

**MEETING MINUTES
VETERINARY MEDICAL BOARD**

**Mission Inn Hotel
3649 Mission Inn Avenue
Riverside, California 92501**

10:00 a.m. Wednesday, April 17, 2019

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

Dr. Jaymie Noland called the Veterinary Medical Board (Board) meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Executive Officer, Ms. Jessica Sieferman, called roll; seven members of the Board were present, and a quorum was established.

2. Board President's Remarks, Board Member Comments and Introductions

Members Present

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

Staff Present

Jessica Sieferman, Executive Officer
Robert Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager
Moneel Singh, Administrative Program Manager
Amanda Drummond, Administrative Program Analyst
Tara Welch, Legal Counsel

Guests Present

Leslie Boudreau, California Registered Veterinary Technicians Association (CaRVTA)
Katherine Buff, RVT, County of Riverside
Mark Cushing, Animal Policy Group
Nancy Ehrlich, CaRVTA
Stacey Evans, Stacey Evans Consulting, LLC
Valerie Fenstermaker, California Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA)
Charis Fifield, VETCBD
Cindy Gonzalez, County of Riverside
Nancy Grittman, American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB)

Paul Hansbury, Lovingly and Legally Grown
Jeffrey Leacox, Esq., Greenberg Traurig
Bonnie Lutz, Esq.
Max Mikalonis, K Street Consulting
Grant Miller, DVM, CVMA
Elaine Myers, CaRVTA
John Pascoe, DVM, University of California, Davis (UC Davis)
Ken Pawlowski, DVM, CVMA
Emma Perez-Singh, County of Riverside
Jaymie Peyton, DVM, UC Davis
Jeff Pollard, DVM, Board Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC)
Tim Shu, DVM, VETCBD
Richard Sullivan, DVM
Susan Tibbon, Lovingly and Legally Grown
David Urrutia, County of Riverside

3. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

No public comments were received.

4. Review and Approval of January 23-24, 2019 Board Meeting Minutes

The Board made minor changes to the January 23-24, 2019 meeting minutes. Dr. Noland also clarified that in her Board President Report at the January 2019 meeting, the \$10 million in cannabis research to be requested by Assemblymember Kalra in a new cannabis bill would be for human research, and Assemblymember Kalra's office was researching whether some of those funds could be allocated to animal cannabis research.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion carried 7-0.

5. Report and Update from Department of Consumer Affairs

Ms. Sieferman reported on behalf of the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA), which provided a letter report as a DCA representative was unable to attend the meeting. The Board inquired as to the status of the Executive Officer salary study, and Ms. Sieferman advised that DCA is aiming for the end of April for the study to be completed.

6. Review, Discussion, and Possible Action on Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC) Report

A. Overview of the April 16, 2019 MDC Meeting

Dr. Jeff Pollard, MDC Chair, addressed the Board regarding the MDC discussion. Dr. Pollard provided an overview of the corporate practice discussion that the MDC held, including a review of approximately 500 survey results regarding corporate practice. The Board asked about the bias of the survey and the control of the survey results, and Ms. Sieferman advised that the intent of the survey was not to provide a statistical analysis, but just to identify if corporate practice is an issue and if it requires further research. Members of the public also provided their input on the discussion, including to encourage the Board to conduct further research into the issue before pursuing any legislative changes. Dr. Pollard advised that the survey would remain open and the MDC would continue working on this issue. The MDC also discussed the development of the cannabis discussion guidelines. The Board and members of the public discussed this issue, and Dr. Pollard advised that with current pending legislation, the MDC guidelines may change. The cannabis discussion guidelines will continue to be a topic at July MDC meeting, and the MDC will be providing their final recommendations to the Board before the January 2020 deadline.

B. MDC Recommendations to Amend Sections 2035.5 and 2030.6, Article 4, Division 20, Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Regarding Minimum Standards and Protocols for Shelter Medicine

Dr. Pollard presented the language approved by the MDC at the January meeting regarding minimum standards and protocols for shelter medicine. Members of the public provided recommended changes for the Board to consider for clarity and consistency purposes. The Board made the following changes to the proposed language:

- Amend CCR section 2035.5 (g) to add “by an RVT, VACSP, or veterinary assistant” so the sentence will read “Rabies vaccines may be administered by an RVT, VACSP, or veterinary assistant to an owned animal...” for clarity purposes.
- Amend CCR section 2030.6 (r)(1) to add the term “surgery” so the sentence will read “A surgery room, separate and distinct from all other rooms” for consistency with the other subsections.
- Amend CCR section 2030.6 (r)(4) to replace the term “surgical” with “surgery” so the sentence will read “The surgery room shall not contain a functional sink with an open drain” for consistency with the other subsections.
- Amend CCR section 2030.6 (r)(5) to strike “...when aseptic surgery services are provided” as it was redundant.
- Ms. Jennifer Loreda moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to approve the proposed regulatory changes as modified, direct the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, authorize the Executive Officer to make any technical or non-substantive changes to the rulemaking package, notice the proposed text for a 45-day public comment period, and if no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, adopt the proposed regulatory changes. The motion carried 7-0.

7. Interviews, Discussion, and Possible Appointment to Fill Vacant Veterinarian MDC Position

Dr. Noland addressed the Board that there was one vacancy on the MDC for a veterinarian position and five applications were received. Of the five applications, two were chosen to be interviewed by the Board. The Board interviewed Dr. Richard Sullivan and Dr. Jaymie Peyton for the vacancy of the veterinarian position with the MDC. Both Dr. Sullivan and Dr. Peyton provided an overview of their experience, skills, and background, and answered questions posed by the Board.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to appoint Dr. Richard Sullivan to the vacant veterinarian position on the MDC. The motion carried 7-0.

8. Update, Discussion, and Possible Board Action on 2019 Legislation

A. Update on Pet Cremation Legislative Proposal

Ms. Sieferman provided an update that staff and legal counsel met with DCA and the California Cemetery and Funeral Bureau (CFB) about this issue, and CFB advised during their sunset review that they would work with DCA in the future to research this issue and propose solutions at a later time. Ms. Sieferman advised that further research is required at this time, and she does not anticipate any further legislation on these issues this session.

B. Assembly Bill (AB) 312 (Cooley, 2019) State government: administrative regulations: review

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of AB 312, which was introduced in response to the Little Hoover Commission's 2011 Report. This bill would require each state agency, by January 1, 2022, to review all regulations and identify any outdated regulations. It would be a huge undertaking, and per the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis, it would cost the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) \$2 million to implement and would require over \$10 million in general and special funds to implement. The bill is currently on suspense.

Ms. Sieferman stated that the concept was important, and she is dedicated to reviewing the current regulations and identifying any outdated information; but at this high fiscal cost and with the strict timeline, the bill is unnecessary.

- Ms. Kathy Bowler moved and Ms. Alana Yanez seconded the motion to watch AB 312. The motion carried 6-0-1. Dr. Christina Bradbury abstained.

The Board also discussed starting to work on this issue preemptively, as it is a large task, and recommended sending the task to the MDC.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse seconded the motion to delegate to the MDC to review current regulations and identify any regulations that are duplicative, overlapping, or outdated. The motion carried 7-0.

C. AB 366 (Bloom, 2016) Animals: blood, blood components, and biologics

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of AB 366 regarding animal blood banks. The hearing for this bill is set for April 25, 2019, and it is currently in the Assembly. The bill after January 1, 2020, would eliminate the “closed colony model” for blood banks. The executive committee expressed concerns with this bill, including the safety of the product produced, the volume of the blood products needed, the production and availability of blood production products, and the environment of donor animals. The Board and members of the public held a discussion regarding the closed colony model in comparison to the community model, as well as the intent behind this bill and the quality of life for donor dogs.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse seconded the motion to oppose AB 366. The motion carried 4-2-1. Ms. Kathy Bowler and Ms. Alana Yanez voted no, and Ms. Jennifer Loreda, RVT, abstained.

D. AB 496 (Low, 2019) Business and professions

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of AB 496. She stated that there was little to this bill now and anticipated that it would be changing, as it currently only contained non-substantive changes.

- Dr. Christina Bradbury moved and Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse seconded the motion to watch AB 496. The motion carried 7-0.

E. AB 611 (Nazarian, 2016) Sexual abuse of animals

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of AB 611 regarding sexual abuse of animals. This bill would amend the law to make sexual abuse a misdemeanor for all animals. This bill is with the Senate and has passed through Assembly. Ms. Valerie Fenstermaker noted that Section 2 of the bill, Penal Code section 286.5(b) needs to be revised to change the term “certified veterinary technician” to “registered veterinary technician” as this is the term used in the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act, and the phrase “under the guidance of a licensed veterinarian” should be revised to state “under the supervision of a licensed veterinarian.” Ms. Fenstermaker advised that CVMA also has adopted a support position for this bill.

- Dr. Christina Bradbury moved and Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse seconded the motion to support AB 611. The motion carried 7-0.

F. AB 613 (Low, 2019) Professions and vocations: regulatory fees

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of AB 613 and that this bill would allow boards to make minor incremental changes to their fees without proceeding through the regulatory process. Legal counsel noted that the language would appear only to authorize the Board to make fee increases once every four years through the new process, even though an initial increase in license fees may not be generating the money the Board expected. Ms. Sieferman stated that the bill does not remove the Board’s ability to go through the regular rulemaking process to increase fees as needed and is intended to provide a streamlined means to increase the fees.

- Ms. Kathy Bowler moved and Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse seconded the motion to support AB 613 if amended to clarify the bill does not eliminate the Board's ability to obtain a fee increase via [regulatory] means. The motion carried 7-0.

G. [AB 1230 \(Quirk, 2016\) Veterinary medicine: declawing animals](#)

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of AB 1230 regarding declawing. This bill would prohibit declawing with the exception of therapeutic declaws. The executive committee addressed a concern with the author's office where the bill originally required veterinarians to submit a report for a therapeutic declaw and the Board would be required to investigate the report. The author's office subsequently amended the bill to remove this requirement and instead require the veterinarian to document the therapeutic declaw in the medical record. The Board expressed concerns with outlawing declawing of cats, as it would encourage back-alley declaw procedures, contribute to additional cats not having homes, and that legislation should not dictate the practice of veterinary medicine.

- Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to oppose AB 1230. The motion carried 6-1. Ms. Alana Yanez voted no.

H. [AB 1553 \(Fong, 2016\) Animal impoundment](#)

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of AB 1553 regarding animal impoundment. The bill makes non-substantive and technical changes.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to support AB 1553. The motion carried 7-0.

I. [Senate Bill \(SB\) 53 \(Wilk, 2016\) Open meetings](#)

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of SB 53 regarding opening meetings. This bill would require that any committee, including task forces and subcommittees of two people to be subject to the Open Meeting Act. Ms. Sieferman commented that subcommittees and task forces do not take official action but primarily perform research and make recommendations to the Board. This bill would be inefficient, costly, and make it difficult for the Board to complete tasks without providing public notice.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Dr. Christina Bradbury seconded the motion to oppose SB 53. The motion carried 7-0.

J. [SB 202 \(Wilk, 2016\) Animal blood donors](#)

SB 202 was discussed with AB 366.

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of SB 202 regarding animal blood banks. This bill is different from AB 366, as it does not eliminate the closed colony model, but allows community blood banks and makes the closed colony records available to public records requests.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Dr. Christina Bradbury seconded the motion to support SB 202. The motion carried 7-0.

K. SB 627 (Galgiani, 2016) Medical cannabis and medicinal cannabis products: veterinary medicine

Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of SB 627 regarding medical cannabis in veterinary medicine. This bill would authorize a licensee to recommend, dispense, and administer cannabis to an animal. The Board had concern over the bill regarding the lack of information and research on the effects of cannabis in treating animals and the lack of disciplinary action the Board could take if a veterinarian is negligent or incompetent. Multiple public comments were received in support of this bill and clarified that the bill would not authorize licensees to dispense medical cannabis for animals until it is made federally legal. The Board discussed the qualifications of a veterinarian prior to administering, dispensing, or recommending cannabis to animal patients, including the need to take a continuing education course and what conditions should be met prior to endorsing or recommending cannabis products.

- Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse moved and Ms. Jennifer Loredo seconded the motion to oppose SB 627. The motion carried 5-2. Dr. Christina Bradbury and Ms. Alana Yanez voted no.
- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Dr. Christina Bradbury seconded the motion to delegate to the MDC to determine what conditions must be met for the Board to approve or endorse the recommendations of cannabis products. The motion carried 6-1. Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse voted no.

9. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding SB 1480 (Hill, Chapter 571, Statutes of 2018), Business and Professions Code Section 4829.5, Drug Consultation

Ms. Sieferman advised the Board that there are concerns regarding the FAQ that is posted on the Board’s website, specifically relating to whether a drug consultation is required to be offered for drugs administered at the veterinary premises. The Board and the public discussed the bill, and the Board determined that the terms “dispense” and “furnish” do not include “administration,” and the Board did not interpret the law to require drug consultations for drug administration. Additionally, the Board determined that while the animal is within the hospital, it is up to the veterinarian in charge to monitor the patient for any drug side effects, not the owner, so it would not be necessary to offer to provide drug consultation services for drugs administered at the veterinary premises. Whereas, when the client takes the medication home, the client would need to be advised of the side effects to watch for an adverse event.

The Board and veterinary medicine practitioners determined that outpatient procedures include many surgical procedures, such as spay and neuter procedures and other procedures that may include anesthesia. Board members and the public expressed the significant difficulty and potential harm to the patient in performing outpatient services that may require administration of medication to the animal patient if the veterinarian had to stop treatment to contact the client and offer to provide the drug consultation. Public comment noted that spay and neuter services

provided to the community would be significantly delayed if the veterinarians had to discuss with each client every anesthetic and pre-anesthetic drug that may be given to the animal patient. In addition, community vaccination events would also be significantly delayed if veterinarians had to go through the litany of possible side effects for each vaccination to be given to each animal patient.

Public comment referenced the existing requirement under California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 2032.1, subdivision (b)(3), the veterinarian-client-patient relationship, which requires the veterinarian to communicate with the client a course of treatment appropriate to the circumstance, and that communication includes the drug consultation to the client for drugs administered to the animal patient at the veterinary premises. Public comment expressed that adding a new requirement to provide the drug consultation for drugs administered to the animal patient would be duplicative of the existing regulatory requirement to communicate the treatment plan that includes the drug consultation. Public comment noted that regulation already covers the scenario when the veterinarian administers the drug to the animal patient, and the statute, BPC section 4829.5, covers the scenario for drug consultation when the client administers the medication to the animal patient at home. Further, the significant list of requirements under BPC section 4829.5 are proving confusing for veterinarians trying to comply with the new requirements, which currently have several provisions that would not apply to administered medications. Members of the public also commented on this discussion and echoed the opinions the Board expressed.

10. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Proposed Regulations

A. Status Update on Pending Regulations

Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss this agenda item in detail. Documentation was provided in the Board packet that reflected a status update on pending regulations.

B. Sections 2027 and 2027.5, Article 3, Division 20, Title 16 of the CCR Regarding DVM Graduates – Veterinary Technician Registration

Due to time constraints, the Board held this discussion on the second day of meetings. Legal counsel, Ms. Tara Welch, provided an overview of this topic. In January 2017, the Board looked at this topic and the existing regulation that authorized DVM graduates to work as an RVT without obtaining registration. Last year, legislation passed that closed that loophole. The Board was presented with the language previously approved by the Board that will be brought back to the Board in July with amendments to reflect the new statute for their consideration and review. Additionally, the Board will discuss at the July meeting if they wish to authorize veterinary students who have not graduated to take the RVT examination, and how much schooling should be completed before they are authorized to take that examination.

C. [Sections 2003, Article 1, Section 2017, Article 2, and Section 2042, Article 5, Division 20, Title 16 of the CCR Regarding Consumer Protection Enforcement Initiative \(CPEI\)](#)

Due to time constraints, the Board held this discussion on the second day of meetings.

Ms. Amanda Drummond addressed the Board that the CPEI rulemaking was noticed by OAL on March 8, 2019, and the comment period for this regulatory package remains open from March 8 until April 22, 2019. To date, one comment was received. Ms. Drummond provided a summary of the comment and a recommended response of the Board for their consideration. The Board made minor amendments to the comment, including that while they understand the concerns raised in the comment, that the Board lacks the authority or resources to provide mental health services to licensees, but that licensees are encouraged to utilize the resources provided by professional organizations.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Ms. Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to approve the recommended response, as amended, to the CPEI comment received. The motion carried 7-0.

11. [Update, Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding Uniform Standards for Substance Abusing Licensees Subcommittee Report](#)

Due to time constraints, the Board held this discussion on the second day of meetings.

Dr. Mark Nunez provided an update from the subcommittee on behalf of himself and Ms. Kathy Bowler. Previously, the Board approved language and chose option 3 to trigger the uniform standards following determination by a judge that a licensee is a substance abuser. Ms. Sieferman provided an overview of the research that the DCA Substance Abuse Coordination Committee has conducted and their findings. Dr. Nunez provided their recommendations and updated the he and Ms. Bowler will review the recommendations from the DCA Substance Abuse Coordination Committee to incorporate into the Board regulatory proposal. Ms. Sieferman advised that she will take the recommendations and formulate them to model conditions to ensure there is no confusion on how to implement these conditions and bring the results to the July meeting.

12. [Update, Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding the Administration of the California Veterinary Technician Examination](#)

Ms. Sieferman addressed the Board and stated that this topic was discussed at the January meeting when the Board requested research be completed to determine if the California Veterinary Technician Examination (CVTE) and Veterinary Technician National Examination (VTNE) could be combined into one examination to help eliminate costs for RVTs. Ms. Sieferman reviewed the CVTE and determined that there were no gaps between the CVTE and the VTNE, and that the CVTE is a jurisprudence examination and is not meeting the requirements in statute to qualify this examination to remain. Ms. Sieferman advised that the

Board has the ability to unapprove the CVTE and that there are other options to ensure that RVTs understand the regulations, including an affidavit. AAVSB provided a comparative analysis for the Board and determined that the VTNE does meet the needs for California RVTs to become licensed. Additional public comment received from stakeholders encouraged the Board to unapprove the CVTE as it presents as a financial barrier to RVTs obtaining initial licensure.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved that the Board pursue through legislation and develop an affidavit under penalty of perjury that the RVT applicants have read the California regulations and legislation and eliminate the CVTE. The motion was withdrawn.
- Dr. Christina Bradbury moved and Ms. Jennifer Loredo seconded the motion to unapprove the CVTE that is currently being administered. The motion carried 7-0.

13. Review and Possible Approval of Records Retention Schedule

Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss this agenda item.

14. Board President Report – Jaymie Noland, DVM

Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss this agenda item.

15. Registered Veterinary Technician Report – Jennifer Loredo, RVT

Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss this agenda item.

16. Executive Officer and Staff Reports

A. Administrative/Budget

Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss this agenda item in detail. Documentation was provided in the Board packet that reflected a status update on administration/budgets.

B. Enforcement

Due to time constraints, the Board held this discussion on the second day of meetings.

Mr. Robert Stephanopoulos addressed the Board and provided a brief update on the enforcement unit and the statistics contained in the report, including how a change in processing will help reduce Attorney General (AG) costs. Mr. Stephanopoulos stated that staff has been proactive in working with the AG's office and reduced the timelines for pending cases. The Board also discussed subject matter expert trainings and ways to improve upon the processes and recommendations from experts.

C. Licensing/Examination

Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss this agenda item in detail. Documentation was provided in the Board packet that reflected a status update on licensing/examinations.

D. Hospital Inspection

Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss this agenda item in detail. Documentation was provided in the Board packet that reflected a status update on hospital inspections.

E. Strategic Plan Update

Due to time constraints, the Board did not discuss this agenda item in detail. Documentation was provided in the Board packet that reflected a status update on the strategic action plan.

17. Future Agenda Items

Due to time constraints, the Board held this discussion on the second day of meetings.

Dr. Noland inquired as to the status of the July meeting, as members of the public are having a difficult time finding affordable lodging. Ms. Siefertman advised that she is working to find reasonable accommodations for the July meeting and would update the Board. If accommodations cannot be found in the Bay Area, the Board will hold the meeting in Sacramento.

Ms. Bowler requested that a future agenda item be to have a representative from a lab come and speak to the Board about drug testing results and how to better interpret results for purposes of disciplinary decisions.

18. Recess until Thursday, April 18, 2019, at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting was recessed at 6:05 p.m.

9:00 a.m., Thursday, April 18, 2019

19. Reconvene - Establishment of a Quorum

Dr. Noland called the Board meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Dr. Noland called roll; seven members of the Board were present, and a quorum was established.

20. Introductions

Members Present

Jaymie Noland, DVM, President
Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM, Vice President
Kathy Bowler, Public Member
Christina Bradbury, DVM
Jennifer Loreda, Registered Veterinary Technician (RVT)
Mark Nunez, DVM
Alana Yanez, Public Member

Staff Present

Jessica Sieferman, Executive Officer
Robert Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager
Amanda Drummond, Administrative Program Analyst
Sidney Villareal, Probation Monitor
Tara Welch, Legal Counsel

Guests Present

Patrick Fong, County of Riverside
Lisa Grosso, Petitioner
Vallera J. Johnson, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings
Amanda Jones, Petitioner
Miranda McCroskey, Attorney
Tory Polin, Deputy Attorney General (DAG), Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice
Maria Sanchez, Kennedy Court Reporters

21. Special Order of Business

A. Petition for Reinstatement – Lisa Grosso, Registration No. 9644

ALJ Johnson presided over the petition for reinstatement. DAG Tory Polin updated and presented the case against Ms. Lisa Grosso. Ms. Grosso and her legal representation, Ms. Miranda McCroskey, presented her case for the petition for reinstatement. Ms. Grosso answered questions from the DAG and members of the Board. ALJ Johnson closed the hearing.

B. Petition for Termination of Probation – Amanda Jones, RVT, Registration No. 12441

ALJ Johnson presided over the petition for termination of probation. DAG Tory Polin updated and presented the case against Ms. Amanda Jones. Ms. Jones represented herself and presented her petition for reinstatement. Ms. Jones answered questions from the DAG and members of the Board. ALJ Johnson closed the hearing.

CLOSED SESSION

22. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3), the Board Will Deliberate on Disciplinary Actions.

Petition for Reinstatement – Lisa Grosso, Registration No. 9644

The Board moved to grant the petition for reinstatement of licensure.

Petition for Termination of Probation – Amanda Jones, RVT, Registration No. 12441

The Board moved to grant the petition for termination of probation.

In the Matter of the Accusation Against Samuel A. Thomas, DVM, and Pet Headquarters Veterinary Hospital – Case No. 1002459437

The Board moved to adopt the decision after rejection.

In the Matter of the Accusation Against Glen Weber, DVM - Case No. 4602016000354, OAH No. 2018030477

The Board moved to adopt the decision after rejection and dismiss the accusation.

23. Adjournment

- Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse moved, and Dr. Mark Nunez seconded, to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.