



Practice Task Force
Monday, January 9, 2012
10:00 a.m. – Noon

1625 N. Market Blvd., Trinity Room (S-307)
Sacramento, CA 95834

1837 Candace Court
Yuba City, CA 95993
(530) 632-2699

13445 Glenoaks Boulevard
Sylmar, CA 91342
(818) 833-6453

350 Los Ranchitos Road
San Rafael, CA 94903
(415) 499-4053

60740 Dillon Road
Whitewater, CA 92282
(760) 329-1282

Teleconference

Task Force Members

Kathy Kelly, Chair (GDB)

Chuck Jordan (GDA)

Bob Wendler (GDD)

Jeff Neidich, Board Member

Executive Officer

Antonette Sorrick

Legal Counsel

Michael Santiago

Guests

*Shannon Dillon, California Association of Guide
Dog Users (CAGDU)*

Roger Oberholzer, CAGDU

*Laurie Mehta, Guide Dog Users Incorporated
(GDUI)*

*Mary Beth Randall, Guide Dog Users of
California (GDUC)*

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Roll Call - (K. Kelly)

Task Force Chair Kelly called the meeting to order at 10:25 a.m. All Task Force Members were present and a quorum was established.

2. Approval of Practice Task Force Minutes January 10, 2011

Task Force Chair Kelly moved to approve the January 10, 2011 minutes as written. Task Force Member Jordan seconded the motion.

Task Force Vote: Motion passed.

3. Regulatory Discussion – Update

a. 2268.2 (Donations; Records) – (A. Sorrick)

b. 2271 (Living Quarters; Attendants) – (A. Sorrick)

Executive Officer Sorrick reported that the next regulatory package from the Board would be to amend sections 2268.2 regarding donations and records sent to the Department of Justice and 2271 removing the requirement that the attendant available to clients be both male and female.

4. Statutory Discussion

a. Practice Privilege

Executive Officer Sorrick described how a practice privilege for accountants requires a registration fee and allows out-of-state practitioners to operate in California. A similar model for out-of-state guide dog instructors was discussed. Ms. Mehta asked about the practicality of the model here in California. Task Force Member Wendler asked how many instructors and schools from out-of-state were currently licensed. Sorrick reported that there were seven schools currently represented by the 110 active instructors. Task Force Member Neidich inquired about the California school's perspective on the issue. Wendler stated that he had not heard of any complaints on the issue. Task Force Member Jordan stated that professionally, there was no problem with allowing out-of-state instructors to provide follow up, but that instruction and follow up currently required licensure. Task Force Member Kelly stated that the problem was not large enough in scale to make any changes. Ms. Dillon expressed a desire not to make the process prohibitive. She stated that schools should be able to practice anywhere and consumers ultimately suffer by having less guide dog schools to choose from. She then went on to say that there was no benefit in doing a practice privilege. Mr. Wendler asked Ms. Dillon what competency level consumers would want. She replied that there would need to be a side-by-side comparison of California versus other state schools. Mr. Oberholzer stated that consumers needed choice and the current and proposed processes seemed prohibitive. After the discussion, Executive Officer Sorrick and legal counsel Santiago both expressed that based on the conversation, there was no

foundation to establish a necessity to make a statutory change such as practice privilege.

5. Consumer Survey

- a. 2276 (Instruction Period)
- b. 2282 (Preliminary Training of Dogs)
- c. 2282.1 (Required Training)

Executive Officer Sorrick notified the Task Force that a consumer survey would be drafted to inquire how guide dog users felt about recent regulatory changes including changes to instruction period, preliminary training of dogs and required training. Task Force Chair Kelly asked what the Board would do with the information. Would the Board get the information from the school as well? Additionally, Kelly asked that the survey be general in nature and not be specific to the regulatory changes. Last, Kelly asked that the survey be based on actual experiences and not just opinions of consumers. Task Force Member Wendler stated that it would take time for consumers to feel the impact of the changes. Ms. Mehta stated that she would be interested in getting feedback on the changes. Would need input from instructors on the questions. Wendler stated that Guide Dogs of the Desert still used a four week training model for first time users and two week program for re-trains. Task Force Member Jordan stated that Guide Dogs of America still used a four week model for first time users as well. Ms. Dillon asked if a consumer could stay in a program if they did not feel prepared. Kelly answered that they would continue training at the client's home.

6. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting - (All)

7. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

8. Adjournment – The phone disconnected during agenda item five at 12:15 p.m.