



NEWS & VIEWS

June 2002

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Board Information

Continuing Education	1
Delinquent Renewal Fees	1
Update on PAVE	5
Board & Committee Meetings	8

Consultant's Corner

Referrals to Emergency Clinics The Sequel	4
--	---

Enforcement

Disciplinary Actions	6
----------------------------	---

Examination & Licensing

CSB Exam Statistics, 2001	3
RVT Exam Statistics, 2001	5

Inside the Next Issue	7
-----------------------------	---

The Continuing Saga Mandatory Continuing Education (CE) No CE? No License!

By Susan M. Geranen, Executive Officer

Effective January 31, 2002, veterinarian licensees are required to certify that they have completed 36 hours of approved CE during the two years immediately preceding their renewal date as a condition for renewing their veterinary license. The license renewal form has been modified to collect information on completion of 36 hours of mandatory CE.

As a renewing licensee, you are required to certify on your renewal form that you have completed 36 hours of approved CE. For the majority of licensees, marking the "yes" box and signing your renewal form meets the certification requirements.

If you are selected for a random CE audit, you are required to submit copies of CE certificates issued by approved providers (as defined below) showing completion of at least 36 hours of CE courses. Failure to complete the requisite 36 hours of "approved" CE means that your license

cannot be renewed and you must cease the practice of veterinary medicine immediately. Accordingly, it is important that all licensees understand the new mandatory reporting requirements and the consequences of not completing the minimum CE requirements.

This article is part of a continuing effort on the part of the VMB to provide information and to answer questions on mandatory CE.

Random Audits

Each month a certain number of licensees renewing are selected for a random CE audit. Audit letters are mailed approximately 90 days prior to renewal. Licensees selected for audit are required to submit documentation to certify completion of 36 hours of "approved" CE.

Please see CE, page 2

Did You Know?

Effective January 1, 2002, payment of all accrued and unpaid renewal fees is required when renewing a delinquent veterinarian license or RVT registration within five years of the expiration date. For instance, Dr. X's license expired on April 30, 1999. He decides on June 13, 2002, that he wants to renew his license. Dr. X

is now required to pay for the past renewal cycle AND the current renewal fee PLUS a delinquent fee of \$25. If the license is expired for more than five years, the Dr. X could then petition the board for reinstatement with full payment of required fees (see Business & Professions Code section 4902 and 4844).

CE, continued from page 1

The following lists the required criteria for certifying completion.

Criteria for Certifying Completion of CE

Certificates of attendance for CE programs must contain the name of the participant (licensee), title of the course/program (topic/subject matter), name of the provider, provider number if applicable, date(s) of the program, and the *actual* hours personally attended by the participant. For large, multi-session or multi-day programs, such as the Western States and Wild West Conferences, a record/log of personal participation listing the individual/specific subject sessions and *actual* hours attended by the participant must be submitted with the certificate of attendance. The certificate of attendance must indicate maximum hours possible at the conference.

I cannot emphasize it enough that effective with the renewal period ending on January 31, 2002, in order to renew your license to practice in California you must certify that you completed 36 hours of “approved” CE. There is a signature line on the license renewal form that you must sign to certify completion in order to renew your license. Licenses cannot be renewed without this certification. The VMB does *not* have the legal discretion to waive this requirement. For licensees being audited, it is the responsibility of the individual licensee to prove attendance and completion prior to renewing their California license.

Questions and Answers

Q What is a CE hour?

A An approved CE hour is a minimum of 50 minutes of instruction. Individual courses that are less than 50 minutes will not be accepted. After the first 50 minutes of instruction, approved CE can be approved in minimum increments of 25 minutes. For instance, a single course that is offered between 11:00 and 11:30 a.m. would not meet the minimum requirement of 50 minutes and would not be approved for purposes of renewal. A course offered between 10:00 a.m. and 11:05 would be approved for one CE hour.

Q I am planning to attend a conference next month. How do I find out if it is approved for California?

A If you need the CE hours for your license renewal, you must verify whether a course is “approved” prior to taking the course. You can find lists of approved CE providers, both statutorily approved and private vendors, through the VMB’s web site at www.vmb.ca.gov.

Q For large multi-session conferences, how do I compute the hours attended?

A Conferences such as the Wild West and Western States are required to print the maximum possible hours that can be completed by an individual licensee on the completion certificate. For instance, a

conference may offer a total of 100 hours of courses, but one person going to all possible courses may only be physically able to attend a maximum of 38 hours. The VMB cannot approve any more than what is listed as maximum possible hours. A certificate submitted recently by a licensee contained language stating that maximum hours were 38. The licensee had completed a supplemental form listing the courses he attended for a total of 46 hours. Since 46 hours was impossible for any one person to complete, that licensee would be asked to explain the discrepancy.

If you attend less than the maximum possible, it is your responsibility to document your actual hours accrued on the log of personal participation included with your conference information.

“There are no provisions within the law to extend the time period for renewing the license without adequate CE.”

Q What happens if I am audited and I do not have enough CE hours to meet the minimum requirement of 36 hours?

A There are no provisions within the law to extend the time period for renewing the license without adequate CE. Without proof of completion of a minimum of 36 hours of CE you cannot renew your California license and you must stop practicing immediately.

Q Can I renew as inactive without completing my CE?

A Yes. You can renew with an inactive status, but you cannot practice in California with an inactive license.

Q What if I renew as inactive and then later I decide that I need to practice. What do I need to do to activate my license?

A Converting an inactive license to an active license requires the same documentation as if you were being audited. You must submit proof of attendance for 36 hours of approved CE completed during the two years immediately preceding renewal.

Q I am scheduled to take a course that starts in one renewal period and ends in another. Can I count it for purposes of renewal?

A Yes and no. Approved CE must be completed in the renewal period in which you expect to receive credit. For instance, a course that begins in one renewal cycle and is completed in the next renewal cycle can only be credited to the second renewal period.

Q I noticed that there are provisions for exemptions for undue hardship. What would constitute an undue hardship?

A The law defines undue hardship as follows: A licensee may request a waiver from all 36 hours of continuing education due to specific circumstances as stated below:

Please see MORE CE, page 8

California State Board Examination Statistics

	April 16, 2001			December 17, 2001		
	Pass	Fail	Pass %	Pass	Fail	Pass%
AVMA Approved Schools						
Auburn University	1	0	100	2	0	100
University of California, Davis	3	0	100	76	31	71
Colorado State University	6	0	100	8	5	62
Cornell University	2	1	67	6	4	60
University of Florida	5	0	100	2	1	67
University of Georgia	2	0	100	0	0	0
University of Guelph, Ontario	0	0	0	1	0	100
University of Illinois	5	0	100	3	4	43
Iowa State University	2	0	100	2	1	67
Kansas State University	4	0	100	4	5	44
Louisiana State University	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan State University	4	0	100	4	1	80
University of Minnesota	2	0	100	1	4	20
Mississippi State University	2	1	67	0	2	0
University of Missouri	1	0	100	0	0	0
University of Montreal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Royal Veterinary College, London	0	0	0	0	0	0
University of Glasgow	2	0	100	0	2	0
University of Utrecht	0	0	0	0	1	0
North Carolina State University	1	0	100	1	0	100
Ohio State University	1	0	100	4	0	100
Oklahoma State University	1	0	100	1	6	14
Oregon State University	2	1	67	5	3	63
University of Pennsylvania	4	1	80	3	7	30
University of Prince Edward	2	1	67	2	3	40
Purdue University	4	0	100	0	2	0
University of Saskatchewan	1	0	100	0	1	0
University of Tennessee	0	0	0	1	1	50
Texas A & M University	5	1	83	0	0	0
Tufts University	4	0	100	3	0	100
Tuskegee Institute	2	2	50	1	3	25
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	2	0	100	3	5	38
Washington State University	5	0	100	4	1	80
University of Wisconsin	1	0	100	1	2	33
TOTAL	76	8	90	138	95	59
Non-AVMA Approved Schools						
Africa	1	0	100	0	0	0
Egypt	0	0	0	0	1	0
England	1	0	100	0	0	0
Germany	0	0	0	1	2	33
India	6	2	75	0	3	0
Ireland	1	0	100	0	0	0
Korea	0	0	0	1	2	33
Mexico	0	0	0	0	1	0
Nigeria	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pakistan	0	0	0	1	0	100
Philippines	3	1	75	0	2	0
Russia	0	1	0	0	0	0
Scotland	1	0	100	0	0	0
West Indies	4	0	100	3	5	38
TOTAL	17	4	81	6	17	26
OVERALL TOTAL	93	12	89	144	112	56

Referrals to Emergency Clinics - The Sequel

By Kay Hossner, DVM

The article in the last newsletter regarding referrals to emergency clinics proved to be so popular (wait, maybe that was unpopular!) with so much demand for additional information on this fascinating subject that we felt obliged to present "Referrals to Emergency Clinics – The Sequel".

When we last saw our hero, Dr. Sotired, he had just been rudely awakened to the fact that he was in violation of California law because he did not properly inform his client, Mr. Barrister, of his financial interest as a shareholder in LifeSaver Emergency Clinic prior to the referral. After Mr. Barrister stormed out of his clinic Dr. Sotired immediately called an attorney with many questions to clarify this thorny situation.

(Of course, *our* attorney requires a disclaimer, so here goes: The following is not intended to be construed as giving legal advice; you should consult your own attorney regarding any further questions you may have regarding your own unique situation.)

Q How can the requirement for disclosure be met?

A This disclosure may be met by posting a conspicuous sign in an area likely to be seen by all clients (e.g. the reception area) or providing those clients with a written disclosure statement.

Suggested wording for such a disclosure for referral to an emergency clinic might be "This is to inform you that I have (or a member of my family has) a financial interest in (the name of the organization) to which I am referring you for service. You have the right to choose any qualified organization for the purpose of obtaining the services that have been ordered or requested."

Q Is this information required to be included in the after-hours telephone message for emergency referrals?

A The law requires the notice of disclosure be made in writing; at the same time the law provides that the disclosure may be met by posting a sign or providing the clients with a written disclosure statement. The apparent intent is to put clients on notice that the licensee has interest in the facility to which the client is referred. It is less clear what sort of notice if any is required for the telephone message that refers to an emergency hospital. It would appear to be consistent with the intent of this law that a similar statement be made on the answering machine.

Q Does the disclosure apply only to referrals to emergency clinics?

A No. It applies to any business to which the veterinarian makes a referral and has a significant beneficial interest. The wording may have to be changed to address the situation. For example, a veterinarian employee of a large veterinary corporation needs to disclose that (s)he is referring to a specialist who is part of the same corporate group.

Q Does this information also have to be included on the sign posted at the entrance of the veterinary facility (also required under minimum standards) stating the telephone number and location where pre-arranged veterinary care is available when the facility is closed (e.g. at lunch or overnight)?

A Yes, if you have a significant beneficial interest in the other facility the disclosure must be included.

Q Most emergency clinics refer clients back to their regular veterinarian after the patient is released. If this veterinarian/practice has an interest in the emergency clinic, must an emergency clinic meet the same disclosure requirements?

A Yes. The easiest way would be for the emergency clinic to list all the shareholder practices utilizing the same general wording used in the example above.

Q Must an emergency clinic also include the disclosure on the sign required to be posted at the entrance stating where pre-arranged veterinary care is available when they are closed (e.g. during daytime hours)?

A Yes. Again, a list of the shareholder practices must be included in the disclosure.

Q It was noted in the previous article that while a veterinarian may refer to any emergency clinic that he/she prefers, if he/she has full knowledge that this facility provides inadequate care that results in the compromise of the patient's health, or if the facility is so far away that a patient's health is compromised due to the length of time required getting there, this could be providing unprofessional care and could constitute Unprofessional Conduct. Does this require a practitioner to refer to the closest competent emergency facility (i.e. closest to their practice?) Since a referring veterinarian's client base is spread out over a geographic area, should he/she refer to more than one competent emergency facility (if possible) so the client can choose which facility is closer?

Please see SEQUEL, page 5

California Registered Veterinary Technician Examination Statistics

	March 27, 2001				August 28, 2001			
	Candidates	Pass	Fail	Pass %	Candidates	Pass	Fail	Pass %
Approved CA Community Colleges:								
Cosumnes River College	7	4	3	57	16	13	3	81
Foothill College	3	2	1	67	19	18	1	95
Harnell College	3	3	0	100	6	5	1	83
Pierce College	8	5	3	63	8	5	3	63
Mt. San Antonio	12	4	8	33	17	8	9	47
San Diego Mesa College	6	2	4	33	26	22	4	85
Yuba College	4	1	3	25	8	6	2	75
Approved CA Private Schools:								
San Joaquin Valley College, Bakersfield	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
San Joaquin Valley College, Fresno	23	6	17	26	20	5	15	25
Lawton School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Western Career College, Sacramento	52	18	34	35	22	7	15	32
Western Career College, S.L.	16	5	11	31	21	8	13	38
Out-of-State Approved Schools								
B.S. Degree in A.S. Related Field	19	15	4	79	23	13	10	57
Coursework/Practical Experience	20	15	5	75	22	15	7	68
Out-of-State Certified RVT's	2	2	0	100	6	3	3	50
Cal Poly Pomona	10	3	7	30	10	5	5	50
DVM Foreign Graduate	14	3	11	21	16	7	9	44
Totals:	209	91	118	44	256	154	102	60

Update on PAVE

An article in the last newsletter reported that an accord had been reached between the American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB) and the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) regarding a joint foreign veterinary graduate program. Unfortunately, based on concerns about liability issues raised by its legal counsel, the AVMA rejected the tentative agreement.

Despite the AVMA's rejection of the proposed agreement regarding the PAVE program, representatives from both the AVMA and the AAVSB recognized the value of fostering a collegial relationship between the two associations for purposes of joint collaboration in appropriate areas. The AAVSB commended the members of the AVMA delegation for their sincere efforts and open minds. If nothing else, the discussions were productive and served to clarify the separate and distinct roles of the two organizations. While the final product of the intense negotiations resulted in both the AAVSB and the AVMA moving ahead with separate foreign graduate programs, it appears that both groups emerged from the meetings with a better understanding of the issues and each other. The AAVSB, and the California Board, remain committed to improved and appropriate communication in the future in common areas where joint efforts can be effective.

Meanwhile, PAVE continues. As requested by member boards, the AAVSB Executive Committee has resumed the PAVE program. The first administration of the new Qualifying Examination will be on Thursday, August 15, 2002.

SEQUEL, Continued from page 4

A There is no "one-size-fits-all" answer to this question because of the wide range of variation in locations of emergency facilities, the geographic spread of the clients, and the varying types of emergencies that might occur. A veterinarian must use his/her best professional judgment in making the determination of what is in the best interests of his/her own patients in the majority of situations that might arise.

Dr. Sotired and his attorney consulted the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act, Business and Professions Code, Section 654.2 – Prohibited Referrals and Billings. After reviewing this Code Section and a few others, Dr. Sotired is now aware of all the fine, stimulating reading available in the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act and plans to read a few sections each evening prior to retiring. (At least if he isn't able to stay awake for long he will become somewhat more familiar with the Practice Act and know where he can look up other information as questions arise!)

Disciplinary Actions & Reinstatements

Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 4883, the Veterinary Medical Board (VMB) has the authority to discipline licensed veterinarians, registered veterinary technicians, and veterinary hospitals. Disciplinary penalties are determined based on a number of factors, including, but not limited to, severity and recency of the offense, rehabilitation evidence, current ability to practice safely, mitigating factors, and past disciplinary history. In addition, the VMB has established Disciplinary Guidelines specific to each of the grounds for discipline in Section 4883. The Guidelines are published in its Practice Act.

Detailed disciplinary documents are available to the public and can be obtained via written request to the VMB at 1420 Howe Avenue, Suite 6, Sacramento CA 95825-3228.

Registered Veterinary Technicians

Meg Jacobs, RVT #880, La Honda, California. Full revocation of Registered Veterinary Technician registration by default effective June 16, 2001. **Basis for discipline:** Ordering animal related supplies for her own personal use and billing the supplies to the City's account for payment; depositing into her personal bank account checks made out to Rohnert Park Animal Shelter; and performing unauthorized practices such as surgery, diagnosis and prognosis of animal diseases, and prescribing of drugs, medicine and appliances.

Faith Mary Froeder, RVT, San Diego, California. Revocation stayed/Three years probation effective December 15, 2001. **Basis for discipline:** In a stipulated agreement, Ms. Froeder stipulated that cause for discipline existed based on past criminal convictions, and multiple misdemeanor convictions.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Three Years

Probation include:

1. Submit biological fluid samples
2. Other standard terms and condition of probation.

Denise Swanson aka Denise Rae Walton, RVT #5172, Rio Linda, California. Full revocation of license by default effective February 24, 2002. **Basis for revocation:** Conviction by the court of obtaining a controlled substance by fraud, and unprofessional conduct.

Veterinarians

Neal David Spiro, DVM #9995, Hanford, California. Revocation stayed/Three years probation effective June 15, 2001. **Basis for discipline:** In a stipulated agreement, Dr. Spiro agreed that cause for discipline existed based on prescribing, dispensing or furnishing dangerous drugs without establishing veterinarian-client-patient relationship with the animal patient or patients and its owner or the owner's authorized agent; failing to maintain premise permit; and recordkeeping violations.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Three Years of

Probation include:

1. Continuing education
2. Limitation on practice
3. Written examination
4. Other standard terms and conditions of probation.

In addition, Dr. Spiro was ordered to pay the Board its cost of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$5,000 and a \$1,000 fine.

Grant Maurer, DVM #4628, Portland, Oregon. Revocation stayed/Five years probation. **Basis for discipline:** In a stipulated agreement, Dr. Maurer stipulated that cause for discipline existed based on disciplinary action taken by another state for acts substantially related to the practice of veterinary medicine.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Five Years of

Probation include:

1. Compliance with Oregon probation
2. Oregon compliance documentation
3. Return to and absence from state/practice
4. Abstain from controlled substances
5. Abstain from alcohol use
6. Submit biological fluid samples
7. Other standard terms and conditions of probation.

In addition, Dr. Maurer was ordered to pay the Board its cost of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$1,749.

Edward Pygatt, DVM #2715, Long Beach, California.

Revocation stayed/Six years probation effective July 20, 2001.

Basis for discipline: Negligence, incompetence, unprofessional conduct, and incomplete recordkeeping.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Six Years or

Probation include:

1. Practice only under the supervision of a veterinarian approved by the Board
2. Supervisors acknowledgement of this Decision
3. Supervisors monthly report to the Board
4. Twenty hours per year (for each year of probation) of educational programs in orthopedics, radiology, critical care and surgery, in addition to the Continuing Education required of all licensees.
5. Intensive clinical training
6. Oral, clinical or written examination
7. Other standards terms and conditions of probation.

In addition, Dr. Pygatt was ordered to pay the Board its cost of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$4,487.

Mei-Chun Wu, DVM #13494, Anaheim Hills, California. Revocation stayed/Three years probation effective August 11, 2001. **Basis for discipline:** In a stipulated agreement, Dr. Wu stipulated that cause for discipline existed based on negligence and/or incompetence in the surgery and post-operative treatment of a patient, and improper recordkeeping.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Three Years of Probation include:

1. Continuing Education
2. Oral, clinical, or written examination
3. Other terms and conditions of probation.

In addition, Dr. Wu was ordered to pay the Board its cost of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$2,450.

Michael Stuart Ford, DVM, Santa Maria, California. Revocation stayed/Three years probation effective August 11, 2001. **Basis for discipline:** In a stipulated agreement, Dr. Ford stipulated that cause for discipline existed based upon his veterinary license having been disciplined in another jurisdiction for an act substantially related to the practice of veterinary medicine.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Three Years of Probation include:

1. Compliance with out of state discipline
2. Continuing education
3. NBEC Disciplinary Exam
4. Other terms and conditions of probation.

Paula S. Johnson, DVM #6532, La Mesa, California. Revocation of license by default effective August 11, 2001. **Basis for discipline:** Convicted by a jury of three counts of failure to care for animals; negligence; incompetence; and animal cruelty.

Marc Laxineta, DVM #8259, Murrieta, California. Revocation stayed/Five years probation effective December 15, 2001. **Basis for discipline:** In a stipulated agreement, Dr. Laxineta stipulated that cause for discipline existed based on cruelty to animals, aiding or abetting unlicensed practice, and unprofessional conduct.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Five Years Probation include:

1. Actual suspension for 45 days
2. Continuing education
3. Psychotherapy
4. Community service
5. Other standard terms and conditions of probation.

In addition, Dr. Laxineta was ordered to pay the Board its cost of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$5,106.

Michael Tracy, DVM #5536, Diamond Bar, California. Revocation of veterinary license stayed/Five years probation effective February 23, 2002. Premises registration suspended until such time as all minimum standards are maintained and all violations are corrected. **Basis for discipline:** In a stipulated agreement, Dr. Tracy stipulated that cause for discipline existed

based on negligence, incompetence, unprofessional conduct and violations in recordkeeping.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Five Years Probation include:

1. Actual suspension for 15 days
2. Continuing education
3. Written examination
4. Other standard terms and conditions of probation.

In addition, Dr. Tracy was ordered to pay the Board a fine in the amount of \$1,000, and the cost of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$6,885.

James C. Platte, DVM #8272, La Verne, California. Full revocation of license by default effective February 18, 2002. **Basis for revocation:** Use of or prescribing for or administering to himself a controlled substance, use of a dangerous drug or alcoholic beverages to the extent or in a manner dangerous or injurious to himself, another person, or the public, or to the extent that the use impairs his ability to practice veterinary medicine safely. Dr. Platte is ordered to pay the Board its cost for investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$7,534.

Sharon Leangelita Zito, DVM #9375, San Diego, California. Revocation stayed/Five years probation effective February 24, 2002. **Basis for discipline:** In a stipulated agreement, Dr. Zito stipulated that cause for discipline existed based on negligence, permitting the unauthorized practice of veterinary surgery, aiding or abetting the unauthorized practice of veterinary surgery, assisting or abetting the violation of regulations, and deception. **Mandatory Terms and Conditions During Five Years Probation include:**

1. Actual suspension for 5 days
2. Supervised practice
3. Community service
4. Other standard terms and conditions of probation.

In addition, Dr. Zito was ordered to pay the Board a fine in the amount of \$2,000, and the cost of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$5,180.

Steven Hee Noh, DVM #9167, Oakland, California. Full revocation of license by default effective February 22, 2002. **Basis for revocation:** Violation of probation ordered pursuant to prior discipline.

Inside The Next Issue . . .

- Internet Pharmacies
- Board Policy Highlights
- Legislative & Regulatory Update
- Executive Officer Update
(AAVSB Annual Meeting)

- a. For at least one year during your current license period, you were or will be absent from California due to military service; or
- b. For at least one year during your current license period you were or will be prevented from practicing veterinary medicine or from completing continuing education courses for the following reasons of health or undue hardship which includes;
 1. Significant physical or mental disability.
 2. Significant physical or mental disabilities of an individual where you have total responsibility for the care of that individual.

Since there is no limit on CE obtained via approved Internet providers, in an undue hardship situation, the expectation is that the hardship would be significant enough to prevent the veterinarian from practicing.

The VMB is also in the process of further defining its program requirements and will be publishing any changes or updates so that veterinarians have the most accurate information possible.

NOTE: The VMB's Executive Officer is available for presentations on CE requirements. Presentations given by the Executive Officer on any subject related to board business are designed to educate licensees and to insure compliance with the laws governing veterinary medicine in California.

Veterinary Medical Board

Registered Veterinary Technician Committee

1420 Howe Avenue, Suite 6
Sacramento, CA 95825-3228
Toll Free: 866-229-0170
Phone: 916-263-2610
Fax: 916-263-2621
E-Mail: vmb@dca.ca.gov
Website: <http://www.vmb.ca.gov>

Board Members

Ellen O'Connor, Public Member, President
Nancy Collins, DVM, Vice President
Ronald Biron, Public Member
Gregory L. Ferraro, DVM
Michael G. Kerfoot, DVM
Roger T. Roach, DVM
Julia Warren, Public Member

Committee Members

Linda Zachritz, JD, Public Member, Chair
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, Vice Chair
Kathleen Cicotte, RVT
Alex Henderson, RVT
Richard Johnson, DVM

Susan M. Geranen, Executive Officer

2002 Meeting Calendar Board & Committees

July 10-11, 2002 (Davis)
September 18-19, 2002*
October 23-24, 2002*
January 14-15, 2003*

The Veterinary Medical Board (VMB) holds quarterly board and committee meetings throughout California to discuss various topics relating to the VMB such as legislation, law changes, licensure, and examinations. The Board has dedicated a portion of each meeting to receive public comments. Meetings are open to the public unless otherwise noted.

If you have any questions regarding the meetings, or if you would like to be added to the mailing list to receive agendas and regulatory notices, please contact the Board.

Attendance at Board meetings is encouraged and welcomed!

**Locations to be determined*

PRSR STD
U.S.POSTAGE
PAID
SACRAMENTO, CA
PERMIT NO. 685