



MEMORANDUM

DATE	April 6, 2026
TO	California Veterinary Medical Board (Board)
FROM	Justin Sotelo, Policy Specialist
SUBJECT	Agenda Item 9. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on 2025-2026 Legislation Impacting the Board, DCA, and/or the Veterinary Profession

Legislation is amended, statuses are updated, and analyses are added frequently; thus, hyperlinks, identified in [blue, underlined text](#), are provided throughout this document to ensure Board members and the public have access to the most up-to-date information. The information below was based on legislation, statuses, and analyses (if any) publicly available on **April 6, 2026**.

A. Priority Legislation for Board Consideration

1. Assembly Bill (AB) [1733](#) (Lee, 2026) License and Registration Renewal: Continuing Education

Status: Assembly Business and Professions Committee

Analysis:

Hearing Date: April 14, 2026

Summary: Currently, veterinarians are required to complete 36 hours of continuing education (CE) credit for license renewal, and Registered Veterinary Technicians (RVTs) are required to complete 20 hours of CE for registration renewal.

As part of the 36 hours, a veterinarian may earn up to six hours combined by taking up to six hours of self-study courses or providing up to four hours of pro bono spay and neuter services, as specified. (BPC, § [4858.1](#), subd. (b)(2).)

Similarly, RVTs may earn up to four hours combined by taking up to four hours of self-study courses or providing up to two hours of animal health care tasks related to spay and neuter services, as specified. (BPC, § [4858.2](#), subd. (b)(2).)

This bill would reorganize the veterinarian and RVT CE statutes to eliminate the combined six-hour cap for self-study courses and pro bono spay and neuter services. Instead, the bill would allow a veterinarian to complete up to six hours of self-study courses and up to four hours of spay and neuter services (up to a total of 10 CE hours of the 36 hours required for license renewal).

The bill would also allow an RVT to complete up to four hours of self-study courses and up to two hours of spay and neuter services (up to a total of six CE hours of the 20 hours required for registration renewal).

In addition, the bill would strike “pro bono” and add “at no cost to” the listed shelters where spay and neuter services may be performed to qualify for CE credit. These amendments would allow the licensee/registrant to claim CE credit while performing spay and neuter services for which the licensee/registrant could be paid, instead of authorizing spay/neuter CE credit for performing these services for free.

According to the bill sponsor (California Animal Welfare Association [CalAnimals]), this is intended to make it clear the organization receiving the benefit is not charged for the veterinarian’s or RVT’s spay/neuter services. The sponsors are not concerned with veterinarians or RVTs being paid by a third party.

With that said, the sponsor believes reorganizing the CE hours to strike the six-hour CE hour cap language and revising the spay and neuter service CE credit from pro bono services to possibly paid services provides more incentive for veterinarians and RVTs to provide the services, as long as the shelter or rescue group were provided the services at no cost.

Staff Comments: At its January 2026 meeting, the Board was [asked](#) to provide informal feedback on CalAnimals’ [draft legislative proposal](#).

While no action was taken, members generally supported the proposal, saying it could motivate veterinarians to participate in hands-on spay and neuter efforts that benefit shelters and address pet overpopulation. Some concerns were noted, including that the services would no longer be pro bono, raising questions about awarding CE credit for paid work, and whether such activities align with the original intent of CE.

Others felt that offering CE credit could encourage practical, in-person experience at a time when virtual CE is increasingly common. Overall, the discussion provided informal feedback and emphasized the need for clear structure and mentorship within shelters.

On March 6, 2026, Board staff reported to the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA), Fiscal Operations/Budget Office that this bill would not have a fiscal impact on the Board and that any associated workload would be minor and absorbable (i.e., minor BreZEze update, Board website update, and outreach to veterinarians and RVTs).

The author's office has provided the [attached](#) fact sheet for AB 1733.

2. **AB 1999 (Kalra, 2026) Veterinary Medicine**

Status: Assembly Business and Professions Committee

Analysis:

Hearing Date: April 14, 2026

Summary: This bill would change California's Veterinarian-Client-Patient Relationship (VCPR) law from "condition-specific" to "patient-specific." California law currently requires a veterinarian to examine an animal for each condition treated in order to establish a valid VCPR. In other states, a VCPR may be established through an examination of the patient within a defined timeframe, after which veterinarians may use professional judgment to determine whether an additional examination is needed for treatment. California's condition-specific model differs from that approach. Some California veterinarians may not be fully aware of the condition-specific requirement, which may create compliance challenges under current law.

Additionally, this bill would create a "retired volunteer" license category at the Board for veterinarians and RVTs who volunteer at shelters, humane societies, or nonprofit animal organizations. This license category would include a reduced licensure fee and fewer administrative requirements.

This bill would also create a "shelter veterinarian" license category to streamline licensure for veterinarians whose employment is limited to animal control shelters or humane societies.

AB 1999 would also improve California's veterinary telemedicine law by incorporating definitions for terms such as "telemedicine," "teleconsultation," and "teletriage," and by updating existing statutory language to clarify how telemedicine may be practiced in the state. Following the passage of AB [1399](#) (Friedman, 2023), some existing regulatory provisions were superseded. The amendments proposed in AB 1999 would address these changes.

Lastly, the bill would narrow California's "owner-exemption" law, which permits animal owners to perform veterinary procedures on their own animals. The current law does not specify species and therefore applies broadly. This can allow non-veterinarians to perform surgical or dental procedures on companion animals. AB 1999 would prohibit owners from

performing surgical or dental procedures on their own dogs and cats while maintaining the exemption for other contexts, including agriculture.

Staff Comments: This measure is co-sponsored by the Board, the California Veterinary Medical Association, San Diego Humane Society, and Social Compassion in Legislation.

The author's office has provided the [attached](#) fact sheet for AB 1999.

As the bill language came from the Board and is co-sponsored by the Board, staff strongly encourages a Support Position.

3. **AB [2010](#) (Soria, 2026) Veterinary Medicine: Veterinary Surgery Premises: Spay and Neuter Services**

Status: Assembly Business and Professions Committee

Analysis:

Hearing Date: April 14, 2026

Summary: This bill would clarify that registered veterinary premises performing high-quality, high-volume spay and neuter services (HQHVSN) are not required to meet certain minimum facility standards set by the Board. Specifically, these spay/neuter operations performed within a registered veterinary premises would be exempt from the following: 1) a requirement for a separate room that is reserved for aseptic surgical procedures that require aseptic preparation; 2) a prohibition on open shelving in the area in which the aseptic surgical sterilization procedure is performed; and, 3) a requirement for equipment for viewing radiographs.

Staff Comments: The topic of HQHVSN and Mobile Animal Sterilization Hospital (MASH) clinics has been discussed by the Board and Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC); most recently, in response to a [letter](#) received from Animal Balance and the San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in July 2025 and a [presentation](#) regarding MASH clinics provided by representatives from Animal Balance and the San Diego Animal Human Society during the October 14, 2025 MDC meeting. Additionally, the MDC further [discussed](#) MASH clinics and minimum standards for alternate veterinary premises at the October meeting. An [overview](#) of the topic was also provided to the Board on October 15, 2025.

On March 10 and March 30, 2026, Board staff reported to the DCA Fiscal Operations/Budget Office that the impacts of this bill would be minor and absorbable, resulting in the following: one-time revisions to Title 24 regulations; updates to inspection procedures/materials/training; outreach to licensees; and, minimal ongoing impact.

The author's office has provided the [attached](#) fact sheet for AB 2010.

The Board's Executive Committee and Executive Officer met with the authors and cosponsors regarding concerns with the March 19, 2026 version. Specifically, the bill would require the HGHVSN services to be performed *in* a veterinary premises. However, it was the understanding from Animal Balance that they would like to provide the services *from* a veterinary premises in large spaces such as gymnasiums.

This bill would also require the veterinary premises to be registered. Currently, if there are mobile premises tied to a fixed facility, the mobile premises would not need to be registered separately. From an implementation standpoint, this would essentially require every "temporary" location to be registered with the Board. This seems unreasonably onerous and expensive for HGHVSN events lasting 1-3 days to apply for and obtain a veterinary premises registration that is good for one year. The amount of time to approve a premises registration application will likely take longer than the event itself.

In addition, the way the bill is worded, it would essentially turn the location (e.g., gymnasium or classroom) into a "small animal fixed veterinary premises" pursuant to CCR section [2030.1](#). veterinary premises, subjecting the location to all requirements under CCR section 2030 and to the California Building Standards Code (BSC) Section 1251.1. BSC Section 1251.1 requires "all veterinary premises" to meet specified requirements, unless otherwise exempted. Some requirements that may be challenging for a classroom, gymnasium, or otherwise large open space to comply with (and what HGHVSN entities may not have any control over) are:

1. Indoor lighting shall be adequate for its intended purpose. *All surgical rooms shall be provided with emergency lighting with a viable power source.*
2. *A reception room and office, or a combination of the two.*
3. *An examination room separate from other areas of the veterinary premises and of sufficient size to accommodate the doctor, assistant, patient and client.*
4. *All floors, doors, table tops, countertops and window coverings shall be nonporous.*
- ..
6. *The temperature and ventilation of the veterinary premises shall be maintained so as to assure the comfort of all patients.*

Mobile veterinary premises, however, would not be subject to the building standards.

4. Senate Bill (SB) [1269](#) (Ochoa Bogh, 2026) Chiropractors: Animal Chiropractic Practitioners

Status: Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

Analysis:
Hearing Date: Unknown

Summary: This bill would create a formal registration program allowing licensed chiropractors to practice animal chiropractic under the oversight of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners (SBCE). Chiropractors would need SBCE registration—based on approved certifications—to treat animals unless they are working under the direct supervision of a veterinarian.

The bill sets standards for animal-chiropractic practice and premises, directs SBCE to establish related registration fees, and authorizes it to adopt necessary regulations in consultation with the Board when animal-care standards are involved. Registered animal chiropractic practitioners would fall under the Chiropractic Act rather than the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act.

Staff Comments: This bill is similar to SB [687](#) (Ochoa Bogh, 2025), which the Board voted to oppose at its April 2025 meeting. [Concerns](#) regarding SB 687 were again shared with the Board at its January 2026. SB 687 died due to legislative deadlines, and the proposal was re-introduced in SB 1269.

On March 9, 2026, Board staff reported to the DCA Fiscal Operations/Budget Office that the impacts of SB 1269 would be minor and absorbable. While the Board would consult with SBCE on their regulations, the bill would mainly impact SBCE for the reasons stated above.

The author's office has provided the [attached](#) fact sheet for SB 1269.

5. **SB [1311](#) (Wahab, 2026) Licensed Professions**

Status: Senate Appropriations Committee
Analysis: 3/20/26 - Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee
Hearing Date: April 13, 2026

Summary: On March 26, 2026, this bill was amended to include the following proposed changes to the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act: requiring that the Governor also appoint the additional RVT member (total of two RVTs) to the Board; modifying the educational requirements to become an RVT to include education provided by a California public school; and making other nonsubstantive changes.

This bill is identified as an urgency bill, meaning it would take effect immediately upon signature by the Governor.

Staff Comments: Since this bill includes specific urgent amendments addressing immediate issues impacting the Board’s composition and legitimate RVT educational programs, staff strongly recommends a support position.

6. **SB [1445](#) (Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development, 2026) Healing Arts**

Status: Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

Analysis:

Hearing Date: Unknown

Summary: SB 1445 is an omnibus healing-arts bill that makes a series of technical, conforming, and minor statutory updates across multiple boards and programs within DCA.

Staff Comments:

The Board’s 2025 Sunset Report requested amendments to BPC section 4887 be included in its Sunset Bill. Unfortunately, those amendments were unintentionally not included in AB 1502. As such, staff recommends the Board take a Support if Amended position and ask for the attached amendments to be included.

In addition, staff recommend the Board consider requesting the following amendments:

- Repealing BPC Section [4840.9](#):
~~Registered veterinary technicians and veterinary assistants may be employed by any veterinarian licensed or authorized to practice in this state or by any governmental agency which employs veterinarians. However, the employer must be fully aware of the provisions of this article as stated by regulations adopted by the board pursuant to Section 4836.~~

Rationale: RVTs and VAs can (and often are) employed by anyone – including unlicensed individuals. This statute does not state they can *only* be employed by veterinarians. If a veterinarian is not providing adequate supervision, the Board has authority to take action.

However, the Board does not have authority over any other governmental agency or otherwise unlicensed employers and could not take action against the employers if they were not fully aware of the article provisions. The Board also would not take action against the RVT or VACSP if the employer wasn’t aware of the requirements. As such this statute appears unnecessary and implies the Board has more authority (and duty to enforce) than it does.

- Repealing BPC Section [4842](#):
~~The board may deny a registered veterinary technician application if the applicant has done any of the following:~~
~~(a) Committed any act that would be grounds for the suspension or revocation of registration under this chapter.~~
~~(b) While unregistered, committed, or aided and abetted the commission of, any act for which a certificate of registration is required by this chapter.~~
~~(c) Knowingly made any false statement in the application.~~
~~(d) Been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a registered veterinary technician.~~
~~(e) Committed any act that resulted in a revocation by another state of the applicant's license, registration, or other procedure by virtue of which one is licensed or allowed to practice veterinary technology in that state.~~

Rationale: BPC Section [4883](#) covers everything under 4842; 4842 is redundant and unnecessary.

- Amending BPC [4826.3](#):
~~(a) Notwithstanding any law, a veterinary technician, veterinary assistant, and veterinary assistant controlled substances permitholder registered in this state shall wear a name tag identification in at least 18 point type in any area of the veterinary premises that is accessible to members of the public. The name tag shall include the veterinary technician, veterinary assistant, and veterinary assistant controlled substances permitholder's name, and, if applicable, the license, registration, or permit type and number issued by the board.~~
~~(b) A person subject to the requirement in subdivision (a) may remove the name tag when working with or handling animal patients.~~
~~(c) This section shall become operative on January 1, 2023.~~

Rationale: Subsection (c) was necessary due to the delayed implementation date. As the delayed implementation date occurred over three years ago, this subsection can be struck.

B. Other Board-Monitored Legislation

1. AB [1558](#) (Arambula, 2026) Uniform Emergency Volunteer Health Practitioners Act

Status: Assembly Health Committee

Analysis:

Hearing Date: Unknown

Summary: This bill would enact the Uniform Emergency Volunteer Health Practitioners Act, expanding how volunteer health professionals—including those providing veterinary services—may be registered and authorized to practice in California during a declared emergency. It allows additional entities to operate approved volunteer registration systems and requires those systems to verify a volunteer’s out-of-state licensure and good standing before they provide services.

The bill sets scope-of-practice rules for volunteers and gives the Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA), licensing boards, and host entities authority to limit or regulate volunteer activities during an emergency. It also exempts registered volunteers from unauthorized-practice laws unless they knowingly act outside permitted limits, authorizes California licensing boards to impose discipline for misconduct during emergency deployments, and deems volunteers state agents for purposes of workers’ compensation.

EMSA would adopt regulations, with approval from the Commission on Emergency Medical Services, to implement the act.

Staff Comments: On March 17, 2026, Board staff reported to the DCA Fiscal Operations/Budget Office that the impacts of this bill would be minor and absorbable. It was further stated that this bill would not create any new or ongoing programs or mandates for the Board; but that it may generate infrequent enforcement or verification activities during emergency declarations, absorbable within existing staff resources.

The author’s office has provided the [attached](#) fact sheet for AB 1558.

Attachments:

1. AB 1733 Fact Sheet
2. AB 1999 Fact Sheet
3. AB 2010 Fact Sheet
4. SB 1269 Fact Sheet
5. Proposed Amendments to BPC section 4887
6. AB 1558 Fact Sheet



ASSEMBLYMEMBER **ALEX LEE** 24TH DISTRICT

AB 1733

VETERINARIAN CONTINUING EDUCATION CREDITS

THIS BILL

AB 1733 updates California’s veterinary continuing education (CE) requirements by separating pro bono spay/neuter (SN) work from the “self-study” category and creating a new, dedicated CE pathway that recognizes up to four hours of no-fee spay/neuter support delivered to shelters and rescue organizations. This modernization increases visibility, encourages volunteer participation, and supports communities struggling with access to affordable spay/neuter care.

BACKGROUND

Under current law, veterinarians must complete **36 hours** of CE every two years, and registered veterinary technicians (RVTs) must complete **20 hours**. CE may currently be satisfied through:

- In-person or online coursework, and
- Limited self-study (reading, recorded content), including pro bono spay/neuter activities.

Currently spay/neuter volunteerism does not have its own category.

PROBLEM

California shelters are experiencing unsustainable overcrowding, increased euthanasia risk, and prolonged length of stay due to the statewide veterinary shortage. Many rely on volunteer veterinarians and RVTs for spay/neuter capacity, yet the current CE structure unintentionally minimizes the value of this contribution and potentially the amount of hours that could be credited. As a result, fewer veterinary professionals volunteer—and shelters struggle to keep up with demand.

SOLUTION

AB 1733 clarifies and expands CE opportunities by creating **three** clearly defined pathways:

1. Self-Study CE

- Reading, webinars, audio/video educational content (up to 6 hours for DVMs; 4 for RVTs).

2. No-Fee Spay/Neuter CE (*new dedicated category*)

- Recognizes up to 4 hours of CE for veterinarians who perform no-fee spay/neuter services for public shelters, humane societies, SPCAs, and rescue groups.

– Recognizes up to 2 hours for RVTs performing qualifying tasks under supervision.

– Must occur at a premises registered with the Veterinary Medical Board.

3. Classroom / Live CE

– Courses, conferences, and workshops provided by approved CE entities.

This bill will expand community spay/neuter access at a time of severe veterinary workforce shortages, recognize and elevate volunteer spay/neuter work to help increase participation, strengthen animal shelter capacity by making free spay/neuter support more attractive and visible, and improves animal welfare outcomes statewide by reducing intake and overcrowding.

SUPPORT (PARTIAL)

California Animal Welfare Association (Sponsor)

CONTACT

Allison Lim, Chief of Staff
Office of Assemblymember Alex Lee
Allison.lim@asm.ca.gov | 916.319.2024

Assembly Bill 1999

Improve Access to Veterinary Care

Assemblymember Ash Kalra

SUMMARY

Assembly Bill (AB) 1999 implements several provisions that will protect the health of domestic animals and improve access to care from qualified veterinary professionals. Specifically, the bill creates streamlined pathways for retired volunteers and out-of-state veterinarians to join shelter veterinary care teams and reduces regulatory inefficiencies that may unnecessarily increase veterinary staff workload. In doing these things, AB 1999 provides the state with more tools to address its ongoing veterinary care shortage.

BACKGROUND

In 2024, the California State Legislature passed ACR 86 (Kalra, Chapter 51, Statutes of 2024), which encouraged the state to address the pet overpopulation crisis by supporting high-volume spay-and-neuter services and filling critical staffing gaps with out-of-state licensed veterinary professionals. Unfortunately, despite the state's efforts to meet these goals, there are still not enough veterinary services available to meet the needs of shelters and private pet owners. Furthermore, the services that do exist are often made less accessible by cumbersome statutes. These issues are felt most acutely by animal shelters, of which [25% lack adequate veterinary staffing and 64% cannot meet their animals' basic medical needs](#).

The impacts of staffing shortages are exacerbated by inefficient statutes, which further reduce existing veterinary staff's limited capacity. Currently, California is one of only two states that still require a veterinarian to re-establish the Veterinarian-Client-Patient Relationship (VCPR) every time a pet owner seeks treatment for their animal. This means that a veterinarian must examine a pet prior to providing any prescription or recommended course of action, even if they already know the animal and its medical history well enough to provide effective guidance for minor issues over the phone or through a messaging platform. While this

inconveniences all pet owners, it distinctly disadvantages low-income owners who often lack the time, transportation, and financial resources to facilitate frequent veterinary visits.

Regulatory impediments aside, animals also suffer from the breadth of the existing owner exemption. This exemption allows animal owners or their unpaid agents to perform various medical procedures on their animals, including surgeries. Because most animal owners have not received a veterinary education, they are unable to safely perform these high-risk procedures, causing needless animal suffering.

SOLUTION

AB 1999 improves access to veterinary care by:

- Creating a "retired volunteer" status for veterinarians and RVTs who wish to provide unpaid, voluntary labor to animal shelters and humane societies.
- Creating a streamlined pathway for out-of-state veterinarians to become licensed "shelter veterinarians".
- Reforming VCPR statute to allow veterinarians to provide care without re-establishing an existing VCPR.

This bill also clarifies veterinary telemedicine statute and narrows the scope of the owner exemption to exclude surgical procedures.

SPONSORS

California Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA)
California Veterinary Medical Board (VMB)
San Diego Humane Society
Social Compassion in Legislation (SCIL)

CONTACT

Marissa Plante, Legislative Aide
Marissa.Plante@asm.ca.gov
(916) 319-2025



Assemblywoman Esmeralda Soria, 27th Assembly District

AB 2010 – The Spay/Neuter Improvement for Pets (SNIP) Act

SUMMARY

Assembly Bill (AB) 2010, the SNIP Act, provides that High-Quality, High-Volume Spay and Neuter (HQHVSN) services performed in a registered veterinary premises do not require a dedicated surgical suite, equipment for viewing radiographs, or an absence of shelving in the room.

BACKGROUND

California is in the midst of a multi-decade pet overpopulation crisis, which has only worsened since the pandemic. While there are many contributing factors to this crisis, the simple fact is that California's veterinary shortage has meant that the number of animals spayed and neutered every year has not kept up with the number of pets that need these services. This has led to severely overcrowded shelters, large numbers of stray and abandoned animals, and tens of thousands of healthy animals euthanized annually. The crisis is even more dire in rural regions like the Central Valley, where the nearest access to spay and neuter services may be an hour away and unaffordable to many disadvantaged communities.

Fortunately, advancements in veterinary surgical practices have led to a pathway to address this growing crisis. While a veterinarian using traditional spay and neuter techniques can help less than 10 animals a day, HQHVSN practitioners can perform a minimum of 25 surgeries a day. Through the use of the smallest incision possible, dedicated support teams, and sequential workstations, HQHVSN eliminates unproductive time and enables the efficient spay and neuter of large number of pets while ensuring optimal veterinary oversight and maintaining high standards of health and safety.

However, regulatory barriers currently prevent HQHVSN from being used to its maximum potential, which can consistently allow for the spay and neutering of more than 60 animals a day at a lower cost than traditional surgeries. In California, veterinary regulations (CCR Tit. 16 § 2030 (g)) require a separate room for all aseptic surgeries, a requirement not shared with most other states. Not only does this requirement drastically slow down HQHVSN, it also prevents the use of Mobile Animal Sterilization Hospital (MASH) clinics, which can bring travelling HQHVSN units to underserved and rural areas.

THIS BILL

In order to promote the use of HQHVSN to combat California's pet overpopulation crisis, we must remove unnecessary barriers to its fullest and most efficient use. AB 2010 will do this by specifying that HQHVSN services performed in a registered veterinary premises do not require a dedicated surgical suite, equipment for viewing radiographs, or an absence of shelving in the room, while still maintaining the applicability of all other health and safety standards.

By removing unneeded restrictions on the use of HQHVSN, AB 2010 will allow MASH clinics to bring affordable, accessible spay and neuter services to all corners of the state, from underserved and overwhelmed urban areas to rural communities where there may be no local access to spay and neuter services. AB 2010 provides a much-needed fix to allow spay and neuter services at the scale needed to meet the public need, relieve our overcrowded shelters and save the lives of countless animals.

SUPPORT



Assemblywoman Esmeralda Soria, 27th Assembly District

AB 2010 – The Spay/Neuter Improvement for Pets (SNIP) Act

- American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Co-sponsor)
- Animal Balance (Co-sponsor)
- San Diego Humane Society (Co-sponsor)
- San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Co-sponsor)

CONTACT

Ben Endsley, Legislative Aide

(916) 319-2027

ben.endsley@asm.ca.gov



Senate Bill 1269: Animal Chiropractic Care - Direct Access

Summary

Senate Bill 1269 would update the chiropractic scope of practice to allow Doctors of Chiropractic to deliver animal chiropractic services without the direct supervision of a licensed veterinarian for the first three months or eight visits of care, if they possess a valid certification from one of the following organizations:

- American Veterinary Chiropractic Association (AVCA); or
- International Veterinary Chiropractic Association (IVCA).

Chiropractors who are not certified may continue to practice animal chiropractic under the direct supervision of a licensed veterinarian.

The bill would establish language for the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners (BCE), to regulate Doctors of Chiropractic who provide animal chiropractic services.

Existing Law

On November 7, 1922, California voters passed the Chiropractic Initiative Act of California, which created BCE, the entity that oversees the licensure and regulation of chiropractic doctors in California.¹

According to the California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Sec. 2038, a California-licensed Doctor of Chiropractic (DC) must work under the direct supervision of a licensed veterinarian when providing chiropractic services to animals.²

However, the California Veterinary Medical Board (CVMB) does not regulate chiropractic licenses, and because current law only allows DCs to perform animal chiropractic under the supervision of a veterinarian, this creates limitations and confusion for both BCE and CVMB.

Currently, eight states have passed laws allowing DCs to adjust animals without the direct supervision of a veterinarian:

- Oklahoma (2011)
- Colorado (2018)
- Ohio (2020)
- Utah (2021)
- Arkansas (2021)
- Nebraska (2021)
- New Hampshire (2025)
- Tennessee (2025)

Nineteen additional states are actively advancing similar legislation

Background

The ASPCA estimates that about 31 million U.S. households adopted a pet during the COVID-19 pandemic.³

This increase in pet ownership, coupled with more veterinarians retiring from the profession than graduating, has exacerbated the staffing issues that plagued the veterinary medicine industry before the pandemic.⁴

According to a 2023 study by Mars Veterinary Health, pet healthcare services spending is

¹ Chiropractic Initiative Act of California

² California Veterinary Medicine Practice Act, Page 96.

³ ASPCA, May 26, 2021

⁴ Garcia, Catherine. "The U.S. Veterinarian Shortage Crisis." The Week, July 18, 2023.

Sponsor: CA Chiropractic Association (CalChiro)
Kehinde (Kenny) Ojeikere
Kehinde@weidemangroup.com
(916) 447-1488

Bill text and status can be found at
<http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>

expected to increase 3-4% per year beyond inflation over the next 8-10 years.⁵

Given this situation, allowing certified DCs to adjust animals, alongside traditional veterinary medicine, will give pet owners more options when making decisions about their pet's health and well-being.

Solution

SB 1269 would add language to the Business and Professions Code to ensure that only those who have earned a DC degree and are properly licensed and certified will be allowed to administer chiropractic adjustments to animals without being under the direct supervision of a veterinarian for the first three months or eight visits of care. Upon completion of this initial period, the animals will be referred to their primary veterinarian.

In addition to a DC license, chiropractors would register with the BCE as an animal chiropractic practitioner and would maintain requirements, including certification, continuing education from one of two specified entities, and premise permits. The DC will also be required to carry malpractice insurance.

A DC who is not a certified animal chiropractic practitioner may continue to deliver animal chiropractic services under the direct supervision of a veterinarian.

Veterinarians will continue to provide primary care for companion animals. Allowing certified animal chiropractors to practice without direct supervision represents a positive contribution to the pet healthcare industry by opening another avenue for owners to access affordable care for their beloved pets.

For More Information

Staff: Tanya Vandrick
tanya.vandrick@sen.ca.gov
(916) 651-4276

⁵ Mars Veterinary Health. "Tackling the Veterinary Professional Shortage." Aug. 2023.

CALIFORNIA VETERINARY MEDICAL BOARD

**REQUESTED ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO AB 1502 (BERMAN, 2025)
TO AMEND BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTIONS 4887 AND 4902
REGARDING REINSTATEMENT OF CANCELED LICENSES**

Additions are indicated in *italic blue text*.

Deletions are indicated in ~~red single strikethrough~~.

SEC. 37. Section 4887 of the Business and Professions Code is amended to read:

4887. (a) (1) A person whose license, ~~or~~ registration, *or permit* has been revoked or *surrendered to resolve a disciplinary proceeding or* who has been placed on probation may petition the board for reinstatement or modification of penalty including modification or termination of probation after the period as described below in subparagraphs (A) to (C), inclusive, has elapsed from the effective date of the decision ordering the disciplinary action. The petition shall state facts as required by the board. The period shall be as follows:

(A) At least three years for reinstatement of a surrendered or revoked license, *registration, or permit*.

(B) At least two years for early termination or modification of probation of three years or more.

(C) At least one year for modification of a condition or termination of probation of less than three years.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the board may, upon a showing of good cause, specify in a revocation order, a surrender order, or an order imposing probation of more than three years that the person may petition the board for reinstatement or modification or termination of probation after one year.

(b) The petition shall be accompanied by both of the following:

(1) At least two verified recommendations from veterinarians licensed by the board who have personal knowledge of the activities of the petitioner since the disciplinary penalty was imposed.

(2) A full set of fingerprints for purposes of conducting a criminal history record check.

(c) A petition under this section shall not be considered if:

(1) The petitioner is under sentence for any criminal offense, including any period during which the petitioner is on court-imposed probation or parole.

(2) An accusation or petition to revoke probation is pending against the petitioner.

(3) The petitioner's license, registration, or permit was canceled pursuant to Section 4902, and petitioner has not submitted proof of satisfaction of the applicable requirements for licensure in effect at the time of submission of the petition to the board.

~~(c)~~*(d)* The petition shall be heard by the board. The board may consider all activities of the petitioner since the disciplinary action was taken, the offense for which the petitioner was disciplined, the petitioner's activities since the license, ~~or~~ registration, *or permit* was in good standing, and the petitioner's rehabilitation efforts, general reputation for truth, and professional ability. The hearing may be continued from time to time as the board finds necessary.

(e) A revoked or surrendered license that was cancelled pursuant to Section 4902 shall not be reinstated, but a new license may be issued if the petitioner has submitted proof of activities pursuant to subdivision (d) and satisfaction of all applicable requirements for licensure, registration, or permit in effect at the time of submission of the petition to the board.

~~(d)~~*(f)* The board reinstating *or issuing a new* the license, ~~or~~ registration, *or permit* or modifying a penalty may impose terms and conditions as it determines necessary. ~~To reinstate a revoked license or registration or to otherwise reduce a penalty or modify probation shall require a vote of five of the members of the board. The terms and conditions imposed for reinstatement or issuance of a new license, registration, or permit shall include payment of all outstanding costs of investigation and enforcement awarded pursuant to Section 125.3 in the prior decision.~~

(g) If, within one year of the effective date of a decision reinstating or issuing a new license, registration, or permit, the petitioner fails to satisfy any terms and conditions, including payment of costs of investigation and enforcement, required prior to reinstatement or issuance of a new license, registration, or permit, the petition shall be deemed abandoned, and the license, registration, or permit shall not be reinstated or issued as ordered by the decision.

~~(e)~~*(h)* ~~The petition shall not be considered while the petitioner is under sentence for any criminal offense, including any period during which the petitioner is on court-imposed probation or parole.~~ The board may deny without a hearing or argument any petition filed pursuant to this section within a period of two years from the effective date of the prior decision following a hearing under this section.

(e) If the petition is granted, the petitioner shall have one year from the effective date of the decision to satisfy all conditions required to be completed prior to any change of the status of the license, registration, or permit as ordered in the decision.



ASSEMBLYMEMBER JOAQUIN ARAMBULA, M.D. 31ST ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

AB 1558 (Arambula) - Emergency Volunteers

Summary

AB 1558 enhances California's emergency response system by reducing administrative delays that prevent licensed out-of-state health professionals from helping in the aftermath of a disaster.

Background

Historically, emergency responses during natural disasters and public health crises have faced challenges in efficiently integrating volunteer health professionals. Federal programs such as the Emergency System for Advance Registration of Volunteer Health Professionals (ESAR-VHP) registry were created after the September 11 attacks to streamline credentialing and deployment of health volunteers across state lines. Since then, many states have adopted model laws like the Uniform Emergency Volunteer Health Practitioners Act to formalize these practices at the state level and ensure states can prepare for disasters before they happen.

Currently, the Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA) manages emergency medical planning and the state's Disaster Healthcare Volunteers system. Under this system, volunteers often cannot be deployed until the state formally approves them to serve. This approval process takes time and can delay response efforts. Although the state allowed a temporary workaround during the Los Angeles wildfires, officials made clear that this workaround would need to be requested and approved separately for each future disaster. This case-by-case approach creates uncertainty and slows emergency response.

Without a clear statewide law, California will continue to face ongoing delays and administrative barriers when deploying out-of-state volunteer health practitioners during disasters, potentially limiting timely access to critical care for affected communities. The need for medical care is often greatest at the very beginning of a disaster, when first responders, hospitals, and local health systems are also stretched thinner. People who are injured, displaced,

elderly, or living in disaster-impacted areas face higher risks without care in this critical window. Expediting access to licensed volunteers from out-of-state is a key way to increase access to care for communities when they need it the most.

Related Legislation

AB 64 (Berg, 2007) attempted to facilitate process for out-of-state health and veterinary professionals to assist Californians in an emergency.

22 other states, including Illinois, Washington, and Texas, have passed similar pieces of legislation providing reciprocity to other states' licensees during emergencies. Legislation currently pending in Hawaii and New York.¹

This Bill

- 1) Allows qualified, licensed health professionals from other states to serve immediately during declared disasters
- 2) Provides clear authority and guidance to state agencies during emergencies.

Support

American Red Cross (sponsor)

For More Information

Arali Seneviratne (she/her)
Office of Assemblymember Dr. Joaquin Arambula
Arali.Seneviratne@asm.ca.gov or (916) 319-2031

¹ <https://www.uniformlaws.org/committees/community-home?CommunityKey=565933ce-965f-4d3c-9c90-b00246f30f2d>