

VETERINARY MEDICAL BOARD TELECONFERENCE MEETING MINUTES

Pursuant to Governor Gavin Newsom's Executive Order [N-29-20](#), issued on March 17, 2020, the Veterinary Medical Board (Board) met via teleconference/WebEx Events with no physical public locations on **Thursday, April 22, and Friday, April 23, 2021.**

9:00 a.m., Thursday, April 22, 2021

1. Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of a Quorum

Dr. Mark Nunez called the Board meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Executive Officer Jessica Sieferman called roll; seven members of the Board were present, and a quorum was established. Dr. Maria Preciosa S. Solacito was absent.

Board Members Present

Mark Nunez, Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM), President
Kathy Bowler, Public Member, Vice President
Christina Bradbury, DVM
Jennifer Loreda, Registered Veterinary Technician (RVT)
Jaymie Noland, DVM
Dianne Prado, Public Member
Alana Yanez, Public Member

Staff Present

Jessica Sieferman, Executive Officer
Matt McKinney, Enforcement Program Manager
Timothy Rodda, Administration/Licensing Manager
Patty Rodriguez, Hospital Inspection Program Manager
Rob Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager
Andrea Amaya-Torres, Inspection Program Analyst
Cheryl Douglas, Enforcement Analyst
Jacqueline French, Administrative Analyst
Wendy Garske, Enforcement Analyst
Virginia Gerard, Probation Monitor
Kimberly Gorski, Enforcement Analyst
Amber Kruse, Enforcement Analyst
Terry Perry, Enforcement Technician
Kim Phillips-Francis, Enforcement Technician
Ashley Sanchez, Inspection Program Technician
Justin Sotelo, Lead Administrative & Policy Analyst
Jennifer Tarrant, Enforcement Analyst
Karen Halbo, Regulatory Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)
Tara Welch, Board Counsel, DCA

Guests Present

Michelle Angus, Assistant Chief Counsel, DCA, Legal Affairs Division

Karen Atlas, PT, MPT, President, California Association of Animal Physical Therapists (CAAPT)
/ Animal Physical Therapy Coalition (APTC)
Daniel Baxter, California Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA)
Diane Broitman
David Bruggeman, Policy and Regulatory Analyst, DCA, California Acupuncture Board
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, California Registered Veterinary Technicians Association (CaRVTA)
Jennifer Fearing, President, Fearless Advocacy, Inc.
Charis Fifield, Chief of Staff, VETCBD
Nancy Grittmann, Director of Program Services, American Association of Veterinary State Boards
(AAVSB)
Paul Hansbury, Lovingly and Legally Grown
Trina Hazzah, DVM, President/Co-Founder, Veterinary Cannabis Society
Carrie Holmes, Deputy Director of Board and Bureau Relations, DCA
McKenna Jenkins, Legislative Advocate, K Street Consulting, LLC
Shelly Jones, Moderator, DCA
Brandy Kuentzel, General Counsel, San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to
Animals (SF SPCA)
Kevin Lazarcheff, DVM, Vice-Chair, Board Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC)
Pamela Lopez, Partner, K Street Consulting, LLC
Bonnie Lutz, Esq., Klinedinst
Thomas Ly, Legislative Aide, California State Senate
Kendall MacGregor, Animal Policy Group (APG)
April Massarene
Grant Miller, DVM, CVMA
Erin Norwood, Partner, Norwood Associates, LLC
John Pascoe, DVM, University of California, Davis
Ken Pawlowski, DVM, Insight Veterinary Wellness Center
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, Chair, MDC
Gabby Reynaga, Norwood Associates, LLC
Susan Riggs, Senior Director of State Legislation, American Society for the Prevention of
Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)
Nickolaus Sackett, Director of Legislative Affairs, Social Compassion in Legislation
Mike Sanchez, Television Specialist, DCA, Office of Public Affairs (OPA)
Dianne Sequoia, DVM
Tim Shu, DVM, Founder/CEO, VETCBD
Heather Skogerson, DVM
Richard Sullivan, DVM, MDC
Susan Tibbon, Lovingly and Legally Grown
Jill Tucker, CEO, California Animal Welfare Association (CAWA)
Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM, Waterhouse Animal Hospital

Dr. Nunez welcomed all attendees and guests to the meeting. He thanked MDC Chair Kristi Pawlowski for running the MDC meeting on the previous day. He also thanked everyone for all of the hard work they do in light of the new realities that everyone is facing. With all of the issues that people are dealing with, he stated that he hoped everyone could be kind to each other and respect each other because things are difficult enough as it is.

2. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments.

3. Review and Approval of Board Meeting Minutes

A. January 28-29, 2021

The Board reviewed the January 28-29, 2021 meeting minutes.

- Ms. Kathy Bowler moved and Ms. Jennifer Loreda seconded the motion to approve the January 28-29, 2021 meeting minutes. The motion carried 6-0-1, with Dr. Christina Bradbury abstaining.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

4. Report and Update from Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

Carrie Holmes, DCA Deputy Director of Board and Bureau Relations, thanked the Board for inviting her back to provide a DCA update. She stated COVID-19 has affected every aspect of DCA's work for more than a year now. She thanked Ms. Siefertman and Board staff who have worked hard to maintain excellent customer service throughout these times.

Ms. Holmes reported that DCA offices have remained open with preventative measures in place to safeguard the health and safety of DCA employees and visitors. She stated that boards and bureaus are looking ahead to what changes can be made permanent for efficiency and employee well-being, such as telework and eliminating paper processes. Ms. Holmes encouraged all members and the public to visit DCA's COVID-19 web page for updates and resources on the State's reopening plan, public health guidance, vaccination resources, and more.

Ms. Holmes stated DCA has received many questions about when and how boards and bureaus will meet again in person. She explained she did not have a definitive answer at this time, but she wanted to offer some clarification. She stated the ability of the Board to meet remotely was tied to the Governor's executive orders and state of emergency. She added when these are lifted, the Board will be required to follow all aspects of the Open Meeting Act, including publicly noticed and accessible locations. She stated she did not know when the state of emergency would be lifted, or if any changes in the law would occur before then. However, she added DCA will do all it can to assist the boards and bureaus to transition safely and with enough time to plan for in-person meetings.

Ms. Holmes stated while DCA continues with remote meetings, it has created a video background with the DCA and Board logo that Board members can use. She noted members could see the video background behind Ms. Siefertman at this time.

Next, Ms. Holmes stated she wanted to share a few updates regarding DCA's executive team. She noted in January, Governor Gavin Newsom appointed Monica Vargas to the role of Deputy Director of Communications at DCA. She stated Ms. Vargas was an information officer in the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services since 2015. She added Ms. Vargas was also an information officer at DCA from 2013 to 2015, and they were lucky to have her back.

In February, Ms. Holmes stated Governor Newsom appointed Sara Murillo as the Deputy Director of Administrative Services at DCA. She noted Ms. Murillo has gained a wide range of experience in nearly 20 years of service to Californians in various state departments, including California Complete Count – Census 2020. She added Ms. Murillo brings a skill set that makes

her well suited to support all of the entities within California. She explained Ms. Murillo's appointment fills the final vacancy in DCA's Executive Office. She stated DCA is pleased Ms. Murillo has joined the Executive Office.

Lastly, Ms. Holmes stated she wanted to update the Board on two initiatives she has mentioned previously to enhance services to all boards and bureaus. She reported the executive officer cabinet has met several times and is making progress on projects, such as standardizing board reporting requirements. She added the Enlightened Licensing Project has begun a deep dive into the licensing process at the Board of Registered Nursing with process improvements being implemented in real time. She again thanked Ms. Sieferman for her leadership, expertise, and willingness to serve on both work groups. She stated DCA will continue to update the Board as these initiatives progress.

Ms. Holmes stated, as always, Board and Bureau Relations is here to help and if there is anything they can do to assist to please reach out. She stated her presentation was concluded.

Dr. Nunez asked if the Board could be provided with more information regarding the Enlightened Licensing Project. Ms. Holmes stated that Ms. Sieferman could probably provide an inside view of what they have been working on.

Ms. Sieferman stated the intent of the project was to review licensing processes from start to finish. She added she co-chairs with Kristy Underwood, who is the Executive Officer of the Board of Barbering and Cosmetology. She stated they also bring subject matter experts in from all of the DCA boards and bureaus, and they all provide feedback and learn from each other. She added they identify best practices among all boards and bureaus and improve processes together. She stated the idea is to identify ways to streamline processes and save costs for boards and bureaus and for stakeholders.

Dr. Nunez noted the Board is making some extreme improvements to its enforcement and licensing processes. He added the Board's Practice Act will also be reduced to a more concise document with all of the changes that they are making.

Dr. Jaymie Noland noted three or four months ago, the Board had asked about the Executive Officer evaluation and pay raise. She stated Ms. Sieferman works very hard, as noted earlier. She asked Ms. Holmes if there was any progress or movement on that matter.

Ms. Holmes responded the evaluations and all of those considerations do happen, working with DCA, Office of Human Resources (OHR), in the late fall. She stated the good news is the discussions take place after this budget season; the bad news is it is always difficult to get any movement on those issues. However, she noted she could assure the Board that DCA and their partners at Agency are always advocating for the boards and bureaus and are really appreciative of the hard work the executive officers do.

Ms. Sieferman stated the last evaluation that the Board submitted last year was denied. However, she noted CalHR had directed DCA to resubmit the same package in February. She added the same package was resubmitted in February. The DCA Director and individuals in OHR met with CalHR, and the five percent raise was approved.

Ms. Holmes noted she was not aware of that and congratulated Ms. Sieferman.

Dr. Nunez stated the package that Dr. Noland worked so hard on resulted in a pay raise.

Dr. Noland stated she was very happy to hear that news because Ms. Sieferman is so deserving.

Dr. Nunez stated sadly there was a generalized pay cut for everyone at DCA, but in the end, everything worked out well.

Dr. Bradbury stated Ms. Sieferman had provided an update regarding the DCA, Division of Investigation (DOI) and the issues recovering investigative fees based on the formatting of the documents given to the Deputy Attorney General. She asked if Ms. Holmes would be commenting under this agenda item or if there was any need to comment on the item.

Ms. Holmes noted she could obtain more information on that topic, unless Ms. Sieferman had more information.

Ms. Sieferman responded DCA is working closely with DOI to make sure the Board has an updated cost declaration from DOI. She noted an announcement was made the previous week indicating they hoped to roll out the new format by the end of the month. She added she believed the new format has been approved by DCA and that it was now with the Office of the Attorney General (AG's Office) for review and approval. She stated they hope to have a new cost declaration by the end of this month.

There were no public comments made on this item.

5. Review, Discussion, and Possible Action on Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC) Report – Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, Chair, MDC

Dr. Nunez asked MDC Chair Kristi Pawlowski to present the MDC Report.

Ms. Pawlowski stated it would be easier to start with an overview of the previous day's meeting (Agenda Item 5.D.) and then go back to each MDC recommendation from the last meeting.

A. *Recommendation to Amend Business and Professions Code (BPC) Section 4841.5 Regarding RVT Foreign Graduate Review Program

Ms. Pawlowski reported the MDC had been given a report from Nancy Grittmann, Senior Director of Program Services with the American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB). She explained Ms. Grittmann discussed the Program for the Assessment of Veterinary Education Equivalence (PAVE) for Veterinary Technicians program. She also explained how they define an international veterinary technician or nurse graduate. She stated the purpose of the PAVE for Veterinary Technicians program is to assess the educational equivalents of international veterinary technicians or nurse graduates on behalf of participating AAVSB member boards. She explained the process would make it easier in California to approve potential foreign graduates to sit for the Veterinary Technician National Exam (VTNE). Ms. Pawlowski provided additional details regarding the program and the process. She stated AAVSB is expecting the program to launch later in 2021. She explained the process would give the Board the ability to get more RVT foreign graduates into California.

Ms. Sieferman stated the legislative proposal the MDC was recommending was provided within the meeting materials. She explained the proposal would allow the Board to accept PAVE certification for RVTs, similar to how the Board already accepts it for veterinarians. She added

the proposal also removes the Board from the pre-evaluation process for the examination since the Board does not administer the examination. She explained candidates would apply directly to AAVSB to take the national examination. Candidates would then apply to the Board once they have passed the examination and have all of their education. She explained the Board would then make sure the education is equivalent and candidates have met all other requirements. She stated the requested motion was on page three of the cover memo.

- Dr. Jaymie Noland moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded a motion that the Board recommend to the California State Legislature for inclusion in the Board's Sunset bill the legislative proposal to amend BPC section 4841.5 to remove the initial education credits review application requirement and authorize foreign RVT graduate applicants to submit education equivalency certified by the AAVSB to take the VTNE and obtain California RVT registration. The motion carried 7-0.

Dr. Noland asked if the AAVSB had indicated what the cost would be for a foreign graduate to go through the equivalency process.

Ms. Pawlowski responded the application fee would be \$300, and there was an additional \$185 fee for a comprehensive evaluation report completed by the Academic Credentials Evaluation Institute (ACEI). She added, if applicable, there is a \$95 fee for an evaluation report of high school/secondary school transcripts. She also stated there would be additional fees for translating documents to English.

The Board received public comment on the motion. Ms. Gritman thanked the Board for having this action item on the agenda. She added she was very excited to have California at the forefront of this program. She indicated AAVSB was working diligently with U.S. and Canadian programs to address candidates having to potentially take gap courses. She stated she was very confident candidates would be able to complete gap coursework, if needed. She added AAVSB would continue to work with other U.S. jurisdictions and Canada to hopefully follow and accept the PAVE for Veterinary Technicians program. She noted AAVSB anticipates launching the program in late fall.

[B. Recommendation on Section 2032.1, Article 4, Division 20, Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations \(CCR\) Regarding Telemedicine and Time to Refill Prescriptions](#)

Ms. Pawlowski stated the recommendation from the MDC is to make no changes to the regulatory veterinarian-client-patient relationship (VCPR) condition-specific provision. She added the issue had been discussed extensively, and she did not think there was anything new to add. She also stated the Board knew where the MDC was at with creating definitions.

Ms. Siefertman added the last time the Board asked for an extension of the DCA Director's waiver of VCPR requirements, it was at least until the MDC could make their final recommendation or until the end of the state of emergency. She stated, right now, the MDC has made its recommendation, so the Board would need to decide if it wants to ask the DCA Director to extend the waivers through the end of the state of emergency or not.

Dr. Nunez also added this was in response to DCA asking if the Board wanted to make any of the waivers permanent. He clarified the MDC is recommending not to make any of the waivers permanent.

Dr. Nunez asked if a motion was necessary if the MDC was recommending no action.

Ms. Sieferman stated if the Board would like the waivers extended through the end of the state of emergency, she recommended that they make a motion to that effect.

Ms. Bowler asked if the Board had a sense of when the state of emergency would be lifted. Ms. Sieferman responded the Board did not.

- Dr. Christina Bradbury moved and Ms. Jennifer Loreda seconded a motion to extend the VCPR waivers until end of the state of emergency. The motion carried 7-0.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

C. Recommendation to Amend BPC Sections 4836.2, 4853.1, 4900, and 4905 and Repeal Sections 4836.3, 4842.5, and 4846.4 Regarding Licensing Fees and Expiration Dates

Dr. Nunez stated Board members should have received the revised materials for this agenda item, which were currently posted on the Board website.

Ms. Pawlowski stated its subcommittee was tasked with finding alternative ways to generate revenue if RVT fees were decreased by \$623,000.

Ms. Pawlowski provided a detailed summary of the work of the subcommittee. She stated the subcommittee and MDC ultimately agreed the Board should update its premises registration renewal application to include full time equivalent employment data. She explained the Board would have to pursue a regulatory amendment through the rulemaking process.

Ms. Pawlowski stated the MDC heard the Board's concerns at its last meeting regarding the Veterinary Assistant Controlled Substances Permit (VACSP) and made adjustments. She explained that VACSP holders would have an initial \$100 permit fee, which is increased from \$50. She stated this increase would recoup enough costs to not increase the veterinarian fees again.

Ms. Sieferman clarified the proposal would instead add an initial permit fee of \$100 for VACSPs. She added the proposal would also increase the VACSP renewal fee from \$50 to \$100. She also explained how the proposal included technical clean up amendments.

- Ms. Kathy Bowler moved and Ms. Alana Yanez seconded a motion to approve a new option to lower the RVT fees, raise the premises registration and renewal fees, add an initial VACSP fee and raise the VACSP renewal fee, and approve Executive Officer recommendations and submit to the California State Legislature the revised legislative proposal for inclusion in the Board's Sunset bill. The motion carried 7-0.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

Dianne Broitman attempted, but was unable, to provide public comment due to technical difficulties. Ms. Sieferman advised the Board to proceed, as members of the public also have the option of providing written comments via email.

D. *Overview of April 21, 2021 MDC Meeting

Ms. Pawlowski thanked Stuart Eckmann for his service on the MDC. She noted his last meeting was in January, and he moved out of state, so he no longer qualifies to serve on the MDC. She stated Dr. Margaret Warner also took a new job out of state and was not able to attend the MDC on the previous day. Ms. Pawlowski thanked both former members for their hard work and noted they were valuable members of the MDC and will be greatly missed. Ms. Pawlowski also thanked the Board for interviewing to refill Dr. Warner's and Dr. Kevin Lazarcheff's positions.

Ms. Pawlowski welcomed new MDC member Maria Salazar Sperber to the MDC and thanked the Board for her appointment. She noted it was nice that Ms. Sperber was able to jump in and participate during her first meeting.

Regarding the Telemedicine Subcommittee Report, Ms. Pawlowski reported the Subcommittee was very excited to present definitions for telehealth, telemedicine, telerriage, and teleconsultation. She noted those definitions were carefully researched, and the Subcommittee presented them to the MDC on the previous day. Following discussion, it was decided the MDC needed to address one area of concern before presenting a recommendation to the Board. She stated because the MDC members believe they must present a recommendation that clarifies the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act, the MDC chose to rework the proposal and present it at the next meeting.

Dr. Nunez commented it is important that the Board gets the definitions right, as there is a lot of correlation with how the Board defines the VCPR and how the VCPR is going to be applied to the new telemedicine that is being thrust upon the profession and the new reality. He added he applauded the wisdom of Ms. Pawlowski to not make too rapid of a decision on how the terms are defined.

Dr. Nunez and Ms. Pawlowski encouraged all Board members to read the proposed definitions in the MDC meeting materials. Ms. Pawlowski added they were very open when they defined those terms, and they hit on all points. She noted they really tried to work with everybody and the definitions should satisfy a lot of concerns.

Ms. Bowler noted she watched the MDC meeting on the previous day and suggested that Board members also go online and watch the discussion that the MDC had on the topic.

Regarding the VCPR and frequently asked questions item, Ms. Pawlowski explained the topic came up and, even during the Board meeting, there were several questions on the matter. She stated a subcommittee was formed to help define and come up with frequently asked questions to make it easier for Board staff to answer the questions. She reported the MDC was tasked with the development of a frequently asked questions sheet. She added they believed it would be an ongoing work in progress, as these questions would likely lead to more questions. She explained the frequently asked questions that will be presented to the Board will be an initial round of questions, likely followed by additional questions in the future. She added they would like to get the questions published as soon as possible to assist Board staff. She stated the questions would be presented to the Board at its next meeting. Ms. Pawlowski also stated this will be one of the most helpful tools created for the profession because individuals are very confused on a regular basis.

Regarding the veterinary premises checklist item, Ms. Pawlowski reported a subcommittee is reviewing the difficulty in meeting the 20 percent inspection mandate. She explained the Board

is the only board with this type of mandate, which seems unrealistic. She reported the subcommittee is still gathering information; however, it believes inspections should be an educational tool with citations being given for egregious violations. Ms. Pawlowski added there is also a mobile app, which can assist in the inspection process, but it is going to be something that comes later. She added there also has been some discussion on whether inspectors should be hired or contracted. She stated the subcommittee report was very enlightening, and even provided information from other states and jurisdictions.

Regarding the Complaint Process Audit Subcommittee item, Ms. Pawlowski reported the subcommittee reviewed eight cases this time that included citations, petitions to revoke probation, and other disciplinary actions. She stated the subcommittee was given cycle times for each step in the interactive process, and monetary costs related to each step. She added their findings in these eight cases included that: all experts properly identified the standard of care; two of the reviews did not cite sources when it would have been appropriate to do so; and, four of the reviews contained biased language. She stated when provided feedback, the subject matter experts were very appreciative. She added cases involving multiple experts can cause conflicting opinions, which can affect the strength and outcome of the cases. Ms. Pawlowski also discussed how the Board can identify and achieve cost savings through the subcommittee's review process.

Ms. Pawlowski reported the last item discussed by the MDC was about looking for volunteers to help make webinars. She mentioned they would create webinars on statutes and regulations, and what the Board does. She added they also discussed it would be a good idea to create a webinar on telemedicine and the VCPR once those have been clearly defined.

Dr. Nunez stated he was impressed with all of the work that is being done by the MDC in reevaluating all of the things that the Board does.

Ms. Bowler stated in watching the MDC meeting, it reminded her of how lucky the Board is to have the MDC. She added most state boards do not have a committee to do the deep research by experts in the field, by both professional and public members, and present packaged recommendations to their board.

Dr. Nunez thanked Ms. Pawlowski for her report.

There were no public comments made on this item.

6. Interviews, Discussion, and Possible Appointment to Fill Vacant MDC Veterinarian Member Positions

The Board conducted interviews to fill the two veterinarian member positions on the MDC. Prior to the meeting, the Board's Executive Committee selected the following top four candidates for the Board's consideration:

- *Kevin Lazarcheff, DVM, License No. 12786*
- *Dianne Sequoia, DVM, License No. 9743*
- *Heather Skogerson, DVM, License No. 18574*
- *Cheryl L. Waterhouse, DVM, License No. 11381*

Ms. Bowler nominated Dr. Kevin Lazarcheff for reappointment. There were no other nominations for this seat.

- Ms. Kathy Bowler moved and Ms. Alana Yanez seconded a motion to nominate Dr. Kevin Lazarcheff for re-appointment to the MDC to fill the veterinarian member position, effective July 1, 2021. The motion carried 7-0.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

Ms. Prado nominated Dr. Dianne Sequoia. Dr. Bradbury nominated Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse. The Board members discussed the nominations.

- Ms. Dianne Prado moved and Ms. Alana Yanez seconded a motion to appoint Dr. Dianne Sequoia to the MDC to fill the remaining veterinarian member position, effective July 1, 2021. The motion carried 4-2-1, with Drs. Christina Bradbury and Jaymie Noland voting no, and Ms. Kathy Bowler abstaining.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

Dr. Nunez noted there were many qualified candidates to consider and the decision process was very difficult. However, he stated he was very pleased with the composition of the MDC, and the MDC will continue to have great success.

7. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on 2021 Legislation

Ms. Jennifer Loreda was not available when this agenda item commenced.

Dr. Nunez noted there were a number of bills on the agenda. He stated the bills were in the early stages of the process, and the Board may not want to take any definitive positions on the bills at this time.

A. Assembly Bill (AB) 29 (Cooper, 2021) State bodies: meetings

Ms. Sieferman stated this bill was significantly similar to AB 2028 (Aguiar-Curry, 2020), which died last legislative session. She explained staff concerns and how this bill hinders public participation. She recommended the Board take an Oppose, Unless Amended position, similar to the Board's last position on AB 2028.

Ms. Bowler stated AB 29 passed out of the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee to the Assembly Appropriations Committee, and suggested the Board take an Oppose, Unless Amended position on the bill. She explained it would be helpful for the Assembly Appropriations Committee to understand the concerns of the Board.

Dr. Noland agreed with Ms. Bowler, but also noted that it would be helpful if the Board wrote a letter providing examples of its concerns.

- Dr. Christina Bradbury moved and Ms. Alana Yanez seconded a motion to take an Oppose, Unless Amended position on AB 29. The motion carried 6-0. Ms. Jennifer Loreda was not available for the vote.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

B. AB 54 (Kiley, 2021) COVID-19 emergency order violation: license revocation

Ms. Sieferman reported AB 54 was amended on April 5, 2021, to exclude healing arts boards, so it no longer impacted the Board or its stakeholders.

There were no public comments made on this item.

C. AB 107 (Salas, 2021) Licensure: veterans and military spouses

Ms. Sieferman stated staff had no concerns with AB 107.

There were no public comments made on this item.

D. AB 225 (Gray, 2021) Department of Consumer Affairs: boards: veterans: military spouses: licenses

Ms. Sieferman stated staff had no concerns with AB 225.

There were no public comments made on this item.

E. AB 339 (Lee, 2021) State and local government: open meetings

Ms. Sieferman stated the April 15, 2021 amendments removed many of staff's initial concerns. However, she stated that the biggest concern was that the bill would require the Board offer translation services for each meeting, if requested, which could be expensive. She stated she did not think the Board needed to take a position on the bill at this time, and she just wanted to provide an update. She noted staff will continue to monitor the bill closely.

There were no public comments made on this item.

F. AB 384 (Kalra, 2021) Cannabis and cannabis products: animals: veterinary medicine

Ms. Sieferman provided a summary of AB 384 and noted it had been amended on April 15, 2021.

Dr. Nunez stated the Board could take a Support, If Amended position on AB 384, similar to its position on Senate Bill (SB) 627 (Galgiani, 2019) during last legislative session.

Ms. Bowler stated it was likely they would get some public testimony on the bill, as well as a lot of input through the legislative committees, which could result in potential changes to the bill.

Dr. Nunez stated he thought the Board's desired amendments would still be that there is funding for research and that cannabis be sold in medical dispensaries, as opposed to recreational dispensaries. He added he also liked that the bill said that a veterinarian cannot be disciplined for recommending cannabis and there is a requirement for the Board to have guidelines on its website.

Dr. Noland suggested it might be helpful to have public comment on the bill.

The Board received public comment on this item. Dr. Trina Hazzah stated she was speaking directly as the President and Co-Founder of the Veterinary Cannabis Society. She added they are the first non-profit 501(c)(3) organization dedicated to creating solutions that ensure the safe use of cannabis with pets. She stated there were two items they would like to see amended: reduce 10 milligrams of THC to one milligram per serving in adult use dispensaries; and, for animals that require more than one milligram, they need to go to a medicinal dispensary (with an M license) with a veterinary recommendation. She added by including caps, it could at least provide some safeguards, and then there is the ability for the veterinarian to have a discussion with the pet parent. She also stated that all of the amendments to SB 627 weighed down the bill so much that it died.

Ms. Bowler asked Dr. Hazzah what the reaction from committee staff and Assembly Member Kalra was regarding the recommended amendments. Dr. Hazzah stated what she received back from the intermediate person was they were open to the amendments and willing to have a meeting to discuss further. She added Dr. Tim Shu, VETCBD, also was open to having her send him the amendments. She stated she believed there was hope regarding the amendments.

Paul Hansbury, Lovingly and Legally Grown, stated the weighing down of SB 627 with amendments came from Dr. Shu and Assembly Member Kalra. Mr. Hansbury shared the letter he sent to the Assembly Appropriations Committee regarding AB 384. He stated he felt the legislation was self-serving, and he strongly believed that cannabis for pets should only be available in medical dispensaries and with a veterinarian recommendation.

Pamela Lopez, a representative of the AB 384 sponsor, stated she wanted to provide an accurate summary of the bill. She explained the bill was supported by many national animal rights and animal welfare organizations, which are all 501(c)(3)s that engage in the legislative space because they want nothing more than the very best for all animals. She stated the problem they are trying to solve is that cannabis is readily available in dispensaries throughout the state, pet parents are aware of this, and they already are purchasing and dosing their animals. She added there are many pet parents who want veterinarians to make clear and precise recommendations. She also explained the bill would very clearly, under MAUCRSA [the Medicinal and Adult-Use Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act], apply standards that already exist. She stated they would be adding pet cannabis to MAUCRSA under all of the exact same testing and licensing and high-quality standards. She explained that AB 384 is the bill that we all can get this year. She stated their coalition was willing to recommend Assembly Member Kalra amend the bill to limit products that are intended for animal consumption to five milligrams per dose. She added CVMA was very much in support of the bill. She stated they are very tuned in to making sure medical professionals are guiding the development of the language.

Tara Welch, Board Counsel, asked Ms. Lopez how the amendment would work – if only five milligram dosages would be sold at recreational facilities and if there would be no requirement to go to a medicinal retailer to get a higher amount. Ms. Lopez indicated that was correct.

Susan Tibbon, Lovingly and Legally Grown, stated she thought it was important to oppose AB 384, unless amended, and to do that now. She stated although she appreciates Assembly Member Kalra's keeping this issue on the front burner, the main problem with AB 384 is it simply removes censure of veterinarians for discussing cannabis-based medicine. She explained her colleague in Napa County would not be able to use her veterinarian's recommendation in her medical dispensary unless MAUCRSA is amended. She stated pet parents are currently getting recommendations or medical advice from the staff at recreational dispensaries. She added if

this does not get done correctly now, she does not think they will be able to fix it in the foreseeable future.

Dr. Grant Miller stated CVMA currently has a support position on AB 384 in its current form. However, he indicated they do not have a position on the latest discussion topics brought up by Dr. Hazzah, Ms. Lopez, and the other commenters on the bill. He explained CVMA has been approached by them on aspects of the bill, and CVMA is considering those issues now. He stated CVMA has had a dynamic involvement with the bill, but they are standing on their own. He explained they work very closely with the author's office, but they are not part of any coalition. He stated they would like to see a bill go forward that allows recommendation, but they are concerned about multiple amendments to the bill.

Ms. Lopez added they are trying to put together the best policy solutions that they can realistically get out of the Legislature. However, she stated this bill is the best they are going to get now and for a long time. She indicated the questions before the Board were: do we want clear labeling on products, so pet parents are not guessing on dosage; and, do we want pet parents to have very clear conversations with veterinarians without fear of legal repercussion.

Dr. Nunez stated he felt there was not a sense of urgency to take a position on the bill at this time.

Ms. Bowler suggested the Board could perhaps take a Watch position at this time.

Ms. Sieferman stated staff would continue to watch the bill and bring it back to the Board.

G. AB 527 (Wood, 2021) Controlled substances

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

H. AB 553 (Kamlager, 2021) Pet insurance

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

I. AB 646 (Low, 2021) Department of Consumer Affairs: boards: expunged convictions

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

J. AB 1026 (Smith, 2021) Business licenses: veterans

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

K. AB 1236 (Ting, 2021) Healing arts: licensees: data collection

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

L. [AB 1282 \(Bloom, 2021\) Veterinary medicine: blood banks for animals](#)

Ms. Sieferman reported the latest amendment to the bill would require that the Board hire a consultant to develop guidelines for the community blood banks to operate. She explained this bill was essentially a marriage of Assembly Member Bloom's and Senator Wilk's bills from the

previous legislative session. Ms. Sieferman provided a summary of AB 1282 and discussed prior concerns of the Board with regard to this issue. She stated the bulk of the costs associated with this bill would be the upfront costs of creating a program and facilitating implementation.

Dr. Nunez stated the Board definitely recognizes the need for blood products and whole blood and the appeal of community blood banks, as opposed to closed colony blood banks. He added what is confusing is how this is going to work and how the Board can regulate it.

Ms. Bowler stated the new bill does satisfy some of the concerns the Board had last time. She concurred with Dr. Nunez about the desire to expand the supply and community resources. She added she hoped that the sponsors could answer some of the outstanding questions.

Dr. Bradbury stated it would help a lot if California was able to get products from elsewhere and not have that limitation. However, she noted that it seems complicated, and she worries about the fiscal impact.

The Board received public comment on this item. Jennifer Fearing, Fearless Advocacy, Inc., stated she was working with a number of organizations that were supporting the bill. She noted Assembly Member Bloom wanted to be the leader of his bill to ensure all stakeholders felt that their voices were heard. She stated she could address some of the questions that were raised. Ms. Fearing indicated the author has already communicated he intends to request funds to do the upfront implementation. She explained he would like to do something similar with the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), if they identify similar upfront costs. Regarding the imports questions, she explained the imports would have to be consistent with what is lawful in California. Lastly, she stated they did try to address concerns the Board had with last year's legislation. Ms. Fearing explained the product quality side of things would remain with CDFA, while the community blood bank, veterinarian collection piece would be under the Board.

Ms. Bowler asked if they envisioned CDFA inspecting out-of-state blood banks. Ms. Fearing responded they are hoping CDFA will engage in dialogue with the author's office regarding the issue.

Ms. Bowler also asked if they were envisioning third party entities would do the processing, storing, tagging, and distributing, and oversee the quality control of the blood products.

Ms. Fearing responded there are a lot of ways this can play out once the market opens up, and it is speculation, at this point, to know how this will sort out. However, she stated they want to keep veterinarians engaged in all steps in the process.

Nickolaus Sackett, Social Compassion in Legislation, stated the idea of shelters allowing dogs to give blood, on its face, seems benign, but they would be concerned about loopholes in the law. He also stated that another concern they had regarding the trigger language is the requirement that the trigger be based on community blood banks selling the blood versus producing the blood. He added they have conveyed this concern to the author's office and will continue to engage the author's office regarding those concerns.

Ms. Bowler asked if CVMA had any comments regarding the bill.

Dr. Miller stated Ms. Fearing had encapsulated their conversations. He added the author's office has been very receptive to listening to some of CVMA's concerns. He stated the author's office

is grappling with some of the same questions that CVMA has, such as when the trigger will actually occur, how will it occur, and how will they accurately quantify blood and blood products. He explained CVMA's number one concern has always been about preserving the safety and quantity of blood and blood products in California. He added the bill is a work in progress, the most recent round of amendments were a good indication, and CVMA will continue to work with the author's office.

Ms. Yanez asked if CVMA was in support of this bill. Dr. Miller responded they had an Approved position, which is essentially very similar to a support position.

Ms. Bowler stated another consideration is to ensure the cost of blood products stays consistent with what it is now.

Ms. Bowler stated the Board could take a Watch position and see how the amendments turn out.

Dr. Nunez stated he was in support of a lot of things in the bill, but he was still a little hesitant as to what the Board would be committing itself to. He stated he was OK with a Watch position, but was open to hearing other input. Dr. Bradbury stated a Watch position made sense.

- Ms. Alana Yanez moved and Ms. Dianne Prado seconded a motion to take a Support position on AB 1282.

Ms. Bowler stated, in concept, she was in favor of the bill, but had concerns about the fiscal impact. She added she wished they had more details regarding the impacts to the Board.

Ms. Yanez asked if the Board could take a Support, If Amended and Funded position.

Dr. Bradbury expressed concerns about a Support position and stated that the Board should perhaps take a Watch position.

Ms. Yanez asked if Ms. Fearing could clarify the issue of funding.

The Board received public comment on the motion. Ms. Fearing stated the Legislature is currently in the process of taking member requests, and Assembly Member Bloom has committed to doing a request of one-time funds to try to provide those resources.

Ms. Bowler stated this is the first time she has ever heard of a Board potentially getting one-time funds from the General Fund.

Ms. Sieferman asked Ms. Fearing to clarify if she meant funds would come from the General Fund. Ms. Fearing confirmed she was talking about funds coming from the General Fund.

Ms. Welch asked for clarification on the actual motion. Ms. Yanez responded the motion was to Support, If Funded.

The motion was amended, as follows:

- Ms. Alana Yanez moved and Ms. Dianne Prado seconded a motion to take a Support, If Funded position on AB 1282. The motion carried 5-2, with Dr. Christina Bradbury and Dr. Mark Nunez voting no.

There were no public comments made on the amended motion.

M. AB1386 (Cunningham,2021) License fees: military partners and spouses

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

N. [AB 1535 \(Committee on Business and Professions, 2021\) Veterinary Medical Board](#)

Ms. Sieferman stated the bill was recently amended to include the legislative proposals the Board has approved thus far.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Dr. Christina Bradbury seconded a motion to take a Support position on AB 1535. The motion carried 7-0.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

O. [Legislative Proposal for Inclusion in AB 1535 to Amend BPC, Division 2, Chapter 11, Article 3.5 \(Commencing with Section 4860\) Regarding Diversion Evaluation Committees](#)

Ms. Sieferman stated the legislative proposal essentially changes all instances of the term “diversion” to “wellness”.

- Ms. Jennifer Loreda moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded a motion to approve the legislative proposal to amend BPC, Division 2, Chapter 11, Article 3.5 (Commencing with Section 4860) regarding Diversion Evaluation Committees and to include it in the Board’s Sunset bill. The motion carried 7-0.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

P. Senate Bill (SB) SB 102 (Melendez, 2021) COVID-19 emergency order violation: license revocation

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

Q. [SB 344 \(Hertzberg, 2021\) Homeless shelters grants: pets and veterinary services](#)

Dr. Noland asked if anyone had heard more about this bill.

Ms. Bowler stated she had not, but she really liked the bill. She explained for public and pet protection, this bill was very important for California. She added she felt the Board should take a position on the bill. Dr. Nunez and Ms. Prado concurred.

- Ms. Dianne Prado moved and Ms. Alana Yanez seconded a motion to take a Support position on SB 344. The motion carried 7-0.

The Board received public comment on the motion. Ms. Fearing stated on behalf of SF SPCA, San Diego Humane Society, and Best Friends Animal Society, this was her favorite bill of the legislative session.

R. SB 547 (Glazer, 2021) Animals: emergency response: California Veterinary Emergency Team program

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

S. SB 585 (Stern, 2021) Cats: declawing procedures: prohibition

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

T. SB 731 (Durazo, 2021) Criminal records: relief

There was no discussion regarding this bill.

U. [SB 772 \(Ochoa Bogh, 2021\) Professions and vocations: citations: minor violations](#)

Ms. Bowler stated this bill would be a problem for the Board.

Ms. Siefertman explained the bill removes the ability for the Board to assess a citation under certain conditions. She also stated a fine is a really good enforcement mechanism for the Board to incentivize compliance. She added removing this ability would also be a disservice for enforcement.

- Dr. Christina Bradbury moved, and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded a motion to take an Oppose position on SB 772. The motion carried 7-0.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

8. [Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Proposed Regulations](#)

A. [Status Update on Pending Regulations](#)

Justin Sotelo provided a status update on the Board's pending regulations. He indicated the update included changes in the status of rulemaking packages since January 2021. He reported three rulemaking packages had been recently approved by the Office of Administrative Law and one package had been withdrawn, as a result of the MDC's recommendation and the Board's approval. Next, he reported the Board currently had 16 rulemaking packages that were pending the regulatory process; five of which were in various stages of the initial or final phase of the process, and eleven that were pending preparation by Board staff for submission to DCA. Mr. Sotelo provided a specific update on each package, discussing all steps that had occurred since January 2021.

There were no public comments made on this item.

B. [Section 2039, Article 4, Division 20, Title 16 of the CCR Regarding Sodium Pentobarbital/Euthanasia Training](#)

Ms. Siefertman stated the requested action was to update terminology in the regulation, as a result of the California Animal Control Directors Association and the State Humane Association of California merging to form the California Animal Welfare Association. She noted the regulatory change could be pursued through a Section 100 rulemaking.

- Dr. Jaymie Noland moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded a motion to approve amendments to CCR, title 16, section 2039 and direct the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the section 100 rulemaking process, make any technical or non-substantive changes to the rulemaking package, and adopt the proposed regulatory changes. The motion carried 7-0.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

9. [Recess until April 23, 2021, at 9:00 a.m.](#)

The meeting was recessed at 3:50 p.m.

9:00 a.m., Friday, April 23, 2021

10. Reconvene - Establishment of a Quorum

Dr. Mark Nunez called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Jessica Sieferman called roll; seven members of the Board were present, and a quorum was established. Dr. Maria Preciosa S. Solacito was absent.

Members Present

Mark Nunez, DVM, President
Kathy Bowler, Public Member, Vice President
Christina Bradbury, DVM
Jennifer Loreda, RVT
Jaymie Noland, DVM
Dianne Prado, Public Member
Alana Yanez, Public Member

Staff Present

Jessica Sieferman, Executive Officer
Matt McKinney, Enforcement Program Manager
Timothy Rodda, Administration/Licensing Manager
Patty Rodriguez, Inspection Program Manager
Rob Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager
Cheryl Douglas, Enforcement Analyst
Virginia Gerard, Probation Monitor
Kimberly Gorski, Enforcement Analyst
Justin Sotelo, Lead Administrative & Policy Analyst
Jennifer Tarrant, Enforcement Analyst
Tara Welch, Board Counsel, DCA

Guests Present

Timothy Aspinwall, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings
Sumer Avila, Provost/Vice President of Curriculum & Instruction, San Joaquin Valley College (SJVC)
Naomi Barnes, DVM, Professor, Mt. San Antonio College
Bikram Dhaliwal, DCA, Budget Office
Rebecca Diaz, Petitioner
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, CaRVTA
Michael Floyd, DVM
Carrie Holmes, Deputy Director of Board and Bureau Relations, DCA
Heidi Holtz, RVT
Anita Levy Hudson, RVT, CaRVTA
Shelly Jones, Moderator, DCA
Ann Leitz, Court Reporter
Grant Miller, DVM, CVMA
Samantha Morse, Policy Analyst, APG
Greg Osborn, Corporate Director of Program Compliance, SJVC
Michele Perez, Veterinary Technology Program Director, SJVC
Mike Sanchez, Television Specialist, DCA, OPA
Dianne Sequoia, DVM
Tim Shu, DVM, Founder/CEO, VETCBD

Malissa Siemantel, Deputy Attorney General (DAG), Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice
Marie Ussery, RVT

11. Hearing on Placement of San Joaquin Valley College RVT Program on Board Probation

Ms. Sieferman stated the Board, at its last meeting, voted to place SJVC's RVT program on probation pursuant to CCR section 2065.8 because their first-time candidate pass rates for fiscal year 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 fell below 10 percentage points of the state's average pass rates. She added pursuant to CCR section 2065.8.2, the Board is required to provide a program an opportunity to be heard.

She noted if the Board decides to keep the program on probation, that will include periodic reports to the Board, special visits to the Board throughout the period of probation, and notifying all current and prospective students and employees of their probationary status.

Ms. Sieferman reported after the last Board meeting, the SJVC RVT program was notified to alert them of the probationary status and the opportunity to be heard. She noted the program then submitted a written response to the concerns regarding the pass rates and everything they have done thus far to help improve those test scores.

She stated SJVC's Corporate Director of Program Compliance Greg Osborn and his representatives were available to answer any questions. She added in the cover memo she provided an overview of other entities that provide oversight of the program. She stated she reached out to all of those entities and found out that no adverse action has been taken against the SJVC RVT program.

Mr. Osborn thanked the Board for the opportunity to address questions and noted Dr. Sumer Avila and Program Director Michele Perez were also present. He stated Ms. Perez could speak to the curriculum changes they have made over the years, as well as the VTNE pass rates, and some of the challenges they have seen in the past and what they are doing to ensure better performances in the future. He noted Dr. Avila could also provide a senior leader perspective.

Dr. Bradbury asked if the SJVC program has been an RVT program since 2017.

Dr. Avila responded the program, prior to pursuing American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) approval in 2013, was a veterinary assisting program. She added they had state approvals then under different agencies. In 2012, she noted the program elected to be under the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education. She added they then pursued AVMA approval for their veterinary technician program at that time. She explained they only offered a degree program, and they then moved forward. In 2017, she stated they opted to enact the transition to a certificate-only program. Ultimately, she explained they returned to offering a newly built associates degree program last June. She stated all of their programs have always had state authorization.

Ms. Yanez asked if the certificate-only students were eligible to sit for the VTNE. Dr. Avila responded the certificate, plus field experience, would give them eligibility to sit for the examination.

Ms. Yanez asked for the years when the program pass rates were under 50%, do they know if the students taking the examination during that time completed the certificate or the degree. Dr. Avila responded they do not get student level data, so they do not know which students were taking the examination at that time. Since then, she explained they have put systems in place to know who is applying and sitting for the examination.

Ms. Perez also explained the preliminary reports inform who is scheduled to take the examination, but the second reports only provide the pass rates. She added she has to do additional legwork to determine who passed, who failed, and who are first-time and repeat test takers.

Ms. Perez also stated one of the largest challenges they have had is getting students to take the test. She explained they might have 100 eligible graduates, but only 32 take the test.

Ms. Yanez asked what the cost of the examination was. Ms. Perez responded it was \$330 for the test, plus the cost of the application to the state and the initial licensing. In total, she stated the total cost was over \$600, which is cost prohibitive. She added the program has offered to pay for the test and many other incentives. She also explained there are many reasons why students choose not to test.

Dr. Avila noted Ms. Perez provided several examples of tasks that are part of their institutional action plan. She added raising their pass rates to above the 50 percent threshold for the three-year average is very important to them. She stated any of their programs that fall below expected thresholds are required to have action plans that include staffing considerations, curriculum considerations, test preparation, student accountability, etc. She explained they are committed to improvements and have dedicated extensive resources to their efforts. She added every recommendation that AVMA has made, they have embraced and have made extensive contributions to ensure the success of their program. She reiterated VTNE pass rates are very important to them.

Dr. Avila also clarified all of the graduates in the test reports are from a previous version of their program, not from the more recent overhauled curriculum that was relaunched.

Ms. Yanez asked when the new curriculum was relaunched. Dr. Avila responded this year.

Mr. Osborn added they are looking forward to the full benefit of the new full degree program, but they will not see that until the 2022 and 2023 reporting years.

Ms. Perez explained how she is very passionate about graduates getting their RVT license. She also added they have worked very hard on curriculum improvements, and the curriculum is designed to build on itself. She explained students are not able to drop in in the middle of the program because they have got to have that foundation at the beginning. She stated they also continue to look at how they can get their examination pass rates up. Ms. Perez also explained the admission requirements for the program.

Dr. Avila explained their work has been an iterative process; if an implemented action item or initiative does not give them the desired result, they pivot and put forward another initiative so that they can gain success. She stated they are confident with the structures and systems in place, both internally and externally, and they will continue to see positive growth.

Mr. Osborn stated the AVMA pass rate threshold is 50 percent, but they want to exceed that. He noted they have set an internal threshold, as an institution, at 75 percent or higher.

Dr. Nunez stated he appreciated the SJVC representatives talking about their program. He added he hoped they understand that oversight makes everyone better. He explained the Board just had its oversight hearing as well before the Legislature. He also acknowledged that RVT students, in general, have more challenges when it comes to testing, compared to veterinarian students; however, he asked if other things can be done, such as mentoring, counseling, alumni programs, etc. Ms. Yanez also asked if the program has ever engaged local veterinarians to be partners and encourage students to sit for the examination. Dr. Nunez also asked if there was anything the Board could do to assist.

Dr. Avila responded they have made those efforts and continue to look for opportunities. However, she explained the pandemic has presented challenges. She and Ms. Perez detailed the many efforts of the program and stated they are committed to the success of students from a comprehensive standpoint.

Ms. Bowler thanked the SJVC representatives for their presentation and noted that it sounds like they, individually and collectively, care about the program and the students. She asked when their next site visit from AVMA is. Ms. Perez responded it was 2022. Ms. Bowler also noted perhaps something could be done so that RVT programs get student-level data, so they know which students pass and fail the examination. Ms. Sieferman responded she would reach out to AAVSB to see if that information can be provided to all programs.

Dr. Bradbury noted she was pleasantly surprised by the representatives' level of dedication and investment in the program. Dr. Bradbury also offered to visit the program and speak to their students. Dr. Avila responded she would be happy to have that happen. Mr. Osborn added that a Board member visit would be very welcomed.

Ms. Bowler stated she was very impressed with the presentation and the responses from the representatives. She added the results of a lot of the recent changes and improvements discussed have not been seen yet. She therefore stated she was not sure if the Board should proceed with probation because it seems like the program is working very hard to make some significant changes. She stated she would be in favor of removing the probationary status.

Dr. Nunez stated he can tell the presenters care very much about their students on a personal level and was very refreshing to see. He noted he would be in support of taking the program off of probation. Ms. Yanez concurred.

Ms. Welch clarified that, technically, the SJVC RVT program was not on probation yet. She explained the way the regulation works, the Board has to give a program an opportunity to be heard before placing them on probation. She added Ms. Bowler's motion should be to not place the program on probation.

- Ms. Kathy Bowler moved and Ms. Jennifer Loreda seconded a motion to not place the San Joaquin Valley College Registered Veterinary Technician Program on probation. The motion carried 7-0.

The Board received public comment on the motion. Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, CaRVTA, stated she appreciated all of the comments that have been heard from the program, and she was very impressed they are trying very hard to raise their passing rates. She added the real problem is

the veterinarians in that community do not care if a person is an RVT or a veterinary assistant. She stated veterinarians are using veterinary assistants to do RVT job tasks because they are not being cited and fined by the Board. She also stated fees for RVT candidates are cost prohibitive.

Ms. Anita Levy Hudson, RVT, CaRVTA, acknowledged the great work and efforts of the SJVC RVT program. She added she is glad to see this oversight and to see these discussions. She stated the cost of RVT programs are also sometimes cost prohibitive, especially when you look at private colleges.

Dr. Nunez stated the best way to enforce the Practice Act is through filing a complaint. He added that is how the Board finds out about those things.

Dr. Nunez thanked the representatives from SJVC. Mr. Osborn also thanked the Board for the opportunity to interact with the Board.

12. Board President Report – Mark Nunez, DVM

Dr. Nunez reported, since the last Board meeting, he attended a board presidents training program at DCA on February 2, 2021. He noted Dr. Waterhouse was a presenter at the training. He explained the training covered how to more effectively run a board. He stated the training was helpful and provided some good recommendations on how to stay on top of your board's budget and strategic plan.

Next, Dr. Nunez reported he and Ms. Sieferman gave a presentation via Zoom to the freshman class at Western University. He explained they do that every year and tell the students about the Board and how to apply for a license.

Dr. Nunez next reported, on March 3, 2021, the Board had its Sunset hearing. He noted Ms. Sieferman forwarded a link to the hearing to Board members. He added he, Ms. Bowler, and Ms. Sieferman were present at the hearing, and everyone did a very good job. He stated, a day or two before the hearing, they had a mock session with DCA staff to prepare for the hearing, and it was very helpful. He noted the Board of Psychology also had its Sunset hearing on the same day. He stated, overall, the Board's hearing went very well.

Dr. Nunez reported, on March 20, 2021, there was a CVMA Board of Governors meeting, but he was not able to attend it. However, he noted the Board was very well represented by Ms. Sieferman.

Ms. Bowler noted Dr. Waterhouse had a great presentation at the DCA presidents training and mentioned that the monthly one-hour webinars that DCA offers are very helpful. She stated she believed the webinars are available to all Board members.

There were no public comments made on this item.

13. Registered Veterinary Technician Report – Jennifer Loreda, RVT

Ms. Loreda stated she gets a lot of feedback throughout the year from various people, colleagues, RVTs, and other individuals in the industry. She explained they share their concerns, and she sometimes directs them to other resources to get their concerns addressed.

She noted a lot of things she hears are not within the purview of the Board to address. For example, she explained title protection is not something that the Board is able to address.

Ms. Loredo stated board members are all working professionals and essentially serve on a volunteer basis, but they do the best they can. She explained when she is very passionate about an issue, it is because she sees it every day. She added it is very easy when we live in this regulatory world to lose sight of what is going on in the real world.

Ms. Loredo noted there is an opening on the MDC for an RVT, and her position on the Board is terming out next year. She explained, on the previous day, there were a number of highly qualified applicants who applied for veterinarian positions on the MDC. She stated she would love to see that with RVT applicants in the future. She noted, in past reports, she has reached out to RVTs to get more involved with the Board; however, she is now reaching out to their employers and asking that they be supportive. She stated because the Board has been talking so much about equity, she tries to remember where she came from and tries to represent everybody. She said she would like to see more RVTs get involved.

Ms. Loredo asked if it would be possible to continue with remote meetings in the future. She explained that might make it easier for RVTs to participate, so they do not have to travel and take as much time off from work. She asked if the Board could consider this.

Ms. Loredo also discussed how they have heard about veterinarians not being supportive of RVTs. She explained it is very easy for a veterinary hospital to work with just veterinary assistants because veterinarians can perform the tasks that RVTs perform.

Next, Ms. Loredo mentioned the news about the RVT Job Tasks regulations being approved was a huge win for RVTs. She explained RVTs can now apply casts and splints under indirect supervision of a veterinarian, instead of direct supervision.

In conclusion, Ms. Loredo again stated she would like to see more opportunities for RVT involvement with the Board.

The Board received public comment on this item. Ms. Ehrlich acknowledged the Board's new flyer that was recently distributed, entitled Who's Who in the Vet Office. She stated the flyer was excellent, and it explains what veterinarians, RVTs, and veterinary assistants do, and what VACSP means. She noted it would be beneficial for all veterinarians to receive the flyer, so they know how to utilize RVTs properly. She suggested the Board consider requiring that veterinary hospitals post the first page of the flyer in their waiting rooms, so that everyone can understand who works in a veterinary hospital and what they are allowed to do.

Ms. Siefertman noted the flyer was part of the meeting materials found under Agenda Item 15.G. (Outreach). She explained the flyer was developed in partnership with DCA's Office of Public Affairs, and it was sent out on the previous day and posted on the Board's website. Additionally, she stated licensees and hospitals were encouraged to post the flyer in offices, so consumers can easily see the document.

Ms. Loredo stated she saw the flyer, opined it was wonderful, but there were a couple of things she had questions and issues with.

Ms. Hudson stated she liked the flyer and she was happy to see something that educates the public. She also thanked Ms. Loredo for her comments about encouraging more RVT support

and participation. Next, Ms. Hudson asked if there might be an opportunity to have some time with someone on the MDC or Board to create a short informational piece to help people under the Board's processes. She explained it could cover how the Board works, in general, how to bring an issue to the Board, or how to participate in Board processes.

14. National Association Involvement Reports – Kathy Bowler and Mark Nunez, DVM

A. International Council for Veterinary Assessment

Ms. Bowler noted she is thrilled to serve on the International Council for Veterinary Assessment (ICVA).

She reported, in 2021, the testing window for winter had been extended to November 1 through December 31. She stated things hopefully will go back to normal in 2022.

Ms. Bowler also reported, on the previous day, ICVA released a publication called the 2019-2020 technical report. She explained it includes a review of the North American Veterinary Licensing Examination (NAVLE), a synopsis of examination development and administration, a psychometric analysis of the NAVLE, a summary of statistics of candidate performance, etc. She added the report also included information on an exit survey that was sent out to individual test takers. Ms. Bowler stated the report was sent out to the stakeholder regulatory boards yesterday. She mentioned if Board members were interested in seeing the report, Ms. Siefertman could provide it to them.

Next, Ms. Bowler stated she serves on two ICVA subcommittees: the talent management committee; and the governance review committee. She noted the two subcommittees have been meeting via Zoom.

Ms. Bowler noted the next board meeting would be held virtually in June, and the next AAVSB conference would be held in September.

She stated many veterinarians applied for the two board positions. She noted she was the only public member on the board, and all other members have to be DVMs. She added her term was up, and she was up for renomination. She stated nominations would be addressed later in the meeting agenda.

There were no public comments made on this item.

B. AAVSB, Member and Program Services Think Tank

Dr. Nunez explained the Think Tank is an AAVSB committee that looks at all of the programs and services AAVSB provides for members. He stated the programs and services are evaluated to ensure they are serving the needs of members or to determine if there is an opportunity for other needs.

He stated he is impressed that AAVSB updates its strategic plan every year.

Dr. Nunez reported AAVSB is in the process of streamlining the eligibility review application for the NAVLE. He stated he believed that would really increase accessibility for individuals seeking licensure. He added California's removal of the California State Board Examination (CSBE) requirement would also improve accessibility.

He also reported AAVSB is continuing to work on defining different levels of training for veterinary assistants, registered veterinary assistants, and nurses.

Next, Dr. Nunez reported the API data transfer that California is participating in is expected to be completed by May 2021.

He stated the Board would also address AAVSB nominations under Agenda Item 16.

Ms. Loreda commented on the veterinary nurse initiative. She stated she did not have any updates on the matter, but mentioned the effort is driven by the National Association of Veterinary Technicians in America (NAVTA). She explained California was supposed to be one of the last states where they would try to implement that due to nurse being a protected title. Ms. Loreda stated she had mixed feelings on the matter. She explained registered veterinary nurse is a much more accurate title for what RVTs do; however, RVTs are also x-ray technicians, ultrasound technicians, dental hygienists, etc. She stated she felt the driving force behind the initiative is due to not having enough RVTs, not having enough recognition and retention in the field, etc. She noted, at some point, the Board likely will be hearing from NAVTA on this matter.

There were no public comments made on this item.

15. Executive Management Reports

A. Administration

Administration/Licensing Manager Timothy Rodda provided a staff update and noted the Board was able to make a conditional offer for the receptionist position. He also reported two new licensing/examination staff started with the Board in March.

Mr. Rodda next asked DCA Budget Analyst Bikram Dhaliwal to provide an update on the Board's Budget/Expenditure Projection Report and Fund Condition.

Mr. Dhaliwal stated he would present the status of the Board's fund condition and also provide a general budget overview. He stated the expenditure projections provided data through the first eight months of the fiscal year, through February. He noted, as of fiscal month eight, based on the projections, the Board would revert about 14.5 percent of its budget, which is \$922,214. He explained this was good news for the Board. He stated the Board has had cost savings, as a result of the pandemic and less travel costs. He added there were also reversions coming from personnel services and Attorney General (AG) costs. He explained the overall savings absorbs any over expenditures in other line items.

Dr. Nunez noted a lot of the cost savings seemed to be as a result of COVID-19. He asked what the budget might look like after things open back up.

Mr. Dhaliwal responded it is difficult to project expenditures for the next fiscal year and onward. He noted Budget Office and Board staff will continue to monitor expenses and line items going forward. He stated programs will probably get back to normal or a new normal at the start or middle of the next fiscal year. He also added that prior to the pandemic, the Board still had reversions in the travel line item, so that was a good sign.

Ms. Bowler acknowledged the cost savings in the AG line item, and noted it could be due to Board staff streamlining processes. She also noted previous travel costs could have been lower due to the Board holding more meetings in Sacramento.

Dr. Noland asked about the fluctuating expenditures under the Consolidated Data Center and Information Technology line items. Mr. Dhaliwal stated he would have to research those costs further to determine what they were and why they fluctuate.

Dr. Noland also asked about the \$21,000 in current year expenditures under Equipment. Ms. Sieferman responded those expenses were for laptops purchased for staff for teleworking.

Ms. Yanez stated she liked the idea of continuing to do meetings remotely, and asked if boards would be required to go back to holding in-person meetings.

Ms. Sieferman responded Ms. Holmes had indicated that DCA still does not know exactly what things will look like once the state of emergency is lifted. However, she noted the Board is only required to hold one meeting in northern California and one in Southern California each year. She stated the unknown is how boards will engage the public. She noted the Board could consider holding two in-person and two virtual meetings each year; however, for the virtual meetings, physical locations where Board members are participating from would have to be publicly noticed.

Mr. Dhaliwal stated the Fund Condition displayed actual year-end figures for 2019-2020 and Current Year, Fiscal Month 8, revenue and expenditure projections. He added the figures for 2021-2022 are tied to the Governor's Budget.

Mr. Dhaliwal stated revenues are projected to materialize greater than what was originally anticipated in the amount of \$40,000. He noted renewal fees are the main revenue driver. He also explained the \$5,460,000 in expenditures came directly from the expenditure projection report. He stated with the revenue and expenditures plugged in, the Board is left with a fund balance of \$4,389,000, which equates to 7.2 months in reserve.

Dr. Nunez asked if the Fund Condition reflected the Board making its temporary positions permanent and the loan the Board gave to the General Fund. Mr. Dhaliwal stated the Fund Condition did not reflect the positions becoming permanent, but the loan to the General Fund was included. He added it was his understanding that the \$321,000 loan to the General Fund would be paid back in 2023-2024. He also noted the \$321,000 was equivalent to the employee compensation reductions that were implemented in the current year.

Dr. Nunez asked if the revenue was based on current fees. Mr. Dhaliwal responded the revenue was based on the current fee structure, as a result of the emergency fee increase that took effect in January 2020.

Ms. Bowler stated she did not think the General Fund loan would get paid back unless the Board was going to go insolvent. Mr. Dhaliwal noted the Governor's budget release memo stated that loans would be repaid when the originating fund has need for the money to be returned or when there is no longer a need for the monies in the General Fund. He restated he is hearing that loans will be repaid in 2023-2024.

There were no public comments made regarding Mr. Dhaliwal's presentation.

Mr. Rodda reported the Board had completed a training video on how to apply for a veterinarian license through BreEZe. He noted they would be posting that to the Board website soon. He added they are also creating subsequent videos for all of the other application types. He stated the Board was also streamlining its email accounts to save money and provide better access to the public. Similarly, he noted with the Board's phone lines, they are working with DCA's Office of Information Services to eliminate the in-house phone tree system and move to a Microsoft Teams system, which will be accessible to all staff at their computers. He also mentioned the next Diversion Evaluation Committee was scheduled for June.

B. *Examination

Mr. Rodda reported the Board paused examination development because of the elimination of the CSBE. He stated pass rates were provided in the cover memo. He noted they were still quite high for the NAVLE and CSBE, which was good news. Regarding VTNE statistics, he added the Board anticipates receiving imported scores electronically beginning in May.

C. Licensing

Mr. Rodda stated the Board still receives a lot of contacts regarding the fingerprinting requirement; however, he noted he does expect that to decrease because the fingerprinting requirement for renewals was implemented in BreEZe in May of 2019. He explained May will be the two-year point where it should have captured all licensees, so there should be fewer contacts going forward. He noted that should also decrease processing times for renewals because everything will now be automatic.

Regarding licensing performance measures, Mr. Rodda reported the Board has received more applications. However, he pointed out that he has noticed an increase in applications around the time of graduation, and then things slow down when it gets closer to summer.

Mr. Rodda also reported the Board is seeing an increased use of BreEZe because it contains many of the Board's primary application types. He added the Board is also trying to update BreEZe to allow candidates and licensees to upload documentation through their online accounts.

Dr. Nunez stated he is still hearing reports from people saying that the Board is not answering phone lines with regard to their license applications. Mr. Rodda responded he was not sure why that was, and he would have to discuss with his staff. He stated staff should be answering their phones calls and returning calls in a timely manner. He added that is something he has been following up on with staff to make it a priority.

Ms. Bowler noted she felt like the Board has supercharged its communications. She stated with all of the recent updates, new tools, etc., she hoped people are looking at the information. She again stated she has seen a lot more communication from the Board as a member of the public.

Ms. Bowler also mentioned she had a couple of questions regarding licensing. She noted for first quarter 2021, veterinarian numbers were down 17 percent, RVT numbers were down 44 percent, and premises numbers were down 24 percent. She asked why that might be the case.

Mr. Rodda responded he believed that it is more tied to graduation and examination availability. With regard to premises registrations, he noted a majority of the premises renewals happen in May.

In order to address action items before the petition hearing, the Board [proceeded to Agenda Item 16](#).

The Board [returned to Agenda Items 15.B. and 15.C.](#) at 3:45 p.m. after Closed Session.

Dr. Bradbury stated she had a question regarding the RVT School Inspection table. She noted it seemed to her that there is no way to know if candidates were first-time candidates. She asked how staff was determining that.

Mr. Rodda responded staff receives a report directly from AAVSB that identifies first-time test takers.

Dr. Nunez asked about the other schools on the tables falling below 10 percent of the state average pass rate for first-time candidates for two consecutive years.

Ms. Sieferman clarified the schools Dr. Nunez was referring to were subject to inspection, not probation, but the Board, at its previous meeting, decided to not do inspections during the pandemic. However, she stated those schools would be notified they have fallen below that pass rate for two consecutive years and asked to provide information to the Board as to why that occurred.

Ms. Bowler asked if the notifications had been sent out yet.

Ms. Sieferman responded they had not, but she would finalize the letter with Ms. Welch and get the notifications sent out.

Ms. Bowler asked Ms. Sieferman if staff knew what the pass rate or probation/inspection requirements were for AVMA or for the other accreditation agencies.

Ms. Sieferman responded she did not know, but she did have a follow up meeting with the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education regarding this topic. She stated she hoped to have more information in July.

D. [*Enforcement](#)

Enforcement Manager Rob Stephanopoulos reported the Board filled the six limited term positions, which was great news. For two of the positions, he noted they are awaiting staff to transition over from the Licensing Unit. He added, in order to oversee more staff, the Board also hired a new Enforcement Program Manager, Matt McKinney. Mr. Stephanopoulos also stated the Board filled an Office Technician position for the Probation Unit. He added the Board will also have another probation monitor position in the coming months.

Mr. Stephanopoulos stated enforcement staff is continuing to work on the oldest cases. However, he explained they are some of the most complex cases the Board has. He added the Enforcement Unit has been working hand-in-hand with DAG Liaison Karen Denvir, and she has been extremely helpful.

Regarding intake, Mr. Stephanopoulos stated staff continues to meet their 10-day target of assigning complaints. He explained the Board will probably have more than 1,400 complaints this year, which will be the highest number the Board has had of any year. He noted over half of

the complaints allege negligence and incompetence, which are the highest priority complaints. He added the Board still has many complaints that are over three years old, so those are also a priority. He stated that Board has over 3,000 complaints in its backlog.

Regarding DOI usage, Mr. Stephanopoulos explained it is consistent with what has been reported before; the Board is really trying to minimize its use of DOI. He explained the Board has the benefit of utilizing the Inspection Unit for a majority of Board cases.

Mr. Stephanopoulos provided a brief summary of the Complaint Process Audit Subcommittee update that was provided at the recent MDC meeting.

He stated information regarding Strategic Plan accomplishments, disciplinary action vote results, and performance measures was also available in the enforcement report.

Next, Mr. McKinney introduced himself to the Board.

Mr. Stephanopoulos discussed the possibility of re-examining the statutory priority list when it comes to enforcement cases, as over half of the Board's cases are negligence and incompetence cases, which are deemed first priority cases.

Ms. Bowler asked if the data gathering requested by Senator Richard Roth and required for the Sunset hearing was completed. Mr. Stephanopoulos indicated it was completed.

Ms. Bowler asked if the Board would see some changes in statistics by the July meeting, as a result of new enforcement staff. Mr. Stephanopoulos responded he hoped so, but it might take several months for new staff to get up to speed.

Ms. Siefertman added the data gathering requested by Senator Roth was completed on the previous day, and she now has to review the data and compile a report, which is due to the Legislature on the following Friday. She noted she would also ask for Board member input before submitting the report.

Dr. Bradbury stated she sees big differences in how cases are being investigated and positive reviews by the MDC Complaint Process Audit Subcommittee. She added she appreciated all of the work that enforcement staff are doing.

E. Probation

Probation Monitor Virginia Gerard reported the Board had 88 licensees on probation and 22 licensees participating in biological fluid testing. She added there was also 116 pending complaints against 29 probationers. Ms. Gerard also reported there were five probation violation cases pending at the AG's Office, and the Board sent nine letters regarding compliance concerns to probationers in the last quarter. She reported, in March 2021, one probation case was submitted to the AG's Office with a request to revoke the license.

Ms. Gerard also stated the Probation Unit was happy to have a new Enforcement Program Manager, Matt McKinney, and a new Probation Technician.

Ms. Siefertman added the Board gets authority for an Associate Governmental Program Analyst (AGPA) position on July 1, and they were in the process of putting the recruitment package together. She stated the hope was to start recruitment prior to July 1, so the new hire could start

work on July 1. She stated between Ms. Gerard, the AGPA, and the Probation Technician, they hope to have a much stronger Probation Unit.

F. Hospital Inspection

Ms. Sieferman reported the Inspection Unit is continuously working on the oldest inspections; however, if there are older enforcement cases that need an inspection, those inspections become a priority. She stated staff continues to work with the BreEZe team and the DCA business integration analyst to try to improve BreEZe for inspections. She noted what they are finding is they have several more tools in the enforcement module versus the inspection module. So, she explained they are working on transitioning into tracking cases with the enforcement module, so they can track more information that is helpful for the team and management. She stated they believe there are a lot of process improvements in BreEZe they are able to utilize and will continue to utilize in the coming months.

She also reported the Inspection Unit hopes to use the mobile application, which should improve the system and automate many of the manual processes. She stated they hope to have the application role out by the summer of 2022.

Ms. Sieferman also reported the Inspection Unit has also worked closely with the MDC's Inspection Subcommittee. She stated they are devoted to trying to find ways to improve the process to perform more inspections and make it more streamlined.

Dr. Nunez asked Ms. Sieferman if she thought the 20 percent inspection mandate was a reasonable number.

Ms. Sieferman responded she never thought the 20 percent mandate was a reasonable number. She stated the issue is something the Board has tasked the MDC to evaluate.

Ms. Loreda stated she thought they proved that the 20 percent mandate is just not feasible. She added the boards they met with did not have that type of mandate, and one board does not even do random inspections. She stated she believes the Board can increase the number of inspections that it does, if it has the technology that has been discussed. She added given the resources the Board has, it is doing an amazing job. She stated she believed the Board needs to change the 20 percent mandate to something that is more reasonable.

Ms. Bowler stated she agreed that the 20 percent mandate was probably not feasible; however, she noted the intent was to try to catch things before they became a problem. She added for the sake of public, animal, and employee protection, the Board's Inspection program is still very critical. She stated the Board may want to lower the mandate; however, she believed the random inspections are very helpful. She noted the Board could do a little more outreach, or even consider doing virtual inspections. Ms. Bowler stated she would not be in favor of abandoning a percentage, but perhaps it could be lowered.

G. Outreach

Ms. Sieferman stated, in the cover memo, she provided each activity that has been completed since the last Board meeting. She explained it included meeting with the associations, requesting volunteers at the MDC meeting to assist Board staff with creating content for webinars, increasing the Board's social media presence, developing and distributing the Who's

Who in the Vet Office flyer, and reaching out to schools to establish student liaisons to the Board.

H. Strategic Plan

Ms. Sieferman stated the Action Plan was provided in the meeting materials. She explained after the Board approved the Strategic Plan, staff set up a meeting with SOLID to create the Action Plan. She stated with each objective, staff came up with specific actions they felt were necessary in order to complete each objective. She added for future meetings, staff will include an update on every action and the completion dates for each item.

There were no public comments made on the Executive Management Reports.

16. *Update, Discussion and Possible Action Regarding AAVSB Activities

A. Cannabidiol Guidelines

This item was not discussed.

B. Call for Regulation

This item was not discussed.

C. Call for Topics

This item was not discussed.

D. *Call for Nominations

Dr. Nunez reported Ms. Bowler was up for reappointment on her seat as an AAVSB representative to ICVA. He stated there was also an open Director position on the AAVSB Board of Directors.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Dr. Christina Bradbury seconded a motion to nominate Ms. Kathy Bowler for reappointment as an AAVSB representative to ICVA. The motion carried 5-0. Dr. Jaymie Noland and Ms. Alana Yanez were not available for the vote.

Ms. Bowler thanked the Board members and stated she accepted the nomination.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

- Ms. Kathy Bowler moved and Ms. Jennifer Loreda seconded a motion to nominate Dr. Mark Nunez for appointment as a Director on the AAVSB Board of Directors. The motion carried 5-0. Dr. Jaymie Noland and Ms. Alana Yanez were not available for the vote.

Dr. Nunez thanked the Board members for the nomination.

There were no public comments made on the motion.

At the conclusion of this agenda item, the Board proceeded to Agenda Item 18.

E. AAVSB Annual Meeting & Conference

This item was not discussed.

F. CE Tracking & Auditing

This item was not discussed.

G. VTNE Scheduling Update

This item was not discussed.

H. AAVSB COVID-19 Tracking

This item was not discussed.

There were no public comments made on these items.

17. *Future Agenda Items and Next Meeting Dates

- **July 22-23, 2021**
- **October 21-22, 2021**

Ms. Sieferman stated she anticipated that the remaining 2021 Board meetings would be held virtually.

For the July 2021 meeting, she noted the following items would be brought before the Board: the RVT program issue; an overview from AVMA and the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education; the Administrative Procedure Manual; legislation; regulations; and, perhaps one petitioner.

For the October 2021 meeting, she noted the following items would be brought before the Board: recruitment for an RVT; and, election of officers for 2022.

There were no public comments made on this item.

18. *Special Order of Business (1:00 p.m.)

This agenda item commenced at 1:00 p.m.

ALJ Timothy Aspinwall commenced the petition hearing.

A. *Petition for Reinstatement – Rebecca Diaz, Surrendered Veterinarian License No. 13706

ALJ Aspinwall presided over the petition for reinstatement. DAG Malissa Siemantel updated and presented the case against Rebecca Diaz. Ms. Diaz represented herself and presented her petition for reinstatement. Ms. Diaz answered questions from the DAG and members of the Board. ALJ Aspinwall closed the hearing.

Open session recessed at 2:18 p.m.

19. Pursuant to Government Code Section [11126\(c\)\(3\)](#), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to Deliberate and Vote on the Above Petition and Disciplinary Matters, Including Stipulations and Proposed Decisions

Closed session convened at 2:23 p.m.

Petition for Reinstatement – Rebecca Diaz, Surrendered Veterinarian License No. 13706

The Board adopted a motion to grant the petition, reinstate the veterinarian license, immediately revoke the license, and place petitioner on probation.

In the Matter of the Accusation and Petition to Revoke Probation Against Balpal S. Sandhu, Veterinarian License No. 13678, AV Veterinary Center, All Creatures Veterinary Center, and Canyon Country Veterinary Hospital, OAH Case No. 2020021167 – Proposed Decision

The Board adopted a motion to reduce prosecution costs, and make minor and technical corrections (per draft Decision and Order).

In the Matter of the Accusation and Petition to Revoke Probation Against Mukand S. Sandhu, Veterinarian License No. 11634, 4 Paws Pet Hospital & Pet Supply, OAH Case No. 2019070628 – Proposed Decision

The Board adopted a motion to reduce prosecution costs, and make minor and technical corrections (per draft Decision and Order).

Closed session adjourned at 3:26 p.m.

Open session reconvened at 3:29 p.m.

The Board [returned to Agenda Items 15.B. and 15.C.](#) at 3:45 p.m.

20. Adjournment Upon Conclusion of Business – Due to technological limitations, adjournment will not be broadcast. Adjournment will immediately follow Closed Session under Item 18, and there will be no other items of business discussed.

Dr. Nunez adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

**Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order. The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.*