

1993

Committee Reports

Wyoming State Bar

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.law.uwyo.edu/land_water

Recommended Citation

Wyoming State Bar (1993) "Committee Reports," *Land & Water Law Review*. Vol. 28 : Iss. 1 , pp. 395 - 424.
Available at: https://scholarship.law.uwyo.edu/land_water/vol28/iss1/12

This Wyoming Bar Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by Law Archive of Wyoming Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Land & Water Law Review by an authorized editor of Law Archive of Wyoming Scholarship.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

BOARD OF CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION

Peter C. Maxfield, Chair

The Wyoming State Board of Continuing Legal Education met four times during the past year and since August 7, 1991, the date of the last annual report, on February 20, May 18, June 26, and August 13, 1992. The business of this hard-working committee consisted generally of drafting several proposed changes in the Rules for Continuing Legal Education of Members of the Wyoming State Bar; deciding several requests for waivers and numerous credit appeals by Bar members; performing responsibilities regarding attorneys delinquent in CLE requirements and attorneys on suspension for non-compliance with CLE rules; resolving status of attorneys who had previously been granted indefinite exempt status; and addressing the several long-standing, unwritten policies previously utilized by the State Bar in answering CLE credit questions.

A proposal was adopted by the Board upon recommendation of a subcommittee composed of Board members Margaret Bunning, David Evans, and Roger Schreiner, to revise Rule 5 of the rules mentioned above to allow attorneys to report their CLE activities to the State Bar as programs are attended, rather than in an annual report as was previously required. This reflected a change in practice that had occurred several years previously. The new rule requires the Bar to send out to each attorney a record of accredited legal education as soon after January 30 as possible. Upon recommendation of the same subcommittee, the Board proposed that Rule 7 be revised to change the timing for billing and payment of the annual CLE fee to coincide with the billing for the annual Bar dues in order to save the time and expense of two mailings. These proposals have been submitted to the Bar Commissioners and the Supreme Court for their consideration.

The Board is pleased to report that no attorneys were recommended for suspension in 1992 for delinquency in CLE requirements. The nineteen attorneys who prior to 1990 had been granted an indefinite exemption from the CLE requirements were notified that the rules no longer allowed such status. With the possible exception of one person, all of these attorneys have now either elected full inactive or active status under the rules.

Following the review and revision of rules this year, the Board began dealing with a number of accreditation policies established by the Board over the course of ten years or more. Some of these precedents included methods for calculating credit hours and other standards for decision-making. The eventual goal is to incorporate these precedents into the rules or abandon them.

Initial CLE reports were mailed to all active Bar members on October 24, 1991 and May 1, 1992. On March 5, 1992 delinquency notices were mailed to seven attorneys delinquent for 1989 and 41 attorneys delinquent for 1990. One attorney requested a change to inactive status, two requested waivers, 16 submitted applications bringing themselves into compliance and 14 requested extensions. Fifteen attorneys did not respond to the first notice and were sent a second notice April 1, 1992. Four requested extensions and seven submitted applications bringing themselves into compliance. On April 17, 1992 the Court sent notices to the four attorneys who did not respond to the first or second notice. All four attorneys replied within 30 days, two requested extensions and two submitted CLE applications bringing themselves into compliance.

Comparative statistics for the CLE delinquencies are listed below:

	May 1992	May 1991	May 1990
Members 1 year Delinquent	265	138	348
Members 2 years Delinquent	27	35	20
Members 3+ years Delinquent	3	-0-	24
Total Members Delinquent	295	173	392
Recommended Suspensions	-0-	2	9
Total Suspended	-0-	1	8

Members of the 1992 Board include Pete Maxfield, Chairman; Stuart Day, Vice Chairman; Richard Barrett, David Evans, Sue Kearns, Darlene Reiter, Margaret Bunning, Leo Sanchez, and Roger Schreiner. The Board appreciated the very thorough and efficient assistance of Tony Lewis and Lesley Osen, Executive Secretary and CLE Assistant of the State Bar, respectively.

STATE BOARD OF LAW EXAMINERS OF WYOMING

Calvin E. Ragsdale, Chair

The State Board of Law Examiners now consists of William K. Bormuth, Cody; Calvin E. Ragsdale, Green River; Judith A.W. Studer, Casper; Donald P. White, Riverton; and Rhonda Sigrist Woodard, Cheyenne.

The State Board of Law Examiners administered the Bar Examination twice in 1992: on February 25 and 26 and on July 28 and

1993

STATE BAR PROCEEDINGS

397

29, both times at the University of Wyoming College of Law. The examination presently consists of two parts, the Multi-State Bar Examination (MBE), for which questions are prepared and grading is done under the administration of the National Conference of Bar Examiners, and an Essay portion prepared and graded by the State Board. An applicant must successfully complete both portions of the examination for the Board to recommend the applicant to the Supreme Court of Wyoming for admission. The table below reflects combined passage rates for the February and July examinations for both portions, compared with rates in prior years:

	1992	1991	1990	1989
Total Tested	86	100	66	106
Total Passed	57*	69	45	70
Total Failed	27*	31	21	36
Passage Rate	69%	69%	68%	66%

* Pass and fail figures do not add up to total tested for the reason that 2 files are not complete and final recommendation has not yet been made.

In addition to those examined, the Board considered applicants for admission on motion pursuant to Rule 5(e), Rules of the Supreme Court of Wyoming, the results of which are reflected in the table below, compared with prior years:

	1992	1991	1990	1989*
Total Applications	61	48	25	2
Total Recommended	43	37	20	2
Pending File Completion or Further Investigation	24	N/A	N/A	N/A
Not recommended	**	11	5	0

* On March 15, 1988, provisions for admission on motion for non-resident attorneys were deleted from Supreme Court rules governing admissions. They were reinstated in July, 1989.

** At the present time, the column cannot be completed for the reason that various files are incomplete and cannot be considered, or further investigation has been requested and such investigation has not been completed.

In other business, the Board continued its consideration of proposed rules and procedures governing admissions, and on July 29, 1992, recommended adoption of proposed rules and procedures to the Wyoming Supreme Court. At the time of the preparation of this

report, those rules were being reviewed and considered by the Supreme Court.

At its meeting of August 14, 1992, the Board passed a resolution commending Board member and Secretary of the Board, Rhonda Sigrist Woodard for her substantial work on the drafting and completion of the proposed rules and procedures governing admission to the practice of law in Wyoming, which resolution was to be forwarded to the President of the Wyoming State Bar for acknowledgment at the Annual Business Meeting.

BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Joseph E. Vlastos, Chair

Calendar Year 1991 (last year for which full statistics are available)

I. Cases Carried Forward from Prior Years:	110
II. Cases Opened in 1991:	78
III. Cases Dismissed in 1991:	
Cases opened in 1987:	1
Cases opened in 1988:	2
Cases opened in 1989:	5
Cases opened in 1990:	29
Cases opened in 1991:	<u>15</u>
Total	52

Note: Cases are dismissed generally because the facts did not prove the allegations, no unethical conduct occurred or the evidence was highly conflicting to a degree which would not approach the required burden of proof. In certain instances dismissals occur because of lack of jurisdiction.

IV. Discipline Imposed in 1991:	
Disbarment	2
Suspension	1
Public Censure	2
Private Reprimand	3
Informal Admonition	2
Probation	0
Disability/Inactive	0

Year to Date 1992 (through August 21, 1992)

I. Cases Carried Forward From 12/31/91:	114
II. Cases Opened:	49

III. Cases Dismissed:

Cases opened in 1986:	1
Cases opened in 1987:	0
Cases opened in 1988:	0
Cases opened in 1989:	2
Cases opened in 1990:	7
Cases opened in 1991:	33
Cases opened in 1992:	<u>19</u>
Total:	62

Note: Cases are dismissed generally because the facts did not prove the allegations, no unethical conduct occurred or the evidence was highly conflicting to a degree which would not approach the required burden of proof. In certain instances dismissals occur because of lack of jurisdiction.

IV. Board Hearings Held: 3

V. Discipline Imposed:

Disbarment	1
Suspension	1
Public Censure	1
Private Reprimand	3
Informal Admonition	3
Interim Suspension	0
Felony Suspension	0
Disability/Inactive Suspension	0

Cases Opened Since Last Annual Report
(Case Nos. 43-91 to 78-91; 1-92 through 49-92)

I. Number Pending:	40
Number Dismissed:	45

II. Type of Cases Giving Rise to Complaints

Abstract & Title Opinions:	0
Adoption	0
Bankruptcy	3
Collections	2
Corporations 0	
Criminal	26
Contract	0
Domestic Relations	18
Estate Planning	0
Guardianships	1
Governmental	0
Labor Law	1

Litigation	22
Minerals	0
Oil & Gas	1
Personal Injury	0
Probate	5
Partnership	0
Real Estate	5
Trust	0
Workers Compensation	0
Wills	0
Tax	0
Other	1

III. Type of Initial Complaint

Deceit or Misrepresentation	22
Incompetent Representation	11
Lack of Diligence	33
Conflict of Interest	6
Fees	13
Refusing to Follow Client's Wishes	5
Lack of Communication	36
Harassment	3
Acting Without Client Consent	1
Adversely Reflecting on Fitness to Practice	10
Ex Parte Contact	1
Counselling Illegal Conduct	2
Ineffective Assistance of Counsel	3
Breach of Confidentiality	2
Refusal to Deliver Accounting or Files	8
Tampering with Evidence	0
Collusion	0
Frivolous Claim	4
Refusal to Pay Deposition or Expert Fee	3
Other	19

Comments:

The current active caseload is approximately 82 files. At any given time, the static caseload is approximately 85 files. This fluctuates upward by 10 to 15 files from time to time. The Board's present emphasis is to bring the trial case docket current as well as bring the overall open/investigative case docket current.

Approximately 30 matters per year which would otherwise have constituted investigative case docket files have been handled by Bar Counsel, Randal R. Arp, through letters, in-person conferences or telephone conversations with members of the public. These matters are not reflected in the data compilation above.

Members of the Board in 1991-92 consisted of Joseph E. Vlastos, Chairman; James L. Edwards, Michael H. McCarty, Timothy O. Beppler, Rebecca A. Lewis, Herb Carter and Mary Flitner.

CLIENT'S SECURITY FUND

Charles S. Chapin, Chair

The Client Security Fund of the Wyoming State Bar met on five occasions in the past year, on October 29, 1992, November 26, 1992, December 5, 1992, March 10, 1992 and April 7, 1992.

This year's docket included six claims on file with the Committee, and as the result of the investigations by members, the sum of \$1,470.00 was paid to a claimant who filed against the former Green River lawyer, Dean Clark, and \$500.00 was paid to a claimant who filed against former Green River lawyer, Dean Clark. Two claims were denied by the Committee and the remaining two claims are currently under investigation.

The major accomplishment of the Committee, with the assistance of the Wyoming Supreme Court and the Wyoming State Bar Commissioners, was the drafting and adoption by the Wyoming Supreme Court of a new set of rules and regulations for the Committee. Much of the work performed in the drafting of the new rules and regulations was undertaken by Robert Berger and Mary Guthrie. The Committee would like to extend its appreciation to these two individuals for their assistance and leadership during the process.

In other business, the Committee, together with the Board of Commissioners, continues to explore future funding options of the Committee. With this year's award subtracted, the balance of the fund stands at \$20,843.86.

Members of this year's Committee include: Charles S. Chapin, Chairman; Barbara L. Lauer, Laramie, Jeffrey A. Donnell, Worland, Anthony V. Vehar, Evanston, Steven R. Cranfill, Cody, Mary Bell Guthrie, Cheyenne, Gary M. Greenhalgh, Rock Springs, Ann T. Schnelzer, Torrington, and Robert G. Berger, Sheridan.

LEGAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Paul Schierer

The Legal Education Committee of the Wyoming State Bar held an open forum with students at the law school on October 15, 1991. General questions about the Bar were answered, and suggestions were taken from the students. The Committee hopes to hold an open forum on an annual basis and act on some of the issues raised.

LAWYERS' ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

Gregory Dyekman, Chair

The past year has been one of encouragement and frustration for this committee. We began dealing with referrals and continued to gather information about available treatment programs so that we can offer a choice of programs to any situation that calls for such treatment. In addition, we heard from several attorneys who volunteered to help as needed with the work of the committee. However, your committee has still apparently not gained the trust and confidence of the members of the Bench and Bar, as few referrals have come to the committee. Among those which we have received, at least two dealt with persons who were no longer members of the Wyoming State Bar and were therefore outside our scope of responsibility. As a result, the committee has not been as active as it had hoped to be in providing direct assistance. Nevertheless, committee members have participated actively and have expressed a willingness to become more involved should additional referrals be received.

The committee's focus will continue to be on confidentiality and advocacy for attorneys in need of assistance, with additional emphasis on education of members of the Bench and Bar. The committee will make a short presentation to the Judicial Counsel meeting in September and hopes to sponsor programs at bar meetings throughout the state.

Problems caused by various sorts of impairments are faced by Wyoming lawyers every day. This committee continues to stand ready to offer its assistance when called upon to do so.

Members of this year's committee include: Hon. James N. Wolfe, William D. Hjelmstad, Thomas E. Lubnau II, Bobbi D. Renner, John D. Rossetti, and John E. Stanfield.

COMMITTEE FOR THE RESOLUTION OF FEE DISPUTES

Cary R. Alburn III, Chair

Last year, in making this report to the State Bar, I was perhaps guilty of a little overkill, since I had not made such a report previously. I thought it would be helpful to the State Bar members for me to describe the functions of the committee in substantial detail. It had been my experience for several years on the committee that very few attorneys knew anything about the committee until they became subject to a fee dispute, and even then, the committee was viewed as some sort of unknown entity whose functions were largely

unknown. So if you are still among those attorneys who are in the dark about the Committee for the Resolution of Fee Disputes, you can learn almost anything you ever wanted to know, and perhaps a lot more, by looking at last year's report, appearing in Volume XXVII No. 1, *Land and Water Law Review*.

Rule Revision

We are hoping for some minor revisions to the Rules, to cover a couple of problem areas that have arisen. Specifically, I have asked for rules that will tighten up the time for accomplishing the committee's tasks, some clarifications of some ambiguous language, and a reordering of the Rules, so that they will be in a more logical format. What changes the Supreme Court will approve remain to be seen. Within the framework of the existing rules, the only complaints we have had are in three areas: that sometimes the committee takes too long accomplishing its tasks, that some of the rules need clarifying (which I have been doing on an ad hoc basis), and that the rules are in an illogical order.

Summary of Activities

The committee continues to meet as individual hearing panels, appointed to informally determine fee disputes between clients and attorneys. Since each panel's decisions are reviewable and enforceable by the District Courts, the committee serves an important function in resolving these matters. While it is rare that a decision of a panel is contested, so far such decisions have been upheld. The committee members generally take their tasks very seriously, bending over backwards to be fair to all parties involved. Since all of this work is done strictly voluntarily, with no compensation except for expenses (which most committee members donate, anyway), I continue to be pleased at the high quality of the committee members' work and their devotion to accomplishing the task in a fair and impartial manner.

FY 1991-92

Disputes on file as of 9/1/92:	20
Disputes resolved in favor of attorney:	9
Disputes resolved in favor of client (including settlements):	6
Did not meet 90-day Rule:	2
Pending:	3;

UNIFORM STATE LAWS COMMISSION

Charles G. Kepler, Chair

Wyoming Commissioners Justice Richard J. Macy, Ralph E.

Thomas, and Charles G. Kepler attended the 101st annual meeting of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws which was held in San Francisco, California, on July 30 - August 6, 1992. The San Francisco meeting promulgated four uniform acts recommending them for adoption by the several states.

Uniform Partnership Act (1992)

The Revised Uniform Partnership Act (RUPA) is a complete revision of the Uniform Partnership Act (UPA) promulgated in 1914 and adopted by all jurisdictions other than the State of Louisiana and Puerto Rico. RUPA includes the general rule that its provisions govern the relations among partners unless there is a partnership agreement to the contrary. Certain provisions of RUPA may not be abrogated by agreement, however. Most importantly, a partner's obligation of good faith may not be eliminated but the partners may by agreement determine the standards by which the performance of the obligation is to be measured, if those standards are not manifestly unreasonable.

RUPA provides unequivocally that a partnership is an entity and eliminates UPA's concept of a tenancy in partnership. Property acquired by a partnership becomes property of the partnership and not of the partners individually. Property may be acquired in the partnership name or in the name of any one or more of the partners with an indication of their capacities as partners or of the existence of a partnership. The partnership may sue and be sued in the partnership name. A judgment against a partnership is not by itself a judgment against a partner, and a judgment against a partnership may not be satisfied from a partner's assets unless there is a judgment against the partner. RUPA requires a partnership creditor generally to levy unsuccessfully on the partnership's property before levying on a partners' individual property. A partner has no right to receive a distribution in kind and may not be required to accept a distribution in kind. A partner may sue his partnership on a tort or other theory, rather than being confined to an action for dissolution or an accounting. Generally, the relationships between a partnership and its creditors are unaffected by the disassociation of a partner or by the addition of a new partner, unless there is an agreement to the contrary.

RUPA provides for the voluntary filing at the state level of a statement of partnership authority. This statement must specify the partners authorized to execute an instrument transferring real property held in the name of the partnership. The statement also may contain any other matters the partnership chooses, including the authority, or limitations upon the authority, of some or all of the partners to enter into other transactions on behalf of the partnership. A

grant of extraordinary authority binds the partnership to a person who gives value without knowledge that there is no authority. A grant of extraordinary authority to transfer real property must be recorded with land titles to bind the partnership. A restriction on a partners' authority, on the other hand, only binds nonpartners who know of it. A restriction on a partner's authority to transfer real property is effective if, and only if, recorded with the land titles.

The only fiduciary duties a partner owes to the partnership and the other partners are the duty of loyalty and the duty of care. RUPA states that a partner's duty of loyalty to the partnership and other partners is "limited to" three rules. The first is based upon UPA and provides that a partner must account to the partnership and hold "as trustee" for it any property, profit, or benefit derived by the partner, without the consent of the other partners, in the conduct and winding up of the partnership business or from use by the partner of partnership property. Second, a partner must refrain from dealing with the partnership on behalf of a party having an interest adverse to the partnership without the consent of the other partners. Third, a partner must refrain from competing with the partnership without the consent of other partners. These rules may be varied or eliminated in the partnership agreement.

RUPA rewrites the rules on partnership breakups but retains much of the substance of UPA. There is no dissolution if a department partner is bought out. RUPA does continue the present rule which give a partner at will the ultimate power to compel a winding up of the partnership business, but the winding up may be postponed for up to 90 days to that the remaining partners have an opportunity to negotiate with a disassociating partner for a continuation of the partnership without a liquidation of the business or a technical dissolution of the partnership entity. There are numerous other changes made by RUPA. One of the more interesting changes is that a general partnership may convert to a limited partnership and a limited partnership may convert to a general partnership. RUPA also authorizes the merger of a partnership with one or more general or limited partnerships.

Uniform Interstate Family Support Act

Congressional legislation in 1984, 1986, and 1988 has had a major impact on state child support enforcement law, both substantive and procedural. The Bradley Amendment adopted in 1986 prohibits retroactive reduction of a child support arrearage stemming from a court order. The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws first entered the field with a Reciprocal Enforcement of Support (URESAs) in 1950, which was amended in 1958 and again in 1968. In 1988 a special committee was appointed to review URESAs

and to adopt revisions or to propose a freestanding act on the subject of child support enforcement. Work on the revisions was continued but no formal action taken until the U. S. Commission on Interstate Child Support could complete its work. As a part of the review and amendment process, it was decided to rename the act Interstate Family Support Act, which completely revises and replaces URESA. The Act has been completely reorganized into a more logical, and understandable order. Under the present URESA, support proceedings are de novo. This means that more than one support order can remain outstanding in more than one state. The Act introduces for the first time to allow only one support order to be effective at any one time, so far as that is possible. This principle is carried out by a series of sections resolving actions pending in two or more states, setting forth rules for determining which tribunal has continuing exclusive jurisdiction over an order, reconciling orders issued before the effective date of the Act, and providing for multiple orders for two or more families supported by the same obligor. Under the new Act, the only tribunal which can modify a support order is the one having continuing exclusive jurisdiction over the order, except in narrowly defined circumstances. A separate interstate action for the establishment of parentage is included. The Act may be used only for proceedings involving the support of a child or a spouse of the support obligor and is not to enforce other duties of support such as a support of a parent. As to the duties of support, the new Act provides that the forum law and procedures apply, subject to certain exceptions. Reciprocity of laws among the states on this subject is no longer required because all states have quite similar laws. A number of improvements have been made in order to streamline and shorten delays in interstate proceedings. The Act explicitly authorizes parties to use private legal counsel as well as state support enforcement agencies in pursuing support actions. The Act contains a broad long arm jurisdiction provision in an effort to give tribunals in the whole state of the supported family as wide as possible an opportunity to secure support order jurisdiction in that state's tribunals. The Act provides for two direct enforcement procedures without going through a tribunal. One pursues a direct voluntary wage withholding by an obligor's employer in another state or direct administrative enforcement by the support enforcement agency of the other state.

Uniform Victims of Crime Act

In 1973 the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws promulgated the Uniform Crime Victims Reparations Act. This Act was adopted in five states with four other states adopting a substantially similar act. In 1989 the decision was made to revise and rename the Act to include within its scope the addition of various areas that are usually referred to as victims' rights.

The fundamental objective underlying this new Act is the protection of the best interests of victims of crime. The Act seeks to insure that crime victims are treated with the dignity and respect they deserve while functioning in a system in which they find themselves through no fault of their own. The Act seeks to accommodate the objectives and to balance crime victims' needs and rights against defendants' constitutional rights.

Although all states have some form of victim restitution, there is an inconsistency. The states are not in agreement on the definition of "victim." Some states have comprehensive statutory enactments, but the legislation on the most part is not consolidated in one place. In most jurisdictions there is no assignment of responsibility for informing the victim of what rights he does have. The new Act defines operative terms such as crime, member of victim's family, person, state, and victim. It provides for the designation of an agency to comply with the specific requirements of the Act in order to protect the victim's rights to nondisclosure of information, speedy prosecution, safety, presence at courtroom proceedings, prompt return of property, freedom from employment discipline, participating in the presentence investigation, presenting victim-impact statements, and receiving information about support services, court procedures, sentencing, incarceration, and release. If a victim is a minor or is incapacitated, incompetent, or deceased, an adult member of the victim's family may exercise these rights.

The Act specifies the powers and duties of the agency administering the victim's compensation programs and specifies who may apply for an receive compensation. The Act specifies time limits and monetary limits and authorizes an emergency award up to \$1,000.00.

The Act specifies that whenever a court imposes a criminal penalty or disposition, it shall also make a finding of the total economic loss directly caused to any person by the crime. This permits the court to enter a judgment against the defendant for the economic loss and specifies that the judgment may be enforced by the state, the victim, a deceased victim's estate, or any other beneficiary of the judgment in the same manner as a judgment for money in a civil action.

Uniform Unincorporated Nonprofit Association Act

This Act reforms the common law concerning unincorporated, nonprofit associations in three basic areas: authority to acquire, hold, and transfer property, especially real property; authority to sue and be sued as an entity; and the contract and tort liability of officers and members of the association.

At common law an unincorporated association, nonprofit or profit, was not a separate legal entity. It was considered an aggregate

of individuals. This obviously created problems. A gift to an unincorporated association failed because there was no legal entity to receive it. Since it was not a legal entity, members needed to be joined as party plaintiffs or defendants in litigation. Since it was not a legal entity, an unincorporated association could not be liable for conduct, in tort, contract, or otherwise, taken in its name. On the other hand, its members could be.

Over a period of time, courts and legislature have provided various solutions to these problems, resulting in a great deal of inconsistency among jurisdictions. This Act seeks to deal with a limited number of major issues relating to unincorporated nonprofit associations. It applies to all unincorporated, nonprofit associations. In this respect it is not limited to nonprofit organizations described under Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. It covers philanthropic, educational, scientific, and literary clubs, unions, trade associations, political organizations, and all other unincorporated nonprofit associations. Their members may be individuals, corporations, or other legal entities or any mix thereof.

The basic approach of the Act is that an unincorporated, nonprofit association is a legal entity for the purposes it addresses. It does not make these associations legal entities for all purposes. This is left to the courts of an adopting state whether to use this Act to determine by analogy that one of these associations is a legal entity for some other purpose.

Under the Act, both real and personal property may be acquired, held, encumbered, and transferred by a nonprofit association, whether or not the association or a member has any relationship to the estate. A nonprofit association may be a legatee, devisee, or beneficiary of a trust or contract. A nonprofit association may execute a statement of authority to transfer an estate or interest in real property in the name of the nonprofit association. The title may be transferred by a person so authorized in the statement. The statement must set forth the name of the nonprofit association, its address in the state, the name or title of the person authorized to transfer an estate or interest in the property, and the action, procedure or vote of the nonprofit association which authorizes the person to transfer the title. A person is not liable for a breach of a nonprofit association's contract simply because the person is a member. A person is not liable for a tortious act or omission from which a nonprofit association is liable merely because the person is a member. The tortious act or omission of a member or other person for which a nonprofit association is liable is not imputed to a person because of membership only. A member may assert a claim against a nonprofit association either in contract or in tort. A judgment or order against a nonprofit association is not by itself a judgment or order against a member.

The Act provides for the disposition of personal property of an inactive nonprofit association. It also provides the association may file in the Secretary of State's office a statement appointing an agent authorized to receive service of process. It provides how service of process may be served on an agent authorized by appointment, an officer, managing or general agent, or a person authorized to participate in the management of its affairs.

REPORT OF THE DELEGATE TO THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN MINERAL LAW FOUNDATION

Thomas E. Lubnau II

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I represented the Wyoming State Bar at the 38th Annual Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Institute in Vancouver, B.C., on July 21-25.

I am pleased to report that the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation is thriving as an institution in a depressed mineral economy. I think much of the credit is due the Executive Director of the Foundation, David Phillips, for its success. He should be congratulated on his management of the Institute.

The Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation is in its best financial condition ever, having \$3,199,000 in investment assets. The budget adopted for fiscal year 1993 looks for a net annual gain on operations of \$11,700.

The Foundation ended the calendar year 1991 with a net gain of \$187,571, compared with \$181,649 in 1990 and \$11,153 in 1989. This gain is attributable to several successful institutes, increased royalty revenue, the Cower Federal Royalty Valuation and Management Service, publication sales, increased annual membership and interest.

The permanent sustaining fund, the permanent investment fund of the Foundation, received contributions totalling \$49,000 during the last year. Donations and the number of donors to the permanent sustaining fund have decreased over the past year.

The Joe Rudd Scholarship Fund funded four scholarship to four outstanding mineral law students. The scholarship fund was established in memory of Joe Rudd, a former Trustee, and the corpus of the fund from contributions has grown to \$216,055. The fund is "restricted" and may only be used for academic scholarships at Governing Law Schools. I would encourage students at the University of Wyoming to apply for this scholarship.

The board of trustees has authorized the Executive Committee of the Foundation to prepare a matching fund scholarship program. As the fund develops, I will provide you with more information. The

fund is now in the formative stages, but promises to be one of the significant scholarship programs in the Rocky Mountain region.

The following sites have been selected for future Annual Institute locations:

- 39th Annual Institute, July 22-24, 1993 — Vail, CO
- 40th Annual Institute, July 21-23, 1994 — San Diego, CA
- 41st Annual Institute, July 20-22, 1995 — Sun Valley, ID
- 42nd Annual Institute, July 24-26, 1996 — Santa Fe, NM

The Foundation is looking forward to holding special institutes on the following topics in the future.

1. Spring 1993 — Oil and Gas Royalty on Non-Federal Lands.
2. Spring 1993 — Corporate Environmental Management.
3. Environmental Issues for Oil and Gas Operations.
4. Surface Damage Issues and Rights of Access.
5. Land Issues for Landmen
6. Workshop on Drainage and Compensatory Royalties.
7. International Mineral Development in Latin America.
8. Insurance Coverage for Environmental Claims.

The Foundation sponsored several successful institutes during the last year, including the Institute on Natural Gas Marketing and Transportation, Institute on Royalty Valuation and Management, Institute on Mineral Title Examination, Institute on Coalbed Gas Development, and Institute on Public Land Law. All of the institutes were well attended and successful.

In addition to the institutes offered, the Foundation offered the following short courses: Short Course on Oil and Gas Law, Short Course on Federal Oil and Gas Leasing, and Short Course on Management of Hazardous Substances.

The Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation terminated their arrangement with Matthew Bender & Co., as publisher of the proceedings of the Annual Institutes. The Foundation will now publish the proceedings itself. This is a monumental undertaking, and although no difficulties are anticipated, there may be a period of adjustment.

The Foundation has sponsored the following publications and supplements: American Law of Mining, 2d ed., Law of Federal Oil and Gas Leases, the Proceedings of the Annual Institutes, Public Land and Resources Law Digest, the Mineral Law Newsletter, the Water Law Newsletter, the Mining Lease Handbook, Mining Law and Regulations of Mexico, and Institute Manuals and Audio Tapes.

In a new and challenging project, which represents the wave of the future, the Foundation is sponsoring the Mining Agreement Document Assembly System (MADAS). The MADAS is a unique computer program of nested macros in WordPerfect 5.1, which will, through a series of multiple choices, allow an attorney to generate a complete mining agreement. The system should be available to test market in the fall. The program is intriguing.

Louisiana State University was admitted as a governing member of the Foundation.

I have, by letter, requested appointment to any of the operating committees, with special interest paid to the Special Institutes Committee and the Scholarship and Grants Committee. I will advise on whether or not I have been appointed.

It is difficult to express the pride with which I represent the Wyoming State Bar to the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation. The Foundation, and the Wyoming Members of the Foundation, have a great tradition of service and success.

Special tribute goes out to Craig Newman who did an outstanding job representing the State of Wyoming in the Foundation. His reputation and contributions to the Foundation preceded me to every meeting, and I have big shoes to fill. He deserves a great deal of thanks for his time and effort.

**WYOMING STATE BAR
1992-93 BUDGET WORKSHEET
General Fund**

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1991-92 ACTUAL	1992-93 PROPOSED
REVENUE					
Annual Dues	\$245,591	\$274,214	\$320,000	\$321,412	
Interest	\$20,000	\$18,086	\$15,000	\$10,000	
Superv Fees	\$5,100	\$14,961	\$5,100	\$12,000	
TOTAL REVENUE	\$270,691	\$307,261	\$340,100	\$343,412	
EXPENSES					
Exec Dir Salary	\$32,500	\$32,500	\$37,500	\$37,500	
Bar Counsel	\$38,850	\$37,778	\$40,000	\$40,000	
Asst Bar Cnsl	\$15,000	(on p. 4)	\$15,360	\$15,360	
Dir Comm	\$20,000	\$16,748	\$20,600	\$21,200	
Admin Asst	\$18,200	\$22,136	\$19,400	\$19,400	
CLE Asst	\$14,000	\$14,304	\$14,000	\$14,000	
BPR Asst	\$11,250	\$12,081	\$12,450	\$14,400	
Consulting	\$3,000	\$797	\$3,000	\$3,000	
Benefits	\$17,512	\$19,566	\$22,000	\$22,000	
TOTAL SALARIES	\$170,312	\$155,910	\$184,310	\$186,860	
President Travel	\$5,000	\$6,079	\$5,500	\$5,500	
Pres.-Elect	\$3,000	\$1,668	\$3,000	\$3,000	
Vice-Pres.	\$1,500	\$994	\$1,500	\$1,500	
Sec. Treas.	\$1,000	\$986	\$1,500	\$1,500	
Com. Dis #1	\$1,000	\$55	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Com. Dis #2	\$1,000	\$55	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Com. Dis #3	\$1,000	\$945	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Com. Dis #4	\$1,000	\$799	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Com. Dis #5	\$1,000	\$55	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Com. Dis #6	\$1,000	\$552	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Com. Dis #7	\$1,000	\$123	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Com. Dis #8	\$1,000	\$336	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Com. Dis #9	\$1,000	\$912	\$1,000	\$1,000	
ABA Delegate	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,000	\$1,000	
Exec. Dir.	\$4,500	\$4,476	\$4,000	\$4,000	
Bar Counsel	\$3,750	\$711	\$2,500	\$2,500	
Dir. Comm.	\$1,500	\$2,865	\$1,500	\$1,500	
Misc. Travel	\$5,000	\$4,014	\$1,000	\$1,000	
TOTAL TRAVEL	\$35,750	\$27,125	\$30,500	\$30,500	
Office Rent, Util	\$18,970	\$23,113	\$23,610	\$25,000	
Maintenance	\$2,500	\$2,743	\$2,500	\$2,500	
Supplies	\$5,800	\$4,514	\$5,500	\$5,500	
Leases	\$1,836	\$1,912	\$1,800	\$2,500	
Comp. Prog.	\$2,000	\$780	\$4,000	\$2,000	
Telephone	\$8,000	\$7,771	\$8,000	\$8,000	
Postage	\$6,450	\$11,000	\$6,500	\$6,500	
Audit	\$3,000	\$2,830	\$3,000	\$2,400	
Contingency	\$10,000	\$8,655	\$3,000	\$3,000	
Depreciation	\$0	\$6,332	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL OFFICE	\$58,556	\$69,650	\$57,910	\$57,400	
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$264,618	\$252,685	\$272,720	\$274,760	

1993

STATE BAR PROCEEDINGS

413

WYOMING STATE BAR
1992-93 BUDGET WORKSHEET
 Summary of Fund Balances

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1992-93 PROPOSED
REVENUE				
General Fund	\$282,144	\$307,261	\$340,100	\$343,412
Communications	\$16,200	\$17,773	\$20,000	\$20,000
Annual Meeting	\$52,107	\$68,358	\$52,107	\$52,107
Bd. of Prof. Resp.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CLE Program	\$13,525	\$7,171	\$5,000	\$5,000
Bar Committees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUE	\$363,976	\$400,563	\$417,207	\$420,519

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1992-93 PROPOSED
REVENUE				
Directory	\$5,500	\$8,025	\$8,000	\$8,000
EXPENSES				
Wyoming Lawyer	\$2,500	\$4,818	\$4,000	\$4,000
General Fund	\$264,618	\$252,685	\$272,720	\$274,760
Misc. Public.	\$8,200	\$4,930	\$8,000	\$4,000
Communications	\$56,156	\$45,618	\$58,883	\$59,725
TOTAL REVENUE	\$16,200	\$17,773	\$20,000	\$16,000
Annual Meeting	\$53,717	\$58,442	\$50,000	\$50,000
Bd. of Prof. Resp.	\$26,000	\$29,332	\$25,650	\$25,650
CLE Program	\$11,250	\$4,358	\$3,500	\$3,500
EXPENSES				
Bar Committees	\$6,375	\$5,811	\$6,575	\$8,075
Directory	\$6,500	\$6,488	\$6,800	\$7,500
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$418,116	\$396,246	\$417,328	\$421,710
Wyoming Lawyer	\$9,800	\$9,379	\$12,400	\$12,400
Land/Water Law	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000
Bar Brief	\$0	\$0	\$2,200	\$2,200
Jud. Survey	\$0	\$1,181	\$5,500	\$0
Unrestricted Cash Balance as of October 1, 1992				\$145,000 (projected)
Mem. Survey	\$6,500	\$0	\$0	\$6,500
Teaching Inst.	\$2,000	\$16	\$0	\$0
Projected Cash Balance at October 1, 1993				\$143,809
Consumer Guide	\$0	\$289	\$0	\$0
Misc. Pub.	\$2,000	\$1,050	\$1,500	\$1,500
UWLS Scholarsh**	\$2,006	\$0	\$3,108	\$2,000
New Adm. Lunch	\$1,000	\$1,215	\$1,000	\$1,250
Dues-Rel. Org.	\$350	\$0	\$375	\$375
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$56,156	\$45,618	\$58,883	\$59,725

1993

STATE BAR PROCEEDINGS

415

	Annual Meeting			
	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1992-93 PROPOSED
REVENUE				
Registrations	\$45,000	\$55,600	\$45,000	\$45,000
Exhibitors	\$1,035	\$1,758	\$1,035	\$1,035
Sponsors	\$5,072	\$10,000	\$5,072	\$5,072
Misc. Rev.	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
TOTAL REVENUE	\$52,107	\$68,358	\$52,107	\$52,107
EXPENSES				
Food/Catering	\$22,770	\$29,765	\$20,000	\$20,000
Guest/Spkrs	\$10,350	\$9,050	\$9,403	\$9,403
Print/Photoc.	\$5,175	\$6,215	\$5,175	\$5,175
CLE Programs	\$5,175	\$4,400	\$5,175	\$5,175
CLE Equip.	\$2,070	\$1,850	\$2,070	\$2,070
Staff Exp.	\$1,553	\$1,453	\$1,553	\$1,553
Postage	\$1,242	\$1,200	\$1,242	\$1,242
Sports Exp.	\$1,553	\$1,463	\$1,553	\$1,553
Awards	\$983	\$875	\$983	\$983
Conv. Supplies	\$776	\$560	\$776	\$776
Miscel.	\$2,070	\$1,611	\$2,070	\$2,070
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$53,717	\$58,442	\$50,000	\$50,000

**WYOMING STATE BAR
1992-93 BUDGET WORKSHEET
Board of Professional Responsibility**

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1992-93 PROPOSED
REVENUE				
TOTAL REVENUE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
EXPENSES				
Asst Bar Cnsl	\$15,000	\$4,045	(on p. 2)	(on p. 2)
Investigator	\$9,000	\$8,467	\$12,000	\$12,000
Postage	\$750	\$563	\$750	\$750
Telephone	\$1,300	\$1,408	\$1,750	\$1,750
Legal Books	\$1,300	\$1,049	\$500	\$500
Supplies	\$3,500	\$3,116	\$500	\$500
NOBC Dues	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150
Comm. Exp.	\$12,000	\$10,534	\$10,000	\$10,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$28,000	\$29,332	\$25,650	\$25,650

	CLE Programs			
	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1992-93 PROPOSED
REVENUE				
Adm. Law Sem.	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000
Business Law Sem.	\$5,000	\$5,415	\$0	\$0
CJ Rules Sem.	\$3,375	\$0	\$0	\$0
Vid. Rental	\$150	\$1,756	\$0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUE	\$13,525	\$7,171	\$5,000	\$5,000
EXPENSES				
Adm. Law Sem.	\$2,500	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000
Business Law Sem.	\$5,200	\$4,358	\$0	\$0
CLE Outreach	\$2,850	\$0	\$0	\$0
Comm. Expenses	\$700	\$0	\$500	\$500
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$11,250	\$4,358	\$3,500	\$3,500

1993

STATE BAR PROCEEDINGS

417

**WYOMING STATE BAR
1992-93 BUDGET WORKSHEET
Bar Committees**

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1992-93 PROPOSED
REVENUE				
TOTAL REVENUE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
EXPENSES				
Bench-Bar Rel.	\$100	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civ. Patt Ins	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
Clts. Sec Fnd				
Listed on p. 6 *				
Comp. & Tech	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CLE Board				
Listed on p. 6 *				
Crim Patt Ins	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
Fee Arbit.	\$1,500	\$619	\$1,000	\$1,000
Insurance Comm.	\$200	\$0	\$0	\$0
Jud. Nom Comm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Jud. Sup Comm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Law Exam Bd				
Listed on p. 6 *				
Law Reform	\$100	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lawyers Asst.	\$0	\$0	\$2,000	\$2,000
Legal Aid Serv	\$200	\$0	\$0	\$0
Legal Ed Comm	\$100	\$0	\$0	\$0
Legis. Comm	\$1,600	\$2,930	\$2,000	\$2,000
Long-Rng Plng	\$200	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medical/Legal	\$175	\$0	\$175	\$175
PmCmCts Lim Js	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pm Rls Ad (cr)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pm Rls Ad (cv)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PI & Com. Cm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PI Subcm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Prf Rsp Bd.				
Listed on p. 4 *				
Rls Prc Cnt Cts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Survey Comm	\$200	\$0	\$200	\$200
Unauth Pract.	\$1,000	\$337	\$700	\$700
Unfm Lws Comm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Cm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sections:				
Young Lawyers	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$500	\$0
Other	\$1,000	\$925	\$0	\$0
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$7,375	\$5,811	\$6,575	\$8,075

**WYOMING STATE BAR
1992-93 BUDGET WORKSHEET
Restricted Funds**

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1992-93 PROPOSED
REVENUE				
Leg Serv. Dev*	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$0
LTC Ombuds.*	\$41,885	\$41,885	\$54,083	\$0
Client Sec.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
MCLE	\$7,800	\$7,635	\$6,500	\$7,300
Law Examiners	\$7,800	\$8,663	\$9,000	\$12,000
TOTAL REVENUE	\$108,985	\$109,683	\$121,083	\$19,300
EXPENSES				
Leg. Serv. Dev	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$0
LTC Ombuds.	\$41,885	\$41,885	\$54,083	\$0
Client Sec.	\$0	\$3,590	\$0	\$0
MCLE	\$7,800	\$6,986	\$6,500	\$7,300
Law Examiners	\$10,250	\$7,800	\$7,500	\$12,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$111,435	\$111,761	\$119,583	\$19,300

*Programs closed out on 3/31/92.

1993

STATE BAR PROCEEDINGS

419

**WYOMING STATE BAR
THREE-YEAR BUDGET REPORT
General Fund**

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1991-92 ACTUAL	1992-93 BUDGET
REVENUE					
Annual Dues	\$245,591	\$274,214	\$320,000	\$322,040	\$321,412
Interest	\$20,000	\$18,086	\$15,000	\$9,607	\$10,000
Superv Fees	\$5,100	\$14,961	\$5,100	\$3,786	\$12,000
TOTAL REVENUE	\$270,691	\$307,261	\$340,100	\$335,433	\$343,412
EXPENSES					
Exec Dir Salary	\$32,500	\$32,500	\$37,500	\$37,500	\$37,500
Bar Counsel	\$38,850	\$37,778	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
Asst Bar Cnsl	\$15,000	\$4,045	\$15,360	\$10,251	\$15,360
Dir Comm	\$20,000	\$16,748	\$20,600	\$20,900	\$21,200
Admin Asst	\$18,200	\$22,136	\$19,400	\$19,604	\$19,400
CLE Asst	\$14,000	\$14,304	\$14,000	\$12,086	\$14,000
BPR Asst	\$11,250	\$12,081	\$12,450	\$13,307	\$14,400
Consulting	\$3,000	\$797	\$3,000	\$2,419	\$3,000
Benefits	\$17,512	\$19,566	\$22,000	\$21,402	\$22,000
TOTAL SALARIES	\$170,312	\$159,955	\$184,310	\$177,469	\$186,860
President Travel	\$5,000	\$6,079	\$5,500	\$4,054	\$5,500
Pres.-Elect	\$3,000	\$1,668	\$3,000	\$2,599	\$3,000
Vice-Pres.	\$1,500	\$994	\$1,500	\$27	\$1,500
Sec. Treas.	\$1,000	\$986	\$1,500	\$1,398	\$1,500
Com. Dis #1	\$1,000	\$55	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Com. Dis #2	\$1,000	\$55	\$1,000	\$317	\$1,000
Com. Dis #3	\$1,000	\$945	\$1,000	\$961	\$1,000
Com. Dis #4	\$1,000	\$799	\$1,000	\$821	\$1,000
Com. Dis #5	\$1,000	\$55	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
Com. Dis #6	\$1,000	\$552	\$1,000	\$700	\$1,000
Com. Dis #7	\$1,000	\$123	\$1,000	\$931	\$1,000
Com. Dis #8	\$1,000	\$336	\$1,000	\$302	\$1,000
Com. Dis #9	\$1,000	\$912	\$1,000	\$973	\$1,000
ABA Delegate	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
Exec. Dir.	\$4,500	\$4,476	\$4,000	\$3,955	\$4,000
Bar Counsel	\$3,750	\$711	\$2,500	\$255	\$2,500
Dir. Comm.	\$1,500	\$2,865	\$1,500	\$1,426	\$1,500
Misc. Travel	\$5,000	\$4,014	\$1,000	\$1,884	\$1,000
TOTAL TRAVEL	\$35,750	\$27,125	\$30,500	\$22,603	\$30,500
Office Rent, Utl	\$18,970	\$23,113	\$23,610	\$23,302	\$25,000
Maintenance	\$2,500	\$2,743	\$2,500	\$2,520	\$2,500
Supplies	\$5,800	\$4,514	\$5,500	\$5,416	\$5,500
Leases	\$1,836	\$1,912	\$1,800	\$155	\$2,500
Comp. Prog.	\$2,000	\$780	\$4,000	\$2,121	\$2,000
Telephone	\$8,000	\$7,771	\$8,000	\$8,016	\$8,000
Postage	\$6,450	\$11,000	\$6,500	\$7,263	\$6,500
Audit	\$3,000	\$2,830	\$3,000	\$2,400	\$2,400
Contingency	\$10,000	\$8,655	\$3,000	\$2,389	\$3,000
Depreciation	\$0	\$6,332	\$0	\$4,928	\$0
TOTAL OFFICE	\$58,556	\$69,650	\$57,910	\$58,510	\$57,400
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$264,618	\$256,730	\$272,720	\$258,582	\$274,760

**WYOMING STATE BAR
THREE-YEAR BUDGET REPORT**

**Summary of Fund Balances
At Year-End FY 1991-92**

	1990-91	1990-91	1991-92	1991-92	1992-93
	BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET
REVENUE					
General Fund	\$282,144	\$307,261	\$340,100	\$335,433	\$343,412
Communications	\$16,200	\$17,773	\$20,000	\$18,005	\$20,000
	Communications				
Annual Meeting	\$52,107	\$68,358	\$52,107	\$76,829	\$52,107
Bd. Prof. Resp.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,618	\$0
CLE Program	\$13,525	\$7,171	\$5,000	\$3,488	\$5,000
Bar Committees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUE	\$363,976	\$400,563	\$417,207	\$436,373	\$420,519
Directory	\$5,500	\$8,025	\$8,000	\$7,230	\$8,000
EXPENSES					
Wyoming Lawyer	\$2,500	\$4,818	\$4,000	\$6,508	\$4,000
General Fund	\$264,618	\$252,685	\$272,720	\$258,582	\$274,760
Misc. Public.	\$8,200	\$4,930	\$8,000	\$4,267	\$4,000
Communications	\$56,156	\$45,618	\$58,883	\$57,743	\$59,725
TOTAL REVENUE	\$16,200	\$17,773	\$20,000	\$18,005	\$16,000
Annual Meeting	\$53,717	\$58,442	\$50,000	\$63,639	\$50,000
Bd. Prof. Resp.	\$26,000	\$29,332	\$25,650	\$11,298	\$43,650
CLE Program	\$11,250	\$4,358	\$3,500	\$74	\$3,500
EXPENSES					
Bar Committees	\$6,375	\$5,811	\$6,575	\$5,430	\$8,575
Restricted Expense*	- NA -	- NA -	- NA -	\$6,699	- NA -
Directory	\$6,500	\$6,488	\$6,800	\$7,476	\$7,500
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$418,116	\$396,246	\$417,328	\$403,465	\$440,210
Wyoming Lawyer	\$9,800	\$9,379	\$12,400	\$11,080	\$12,400
Land/Water Law	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000
NET/INCOME	(\$54,140)	\$4,317	(\$121)	\$32,908	(\$19,691)
Bar Brief	\$0	\$0	\$2,200	\$1,625	\$2,200
Jud. Survey	\$0	\$1,181	\$5,500	\$5,590	\$0
Unrestricted Cash Balance as of October 1, 1992					\$176,638
Mem. Survey	\$6,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,500
Teaching Inst.	\$2,000	\$16	\$0	\$0	\$0
Projected Cash Balance at October 1, 1993					\$156,947
Consumer Guide	\$0	\$289	\$0	\$0	\$0
Misc. Pub.	\$2,000	\$1,050	\$1,500	\$1,665	\$1,500*
UWLS Scholarsh**	\$2,006	\$0	\$3,108	\$3,108	\$2,000
New Adm. Lunch	\$1,000	\$1,215	\$1,000	\$844	\$1,250
Dues-Rel. Org.	\$350	\$0	\$375	\$355	\$375
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$56,156	\$45,618	\$58,883	\$57,743	\$59,725

*Restricted expense includes MCLE expenses in 1991-92 which were not offset by corresponding revenues, since collection of the calendar-year \$5 MCLE fee was Annual Meeting delayed by 9 months so that it could be assessed on the same invoice as the annual dues.

1993	STATE BAR PROCEEDINGS				421
	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1991-92 ACTUAL	
REVENUE					
Registrations	\$45,000	\$55,600	\$45,000	\$68,229	\$45,000
Exhibitors	\$1,035	\$1,758	\$1,035	\$1,200	\$1,035
Sponsors	\$5,072	\$10,000	\$5,072	\$6,400	\$5,072
Misc. Rev.	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
TOTAL REVENUE	\$52,107	\$68,358	\$52,107	\$76,829	\$52,107
EXPENSES					
Food/Catering	\$22,770	\$29,765	\$20,000	\$37,686	\$20,000
Guest/Spkrs	\$10,350	\$9,050	\$9,403	\$3,700	\$9,403
Print/Photoc.	\$5,175	\$6,215	\$5,175	\$8,029	\$5,175
CLE Programs	\$5,175	\$4,400	\$5,175	\$7,806	\$5,175
CLE Equip.	\$2,070	\$1,850	\$2,070	\$750	\$2,070
Staff Exp.	\$1,553	\$1,453	\$1,553	\$635	\$1,553
Postage	\$1,242	\$1,200	\$1,242	\$1,000	\$1,242
Sports Exp.	\$1,553	\$1,463	\$1,553	\$1,500	\$1,553
Awards	\$983	\$875	\$983	\$1,476	\$983
Conv. Supplies	\$776	\$560	\$776	\$350	\$776
Miscel.	\$2,070	\$1,611	\$2,070	\$707	\$2,070
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$53,717	\$58,442	\$50,000	\$63,639	\$50,000

**WYOMING STATE BAR
THREE-YEAR BUDGET REPORT
Board of Professional Responsibility**

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1991-92 ACTUAL	1992-93 BUDGET
REVENUE					
TOTAL REVENUE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,618	\$0
EXPENSES					
Asst Bar Cnsl	\$15,000	\$4,045	(on p. 2)	(on p. 2)	(on p. 2)
Investigator	\$9,000	\$8,467	\$12,000	\$5,861	\$12,000
Postage	\$750	\$563	\$750	\$500	\$750
Telephone	\$1,300	\$1,408	\$1,750	\$1,389	\$1,750
Legal Books	\$1,300	\$1,049	\$500	\$594	\$500
Supplies	\$3,500	\$3,116	\$500	\$493	\$500
NOBC Dues	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150
Comm. Exp.	\$12,000	\$10,534	\$10,000	\$2,311	\$28,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$28,000	\$29,332	\$25,650	\$11,298	\$43,650

	CLE Programs				
	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1991-92 ACTUAL	1992-93 BUDGET
REVENUE					
Adm. Law Sem.	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$385	\$5,000
Business Law Sem.	\$5,000	\$5,415	\$0	\$748	\$0
CJ Rules Sem.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,355	\$0
Vid. Rental	\$150	\$1,756	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL REVENUE	\$10,150	\$7,171	\$5,000	\$3,488	\$5,000
EXPENSES					
Adm. Law Sem.	\$2,500	\$0	\$3,000	\$0	\$3,000
Business Law Sem.	\$5,200	\$4,358	\$0	\$0	\$0
CLE Outreach	\$2,850	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Comm. Expenses	\$700	\$0	\$500	\$74	\$500
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$11,250	\$4,358	\$3,500	\$74	\$3,500

1993

STATE BAR PROCEEDINGS

423

**WYOMING STATE BAR
THREE-YEAR BUDGET REPORT
Bar Committees**

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1991-92 ACTUAL	1992-93 BUDGET
REVENUE					
TOTAL REVENUE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
EXPENSES					
Bench-Bar Ref.	\$100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civ. Patt Ins	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
Clts. Sec Fnd					
Listed on p. 6 * * * * *					
Comp. & Tech	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CLE Board					
Listed on p. 6 * * * * *					
Crim Patt Ins	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
Fee Arbit.	\$1,500	\$619	\$1,000	\$1,103	\$1,000
Insurance Comm.	\$200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Jud. Nom Comm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Jud. Sup Comm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Law Exam Bd					
Listed on p. 6 * * * * *					
Law Reform	\$100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lawyers Asst.	\$0	\$0	\$2,000	\$344	\$2,000
Legal Aid Serv	\$200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Legal Ed Comm	\$100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Legis. Comm	\$1,600	\$2,930	\$2,000	\$288	\$2,000
Long-Rng Plng	\$200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medical/Legal	\$175	\$0	\$175	\$55	\$175
PmCmCts Lim Js	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pm Rls Ad (cr)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pm Rls Ad (cv)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PI & Com. Cm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PI Subcm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Prf Rsp Bd.					
Listed on p. 4 * * * * *					
Rls Prc Cnt Cts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Survey Comm	\$200	\$0	\$200	\$2,880	\$200
Unauth Pract.	\$1,000	\$337	\$700	\$416	\$700
Unfm Lws Comm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Cm	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sections:					
Young Lawyers	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$500	\$344	\$500
Other	\$1,000	\$925	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$7,375	\$5,811	\$6,575	\$5,430	\$8,575

**WYOMING STATE BAR
THREE-YEAR BUDGET REPORT
Restricted Funds**

	1990-91 BUDGET	1990-91 ACTUAL	1991-92 BUDGET	1991-92 ACTUAL	1992-93 BUDGET
REVENUE					
Leg Serv. Dev*	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$21,458	\$0
LTC Ombuds.*	\$41,885	\$41,885	\$54,083	\$22,535	\$0
Client Sec.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
MCLE	\$7,800	\$7,635	\$6,500	\$665	\$7,300
Law Examiners	\$7,800	\$8,663	\$9,000	\$12,307	\$12,000
TOTAL REVENUE	\$108,985	\$109,683	\$121,083	\$56,965	\$19,300
EXPENSES					
Leg. Serv. Dev	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$21,458	\$0
LTC Ombuds.	\$41,885	\$41,885	\$54,083	\$22,535	\$0
Client Sec.	\$0	\$3,590	\$0	\$267	\$18,000
MCLE	\$7,800	\$6,986	\$6,500	\$7,364	\$7,300
Law Examiners	\$10,250	\$7,800	\$7,500	\$10,343	\$12,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$111,435	\$111,761	\$119,583	\$61,967	\$37,300

*Programs closed out on 3/31/92.