



REGULATORY AGENCY ACTION

SB 958 (Rogers), as amended April 11, would amend Public Resources Code section 2774, which currently specifies that those conducting surface mine inspections must be state-registered geologists, state-registered civil engineers, state-licensed architects, or state-registered foresters. SB 958 would delete the requirement for state registration or licensure, and states that the proposed inspections would be conducted by a qualified professional with experience in land reclamation. This two-year bill is pending in the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Wildlife.

Future Legislation. BRGG's Professional Practices Committee recently completed draft legislation which would amend its enabling act to allow the Board to certify hydrogeologists as a specialty. The certification of hydrogeologists would be similar to the Board's current Certified Engineering Geologist (CEG) specialty, and would require an applicant to first meet all of the requirements for geologist registration before being eligible to take the specialty examination. The legislation is proposed as a replacement for AB 892 (*see above*).

The difference between the Board's proposal and AB 892 (and the source of ongoing discussions between the Board and Assemblymember Sally Tanner) is that AB 892, unlike the Board's proposal, would not require hydrologists to meet the Board's current requirements for geologists, but would instead provide for their registration by establishing separate requirements including the administration of an entirely different examination. Although BRGG would be required to develop a new specialty examination even under its own proposal, the Board believes that the requirements should emphasize skills in geology (below surface), rather than traditional hydrology (above surface), in order to remain within its field of expertise; that distinction illustrates the difference between a hydrogeologist and hydrologist. Another interested party is the Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, which appears to be concerned with the scope of both proposals—especially AB 892.

At this writing, BRGG does not know which legislator might introduce its proposal, but is hopeful that Assemblymember Tanner will simply adopt BRGG's proposal in lieu of AB 892. The Board was scheduled to vote on the legislative proposal at its January 13 meeting.

RECENT MEETINGS:

At its October 7 meeting, the Board discussed its recent efforts to encourage

the Wilson administration to fill its two public member vacancies; the administration has reportedly assured the Board that the appointments are forthcoming.

The Board also agreed to send a letter to its equivalent board in Maine in an attempt to reestablish the examination reciprocity they once shared. Examination reciprocity enables the boards to become informed on national developments in the profession by exchanging examinations and examination techniques. BRGG maintains reciprocity with Georgia, Arizona, and Idaho.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

To be announced.

BOARD OF GUIDE DOGS FOR THE BLIND

Executive Officer: Manuel Urena (916) 445-9040

The Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind has three primary functions. The Board protects the blind guide dog user by licensing instructors and schools to ensure that they possess certain minimum qualifications. The Board also enforces standards of performance and conduct of these licensees as established by law. Finally, the Board polices unlicensed practice.

The Board, authorized by Business and Professions Code section 7200 *et seq.*, consists of seven members, two of whom must be dog users. In carrying out its primary responsibilities, the Board is empowered to adopt and enforce regulations, which are codified in Division 22, Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

The Board currently licenses three guide dog schools and 48 trainers.

LEGISLATION:

AB 567 (Hunter), as amended April 18, would abolish the Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind and require the trainers of guide, signal, or service dogs to register with the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA); these registered trainers would be permitted to authorize other personnel to train the dogs. DCA would be required to establish and maintain a registry of these persons and issue registration certificates. This two-year bill is still pending in the Assembly Human Services Committee.

SB 756 (Marks) would change the composition of the Board by providing that one member shall be the Director of the Department of Rehabilitation or his/her representative, one shall be a veterinarian, one shall be a member of the general public, and the remaining

members shall be blind persons who use guide dogs. This two-year bill is still pending in the Senate Business and Professions Committee.

RECENT MEETINGS:

At its October 18 meeting in Los Angeles, the Board decided that the annual production costs for each guide dog school should be calculated based on all funds expended for the year, regardless of whether they were expended for original training, retraining, or home visits of the person/dog unit. The Board is required to report the guide dog schools' production costs to the legislature each year. (See CRLR Vol. 11, No. 2 (Spring 1991) p. 77 for background information.)

Also at the October meeting, the Board passed a motion to study the issue of ownership of the guide dogs. Currently, under Business and Professions Code section 7215.5, guide dog schools usually maintain ownership of a trained dog even after placement with a blind person in order to conduct follow-up interviews and intervene in cases of abuse. As an alternative, the Board may pursue legislation to enable it to act as the decisionmaker in disputes over rightful ownership. The Board's October action is encouraging; although guide dog ownership issues have been presented to the Board in the past, it has disclaimed jurisdiction over the issue. (See CRLR Vol. 7, No. 2 (Spring 1987) p. 52 and Vol 7, No. 1 (Winter 1987) p. 45 for background information.)

At the October meeting, the Board elected its 1992 officers: Kay Cook was elected president, Mary Anne Thomas was elected vice-president, and Manuel Urena remains secretary.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

To be announced.

BUREAU OF HOME FURNISHINGS AND THERMAL INSULATION

Chief: Gordon Damant (916) 920-6951

The Bureau of Home Furnishings and Thermal Insulation (BHFTI) is charged with regulating the home furnishings and insulation industries in California. As a division of the state Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA), the Bureau's mandate is to ensure that these industries provide safe, properly labeled products which comply with state standards. Additionally, the Bureau is to protect consumers from fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive