are not already.	Dec 21, 2010 12:22 AM
56	California-licensed Attorneys in good standing and Public Members. 3 Attorneys for each Public Member.	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
57	In lieu of some of the active lawyers, I would like to see 1-3 judges, active or recently retired. Perhaps the current and past Chief Justice of the state Supreme Court (or the newest member, even)? And, if the past Chief Justice can't or declines, then the Chief Justice could name another sitting or recently retired judge. Replacing active lawyers with retired judges would also decrease the influence of active non-judge lawyers in the State Bar, which would give strength to the other groups. Active non-judge lawyers should constitute no more than 50% of the board.	Dec 21, 2010 12:29 AM
58	Attorneys and lay persons	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM
59	Attorneys and members of the public	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
60	Lawyers directly elected by all current bar members.	Dec 21, 2010 12:45 AM

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

	Response Text	
61	It should be mixture of lawyers and non-lawyers. The purpose of having a mixture of lawyers and non-lawyers would be to certain that the non-lawyer perspective in taken into consideration.	Dec 21, 2010 12:46 AM
62	Lawyers	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
63	Less lawyers than are currently serving, more and more diverse members of the public.	Dec 21, 2010 1:13 AM
64	I am pretty well satisfied with the present composition of the Board.	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM
65	Individuals should serve on the board who understand the qualities necessary to possess the qualities mentioned above AS WELL AS individuals from the public who are sensitive to the broad range of sophistication (or lack thereof) in the public that uses or needs access to legal services. Also allow for law student interns.	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
66	Lawyers and non-lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
67	A broad range of primarily attorneys with untarnished credentials. More solo practitioners and small firm members should serve. Political appointees should probably not serve.	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM
68	ALL SHOULD BE NONLAWYERS.	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
69	I believe only lawyers should serve. The "public member" -- however fashionable -- seems unnecessary. The only one I've met was a complete, arrogant, jackass.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
70	active members in good standing	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM
71	The current framework seems practical.	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
72	Because "protection of the public" is but one of several State Bar functions, it needs to be only attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM
73	I am satisfied with the current make-up of the Board.	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
74	Majority of public members; minority of attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
75	ethical attorneys who live in the geographical district they represent	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
76	CITIZENS WITHOUT A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND WHO ARE NOT THERE TO BUILD A RESUME, OR FUTHER A FINANCIAL OR POLITICAL CAREER	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
77	Current model is fine.	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
78	Former lawyers should be mandatroy in the composition of the Board	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
79	Predominately lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM
80	Trusted attorneys and judges and some members ot the public who understand the issues	Dec 21, 2010 5:12 PM
81	a mix of attorneys and lay people.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
82	CA licensed lawyers only	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
83	Attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
84	It should be one-third attorneys, one-third judges and one-third members of the public.	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
85	Assuming that this means a sub-Board for the oversight of the disciplinary system: Actively practising lawyers only; meaning that they are not retired, elected to public office or judges	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM
86	I think it would be useful to have a judge serve as an appointed member. In addition, perhaps some of the presidents or delegates of various state associations for public attorneys could serve as non-voting members. For example, I am a past president of the California County Counsels Association. There are similar associations for other public lawyers. In my opinion public lawyers are underrepresented on the Board.	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
87	Attorneys & Judges	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

	Response Text	
88	Combination of attorneys and the public	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM
89	Experienced attorneys - say, 5 years or more in the bar. I'd try and get some in-house as well as a mix of solo and large firm types.	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
90	There should be greater diversity among the public appointments - as it is currently structured you would have to be politically-in with the governor or politicians to get a public recommendation. Insiders taking care of insiders	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
91	lawyers, members of the public and one member of the judiciary (active or retired).Otherwise the composition of the Board shoould remain the same.	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
92	insurance commissioner	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM
93	How is this relevant to the protection of the public more than it already does? This appears to be a politically motivated question rather than one which is intended to actually discover where problems lie. Changing the faces on the board will NOT solve anything. Thus, if this is the only type of question that this survey can come up with, it is useless.	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
94	Lawyers	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
95	The representatives should include several of the practices: solo, big firm, corporate, etc. I don't believe that State appointed persons are representative of the "public".	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
96	Lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 10:59 PM
97	I think the current structure is a good one. Perhaps, there could also be an emphasis for ensuring tha there is equal representation by both the plaintiff and defense bar.	Dec 21, 2010 11:38 PM
98	lawyers	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
99	Respected attorneys, legislatures and/or public officials with years of service.	Dec 22, 2010 12:22 AM
100	Malpractice attorneys, judges, educators, members of the public.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM
101	Representative from FTC or state consumer protection agency, state trial judge, federal trial judge, state AG lawyer, bar counsel, legal aid attorney, transactional lawyer, trial attorney, general counsel, new attorney, healthy dose of non-lawyers, lawyers not from big metropolitan areas.	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM
102	yes if the pay is right.	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM
103	elected lawyers	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
104	I think the current composition is acceptable.	Dec 22, 2010 11:06 PM
105	Majority should be lawyers, with some lay input	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
106	A mix of Lawyers; judges and public members.	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
107	lawyers interested in maintaining high standards in the profession and not just interested in self aggrandizement. Maybe a couple of devoted law school teachers/administrators should be mixed in, but everyone has to understand the challenges of practice in the public. private, corporate and other sectors. Also the board should have diversity: big firm, solo, urban rural.	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
108	Attorneys, Judges and nonlawyers	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
109	Attorneys with clean public disciplinary records should make up at least one-half of the board. Non-lawyers selected by the Governor or the legislature should make up the balance.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
110	I am satisfied with the present method of selecting board members.	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
111	Lawyers.	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
112	A smaller numbere than 22. Experienced lawyers should be on the board, with a few retired judges.	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM
113	Lawyers of unquestionable intetgrity and members of the public who do not contribute or have any conflicts of interest with the bar.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

Response Text		
114	I think it's fine how it's now structured.	Dec 29, 2010 7:15 PM
115	Lawyers and Judges.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
116	More members of the public than lawyers.	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM
117	lawyers and members of the public, as you have	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
118	Primarily lawyers, if not exclusively lawyers. Power and leadership come from consent of the governed. Nonlawyers issuing edicts about how lawyers should behave will not be well accepted.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
119	Lawyers are best qualified to serve on the Board.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
120	I think the mix is about right; there should be public members, but I think the majority should be lawyers.	Jan 4, 2011 1:34 AM
121	Lawyers, judges, and other interested citizens	Jan 4, 2011 1:50 AM
122	Only persons admitted to practice law in the state of California.	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
123	Lawyers and non lawyers	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
124	Good question.	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM
125	Active attorneys, judges and qualified members of the public.	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM
126	Members of the judiciary, a representative cross-section of attorneys, legal educators, some public members.	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
127	Lawyers directly elected by bar members	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM
128	A panel of lawyers and educated lay people	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
129	It should be fairly balanced between attorneys who represent people and those who represent corporations, those who represent criminals and those who are prosecutors, solo practitioners and large law firm attorneys.	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM
130	Instead of 16 Lawyers and 6 Laypersons, the Board should be composed of 20 Lawyers and 2 Laypersons. Laypersons should have had some experience as Clients of Lawyers.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
131	Those individuals, including licensed and active attorneys and non-attorneys, as outlined in applicable sections of the CA B&P Code.	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
132	The present composition of the board of governors is adequate.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM
133	Active attorneys are recognized to meet/exceed these standards and members of the public who have the capability to evaluate professionals such as other current or former licensed professionals (architects, teachers, CPAs, MDs, etc).	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
134	attorneys and non attorneys. These members should not know eachother or be friends of friends.	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
135	Lawyers who have experience in public protection issues; public members must have actual experience in the legal system in some meaningful way.	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
136	Lawyers. I'm not sure that including public members has improved anything.	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM
137	The board should be comprised of both lawyers and members of the public.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
138	attorneys	Jan 8, 2011 10:29 PM
139	As diverse a group of interested,trustworthy, and knowledgeable members of the public, the legislative and executive branches, and the Bar that is yet small enough to have open and frank discussion and able to decisively make uncomfortable decisions	Jan 9, 2011 10:19 PM
140	Only sole practitioners or attorneys in firms of 5 or less attorneys. Attorneys employed by large firms or the government should be disqualified. In the alternative, equal representation - one sole practitioner for ever large firm OR government attorney.	Jan 10, 2011 4:27 AM

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

	Response Text	
141	<p>When lawyers are admitted to the practice, they swear to abide by the core principles of the legal profession, as are articulated in the Rules of Professional Conduct and State Bar Act. Lawyers are fiduciaries as a matter of law, and officers of the court.</p> <p>Many of the constituent groups (voluntary local bar association) opposed the requirement of disclosure of malpractice coverage, and the posting of Notices. The Board enacted those and other protocols because they believed they promoted and enhanced the core values of the profession.</p> <p>We believe lawyers should constitute the majority of the Board of Governors. According to substantial case precedent, lawyers are within the judicial branch of the government, as opposed to the other professions. Lawyers remain one of the last self-regulating professions because of this critical factor.</p> <p>Public members should continue to serve. They are important because (if properly selected) they represent the voices of the consumers of legal services.</p> <p>During the last decade, the Rules Revision Commission has worked with great diligence to rewrite and articulate the Rules of Professional Conduct. While many lawyer members of the Board have attended those meetings, we are advised that public members have rarely, if ever, attended them. We would like to see public members appointed who have demonstrated a commitment to addressing issues of public concern and who are prepared to devote the time and energy necessary to educate themselves in these matters.</p>	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM
142	A majority of lawyers and a minority of highly qualified community leaders.	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
143	lawyers actively engaged in the practice of law	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
144	A variety of people from different parts of the legal profession - large firms, small, solos, government lawyers, public interest lawyers, in house counsel, and one or two members of the public	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
145	Individuals who best represent the interest of a diverse bar should serve on the governing board of the State Bar. This is best accomplished with separate districts that allow for local representation.	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM
146	A variety of previous litigants specifically previous high conflict litigants who have strived to expose deliberately churning of cases which finally has been acknowledged initially by the Elkins Task Force.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
147	Internal Revenue Service verifying attorneys'/lawyers' report monies earned in its corporation & public corporation profession; Congress law committee; State Legislature law committee, & Attorneys'/Lawyers' represent attorney-lawyer	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
148	lawyers	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
149	Lawyers, law professors, or persons otherwise expert on the role that lawyers play in our system of justice.	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM
150	The present mix is fair enough. The overwhelming majority of the board should be active lawyers.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
151	some lawyers, some members of public. should include at least one 'expert' on ethics - perhaps reduce 1 attorney slot & make it an ethics slot, but maybe reduce 2 lawyer slots & make ethics slots.	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
152	Individuals not involved with any judicial agency, law firm or lawyer. The public knows best what is being practiced in our courts. After all, we are the victims of this ongoing corrupted system.	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
153	I would suggest adding a representative from the volunteer Sections.	Jan 19, 2011 7:02 PM

2. Who should serve on the board that governs the State Bar?

	Response Text	
154	Both members of the Bar, plus persons with law degrees who have a track record of being ethical and effective with clients through nonprofit organizations legal work, corporations, etc., for five years or more.	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
155	Board should have a representative of the sections much as the Board has a CYLA representative	Jan 21, 2011 6:31 PM
156	I like the current composition.	Jan 24, 2011 8:54 PM
157	A majority of the Board should be attorneys. While public members serve an important role, they are not really interested in some of the Bar's key functions. For example, last year when the Board spent many hours on adopting new regulations governing the profession, usually none of the public members attended those rules revision sessions because they found them boring. The attorney members did attend, as the regulations were much more meaningful to them. I am opposed to Professor Fellmuth's proposal to change the governance model and to add more public members.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

	Response Text	
1	The attorney members should be elected by the membership at large. Non-attorney members should be appointed by	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	See above for criteria. The Chief Justice should appoint the members with consent of a majority of the sitting members.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	I don't know.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	N/A	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	No strong opinion; bar members can elect lawyers; judges and public should be appointed.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM
6	By persons of wisdom within the profession.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	I believe that the election scheme should be ended, and the board should be fully appointed by the State Senate, Assembly and Governor.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
8	A committee should be appointed to review applications ...criteria as specified above	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
9	Selected by self-application and appointment for certain positions. Appointed by Judicial Council, Governor, and Legislature. Criteria should include, for attorneys, active membership in the bar, proven commitment to ethical practice of law and the general public, for non-lawyers should have a demonstrated commitment to a general population social issue--a commitment to the importance of protection of the public from predatory lawyers, and an interest in providing legal information to the general public in non-legalese terms.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
10	some of the lawyer members should be elected, as they are now. some lawyers should be appointed. the members of the public and the judges should be appointed.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
11	Represent various interests, including legal, political, industry, social causes	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	Present make up appears appropriate	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	By the legislative, judicial and executive branches of government - by appointment powers	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	current selection process seems reasonable	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	Contested elections.	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

Response Text		
16	Current selection method is OK.	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM
17	These individuals should be selected by a nominating committee composed of respected experts in the legal field (i.e. retired judges, professors, retired lawyers). This committee should be insulated from political influence.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
18	They should not be selected by government officials. That system is based on political debts. This is not a formula for selecting talent. Form a selection committee of judges and law school deans.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	By the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM
20	By election and appointment, where necessary. Individuals should have a minimum of 10 years of legal education and attorney experience.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
21	Appointments are worthless - always political. No one will appoint someone not put forward by their entourage, or whom they know personally, so anyone not in the inner circle (or someone whose favor is being carried) is automatically excluded. People should be asked to volunteer and then an impartial (some academicians would be nice) panel should interview, vet and select from the volunteers.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	Attorneys should be elected by practicing members of the bar statewide. There is no reason why there should be 9 geographic areas with a representative each. Being from Shasta County, for example, or any other county, for that matter, brings no particular expertise to the role. Lawyers with less than 5 years should not be represented. They do not have enough experience to make valuable contributions. The Governor, not the Legislature, should appoint the public members. The qualifications are fine as they are.	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
23	One third should come from small firms and the private sector	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
24	Members of the California Bar by members of the bar apportioned by district.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
25	To be fair and non-political, I would select by lottery every year or two-years. Serving would be on NO COMPENSATION but expenses reimburseable basis and mandatory if selected by lottery.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
26	Election by members of the State Bar, by district, with no requirement that any specific group of members being given any preference.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
27	Application	Dec 20, 2010 10:54 PM
28	By public election	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
29	Members of the public could apply. The criteria could be a 4 year degree or higher.	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
30	See response to No. 2.	Dec 20, 2010 11:02 PM
31	The methods currently used seem to be adequate.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
32	I think a committee should be put together to determine the qualifications and then reviewed and selected versus the board itself choosing--nepitism and all (sp?)	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
33	As far as the selection goes no criteria is set forth other than the Governor getting to appoint 4 and one each by the Senate Rules Committee and 1 by the Speaker of the House. I would have the Speaker choose 2 and the Senate Rules Committee choose 2.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
34	By application and appointment.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
35	The composition of panels etc are not the problem is the enforcement models and/bias.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
36	Current selection process is acceptable	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
37	These individuals should be nominated by members of the bar.	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM
38	I'm not familiar with current procedures. But the Bar should reach out for under-represented segments of the public.	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

Response Text		
39	Individuals can volunteer or be appointed by the governor.	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
40	Elected at large	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
41	4 lawyers (1 from L.A. area, 1 from Northern Calif., 1 from Fresno/Bakersfield area, and 1 from Redding/Eureka area); 4 public members from each of those areas; and 1 accountant. Publish openings on the Board in the legal papers, in the main newspapers in L.A., San Diego, San Francisco, Oakland, Sacramento, Fresno, Bakersfield and Redding; and put on Craigslist and a couple of other jobs websites. From interested responses, existing Board can select the best candidates for the next year.	Dec 20, 2010 11:28 PM
42	Current approach is OK	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
43	I am opposed to lay people governing an organization of lawyers. For that reason regulation should be done by the courts or another government agency and the bar association should be private and not in the regulation business.	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
44	They should be elected by the public.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
45	A majority of the board of governors should be attorneys.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
46	Members of the Board of Governors should be selected by the Judges on the California Supreme Court, The California District Courts of Appeal and by the Superior Court judges. Their selection should be based on their knowledge of the experience, competence and high moral standards and ethics of the candidates.	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
47	Similar to the judiciary, lawyers should receive peer ratings. Business and Community members should be elected in the same manner judges are elected.	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
48	nominated by local bars and voted upon by active attorneys	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
49	Lawyers appointed by the California Supreme Court/Judicial Council with perhaps some consent or concurrence by the Governor and Attorney General. Competence and experience.	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM
50	Lawyers - by vote of their peers; public members by appointment of senate (as opposed to 4 selected by governor, 1 each by the leader of the Senate and Assembly. Criteria: Active lawyers, honest and good reputation.	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM
51	Appointment by the Judicial Counsel.	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
52	The State Bar should advertise the public roles in general newspapers, etc and a special committee in the legislature and governor's office should select the members of the public to participate. The committee should ensure diverse representation (economic, sex, political views) so that the members of the public are representative of the community's views. Lawyers should be able to nominate themselves to be appointed and be elected by other State Bar members.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
53	The current structure is acceptable.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
54	The current model is OK.	Dec 21, 2010 12:22 AM
55	By the State Bar Governors	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
56	The active lawyers should be selected by vote of the lawyers in their district. The appointments by the various political authorities is fine, as the the CYL appointee (although this person should probably serve for 3 years, or until age 36, whichever is first). A couple of spots should be designated positions within government or the bar, such as the judges noted above, and could include the Lieutenant Governor or Secretary of State or the person holding some other elected position.	Dec 21, 2010 12:29 AM
57	Attorneys elected by active attorneys, lay persons appointed by Governor	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM
58	Attorneys by members of the California Bar.	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
	Members of the public by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the State Senate.	
59	Election by all current bar members based on a platform.	Dec 21, 2010 12:45 AM

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

	Response Text	
60	They should be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the CA State Senate.	Dec 21, 2010 12:46 AM
61	Election by members. Criteria should include experience, record and accomplishments	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
62	The election of the attorney members by their peers, by a structure that compels geographic distribution, and thereby a mix of law practice backgrounds, has worked well. I was concerned about the appointment of non-attorneys when it began, but the appointments have been generally responsible and the appointees have made useful contributions	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM
63	That is a much more difficult question. Judges, neutrals, lawyers from various disciplines [academia; criminal law; corporate law; immigration; debtor/creditor law; general/commercial litigation; personal law (trusts, estates, probate, family law, conservatorships); solo practitioners; labor; complex litigation; nonlawyers (sociologists, public health experts, mental health/poverty/veterans assistance experts, corporate/banking executives, representatives from other local industries and other consumers of legal services).	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
64	Lawyers elected by the members of the Bar, non-lawyers elected by the general public. NO political appointments, that is no politicians to have a say in the process.	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
65	I think there should be a more random selection method as long as those selected have appropriate experience and a clean record.	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM
66	By the commanding officer of the Salvation Army in California; Selected by diversity of occupation with no relatives who are lawyers.	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
67	I believe the current system of election within districts is the best devised.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
68	Professional achievement as solid evidence of qualification	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM
69	The selection method should be far from political, but of course this is not likely. I think we would all like to see members who appreciate the need to honor Rights, act ethically and with fairness.	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
70	Each superior court and each appellate court should select one person for a 2-year term with no repeats permitted. That group of ~65 should vote on the officers from among themselves. the existing plebiscite is not working. We don't know those people. The people who run usually have some ax to grind OR are a product of the "system," i.e., people who avoid action or attention unless on a politically correct topic.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM
71	I would like to see more minority representation, but I am uncertain as to how to select such representatives and which minorities should have a seat - perhaps a rotating system.	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
72	By membership of the bar and every member of the public who has served on a jury (including as an alternate) in that year or prior three year period.	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
73	these attorneys should be elected by registered voters in the geographical district where they serve	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
74	VOLUNTEERS SHOULD BE SOLICITED. THEY SHOULD BE PEOPLE WITH THE TIME, ENERGY AND SKILL TO FAIRLY GOVERN AND NOT SEEK FINANCIAL REWARD OR ACCOLADES OTHER THAN THE GOAL OF PUBLIC SERVICE	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
75	Active members of the bar. Qualifications obvious criteria.	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
76	A nominating committee comprised of current board members should compile the slate of candidates.	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
77	The members of the legal profession.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM
78	Appointed some by the State bar president, one by the governor and some elected by the bar membership	Dec 21, 2010 5:12 PM

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

	Response Text	
79	Appointment of he Chairman and several top attorneys and several top public persons, application of interested persons for other committee members. Appointments would be by the governor, approved by the assembly.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
80	reginal, by bar members. Candidates should at minimum have held license for 3 years	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
81	By election of State Bar members	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
82	Any member of the Bar who wishes to serve should be required to submit character references that will be published along with their bio's and statement of reasons for wanting to serve, and members of the Bar should vote accordingly. Judges should obviously be volunteering, and elected by their peers, interested in assuring that the least are as well-served as the well-moneyed interests. Members of the public should, perhaps, have to run for the office and be elected by other members of the public to represent their interests.	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
83	By nomination by the members of the State Bar Board of Governors	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM
84	A judge could be appointed by the Chief Justice. Public association members could be selected by their associations.	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
85	Governer Must have significant experience in private practice and/or the bench	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM
86	By the State Bar, the Courts and the Governor's Office through public applications.	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM
87	Vote of bar membership along with the annual dues statement.	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
88	There should be some standards determined regarding skill sets needed to be a member. There should be an application process, with some type of screening criteria developed by the CA Bar, that addresses crucial key issues, such as ethics, not bilking people and making the services more accessible. etc.	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
89	As presently selected. If a judicial officer is appointed it should be made by the Chief Justice.	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
90	elected	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM
91	Again, relevancy?	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
92	Same as at present, except selections should be diverse geographically and by nature and type of private practice.	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
93	Peer nominated, assigned to pools then drawn at random	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
94	Some at random, some elected	Dec 21, 2010 10:59 PM
95	Members should be appointed based upon a nomination process with the caveat that there be representation by both plaintiff and defense attorneys alike.	Dec 21, 2010 11:38 PM
96	elected at large by active members based upon their individual resumes	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
97	By nomination by the State Bar members at large and general election. The indiviual criteria should be left to the discretion of each member	Dec 22, 2010 12:22 AM
98	Nomination by former task force members, and a few by random selection of bar members. Criteria should include minimum number of years as a bar member, record free of disciplinary measures, and some members should have experience with disciplinary actions as a defending attorney or as a judge.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM
99	For the representatives of various stakeholders, I would leave it up to the stakeholder to select the representative (e.g. bar counsel, state AG office, FTC/state consumer protection agency, state trial judge, federal trial judge). Other than that, I'm not sure. Any sort of general election will end up being a popularity or networking contest. Perhaps they should be nominated and then confirmed by general election among bar members, but I'm not sure who should nominate.	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM
100	by vote from members of the bar	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

Response Text		
101	district elections	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
102	The State Bar should select these people	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
103	applicants without conflicts of interests; by a panel of judges and Bar Association officers.	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
104	applications, nominations, references, input from judges, lawyers others.	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
105	Nonlawyers should be elected by the people, everyone else appointed.	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
106	Attorney members elected by members of the State Bar; non-attorney members appointed by the Governor and/or the Legislature.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
107	As stated above, the present selection process is satisfactory.	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
108	By lawyer members of the Bar.	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
109	By election with licensed attorneys voting. Having the governor and legislative appointments politicizes the Board.	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM
110	This is difficult. I'm not sure. Lawyers, by peer review and interviews with people who work with them. Their secretaries, paralegals, etc., who really know them day to day. For example, I worked for a very unethical lawyer who billed illegally as a lawyer for the Los Angeles Fire Department lawyer and was dishonest in general, yet she was voted by peers as a "super lawyer." A perk for the firm? I have no idea. Sad for the industry. For citizens, people who are interested in the process and voted in by some means.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM
111	I don't think the current selection structure as it relates to the public members is appropriate. I do not believe the governor or legislature should be involved. I think the non-attorney (public) members should also be selected by the bar.	Dec 29, 2010 7:15 PM
112	Elected by members of the Bar.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
113	Invite applicants. See what those most interested have to offer.	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM
114	as is	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
115	Election is probably best. It avoids political cronism. Certainly there exist "political" issues within regions that contribute to who is elected, but I'd rather have local politics than the governor play that role.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
116	Lawyers should be selected by plurality vote of their peers.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
117	I would not change the way that public members are selected. I can only speak to the way that members are selected in my district, which is District 7. I think that the Breakfast Club often has disproportionate influence in selecting candidates to run for the board.	Jan 4, 2011 1:34 AM
118	Supreme court some (one third) / attorneys by vote others (one half) / governor others (one sixth)	Jan 4, 2011 1:50 AM
119	Election by members of the bar. There should be no set-asides for attorneys of a certain age (i.e., attorneys under the age of 36).	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
120	By election for lawyers and appointment for non lawyers by the governor and lottery by the state bar.	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
121	Nobody really knows who they are voting for. But voting by bar members	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM
122	Ask attorneys and judges to nominate attorneys, attorneys and judges to nominate judges, and any individual with a demonstrable knowledge of the judicial system ti be nominated or apply for public positions. Above all else, they must have common sense, an understanding of civility and moral (smelltest for right and wrong) behavior and, with regard to the public members, an ability to apply the rules of judicial conduct (perhaps after completing a course on it).	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

	Response Text	
123	One attorney from each county bar. One from each section of the State Bar. One from each accredited law school. One judge from each county. Five-to-seven by the Governor.who may or may not be attorneys, but who cannot have ever been a plaintiff in a malpractice action.	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
124	geographic districts, self-nomination and election within district	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM
125	Self-selection/volunteering; nomination by peers or judges or court personnel	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
126	They should reflect the broad range of attorneys and the range of clients and intersts they represent.	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM
127	The 20 Lawyers should be elected Statewide by the Members of the State Bar as a Whole. The 2 Laypersons should be appointed 1 by the Governor and 1 by the collective action of the State Assembly and State Senate Judiciary Committees acting together.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
128	As currently mandated by the applicable sections of the CA B&P Code.	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
129	The present selection process and criteria are adequate.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM
130	The Board of Governors would solicit nominations from members of the State Bar and present a list of nominees to be selected by the Governor. Nominees from members of the public should be developed by the Governor's office and by the public members of the Board.	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
131	Members of the public should be selected by age, gender, race, income. These are the criteria that predatory attorneys use in selecting their victims. If the board is balanced based on those who have been victimised then it will do the job that it has set out to do. Place an ad in the paper and ask for applications tell the people what you are looking for.	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
132	The election process based upon districts provides a cross-section of experience and should be sustained; the selection of public members should be reviewed since it appears to be become a political trophy.	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
133	The current criteria for election of lawyer members is fine.	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM
134	The present combination of elected and appointed members seems reasonable and effective.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
135	Except for newly admitted, the board representation should be proportional to population density. Otherwise it is not representational.	Jan 8, 2011 10:29 PM
136	As outlined in your material above, but with more of the appointments made by legislative and executive Branches and by other significant institutions (such as Univ of California Regents, California law enforcement organizations, district attorneys,public defenders, etc.)	Jan 9, 2011 10:19 PM
137	Majority vote by the constituency you represent - sole practitioners vote for sole practitioners, etc.	Jan 10, 2011 4:27 AM
138	We support transparency in the selection of the Board that will govern the profession. Greater transparency is achieved through a democratic process. Thus, we support the continued election of the Governors. However, we also believe in a representational democracy. The recent "redistricting" only exacerbated the unfair distribution of Governors through the state. Up to seventy percent of all California lawyers are located in the Southern California corridor (including Los Angeles and Orange County), yet those counties are "under represented" on the Board.	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM

We urge the adoption of direct elections for a new position of President Elect, as the best method to obtain greater transparency and accountability.

It has long been required that our State Bar Committees (appointed by the Board of Governors) reflect all types of diversity, yet the appointing Board acutely fails to reflect the diverse population of California.

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

Response Text		
139	Lawyer members elected by the lawyers much as they are now; non-lawyers appointed by the Chief Justice	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
140	For the licensing, regulation and discipline, the board should be under the supervision of the Supreme Court of California. However, if the bar continues to also have the educational, development of law and trade assn components, the Board should be selected by lawyers actively engaged in the practice of law (including sitting judges who are also lawyers). If I were designing this structure I would require that there be representatives from different fields of law and different sizes of law firms.	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
141	I like the appointment method. It would help ensure diversity as outlined in number 2, in addition to racial, ethnic, and gender diversity. Public interest law would stand a much better chance of being represented.	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
142	<p>These individuals should be selected in a manner that allows for local representation. They should be selected by the members of the local region they are to represent. If multiple representatives are to be selected from one region or county, that region should be divided into several regions, so the unique interests of the entire region is represented.</p> <p>For instance, five representatives from Los Angeles County currently serve on the Board and each of those representatives works for a private or public law firm in downtown Los Angeles. This has historically been the case because governors from Los Angeles County have been endorsed by the downtown breakfast club organization. This is not representative of the diversity of the community or profession in Los Angeles County.</p>	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM
143	They need to have no alliance or attachment to the outcome.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
144	Pursuant Business & Professions Code 6020 & State Bar Protocol; Internal Revenue Service State Bar Corp. & Public Corp. Monetary Task Force; Supreme Court Joint Investigation & Enforcement Task Force Non State Bar.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
145	As presently constituted	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
146	Primarily by the vote of the governed ... members of the bar. Non-lawyers filling the qualifications specified in #2 should be appointed by Chief Justice, with support from the Court.	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM
147	Lawyer candidates should appeal for votes on what ever grounds they believe will secure support. Preselection of candidates and "vetting" sooner or later results in an ossified system of selecting candidates.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
148	Election of attorneys by attorneys OK. Selection of public members could be via general public election for at least 4 of slots - and then 1 by gov, 1 by senate, 1 by assembly.	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
149	Choose individuals familiar with the tactics used by lawyers to scam their clients. Someone that has already been through the system and victimized by the system.	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
150	Appointed by the Council of State Bar Sections.	Jan 19, 2011 7:02 PM
151	By a Bar committee obtaining the names and graduation dates of law students from the top ten law schools in the state, including online law schools. An invitation to all to serve on the Board, with main criteria being four recommendations, two from supervisors and two from clients, of legal performance in the past five years or more.	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
152	I likethe ccurent method	Jan 24, 2011 8:54 PM

3. How should each of these individuals be selected? By whom and by what

Response Text		
153	Attorneys should continue to be elected by attorneys they govern, First, having attorneys elected rather than appointed removes the political considerations and results in a more transparent process. Second, if attorneys were appointed by the Supreme Court as Professor Fellmuth proposes, litigators would have an advantage over attorneys who do transactional work or advice work and are therefore less familiar to the court. Elections also encourage diversity--both diversity of ethnic backgrounds and diversity of practice areas.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM

4. What qualifications should be required for each member of the board?

Response Text		
1	Attorney members - at least five years in practice, no significant history of discipline. Non-attorney members - some business or other background that would demonstrate the ability to understand the complex nature of the issues involved in attorney admission and discipline.	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	See No. 2 above.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	I don't know.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	no opinion	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	Lawyers should have been practicing a minimum number of years and have always been in active good standing with no record of discipline.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM
6	For attorneys, active membership in the bar. For lawyers and non-lawyers, an unblemished record.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	All attorney members should be in good standing with no history of discipline, while non-professional members should have at least a bachelor's degree.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
8	State Bar member 15 years or more Judiciary member more than 10 years non lawyer members professionals or corporate executives	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
9	For lawyers and judges college and law school; for non-lawyers college degree minimum.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
10	the genreal public members should have an understanding of the legal system. the lawyers should be in proactice for a specified number of years and no record of discipline.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
11	Basic understanding of the legal system and role of legal profession	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	Present make up appears appropriate	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	Practicing Attorneys with 5 years of more experience and those with less than 5 years and a member of the public at large - possible two to three.	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	most qualified, AV rating, etc no history of discipline. Outside the bar those who have exhibited a desire for public betterment	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	Minimum of 15 years as a practicing attorney.	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM
16	Current qualifications are OK.	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM
17	A background in the law or familiarity with ethical governance issues.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
18	Knowledge of the practice of law and/or knowledge of business regulatory processes. This should be a very practical group that can be held accountable to measurable results. Not ideology.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	Lawyers should meet the requirements to qualify as an appointed judge; non lawyers should be of a minimum age (50) and demonstrate substantive involvement in public interest matters.	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM

4. What qualifications should be required for each member of the board?

Response Text		
20	Good standing of State Bar; min. of 10 yrs. of legal education and experience.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
21	Silly - without knowing the Board's explicit duties and areas of operation	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	The current qualifications are fine.	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
23	Exemplary record with the bar, substantial real world experience in practicing law, being a judge and from all geographic areas of the State, not just the most populous.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
24	Member of the Bar 5 years in good standing.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
25	A law degree and good standing with the Bar.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
26	Being a member in good standing of the State Bar.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
27	10 years practice and good standing	Dec 20, 2010 10:54 PM
28	A desire to protect the public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
29	4 year degree or active member of the bar.	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
30	Good standing with the Bar; no record of discipline; geographic diversity.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
31	Good record; 10 + years of experience; ability to commit time and energy; ability to speak	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
32	As far as lawyers go, there should be lawyers from all areas without duplication of areas of practice where ever possible.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
33	Desire to serve and history of public service and commitment.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
34	Current qualifications are acceptable	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
35	Unbiased and sole objective is to serve the State Bar.	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM
36	Education, Experience or demonstrated concern for matters affecting public interest - especially where legal services are concerned.	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM
37	Maturity and common sense	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
38	Lawyers should be of the highest ethical standards/ratings and be or have been in active practice 15 years or more. Balance between corporate and solos and try to get at least one attorney who is or was involved in legal malpractice or legal ethics work. Public members should preferably be those who have in the past used, who intend in the future to use, or who are likely to use legal services.	Dec 20, 2010 11:28 PM
39	Current system is OK	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
40	See previous answer.	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
41	Attorneys who are known for being competent and highly ethical, with a minimum of 5 years practice with the state bar.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
42	Attorneys should be from a broad array of backgrounds, including law firms, public agencies, and public interest organizations. Geographic diversity is important, but not the only factor.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
43	Each Member should have at least 109 years of actual practice in California and should have an AV Rating in Martindale and Hubble and should have a reputation in the community for competence and reliability and high moral standards.	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
44	Lawyer candidates should have practiced for 15 or more years - preferably with a mid-size or large firm. Business or Community Members should have received some awards or recognition for public service, charitable, or non-profit work.	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
45	Should be older experienced attorneys with impecable reputations	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM

4. What qualifications should be required for each member of the board?

	Response Text	
46	Some minimum years of practice and geographical and other diversity considerations (e.g. plaintiffs and defense lawyers, personal injury and business litigators, transactional, criminal, estate etc. practitioners. Some members should have specific experience as prosecutors and some should have legal malpractice and attorney disciplinary experience (from both sides). But this is based on the statement in #1 above. I worry that in our unified Bar system, the Sections have taken a real "second seat" to admissions and disciplinary matters.	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM
47	None other then honest and good reputation for non-lawyer members; a California attorney with a good reputation for the attorney members.	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM
48	Minimum 10 years in private practice, at least five of which should be in solo practice or in a firm of four or less attorneys. NO large firm attorneys, no government attorneys!	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
49	For lawyers the main qualification should be that they can demonstrate they are of good moral character. The public members should be representative of the community.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
50	I believe it would be helpful to have additional members knowledgeable of technical issues, such as members trained in science, forensics, and hard science topics in order to add that necessary element to considerations before the Bar as they may affect justice issues. For example, changes in forensic DNA and the appellate process.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
51	For lawyers, at least 5 years of post qualification practice; must be in good standing.	Dec 21, 2010 12:22 AM
52	At least 5 years of experience in the Attorneys' field of practice.5 years of public service for the Public Members	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
53	For active lawyers, they should be over age 30 and have practiced for at least 5 years. Appointed persons should have some qualifications, but I'm not sure what those should be.	Dec 21, 2010 12:29 AM
54	No adverse claims for ethics or fraud violations	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM
55	Attorneys-Members in good standing of the State Bar	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
56	Current member of the bar in good standing.	Dec 21, 2010 12:45 AM
57	The non-lawyers should be citizens of CA over the age of 35, with either a degree of higher learning, military service, or significant professional experience, such as owning a business. The lawyers should be barred in CA for at least 10 years and should have good standing in the legal community for public service and/or pro bono service.	Dec 21, 2010 12:46 AM
58	Minimum time of admission	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
59	Again, I see no reason to deviate from the existing criteria.	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM
60	The board should be represented by two groups ... (1) a diverse group of legal experts and (2) a diverse group of expert consumers of legal services.	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
61	Lawyers in good standing with five years of experience and prior criminal or disciplinary convictions, non-lawyers should have no criminal record and be over 30 years old with a bachelor degree.	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
62	Experience in the practice of law and/or some experience involving the work of attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM
63	Able to devote 4 hours per month; Able to read at 12th grade level in English	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
64	I believe each member must be engaged in the practice of law -- and have done so for no less than ten years.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
65	Professional achievement	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM

4. What qualifications should be required for each member of the board?

Response Text		
66	If the members abide the highest standards of ethics and fairness then these qualities should provide fitness.	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
67	Practicing attorney (active member) for at least 5 years.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM
68	A minimum number of years in practice, being in good standing	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
69	Either minimum bachelor's degree and three years work experience or no degree required but at least seven years business or trades experience. Character for honesty and competence in the community.	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
70	Active member of the California State Bar	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
71	PEOPLE WHO ARE IN A POSITION TO MAKE DECISIONS WITHOUT REGARD TO THEIR PERSONAL FINANCIAL, POLITICAL OR PERSONAL BENEFIT.	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
72	Knowledge of duties, fairness, good judgement.	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
73	The present qulaifications are adequate, except as indicated in 2 above.	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
74	Active practice of the law.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM
75	proven track record of ethical conduct and experience in the law	Dec 21, 2010 5:12 PM
76	For Chairman, 10 or more years as working attorney, without any discipline by the State Bar. Committee members should have a working knowledge of the court systems and understand the fiduciary duties of attorneys.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
77	Candidates should at minimum have held license for 3 years	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
78	Status as a member of the State Bar, in good standing and willing to serve	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
79	For lawyers, at least 10 years in practice, so time is not wasted on impractical, pie-in-the-sky initiatives. Age and experience tends to bring realistic, mature judgment into situations. As this would be an institutional change, it can't be implemented with rallying cries alone, it has to work successfully over time. Judges should have served at least 10 years as judges as well. These seats should be an honor, and carry weight and responsibility. Members of the public would be qualified by whatever qualifications the electorate deems most important when they vote.	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
80	Active practice of law: no public or private reproval; no misdemeanor or felony conviction; no prior State Bar elected position..	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM
81	See above	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
82	see above	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM
83	Fluent in English, College degree (JD for lawyers), 10 years of post-College employment	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM
84	Active bar membership. I would get rid of the non-attorney members.	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
85	Age: 30 plus Education/work experience: High School and 10 years of work in any field.	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
86	In practice for 10 years.	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
87	judge or law degree	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM
88	Irrelevant to the issue of public protection beyond the current application.	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
89	At least 10 years of private practice except for several members chosen to represent CYLA or other designated interest group.	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
90	Varying years of practice, but at least 5. One should have some sort of experience to draw from.	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
91	State Bar membership and a willingness to serve. Board members should not be State Bar employees.	Dec 21, 2010 10:59 PM
92	See answer to question above.	Dec 21, 2010 11:38 PM
93	active membership in the bar	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
94	See above.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM

4. What qualifications should be required for each member of the board?

	Response Text	
95	Utmost ethical behavior; willingness to put in actual work as a board member (not just a resume booster), which can be shown via extensive prior unpaid volunteer service to non-legal organizations; vetting by their peers and state/federal judges via confidential evaluations	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM
96	20 years of private practice - ABSOLUTELY NO ONE FROM THE PUBLIC SECTOR. US AND CALIFORNIA CITIZEN. MUST BE SOBER. PASS AN IQ TEST..	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM
97	5 years of practice	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
98	Successful lawyers with good reputations and outstanding members of the public	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
99	Lawyers: no - NONE - history of discipline actions. Judges the same - Public - no politicians.	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
100	at least 15 years post bar admission, however the board should appoint and consult newer practitioners for their special issues, with presentations and meetings with the board quarterly	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
101	For attorneys at least 5 years of practice; for judges at least 5 years of judging, for public at least a masters.	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
102	Attorney members should have no pending disciplinary proceedings against them, never have been disbarred or suspended, and not have been subject to lesser discipline at any time in the past five years.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
103	The highest level of experience and competency possible for lawyers. For the public members - a history of public service.	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
104	They should have been in practice a long time and be highly respected members of the profession	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
105	A minimum of 10 years of experience as a CA attorney in good standing with no major disciplinary matters decided against the member.	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM
106	A license to practice law for lawyers. Non-lawyers, concerned citizens from varied backgrounds.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM
107	Reputation with respect to ethics.	Dec 29, 2010 7:15 PM
108	Active (or judicial officer) member, in good standing, with no history of any ethical violations. I would make this proven violations, not just allegations.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
109	I think rather than focusing on establishing more extra paperwork and silly rules, the focus should be on "how best to protect the public and what it needs.	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM
110	as is	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
111	If any board members are nonlawyers, they should be highly educated and preferably licensed professionals in another endeavor.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
112	Members of the Board should be lawyers in good standing with the State Bar.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
113	Obviously, no record of public discipline. Minimum of 10 years in practice.	Jan 4, 2011 1:34 AM
114	U.S. citizen registered to vote in California	Jan 4, 2011 1:50 AM
115	Each should be an lawyer admitted to practice in the state of California.	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
116	Understanding of the legal system and the practice of law, but otherwise best qualified based on education and experience.	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
117	Be a member of the bar in good standing.	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM
118	See 3	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM
119	The majority should be attorneys and a number should be judges. No public member should have been involved in a malpractice or disciplinary action.	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
120	active member of the Calif bar	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM

4. What qualifications should be required for each member of the board?

Response Text		
121	Active law practitioners from various practice areas committed to a high ethical standard, 15+ years in practice except for a representative from the newly admitted lawyer group	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
122	Only a member of the bar.	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM
123	Current Qualifications are fine. Except that the Laypersons serving on the Board should have had some significant experience as Clients of Lawyers prior to joining the Board.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
124	As currently mandated by the applicable sections of the CA B&P Code	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
125	The main qualifications should be an interest in the public's need for access to well-qualified and ethical legal counsel.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM
126	A member's background should reflect the high standards of professional competence and conduct expected of members of the State Bar.	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
127	the attorneys should be attorneys. Those representing the public should have the ability to read write and be US Citizens.	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
128	Experience in public protection in some meaningful way; Bar Association experience; understanding of financial statements.	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
129	The same as the current criteria for lawyer-	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM
130	Lawyers should be active members of the bar and members of the public should be generally competent to serve (age, education, experience, and independence from the legal profession), but otherwise no specific qualifications required.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
131	except for 1 newly admitted, at least 5 years in practice	Jan 8, 2011 10:29 PM
132	see question 2 plus add legal resident of state of California for a minimum of three years	Jan 9, 2011 10:19 PM
133	Member of the State Bar	Jan 10, 2011 4:27 AM
134	We would like to see greater diversity, which could be a qualification for the Board. For example the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association has certain positions designated or allocated to under represented segments of the attorney population. Thus, a certain number of positions reflect both racial and gender equality. The diversity we would hope to achieve is not limited to race or gender, because we would like to see more government lawyers, lawyers who are involved in the legal aid community, and the small and solo practitioners.	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM
135	For the non-lawyers, the existing qualifications plus experience running a substantial business, non-profit, or governmental body; for the lawyers, at least 10 years in practice.	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
136	Have been in practice for at least 5 years, in good standing with the State Bar.	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
137	For lawyers, being out at least 5 years and a demonstrated commitment to improving the profession and to access to justice.	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
138	Each board member should be a licensed practicing attorney in good standing with the Bar.	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM
139	Qualified should include knowledge of rules and regulations governing moving large sums of money from one place to another.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
140	Business & Professions Code 6020 & State Bar Protocol; Internal Revenue Service Protocol; Supreme Court Joint Investigation & Enforcement Task Force of Non-Members of The State Bar perferably to monitor State Bar Activities.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
141	Member of the Bar with at least 10 years of practice and no ethical violations	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
142	At least 10 years of practice and prior volunteer service to the Bar and/or the profession.	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM

4. What qualifications should be required for each member of the board?

Response Text		
143	This question seems more pertinent to non-lawyer seats on the board, as the only *required* qualification for lawyer-members should be an active license. I'm not sure that qualifications, no matter how abstractly stated, for non-lawyer candidates can actually produce ideal candidates. The board should represent diversity of philosophies, experience, discipline, but without resort to quotas.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
144	Attorneys don't have to practice (e.g., retired, inactive, professors, etc.). Can't have been disbarred, or under disciplinary review. Similarly, public members can't have judgement or order re violation of ethics (e.g., losing license, conviction for fraud, judgment for misrepresentation, etc.)	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
145	Individual fairness and honesty. Personal credit reports and criminal back ground checks can show the potential of a fair person's judgment.	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
146	Existing qualifications are sufficient -- member in good standing	Jan 19, 2011 7:02 PM
147	Graduation from an accredited law school either in CA or outside. online or walk-on; a member or the Bar should not be mandatory because there are highly qualified administrators of the law who have proven to be highly ethical and professional with the public and clients.	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
148	I like the current criteria	Jan 24, 2011 8:54 PM
149	Except for the CYLA representative, attorneys should have a minimum of 5 years practice to be eligible for election to the Board of Governors.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM

5. What size should the board be?

Response Text		
1	Ten to twenty members.	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	At least twelve members.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	5	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	20 or fewer	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	Not more than 21 members.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM
6	I do not have a view on this.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	15 members. 8 professional members, and 7 nonprofessional members. This board size adheres more closely to the other professional boards in CA, and provides more protection of non-member interests.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
8	8 members	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
9	Anything about 15 is too big. The 9 to 12 range is good.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
10	15-20	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
11	10-20 individuals	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	Present make up appears appropriate	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	No more that 10 members	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	9-11	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	Five members	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM
16	Smaller than it is.	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM
17	A size appropriate to reflect a diversity of perspectives.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
18	Same size or smaller.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	15 to 25	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM

5. What size should the board be?

	Response Text	
20	No more than 19 individuals. Anything larger would be unwieldy.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
21	Silly - can't answer without knowing how current board operates, its problems, communication, meeting frequency and logistics. Without this info, only someone on the board now could have an informed opinion.!	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	The current size is fine.	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
23	current size	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
24	Not fewer than 21.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
25	Twenty-five to thirty-five	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
26	Minium 5, maximum 9.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
27	7 members	Dec 20, 2010 10:54 PM
28	2 judges, 2 lawyers, 3 members of the public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
29	23. The odd number would eliminate deadlocks.	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
30	five persons	Dec 20, 2010 11:02 PM
31	The present size seems adequate,if not a bit large.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
32	About 8-12?	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
33	I can't say that either a larger or smaller Board would be better.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
34	Does not really matter, as long as it is an odd number, so votes will not stalemate.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
35	Current size is OK	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
36	One from each county of California.	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM
37	No particular opinion.	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM
38	Five	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
39	9 is an appropriate size for getting things done. More than that is chaos.	Dec 20, 2010 11:28 PM
40	20 to 30 members	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
41	Much smaller.	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
42	7-10 maximum	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
43	Large enough to ensure diversity of the composition of the board by race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, geography, and type of practice.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
44	No moer than eleven members	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
45	15 members	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
46	The same number as the members of the Supreme Court in order to be effective	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
47	Large enough to be representative and to accommodate some inevitable absences.	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM
48	From not less than 15 members to as many as 30 members.	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM
49	Haven't thought that one out yet. Probably depends on the duties.	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
50	No opinion.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
51	The current size is sufficient, with consideration for additional members as stated in 4 above.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
52	current size is Ok.	Dec 21, 2010 12:22 AM
53	Not more than 15	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
54	It should probably be smaller. The board, like most of California's governing authorities, has become bloated and should be trimmed. The 'right' number - maybe 15, with 6 active lawyers elected by district, 2 judges, the CYL appointee, 1 elected office-holder (e.g. Secretary of State), and 5 political appointees (reduce the governor's by 1).	Dec 21, 2010 12:29 AM
55	12	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM

5. What size should the board be?

	Response Text	
56	13. 8 Attorneys;5 public members.	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
57	5	Dec 21, 2010 12:45 AM
58	It should be not so large as to be cumbersome and an odd number to avoid ties, if there is some kind of voting scheme. Fifteen people, 7 non-lawyers and 8 lawyers, would probably be a good size.	Dec 21, 2010 12:46 AM
59	15-20	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
60	based on state population, e.g. onre rep per million people	Dec 21, 2010 1:13 AM
61	An argument can be made that with the explosion of the number of attorneys in the state, a board that was the right size when the attorney population was much smaller (and less diversified) is no longer representative. But as I have observed it the Board is already so large as to be cumbersome, and a larger board would be even less efficient. I'd keep it about where it is.	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM
62	The board would probably need to be large to be sufficiently representative. IN that case, perhaps it would be better to be regionalized -- northern, central and southern. Each region would have leaders that would form a smaller body that would consider overall recommendations from the regions.	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
63	No more than 11 members	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
64	Less than 25.	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM
65	10	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
66	The current size or a few less.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
67	2 members	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM
68	The board looks appropriate in its current size.	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
69	~65 (see above)	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM
70	The current size or one or two more members at most	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
71	Seven or nine persons, just like the Cal or US Supremes.	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
72	Seven Board Members	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
73	9	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
74	22 may be too large.	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
75	Nine should provide more efficient operation.	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
76	Present size is ok.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM
77	Much smaller. 15 is unwieldy. 5 is plenty.	Dec 21, 2010 5:03 PM
78	7 members	Dec 21, 2010 5:12 PM
79	the size depends on the number o fcomplaints filed against attorneys each year. The minimum size to assure a good cross-section of representation, would be no less than 9 members. Preferrably 15 or so.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
80	7-9	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
81	As small as possible	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
82	Big enough to contain a diversity of ideas, yet not so big as to be bogged down.	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
83	3	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM
84	The Board is too large to make really effective prompt decisions or recommedations. In my opinion 7 to 9 voting members would be an appropriate size. Othre non-voting members could participate in discussions, provide points of view etc.	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
85	7 - 9	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM
86	5 people	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM

5. What size should the board be?

	Response Text	
87	Some odd number in the vicinity of 9 or 11. There are presently too many.	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
88	Not sure of size, but might want to consider having active sub-committees that do the work and take recommendation to the board	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
89	No change save for a judicial officer.e	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
90	7	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM
91	irrelvant. Altering the makeup and size of the board has NOTHING to do with improving public protection.	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
92	15	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
93	Unsure, but something more representative of the amount of active members	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
94	More than about 7 and they won't get anything done.	Dec 21, 2010 10:59 PM
95	Current size is a good one.	Dec 21, 2010 11:38 PM
96	12 plus president	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
97	8-10. A board of more than 12 is unnecessary and less efficient.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM
98	10-15. If too large, then too difficult to do anything because consensus is harder to achieve. If too small, then too much power is consolidated in the hands of the few. Think UN Security Council.	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM
99	three members	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM
100	15	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
101	The State Bar should decide this issue	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
102	12 to 15 members.	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
103	12	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
104	9	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
105	No opinion.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
106	The present size is satisfactory.	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
107	9	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
108	9 or 11.	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM
109	Unsure.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM
110	Seems fine as it is now.	Dec 29, 2010 7:15 PM
111	7-9 members should be plenty.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
112	13	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM
113	as is	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
114	The current size is probably about right.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
115	The size of the Board should be commensurate with the task. Generally, the smaller the better.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
116	Board is probably too large now and unwieldy. Issue is how to winnow the numbers down and still get things done and have sufficient district representation. Should the board be set up like the House of Representatives or the Senate, in other words, should larger districts have more representation, or should all districts be the same?	Jan 4, 2011 1:34 AM
117	30	Jan 4, 2011 1:50 AM
118	Substantially larger than now so that attorneys in rural areas, e.g., eastern contra costa county, are not swamped by attorneys in large urban areas whose practices and interests differ substantially. I should think 45 to 60 members would be about right.	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
119	15 members	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
120	I think the Bar should be completely eliminated so smaller is better.	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM

5. What size should the board be?

	Response Text	
121	Regional panels of 6-8 members, no fewer than 5 hearing any matter	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM
122	Twenty to Fifty	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
123	9 members	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM
124	11 total - 6 lawyers 5 lay people	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
125	Managable.	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM
126	Current Size is fine.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
127	As currently mandated by the applicable sections of the CA B&P Code	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
128	The present size of the board is adequate.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM
129	15-20	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
130	12 members. Just like a Jury	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
131	The same--I think with the Committee structure it cannot be ran efficiently with fewer Board members; I also don't think a larger Board is conducive to management of the State Bar activities.	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
132	Current size is fine. If only lawyers are on the board, the number of districts could be enlarged.	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM
133	The existing 23 seems reasonable. The board should be sized to effectively represent stakeholders but not be too large to be ineffective or overly political.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
134	ok as is	Jan 8, 2011 10:29 PM
135	20-30	Jan 9, 2011 10:19 PM
136	We are concerned that the Board is too large. We suggest 18 to 20 members is more efficient.	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM
	We are opposed to changing the relative proportions of lawyer and public members.	
137	No bigger than it is now.	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
138	No opinion	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
139	I don't have an opinion about this.	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
140	The number is not important, just as long as each unique region of California is represented.	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM
141	10 members	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
142	Enough Internal Revenue Service Personnel to monitor the increasing number of state bar private corp. & public members' corp. monetary activities, with the Supreme Court Task Force to assist Judicial Branch of Government	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
143	as presently constituted	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
144	Not more than 21; not less than 15.	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM
145	I'm not aware of any problems with the present size, which, given the size and complexity of the state, seems appropriate.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
146	15 perhaps too many - ideally, 9 members or less - 3 year terms, 3 selected/elected each year - 1 attorney, 1 public + whichever is left over.	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
147	Seven members?	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
148	Fine as is, with one addition -- see above.	Jan 19, 2011 7:02 PM
149	No more than ten, however, five would be my recommendation.	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
150	Sam as now	Jan 24, 2011 8:54 PM
151	Maintain the current size. More would be too unwieldy and fewer members would diminish representation of the state's attorneys, Public members should stay the same and not be increased. 22 plus the President is the ideal size.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM

6. How long should the terms of the members (and of the president) be?

Response Text		
1	President - two years. members - two to three years	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	Five years.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	4 years	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	3 or 4 years for members, 2 years for president	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	2 years. Maybe 3.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM
6	Between 4 and 8 years would be about right.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	4-year terms, with a 2 term limit.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
8	3 years	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
9	Terms of members - 2 possible terms of three years each; for President a two-year term.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
10	3 year terms, but able to serve for two terms	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
11	Up to 3 years, with rolling terms	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	Present make up appears appropriate	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	At least 4 years.	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	3 years	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	Two years.	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM
16	Current terms are OK.	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM
17	3 years is fine.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
18	Members -- three years, rotating off one third each year. President should be one year.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	3 to 5 years	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM
20	3-year terms.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
21	current terms seem okay	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	The present terms are fine with one exception: all attorney members should serve the same period of time, The president should serve for 2 years. One year is too short to oversee long-term projects or trends or solutions to identified problems.	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
23	3years staggered among the entire body	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
24	Two years with one-half replaced every year	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
25	3 years, with staggered terms..	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
26	4 years	Dec 20, 2010 10:54 PM
27	Judges: 2 years, lawyers: 2 years, public: 3 years	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
28	2 years.	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
29	four years	Dec 20, 2010 11:02 PM
30	Three years staggered terms.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
31	2-4 years	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
32	Actually I thought the terms for both the President and CYLA lawyers to be too short. 2 years for both appears to be more realistic.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
33	No opinion on specific number of years. Should be long enough to get expertise, not so long as to stultify.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
34	there is no need for a "President" (pompous). There needs to be an egalitarian board with a single mission in mind - true protection of the public against attorney abuse.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
35	Current terms are fine	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
36	one year	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM

6. How long should the terms of the members (and of the president) be?

Response Text		
37	No particular opinion	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM
38	2 years	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
39	2 or 3 years. Most people get burned-out serving on committees longer than that.	Dec 20, 2010 11:28 PM
40	Current term lengths are OK	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
41	No opinion	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
42	The term of the president should be for two or three years, not one. One year is not enough time for any president to accomplish anything.	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
43	10 years	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
44	Each Member should have a four year staggered term; i.e. one third of the members should be elected each year so that at least two-thirds of the members will be withing their four year terms.	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
45	Four years	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
46	Two years with no more than two terms	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
47	Four years. (My understanding/impression is that three years is too short and the effect is that it leaves too much discretion and power to the staff, as opposed to the Board. State Bar staff is great, but the policy decisions should be made by the Board.)	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM
48	Attorney members 3 years (without consecutive terms); public members 1 year. As it is now.	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM
49	Two years, renewable.	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
50	President's term should be one year. Members should rotate (3 years maybe) so that at any time 1/3 of the board is up for election.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
51	The current length of service is adequate, though longer periods allow for greater stability in governance.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
52	Current length is OK.	Dec 21, 2010 12:22 AM
53	3 years, staggered terms.	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
54	3 year terms for most is fine. The judges could be 3 years, or until retired more than ... 5(?) years, whichever comes first. The CYL electee should be 3 years or until no longer eligible for CYL, whichever comes first.	Dec 21, 2010 12:29 AM
55	3 years	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM
56	Board members: 5 years. President should serve one full year as President-elect.	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
57	3-4 years	Dec 21, 2010 12:45 AM
58	The terms should be 2 years, with staggered appointments, to ensure some kind of continuity. There should be no term limits.	Dec 21, 2010 12:46 AM
59	2-3 years	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
60	3 yearsm one option to extend three years at discretion of board	Dec 21, 2010 1:13 AM
61	The member terms are about right. I see no reason why an attorney member should not be allowed to run for an additional term or terms. The job is difficult, and it takes time to get up to speed. Experience and expertise should be rewarded, not discarded. For the same reason the term of the president should be longer, recognizing that the role is demanding and can make a heavy inroad on a law practice.	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM
62	4 to 6 years, so that people are no rotating off just when they get good at what they are doing.	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
63	Not less than two years, not more than four.	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
64	Three terms for members and two years for the president who should be selected from amongst the members after at least one year of service on the board	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM

6. How long should the terms of the members (and of the president) be?

Response Text		
65	2 years for both	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
66	The members should serve at least two years, the President only one.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
67	1 year	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM
68	2-3 years	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
69	Two years for members; officers 1 or 2 years. (See above.)	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM
70	Current limits are fine.	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
71	Members: three years; President - one year, with possible second term of one year by vote of members of board.	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
72	3 years	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
73	TWO YEARS. PRESIDENT, ONE YEAR UNLESS HE OR SHE HAS PERFORMED OUTSTANDING SERVICE AND RESULTS	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
74	2 years for members, 1 for President.	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
75	Three years is fine.	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
76	One single term of 7-years.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM
77	2 years staggered	Dec 21, 2010 5:12 PM
78	Three to four years, with staggered start times, so there is a continuity of knowledge re committee procedures, etc.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
79	president 2 years members 3-4 years	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
80	1 year	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
81	President should be at least two years, so as to protect the institution from being too blown about by the whims of each passing president; terms perhaps three or four years, staggered, for the same reason.	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
82	7 staggered years	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM
83	The current terms seem appropriate. I am not clear why lawyers cannot serve consecutive terms.	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
84	2 - 4 yrs	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM
85	4 years	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM
86	2 years	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
87	3 years - with one additional term being allowed	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
88	Three years.	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
89	3 years	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM
90	irrelevant	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
91	Same as at present, except CYLA or other designated interest group members should be two years, and President should be two years.	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
92	3 to 5 years	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
93	4 years	Dec 21, 2010 10:59 PM
94	One year.	Dec 21, 2010 11:38 PM
95	3 years with president serving a 4th year	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
96	4 years	Dec 22, 2010 12:22 AM
97	1-2 years.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM
98	5yrs for members (that way they have to be serious to sign up for it on unpaid or low-pay status - I actually have no idea whether members get paid or not, but I should think they should not get paid much); 2yrs for president (renewable for one term on board vote).	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM

6. How long should the terms of the members (and of the president) be?

Response Text		
99	staggered 3 year terms	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM
100	4 years	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
101	About 3 years	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
102	2 years, renewable maximum 6 years.	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
103	2 to five years, but the president limit 1 to 2 years	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
104	4 years	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
105	No opinion.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
106	The present length of terms is satisfactory	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
107	3 years for Board members, 1 year for President.	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
108	2 years, wiht the president's term being 1 year. Term limits of a maximum of 6 years and 3 years, respectively.	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM
109	Four years.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM
110	Term seems appropriate as it stands.	Dec 29, 2010 7:15 PM
111	Rotating 3 year terms.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
112	See above.	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM
113	as is, with additional term for officers. One of the problems is that the Bar becomes a staff driven organization due to the weakness of the board. The president's term is practically over when he starts, should be at least a one year vp position, where there can be some continuity in shaping an agenda and carrying it through with several presidents and vp's (or president elects).	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
114	I question if perhaps the terms should be longer. It takes too long to figure out what is going on--it is only the last year or so that any board member has a clue.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
115	Three years seems an adquate term for members; one year for the president.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
116	I think the board member terms should stay at three years. I think the president's term should be 2; one year is not sufficient to accomplish anything worthwhile.	Jan 4, 2011 1:34 AM
117	2 years	Jan 4, 2011 1:50 AM
118	1 year.	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
119	4 years	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
120	Don't know.	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM
121	2-4 years	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM
122	3-6 years	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
123	members 3 years	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM
124	two years but they can be re-nominated or re-elected for another two years	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
125	2 years, 4 years	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM
126	Current Terms are fine.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
127	As currently mandated by the applicable sections of the CA B&P Code	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
128	The present terms of members is adequate.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM
129	3 years for both	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
130	3year terms. The President should also have a 3 year term unless a 3/4 members think they should leave sooner..	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
131	3 years term; non-renewable for everyone (including public members), 1 year term for President--even though consideration should be given to a "president elect" which would essentially give the President a year of training.	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
132	Three years is reasonable, but lawyers should be able to serve consecutive terms. The president should not have to leave the board.	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM

6. How long should the terms of the members (and of the president) be?

Response Text		
133	The current terms are reasonable.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
134	2 years renewable once,with the exception of the Chairman of the Board which should continue as is	Jan 9, 2011 10:19 PM
135	2 years - 1 term	Jan 10, 2011 4:27 AM
136	We believe the current terms are sufficient. The Bar is a complex organization with a multimillion dollar budget that requires a certain level of sophistication, training and experience.	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM
137	Four years (plus one year for the President)	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
138	3 or 4 years	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
139	Presidents should definitely serve 2 years at least. One year means little continuity.	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
140	Each board member and the president should serve a two-year term.	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM
141	3 years	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
142	Per protocol of Business & Professions Code 6020 & State Bar Protocol; Internal Revenue Service located at Internal Revenue Service Permanently; Supreme Court Joint Investigation & Enforcement Task Force 3 years rotation.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
143	Board: as presently constituted President: should serve an extra year.	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
144	Members should serve for 4 years. The President should serve for 2 years after completing a full term on the Board	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM
145	Board terms should be three years and vacancies should be staggered such that the board benefits from continuity and fresh blood.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
146	3 years for board - 1 year for president	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
147	As long as that individual continues to avoid being caught in the corrupt system of personal perks provided by attorneys.	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
148	Members -- 3 years. President -- one year.	Jan 19, 2011 7:02 PM
149	Members= three years President= one year	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
150	The members terms should remain 3 years. I think the President should serve for a minimum of 2 years	Jan 24, 2011 8:54 PM
151	Keep terms at 3 years but add a president-elect by election someone who has completed 2 years on the Board as a president-elect. The president elect could also chair a committee but would not be required to do so.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM

7. How should the president and other officers be selected?

Response Text		
1	By internal vote	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	By a majority of the board.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	I don't know.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	no opinion	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	President should be elected by all members of the Bar.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM

7. How should the president and other officers be selected?

	Response Text	
6	It is probably best to have the Board members elect their officers. This affords the Board the opportunity to know who among them has the time and skill set to be most effective in these roles. A vote of the membership, by contrast, would potentially be a popularity (or name-recognition) contest.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	Selected by a vote from board members.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
8	among the board of bar governors once selected	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
9	Succession planning.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
10	election from the whole board	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
11	President could be elected from general board	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	Present make up appears appropriate	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	by the board itself	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	by board	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	Contested elections.	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM
16	President and other officers should be elected by the State Bar members, not by the board.	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM
17	By the nominating committee.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
18	By the board, from among the board.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	By the Board	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM
20	By vote among members in good standing of the State Bar, and/or by appointment of the Board President in case of a vacancy.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
21	Board vote - current system seems okay	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	The officers should be selected by practicing members of the bar.	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
23	By the board itself	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
24	Yearly.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
25	The board members would elect by secret ballot.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
26	The members of the Board should select all officers from its own membership once per year.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
27	by vote of the board	Dec 20, 2010 10:54 PM
28	The president should always be a member of the public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
29	Random selection after a pool of qualified individuals is selected. This would eliminate a favored person being selected.	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
30	president should be appointed by the governor	Dec 20, 2010 11:02 PM
31	By the members	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
32	Nom Committee and then voting by membership	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
33	Election by the Board itself appears to be appropriate.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
34	Vote of other board members.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
35	why do we need to create another hierarchical model?	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
36	Current process is acceptable	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
37	Nomination by the board.	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM
38	On the basis of a representative cross-section of the Bar the the Public.	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM
39	vote of the members	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
40	By vote of the other 8 members of the Board.	Dec 20, 2010 11:28 PM
41	By the governed attorneys	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
42	elected by members of the bar	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM

7. How should the president and other officers be selected?

Response Text		
43	Annually	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
44	I think it would be acceptable for the president to be a public member.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
45	The Members should elect the President and other officers.	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
46	By a majority vote of the members selected.	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
47	By election of the Board members themselves.	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
48	Election by members of the Board, as is done now, seems fine. It has the advantage of having the leadership have the support of the Board members, which has certain advantages.	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM
49	Vote of members of the Board.	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM
50	By the board members themselves.	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
51	By the other members of the board.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
52	The current system is acceptable.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
53	current method is OK.	Dec 21, 2010 12:22 AM
54	By the State Bar Board of Governors.	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
55	If the active lawyers don't make up more than 50% of the board, then vote of the entire board should be sufficient.	Dec 21, 2010 12:29 AM
56	internal board election at first meeting, held every 3 years.	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM
57	By the Board....I fear the escalation of costs and polarization of positions if this were to turn into an electoral contest.	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
58	Direct election by all bar members. You all seem to operate in secrecy. I have been a bar member for 10 years and never once was I asked to vote for you.	Dec 21, 2010 12:45 AM
59	The president should be elected by popular vote. The other officers should be appointed by the president.	Dec 21, 2010 12:46 AM
60	Secret ballot by mail	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
61	by the board	Dec 21, 2010 1:13 AM
62	By the Board, from its members.	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM
63	Internally by the members.	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
64	By the members of the Bar.	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
65	By vote of the board	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM
66	By vote of the board after first meeting.	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
67	I believe by election by all Bar Members -- not by appointment.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
68	no opinion	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM
69	I would like to see part of the input and review from some of our best Judges and a move away from a political contest.	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
70	See above.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM
71	Current system is fine.	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
72	By vote of the seven or nine member board.	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
73	The president should be elected by registered voters in the geographical district, the other officers can be selected by vote of the elected board	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
74	ON MERIT AND NOT ON POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS OR POTENTIAL PECUNIARY BENEFITS TO THEM SELVES.	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
75	By the Board.	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
76	President of the Baord should be selected by the Board of Governors from persons on the public interest Board	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
77	By the members of the board.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM

7. How should the president and other officers be selected?

	Response Text	
78	voted in by the 7 members of the board	Dec 21, 2010 5:12 PM
79	The President or Chairman should be appointed.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
80	president elected by direct vote of members, all others appointed by board	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
81	From within the board in accordance with rules they establish.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
82	I honestly don't know; perhaps once the board is in place, the board would elect its own officers. There has to be a blend of energy and experience; the wrong leadership would be so costly.	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
83	See 3 above, with the Presidency rotating annually	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM
84	The current method seems appropriate.	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
85	by the Board	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM
86	From the 5 members	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM
87	Vote of bar membership along with the annual dues statement.	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
88	Board should select	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
89	By vote of Governors.	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
90	by the board	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM
91	irrelevant	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
92	Same as at present.	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
93	by a vote of the board members	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
94	President elected by members, officers elected by Board	Dec 21, 2010 10:59 PM
95	By vote of the committee at large.	Dec 21, 2010 11:38 PM
96	elected by the other board members	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
97	By nomination and vote of the board.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM
98	Board vote.	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM
99	WHO SAID THERE WOULD BE A PRESIDENT? Board members should be selected by the members of the bar. Cut costs and time wasting - we don't need any other officers.	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM
100	vote of governors	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
101	After the individuals are selected, the group itself should elect its own officers	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
102	by the sitting board.	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
103	democratically	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
104	A vote of all State Bar members for State Bar President would be undesirable, in that it would prevent lawyers without deep pockets from running for president, would lead to political posturing and demagoguery.	Dec 24, 2010 7:26 PM
105	by the board	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
106	Selection by the Board.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
107	The present process is satisfactory.	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
108	By vote of the Board	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
109	By the Board.	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM
110	By nomination and vote.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM
111	The president selection seems fine.	Dec 29, 2010 7:15 PM
112	By the Board, at its organizational meeting following the election.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
113	Let the board select an expedient way through one of several provided for suggestion.	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM

7. How should the president and other officers be selected?

	Response Text	
114	not aware of process now, but a group of aware governors (perhaps in 2nd or 3rd year term; perhaps a board governance committee) should make recommendations, then entire board votes	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
115	President and officers should be elected by the entire board.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
116	Officers should be selected by the Board.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
117	Vote of the State Bar members, which obviously has a cost associated with it.	Jan 4, 2011 1:34 AM
118	By the board	Jan 4, 2011 1:50 AM
119	By all attorneys admitted to practice in the state of California.	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
120	Best qualified via an internal vote with rotating president.	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
121	Voted upon by bar members.	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM
122	Election by the panels	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM
123	Board vote	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
124	President should be selected by direct vote of the Active Bar membership.	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM
125	by vote of the board	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
126	By election.	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM
127	Current selection methods subject to my Answer to Question 3, above are fine.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
128	As currently mandated by the applicable sections of the CA B&P Code	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
129	The present selection process of the board's president is adequate.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM
130	By the Board of Governors	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
131	Members of the board should pick the president. Officers should apply and be chosen by the out going board.	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
132	This needs to be changed since the current process of the sitting Board electing the President promotes a focus on deal making; essentially 12 people can elect our President--too few of number. I would explore the feasibility of a Statewide election by members of the Bar.	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
133	Nominating committee allowing open nominations and elected by the membership.	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM
134	The current method of election is reasonable.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
135	elected annually by the Board	Jan 9, 2011 10:19 PM
136	Same	Jan 10, 2011 4:27 AM
137	The President Elect, should be directly elected by the majority of voting lawyers in California. The current process is flawed. Direct election is democratic and more transparent, and results in greater accountability. We strongly believe a position of President Elect should be established, and that he or she should succeed automatically to become President the next year, without election. This would assure a smooth transition of power, provide a year's opportunity for the President Elect to train for the office, and avoid the necessity of the President Elect to campaign for office the year preceding his or her assumption of office.	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM
138	As they are now. At-large election is far too expensive and time-consuming	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
139	By the board	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
140	I don't feel strongly about this. Election by the Board seems like a good idea.	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
141	The President and officers should be voted on by the members of the State Bar.	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM
142	They need to have knowledge of the high conflict cases held hostage in San Diego Family Law Court for over 10 years without any issues resolves but litigants were billed over \$500,000. No compliance with the California Rules of the Court.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM

7. How should the president and other officers be selected?

Response Text		
143	Per State Bar of California Regular Protocol.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
144	By a vote of the board	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
145	The President should be selected by the Supreme Court, from a "short list" of not fewer than 3 candidates filling the qualifications specified in #6. Other offices should be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Board. All officers (including the President) should be removable by the Board of Governors, as part of its supervisory duties.	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM
146	I don't have a particular opinion, as I haven't seen arguments for or against different methods based on history of the Cal state bar.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
147	can be elected by board	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
148	Depend on their knowledge and interest in "cleaning up" the system and providing fair decisions that benefit the truth. Not dismissing the obvious!	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
149	By the Board. Current system works well and is democratic.	Jan 19, 2011 7:02 PM
150	By self or member nomination and election.	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
151	election by the board of governors	Jan 24, 2011 8:54 PM
152	The President should continue to be elected by the Board. The Board members know better than anyone else who would likely do a good job. The other officers should be selected by the President in consultation with outgoing members of the Board Operations Committee as was decided by the 2009-2010 Board.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

Response Text		
1	Limit the Board's scope of authority to admission and discipline. Cut out all the other activities unless and until all discipline backlogs have been cleared.	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	Focus more on actual malfeasance vs. book keeping errors.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	Summarily disbar attorneys who steal from clients.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	no opinion	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	Discipline seems excessively lax -- I am often shocked and embarrassed by what lawyers do without getting a lengthy suspension or disbarment, particularly the repeat offenders who screw over multiple clients.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM
6	A public agenda.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	Vertical prosecution scheme in terms of discipline.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
8	participation by state bar counsel at each meeting	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
9	Non-profit governance models are generally good to look to.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
10	unknown	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
11	More community feedback to board members	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	Present make up appears appropriate	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	Only that there be some diversity on the board - look at GO 156 from the CPUC only that it represents some percentage that would represent the constituency we would like to protect	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	unk	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	Uncertain.	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM
16	The board should have a mix of attorneys from small law firms and large law firms.	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

Response Text		
17	Unsure of what the current problems may be.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
18	Get rid of the association with elected officials.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	I have no opinion.	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM
20	Increase public access to the Board.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
21	Silly - See 5 above	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	None.	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
23	Keep in mind that attorneys by profession may be the last a best profession to give protection to those injured, damaged or aggrieved, so in addition to discipline, encouraging pro bono representation is a means by which attorneys can serve better to protect the public.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
24	Use subcommittees designated by problem areas; e.g., IOLTA violations, competency, loan modification fraud, probate fraud (trusts and estates), moral turpitude by problem area(drugs, DUI, etc.)	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
25	I wish you'd get off the notion of public protection. It's raised like a shield to protect the Bar's reason for existence.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
26	Determine whether the MCLE actually improves ethics. Educate the public about unscrupulous lawyer and those practicing without a license.	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
27	The board should establish a method of direct complaint by members of the bar about unethical conduct of other attorneys. The current system does not work. It depends entirely upon a judge making findings of misconduct and precludes any other examination on the merits.	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
28	The State Bar as such should be disbanded and the licensing and disciplinary functions taken over by an agency in the Dept of Consumer Affairs. How can anyone trust lawyers to regulate admission to the profession and to discipline themselves. The existing State Bar could continue as a strictly voluntary bar association. There would then be no restrictions on lobbying or public advocacy.	Dec 20, 2010 11:02 PM
29	I am unable to comment based upon lack of information on other governance models.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
30	Truthfully the board may do this already but hold meetings throughout CA, both So and No so all may attend.	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
31	The only possible model that comes to mind is to expensive and unpromising to recommend and that is having the attorneys nominate and vote on attorney members. However I see the political implications of such a proceeding making that process totally unworkable. Likewise having public elections seems likewise unworkable so, I don't know but if anything comes to mind I will be happy to let you know.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
32	Any attorney who is convicted of a felony should be disbarred - no ifs, ands, or buts. And anyone who is disbarred should never be allowed to reinstate. There are plenty of ethical attorneys to serve the public, and if a person is bright enough to pass the Bar, he or she is bright enough to find other work once disbarred. I am disgusted to see attorneys reinstated who have violated the public trust. Why ever?	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
33	do away with present model - simply create the enforcement arm and stop wasting time and money.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
34	I have no suggestions in this regard	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
35	Don't know.	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM
36	Some mechanism to insure a more democratic or representative body of governors and board members should be established.	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM
37	proactive investigations	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

Response Text		
38	When the Bar decides not to take action concerning a complaint against a lawyer, the complainant should be informed of all the reasons why no action was taken. When the complainant gets a letter stating only that the complaint was investigated and the Bar has determined that no action is going to be taken, the complaining party is left frustrated and thinks that the lawyers are just covering up for one another.	Dec 20, 2010 11:28 PM
39	See my answers to questions 1, 2 and 3.	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
40	Oversight over state bar enforcement activities	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
41	The Board should have a Committee of at least tow Members plus a staff of sufficient size to receive suggestions and complaints from the Public and to consider the suggestions and complaints.	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
42	Lawyers who file repetitive plaintiffs' cases - such a ADA cases - should be immediately investigated.	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
43	I advocate the practice of the Guilds where they are self regulated and dedicated to the reputation of the legal profession	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
44	Principal change is to abandon elections. As I told Jon Streeter when he asked, although I know many lawyers, my vote is still often an uninformed vote. We should have more of a screening process that is organized by the Supreme Court, with input by the Governor's Office and Attorney General..	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM
45	Perhaps a somewhat smaller Board would be more efficient. If the Board has a number of committees, perhaps the number of members is satisfactory.	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM
46	Speedy client complaint resolution. 90 days complaint to resolution.	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
47	Main goal should be openness. Perhaps publishing the non-confidential board minutes. The public should be encouraged to contact members of the board for to report any misconduct or any ideas to improve the practice of law in California.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
48	My concern is that insufficient emphasis has been placed on enforcement by the Bar with respect to violations of ethics by elected and other officials who use their positions as attorneys with prosecutorial powers to harm members of the public by abusing their power, seeking to prevent persons from gaining access to defense attorneys, advocating for the waiver of the attorney-client privilege and bringing unwarranted civil or criminal cases in order to manipulate or affect civil or political matters.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
49	There should be an ombudsman to investigate complaints.	Dec 21, 2010 12:22 AM
50	More outreach by task forces of the Bar to the rank-and-file State Bar Members.	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
51	Split lawyers 50% from large firm, 50% from firm 5 persons or smaller.	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM
52	It is critical that the Board and Board officers avoid the "staff domination" that characterized the prior Executive Director, and resulted in unnecessary conflicts with the Legislature and the membership of the Bar.	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
53	Not sure.	Dec 21, 2010 12:46 AM
54	Involvement oof Judicial Council	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
55	Other than my concern that good people are being "termed out" prematurely, my belief is that the governance model of the Board is well suited to all of its responsibilities, including the interest of public protection as I have defined it. To use the venacular, it ain't broken, don't try to fix it.	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

	Response Text	
56	Not sure how to answer that question. In my practice (estate planning, and exempt organizations), I find that most clients don't have the first idea how to get the best value from their attorney's time/efforts/knowledge. I'm not sure what the board of governors might do about this directly, except to suggest that public outreach might be something to consider. It seems that the abject destitute and the wealthy may have the most exposure to attorney services. The former because they are provided free legal services through legal aid or the public defender and the latter because they can afford the high hourly rates that private attorneys charge. For everyone else, hiring an attorney is an agonizing economic choice. The horror of escalating legal bills causes many clients I encounter to make poor use of my time in ill conceived efforts to control my billing. It usually makes my work more difficult. Assuming I can even figure out what is happening (and I don't inadvertently give the client a less than stellar product because I didn't know what s/he really needs), my choice is to "eat" the time and get cross-wise of the partners, write down the time and try to explain to the client why the work really cost that much (or shouldn't have, if s/he had been clear about the project in the first place), or grovel for a write down with the management committee. While the board is at it, maybe they could do something about how the business of law is a misery for those of us who would really just like to practice law. Sorry ... I digress.	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
57	Empower them to enact disciplinary rules that can be easily and swiftly enforced.	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
58	More frequent surveys of attorneys' opinions and public opinions as to appropriate discipline. The discipline seems to be all over the board for similar violations. The State Bar Court needs better direction to avoid such results.	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM
59	Lawyers & judges should NOT be on the board. Consider the board of the San Francisco SPCA as an example.	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
60	I don't know.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
61	no opinion	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM
62	Other than my prior responses I can't add to this.	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
63	Keep the investigatory function essentially separate as now.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM
64	I'm not familiar enough with other systems to make a suggestion.	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
65	I guess you mean 'governance' not 'goverance' ? Transparency. Public hearings. Publication of results of adjudications in newspapers of general circulation (right next to the DUI reports or general police blotter).	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
66	Improved communication channels between the board and the public it serves	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
67	THEY MUST BE AVAILABLE. CONTACTING THE BAR, NOW IS ANTIQUATED. MANAGEMENT AND STAFF MUST BE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC. NOT ON VACATION, SICK LEAVE, AT SEMINARS, ON FLOATING HOLIDAYS. THEY MUST BE AVAILABLE AND ON PHONE CONTACT. THEIR HOURS MUST ACCOMMODATE WORKING PEOPLE. PROVIDING WRITTEN MATERIAL TO THE PUBLIC, WRITTEN IN NON LEGALIZE IS ALSO IMPORTANT.	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
68	See Number 1, above.	Dec 21, 2010 3:10 PM
69	None.	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
70	See above.	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
71	Less influence from the legislature and other activist groups.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM
72	attorney discipline	Dec 21, 2010 5:12 PM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

Response Text		
73	A web site should include information on how to file a complaint, a template for the complaint, allow the complaint to be filed electronically, The web site should also list attorneys on suspension and what for...it should provide educational opportunities for attorneys to explore what may or may not be a conflict of interests and what to do about it.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
74	reduce opeartional costs. reduce size of board. reduce scope of operations.	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
75	none	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
76	The Bar should stop taking positions on any political issues other than the administration of justice. Leave politics out of the State Bar; make it only about serving the public and assisting members of the Bar be better lawyers and advocates.	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
77	The Board may not intervene directly in any disciplinary activity at all: its purpose is to ensure that the disciplinary procedures are efficacious and swift, and to recommend amendation of rules and procedures to the State Bar itself and the legislature.	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM
78	See above. While the policing aspect is very necessary for public protection, the Bar members need support and resources as well. For example, if a public officer seeks an opinion regarding a conflict of interest from the FPPC the official is protected from further prosecution by that opinion. Something like that regarding ethical matters would be invaluable.	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
79	Split the Bar	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM
80	Stop protecting lawyers and stop cutting deals. I am appalled at the conduct it takes to get disbarred - attorneys should be disbarred promptly after a fair hearing shows they breached their fiduciary duty and/or zealous advocacy obligations to their clients. It is a privilege to practice, not a right.	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM
81	Get the bar and all county bars out of the politics business - no more lobbying or making interest statements on any political issues.	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
82	See comments regarding sub committees	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
83	Is there a problem or is this an exercise in search of a problem. The President's letter only states that the Legislature has established a committe to address the issur of how to improve the protection of the public by further regulating lawyers. Are there any new hard evidence that this exercise is justified? The Legislature should spend its time addressing the budget and avoiding a financial collapse,	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
84	initial administrative settlement confer	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

	Response Text	
85	<p>A huge change would be to require that the current billable hours model be forbidden. Minimum billable hours mean that attorneys handle too many cases at once and don't have the time to adequately represent their individual clients to the best level possible. Currently, attys do steerage class legal work in an environment that demands first class premier level workmanship and everyone seems to think this is satisfactory. It is NOT satisfactory as we all know, but, until the system demands better the public will get poor quality representation while everyone else pats each other on the back in congratulations.</p> <p>Another improvement for the protection of the public is to stop allowing employment discrimination during atty hiring. Allowing "ABA only" or similar hiring restrictions limits employment opportunities to those not fortunate enough to go to top tier law schools. These types of restrictions limit the opportunities that minorities have access to due to their educational and financial situation. Yet, the St Bar does NOTHING about this blatant discrimination against qualified attorneys who kick the asses of those "silver spoons" who barely make the grade after multiple attempts. Discrimination based on economic or social limits is still discrimination.</p> <p>Make the Bar Exam TOUGHER. We have too many attys who barely pass the exam who don't know how to tie their shoes let alone file a proper pleading. Better public protection comes from attorneys who know their legal business rather than how much money they can make.</p>	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
86	No governance changes other than as related to prior answers. A more public presentation of information regarding the performance (positive) and discipline (negative) of lawyers would serve the interest of public protection and of the Board.	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
87	??	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
88	more focus on drugs and excessive use of alcohol	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
89	Solicit ideas to improve public protection from state bar members, and consider the most viable ideas in a board meeting.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM
90	You spelled governance wrong, but I think more members with regular contacts with the public who need protecting would be good. Also, more board contact with public who need protecting or their representatives. The law is a complex arena, and the public needs the bar to provide a service to them of at least explaining the legal system's basics to them, giving them the warning signs of unethical attorneys, and directing them to where they may obtain counsel in a small pamphlet (no more than 3-4 pages) as well as online.	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM
91	drop inactive enrollment immediately. educate the public about the role lawyers in problem solving. lawyers that steal client funds should be disbarred for life	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM
92	tougher standards that require longer suspensions and disbaring instead of the sympathy currently shown	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
93	I have no opinion on this	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
94	The Board should develop these.	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
95	publish minutes of meetings, seek input from members on agenda items	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
96	For better continuity, there should be a President-Elect selected a year before the presidential term begins.	Dec 24, 2010 7:26 PM
97	not sure	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
98	Prompt availabiltiy of advisory opinions about ethical issues.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
99	No changes appear to be necessary.	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
100	Get out of the CLE business and do not expand specialization any further.	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
101	Smaller size; minimize politicizing the profession.	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

Response Text		
102	Not sure.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM
103	Remove the persons placed on the Board for the sole purpose of satisfying personal or political agendas.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
104	I have some ideas that would get very fast public input by means of current technology and social media to guide the board and prioritize public input.	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM
105	see #6	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
106	Decreasing the board's involvement in things other than public protection--making the bar simply a licensing body would do it. But I doubt that is appropriate. There are other functions the bar performs that are valuable.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
107	Require all attorneys to have malpractice insurance; be less lenient in penalizing/sentencing attorneys who have been proven in the State Bar Court to have harmed a client; Create special bankruptcy court rules relating to attorneys that will preclude them from avoiding malpractice lawsuits by simply filing for bankruptcy.	Jan 4, 2011 12:51 AM
108	I don't know of any.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
109	Much more transparency in the workings of the board and what it does. It needs to serve the interests of lawyers as well. Just as the public needs to be protected from unscrupulous lawyers, there are unscrupulous members of the public as well. The vast majority of lawyers don't get the credit they deserve, and the State Bar does nothing to promote to the public all the good that lawyers do. If the purpose of the State Bar is going to be purely the protection of the public, then who will speak for the lawyers of California?	Jan 4, 2011 1:34 AM
110	I don't know.	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
111	Better control over attorney's who blatantly use the legal system for personal gain through publicity.	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
112	The bar should be eliminated completely or made voluntary.	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM
113	Act to enforce sanctions against those who abuse the litigation process - judges who refuse to sanction attorneys or parties without counsel should be addressed. I'm tired of following the rules while others don't do so and judges don't care. Civility and honesty are often ideas of the past.	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM
114	There is a decided lack of vision in this area. So far, the push has been for disclosure and an easing of the ability to punish attorneys. Of far more impact to the public is the lack of access to legal services at reasonable cost. This issue is not being addressed in part because the State does not want the Bar to get involved in political issues even though it has no problem in getting involved in Bar issues. Examples of problems not being addressed are the failure to keep the dollar values of small claims and economic litigation in pace with inflation, the increasing backlog of cases in the courts, the push by corporations for arbitration, the unlicensed practice of law by paralegals, and the difficulty in providing unbundled legal services.	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
115	Become a VOLUNTARY BAR and separate from the legislatures' current absolute control over the Bar. OR, shift Bar management to the Calif Dept of Consumer affairs -- DROP the current model of pretending to represent, and create a separate lawyers' bar -- see New York State model	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM
116	Fewer board members can get more done; get the politics out of the State Bar, stop wasting time on the cause-of-the-moment	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
117	The most important thing it can do to better serve the interest of public protections is to streamline the litigation process and make justice more affordable and user friendly.	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

	Response Text	
118	I believe posting on the State Bar's Website disciplinary charges lodged but not yet adjudicated against Members of the Bar is wrong because it is contrary to the Presumption of Innocence, a bedrock of American Jurisprudence. I also believe that Private Reprovals and other Non-Public Disciplinary Actions taken by the Office of the General Counsel of the State Bar against Members of the State Bar should continue to be confidential and should Never be publicly disclosed against the affected State Bar Member on the State Bar's Website. I believe these suggestions will encourage Lawyers to self-police and correct their own less serious mistakes.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
119	None. The current applicalbe sections of the CA B&P code are efficient and to not need any "enhancement." Please do not mess with something that is already working well for the protection of the CA Public. Changing and/or making the CA B&P Code more complicated is not going to result in any additional protection for the public against the well-meaning, hard working attorneys of this State.	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
120	Additional education and outreach to underserved communities on the role of the board of governors would be helpful.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM
121	Effective oversight requires Board members who have the time, interest and knowledge/experience to appropriately exercise their oversight responsibilities	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
122	I would change the number of members and balance the board with more members of the public. I would also allow for more victim in put. I would change the compliant form. It limits the victims abilty to complain which prevents justice.	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
123	Change to the State Bar Act to mandate reporting of other lawyers' unethical behavior; increase the ability of the courts to impose sanctions (similar to Rule 11 in Federal Court), increase educational requirements for lawyers on ethics issues.	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
124	See above.	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM
125	No suggested changes other than to ensure adequate representation of the bar and public stakeholders in the composition of the board.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
126	There should be better efforts to enforce such things as medical records privacy, financial records, telephone, etc privacy all for the common good.	Jan 8, 2011 10:29 PM
127	Board should have a small staff for writing an annual report to the State and for handling documentation related to issues being addressed by the Board	Jan 9, 2011 10:19 PM
128	Retool the investigative and prosecutors office.	Jan 10, 2011 4:27 AM
129	We would also suggest that the Board meetings be streamed live on the Internet. The American Bar Association's House of Delegates is live streamed, and that leads again to a greater transparency.	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM
130	The vountary Sections should be split off from the regulatory body and become a voluntary trade association. The regulatory body should, of course, allow the Sections to take their voluntary dues receipts and reserves with them and all copyrights and other assets.	Jan 12, 2011 10:45 PM
131	None	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
132	The more I think about it, the more it may make sense to divide the bar into two separate entities -- allowing the licensing, regulation and discipline to remain under the oversight of the legislature, and allowing the rest to be spun off into a voluntary bar association controlled by its members.	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
133	Appointment of members	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
134	The San Fernando Valley Bar Association proposes that the San Fernando Valley be a separate district for purpose of representation on the State Bar Board of Governors.	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM

8. What changes or other governance models may enable the board to better

Response Text		
135	Attention to resolving the cases within the 5 year period or provide a trial. When a certain amount of money has been spent and no resolution reached it should go to another step for more assistance. This would prevent the attorneys from working in collusion deciving the Court and deliberately delaying resolution.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
136	Take away the monopoly that attorneys'/lawyers' have over their private & public corporation that has affected United States of America Citizens entitlement to laws passed by "Acts of Congress" & State Legislature.	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
137	The ABA governance model should be looked at	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
138	Much closer supervision of the staff, much as a Board of Directors	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM
139	Somehow the board needs, institutionally, to better reflect the viewpoint of sole practitioners.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
140	stronger sanctions for members, and 3 strikes = lose license. I'm also licensed in oregon & washington, and we don't tolerate same level of misconduct - why individual attorneys should get multiple chances to offend and violate public protection is beyond me.	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
141	I would suggest designating that one seat be reserved for a member of the Executive Committee from one of the State Bar Sections.	Jan 17, 2011 10:07 PM
142	Clean up the corrupt Probate system. Put a limit on fees and demand evidence to support accusations made by disgruntled siblings. Respect the trust creator's wishes.	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
143	No comment at this time.	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
144	Board should have a representative from the Sections	Jan 21, 2011 6:31 PM
145	It is important to realize that the State Bar is very different from agencies in the Executive Branch as it is an agency of the Judicial Branch, so comparisons with most other state agency governance models are not helpful. The present governance model should be retained.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM

9. Would you like to speak at one of the public hearings the Governance Task

Response Text		
1	no	Dec 20, 2010 10:23 PM
2	No.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
3	No.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
4	no thank you.	Dec 20, 2010 10:27 PM
5	No thank you.	Dec 20, 2010 10:28 PM
6	No.	Dec 20, 2010 10:29 PM
7	Barry Jardini, Human Rights/Fair Housing Commission 1112 I St., Ste 250 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916)444-6903	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
	Will not be available to speak at one of the public hearings.	
8	no thank you	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
9	No.	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
10	no	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM

9. Would you like to speak at one of the public hearings the Governance Task

Response Text		
11	No	Dec 20, 2010 10:31 PM
12	no	Dec 20, 2010 10:32 PM
13	January 27, 2011 San Francisco if you need me to speak.	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
14	no	Dec 20, 2010 10:33 PM
15	No.	Dec 20, 2010 10:36 PM
16	Yes. In Los Angeles, January 20, 2011. Douglas A. Crowder, tel. 800-455-1592	Dec 20, 2010 10:38 PM
17	NO.	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
18	No	Dec 20, 2010 10:39 PM
19	Not at this time.	Dec 20, 2010 10:41 PM
20	No thanks.	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
21	No	Dec 20, 2010 10:43 PM
22	no	Dec 20, 2010 10:46 PM
23	I'm working, trying to support my small firm, so I must pass.	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
24	Billing fraud, transparency. LA. sliberto@libertolaw.com	Dec 20, 2010 10:48 PM
25	No as it would likely be a waste of my time.	Dec 20, 2010 10:51 PM
26	No	Dec 20, 2010 10:57 PM
27	I am of the opinion that little will be done to change the current method of attorney discipline to better protect the public. I see little or no benefit to speaking to the Governance Task Force other than the comments made here. Lonnie Reed, Esq. Bar 155544 Post Office Box 20576 Sedona, AZ 86341 (800) 755-2993	Dec 20, 2010 10:59 PM
28	No.	Dec 20, 2010 11:02 PM
29	No	Dec 20, 2010 11:03 PM
30	No.	Dec 20, 2010 11:04 PM
31	No, thank you. I am sure there are many eloquent speakers who share my views.	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
32	no	Dec 20, 2010 11:11 PM
33	No, thanks	Dec 20, 2010 11:16 PM
34	Not at this time.	Dec 20, 2010 11:20 PM
35	Not necessarily. Thank you. Sam Rudolph [510] 886-4876	Dec 20, 2010 11:22 PM
36	no	Dec 20, 2010 11:26 PM
37	No	Dec 20, 2010 11:31 PM
38	No	Dec 20, 2010 11:32 PM
39	No.	Dec 20, 2010 11:39 PM
40	No thank you.	Dec 20, 2010 11:44 PM
41	No.	Dec 20, 2010 11:52 PM
42	NO	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
43	No	Dec 20, 2010 11:53 PM
44	Not particularly, but I am happy to have my views shared in whatever manner anyone considers helpful.	Dec 21, 2010 12:00 AM

9. Would you like to speak at one of the public hearings the Governance Task

Response Text		
45	NO	Dec 21, 2010 12:01 AM
46	I am willing to speak about how too many lawyers of other ethnic backgrounds take advantage of their own people due to language constraints, either out of incompetence or venality. I see this regularly in my practice. My office is in LA, and I can be contacted at: steve@schwaberlaw.com	Dec 21, 2010 12:06 AM
47	No.	Dec 21, 2010 12:17 AM
48	Yes, but I don't have a ready source of transportation, live in San Diego, and thus cannot attend the meeting. I do wonder why a meeting is set for SF and Los Angeles, but not San Diego.	Dec 21, 2010 12:20 AM
49	No.	Dec 21, 2010 12:27 AM
50	No thanks.	Dec 21, 2010 12:29 AM
51	No thank you.	Dec 21, 2010 12:42 AM
52	No, thank you.	Dec 21, 2010 12:43 AM
53	No	Dec 21, 2010 12:57 AM
54	I would not. Thank you for this opportunity to be heard.	Dec 21, 2010 1:20 AM
55	No thank you.	Dec 21, 2010 1:27 AM
56	No thank you.	Dec 21, 2010 3:12 AM
57	unable to due to calenadar conflicts.	Dec 21, 2010 3:23 AM
58	NO!	Dec 21, 2010 4:15 AM
59	No, thanks.	Dec 21, 2010 4:19 AM
60	no	Dec 21, 2010 4:30 AM
61	Thanks for the opportunity for input.	Dec 21, 2010 4:55 AM
62	I don't think so.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 AM
63	No, thank you.	Dec 21, 2010 5:48 AM
64	No.	Dec 21, 2010 5:58 AM
65	yes,on January 20, 2011 in Los Angeles	Dec 21, 2010 12:18 PM
66	JOSEPH DESCALA, JR P.O. BOX 747 SAN ANSELMO, CA 94979-0747 415 453 9391/CELL 415 297 9391	Dec 21, 2010 12:34 PM
67	No	Dec 21, 2010 3:21 PM
68	Only if you need a speaker and believe my suggestions merit further consideration. If I were to speak, SF on 01/27 would be more convenient for me.	Dec 21, 2010 4:05 PM
69	No.	Dec 21, 2010 4:38 PM
70	no	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
71	no	Dec 21, 2010 5:25 PM
72	No thanks.	Dec 21, 2010 5:31 PM
73	No thank you. We totally lack credibility with the public and, frankly, even with ourselves. So much money goes into the Bar, with so very little to show for it. We should stop taking political positions and using the "clout" of the Bar for our own purposes, de-politicize it completely, and make it work to assist the PUBLIC, not ourselves.	Dec 21, 2010 6:07 PM
74	No. David Woolley -- dwoolley@lawyer.com	Dec 21, 2010 6:12 PM

9. Would you like to speak at one of the public hearings the Governance Task

	Response Text	
75	If I did I'd tell them at all this misses the mark in my view. The Bar Assoc. should work as hard to serve its members as it does the public. It does virtually nothing for its membership. It advocates political positions that are not shared by membership. Only the legal requirements of an integrated bar permit its survival. The publications of the Assoc. drip with liberal slant and racial bigotry, smoothly but transparently packaged as "concern." Governance models? Your time would be better spent on building airplane models. Here's your \$410.	Dec 21, 2010 6:13 PM
76	I would recommed that you contact Partick Faulkner, current President of the County Counsels Association of California, or Jennifer Henning, its Executive Director. Both can be reached at 91-327-7535 [this is Jennifer's number].	Dec 21, 2010 6:28 PM
77	no	Dec 21, 2010 6:46 PM
78	No	Dec 21, 2010 7:04 PM
79	I am available if my voice would be helpful, but I have no particular dog in this hunt and am not seeking to speak out. (415) 665-0400.	Dec 21, 2010 7:05 PM
80	No	Dec 21, 2010 7:17 PM
81	Perhaps.	Dec 21, 2010 7:25 PM
82	no	Dec 21, 2010 8:51 PM
83	And exactly how does this allow for those attorneys with good ideas but few financial resources to get their ideas out? It doesn't but it certainly makes everyone involved feel good to hold a "public hearing." It is meaningless beyond mere pagentry.	Dec 21, 2010 9:27 PM
84	No, thank you.	Dec 21, 2010 9:32 PM
85	No thank you.	Dec 21, 2010 10:40 PM
86	No	Dec 21, 2010 10:59 PM
87	No	Dec 21, 2010 11:38 PM
88	no	Dec 22, 2010 12:08 AM
89	No	Dec 22, 2010 12:22 AM
90	No.	Dec 22, 2010 1:46 AM
91	Absolutely not.	Dec 22, 2010 4:45 AM
92	no.	Dec 22, 2010 3:39 PM
93	no	Dec 22, 2010 9:42 PM
94	no.	Dec 23, 2010 5:32 AM
95	Yes, E mail: condorgrup@aol.com. 858-569-6454 January 20, 2011; in Los Angeles. F. Tepedino Bar # 64658	Dec 23, 2010 11:47 AM
96	not available in January	Dec 23, 2010 8:08 PM
97	no	Dec 24, 2010 8:53 PM
98	No.	Dec 26, 2010 5:20 PM
99	no	Dec 26, 2010 7:01 PM
100	no	Dec 26, 2010 10:03 PM
101	No	Dec 27, 2010 4:54 PM
102	No. Preparing to take the bar. Otherwise, I would.	Dec 28, 2010 7:30 AM
103	No thanks.	Dec 29, 2010 7:15 PM
104	No.	Dec 29, 2010 9:30 PM
105	No.	Jan 1, 2011 11:07 PM

9. Would you like to speak at one of the public hearings the Governance Task

Response Text		
106	no, but i am willing to speak with anyone at any time about these issues.	Jan 3, 2011 8:03 PM
107	NO.	Jan 4, 2011 12:00 AM
108	No. I can't conveniently be in either location.	Jan 4, 2011 1:20 AM
109	No	Jan 4, 2011 1:50 AM
110	No.	Jan 4, 2011 2:21 AM
111	no	Jan 4, 2011 5:15 AM
112	No.	Jan 4, 2011 5:23 AM
113	No	Jan 4, 2011 8:19 AM
114	Cannot make either date, sorry.	Jan 4, 2011 3:29 PM
115	Yes, but I work in San Diego and I cannot take off a day for a 3 minute window. Too bad you chose to limit bar access to the hearings. I suggest hearings from 4 pm to 9 pm all around the state	Jan 4, 2011 6:57 PM
116	no thank you	Jan 4, 2011 9:17 PM
117	NO	Jan 4, 2011 11:26 PM
118	No.	Jan 5, 2011 1:23 AM
119	No thank you, too busy with my practice.	Jan 5, 2011 3:12 AM
120	Not available to speak.	Jan 5, 2011 8:21 PM
121	No	Jan 6, 2011 12:27 AM
122	Thank you, for asking. Lets see if the board changes at all in the next three years. Then it may be worth it. For now some uneducated, poor, black woman would not be listened too anyway.	Jan 6, 2011 2:43 AM
123	No	Jan 6, 2011 4:43 PM
124	No thank you.	Jan 6, 2011 10:14 PM
125	No thanks.	Jan 8, 2011 6:59 PM
126	No.	Jan 10, 2011 4:27 AM
127	Yes, on January 20 in Los Angeles. Stephen L. Raucher President, Beverly Hills Bar Association Reuben Raucher & Blum 10940 Wilshire Blvd. 18th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90024 (310) 777-1990 slr@rrbattorneys.com	Jan 11, 2011 12:37 AM
128	Not available - will be in trial. Why not have the public hearings on a Saturday when folks are more likely to be able to participate?	Jan 12, 2011 11:28 PM
129	Probably will not be able to attend, but for the record: Lisa A. Runquist - 818-609-7761 17554 Community St., Northridge, CA 91325	Jan 12, 2011 11:36 PM
130	no thanks	Jan 13, 2011 1:05 AM
131	The San Fernando Valley Bar Association requests that our President, Seymour I. Amster, speak at the January 20 hearing in Los Angeles. Mr. Amster can be contacted through SFVBA Executive Director Liz Post at epost@sfvba.org or (818) 227-0490, est. 101.	Jan 13, 2011 1:45 AM

9. Would you like to speak at one of the public hearings the Governance Task

Response Text		
132	January 20, 2011 Eileen Lasher 619-847-8094	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
133	Yes! I would like to speak on January 27, 2011, in San Francisco, California, my contact information is Name Royal Edward Glaude, located at 8096 Juniper Avenue, Newark, California 94560 E-mail royalnrs2004@yahoo.com	Jan 13, 2011 10:44 PM
134	no	Jan 15, 2011 2:22 AM
135	I would like to, but am unable to shift other obligations on those days.	Jan 15, 2011 3:08 AM
136	Decline.	Jan 15, 2011 9:11 AM
137	not necessary	Jan 16, 2011 5:58 PM
138	I spoke at a hearing of yours a couple of years ago. At first I thought you listened. Later I received your findings. The conflict of interest this attorney openly demonstrated was dismissed by you after the attorney told you he had revealed his conflict verbally to me. Not true! According to my findings, that exposed conflict should have been in writing. It wasn't because it never happened. I won't waste my time and money to attend another of your meetings. I thank you and hope you finely take some type of action to protect the public from these unscrupulous lawyers.	Jan 19, 2011 3:56 PM
139	Not at the moment.	Jan 21, 2011 4:54 PM
140	Not available on those dates.	Jan 27, 2011 7:21 PM