

APPROVED MINUTES

State Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind
BOARD MEETING
September 28, 2007
Guide Dogs for the Blind
350 Los Ranchitos Road
San Rafael, CA

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Jeff Neidich, President
Allan Brenner
Tony Candella
Judy Karau, Secretary
Tom Scott, Vice-President

GUIDE DOGS OF THE DESERT INTERNATIONAL [GDDI]

Kathie Flamm
Kim Laidlaw
Roccie Hill

BOARD STAFF PRESENT

Jane Brackman, Executive Officer
Albert Balingit, Staff Legal Counsel

GUIDE DOGS FOR THE BLIND [GDB]

Holly Deibel
Vanessa Bangle
Ken Stupi
Kathy Kelly
Jenna Bullis

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Antonette Sorrick, Deputy Director, Board
Relations

EYE DOG FOUNDATION [EDF]

Paula Lawrence Brown
Barbara Kuhns

GUESTS

Sherrill Neidich
Janice Peterson, Morris Animal Foundation

President Neidich called meeting to order at 9:00 AM and welcomed attendees. Roll called and present five members constituted quorum for doing business. The new President's goals include make the board readily available to consumers; license instructors from out-of-state schools; finalize an orientation package for new board members including a manual and training workshops; address budget issues including how renewal fees are structured. Tom Scott moved and Allan Brenner seconded that the minutes of the April 13, 2006 meeting be adopted as written.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT:

- 1) Jane Brackman is vacating her position March 1, 2008.
- 2) Three versions of a Board logo presented, to be finalized at next meeting.
- 3) Board reviewed draft of Board Member Orientation Manual. EO to finalize and bring to next meeting.
- 4) DCA's new template for websites discussed. Tony Candela offered to review new website to make sure it is compliant with ADA.
- 5) It was decided that consumer satisfaction survey be pared down to two or three short surveys that can be accessed from the Board's website.
- 6) Regarding the two vacant board positions, Antonette Sorrick reported the Appointments Office has new staff and this might be contributing to the delay. She said she hopes to have a new member at our next meeting.
- 7) A meeting with the Restaurant and Retailers Associations, the CCB and Senator Runner's staff regarding SB 905 is scheduled in October. SB 905 summary: revise the definition of a "service dog" b removing undefined terms "minimal protection work" and "rescue work" from California Civil Code Section 54.1 and Penal Code 365.5.

- 8) Budget and expenses to date presented. Projected expenses through 2010 discussed in view of potential changes in way schools pay fees.

PRACTICAL EXAM PRESENTATION

Jane Brackman described new practical exam process and presented one of the apprentice videos.

[break]

GDB SCHOOL LICENSING RENEWAL FEE

GDB passed its annual inspection. School's financial statement for FY 2006/07 discussed. Legal counsel Albert Balingit explained the Legal Opinion regarding B & P code 7200.7.

GDB's financial statement included an un-audited statement of functional expenses for the Oregon campus totaling \$7,223,762. GDB CFO Ken Stupi reiterated this amount includes no allocations from the San Rafael Center. Guide Dog Board fee on this amount is \$28,895. Deleting it from the Board's income would most likely create a deficit. A Budget Change Proposal [BCP] can be submitted to access money in the reserve. It takes about two years for the process to take affect.

Options discussed. Board is concerned about broader ramifications that could apply to a guide dog school that decides to move all operations out of state to avoid regulation. If GDB funds field reps all over the country where do you draw the line? Is this an acid test to the degree of separateness of the two campuses? Theoretically if there were an OR guide dog board, what fee would they use to tax the school. For example, if Seeing Eye set up an office in California then how much would their licensing fee be. Eye Dog Foundation is not a parallel situation. Even though it has a corporate office in CA and a campus in AZ it's different than GDB because GDB operates a school in CA. Members directed EO to work with all entities and bring proposal to December meeting.

EYE DOG FOUNDATION STATUS UPDATE

Two EDF guests gave an overview of school's recent history which operates in Arizona under an AZ 501 c 3 permit but retains a corporate office in California under a CA 501 c 3 permit. They asked, "If the corporate office is in CA does the Guide Dog Board have jurisdiction over EDF?" Jane Brackman reminded the board that even if it had jurisdiction over the EDF Corporate office in Kern County California, money raised by a CA non-profit comes under the jurisdiction of the Office of the Attorney General. After discussion, the board directed the EO to compose and send a letter to the AG office stating our concern. Tom Scott made a motion with Judy Karau seconding that Albert Balingit write a legal opinion to clarify the meaning of the words "to provide guide dogs for the blind in this state." [B&P 7210.5].

STRATEGIC PLAN

Board is half a year past deadline to revisit strategic plan. Suggestion made to hire a facilitator to conduct a workshop at a future meeting. EO to get cost estimate and names of possible facilitators.

GUIDE DOG DAY

Topic tabled until new EO is hired.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Roccie Hill representing GDD reported on growth of income and resulting parallel growth of programs, staff and also new office in downtown Palm Springs. Terry Barrett representing GDB discussed new administrative heads at both campuses and addition of blind staff. GDA not represented at meeting.

Finally the board decided to establish a committee consisting of Tom Scott and Judy Karau to oversee hiring of a new EO.

Ken Stupi thanked Jane Brackman for her productive two years as EO.

At 1:10 p.m., with no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Brackman
Executive Officer