

MEMORANDUM

DATE	September 28, 2026
TO	California Veterinary Medical Board
FROM	Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM, Chair Multidisciplinary Advisor Committee (MDC)
SUBJECT	Agenda Item 5. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC) Report

B. Overview of September 11, 2026 MDC Meeting ([MDC Meeting Webcast](#))

1. [Call to Order/ Roll Call/ Establishment of a Quorum](#)

Committee Chair, Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM, called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. EO, Jessica Sieferman, called roll, and a quorum was established.

Dr. Waterhouse also welcomed the three new MDC members, Patrick Fung, RVT, Kristin Spring, RVT, and Colleen Tansey, DVM.

2. [Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda](#)

No public comment was received.

3. [Review and Approval of April 14, 2026 Committee Meeting Minutes](#)

The MDC approved the meeting minutes 6-0-3 with Patrick Fung, RVT, Kristin Spring, RVT, and Colleen Tansey, DVM, abstaining.

4. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Recommendations from the Veterinary Practice Subcommittee – *Mark Nunez, DVM, and Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM*

A. [Legislative Proposal to Amend Business and Professions Code \(BPC\) Sections 4826, 4826.3, 4836.5, 4840.7, 4850, 4853, 4853.5, 4854, 4854.1, 4855, 4855.1, 4856, 4900, and 4917, Repeal BPC Sections 4853.1, 4853.6, and 4853.7, and Add BPC Section 4826.9 Regarding Removing Licensee Manager Requirement and Shifting Specified Responsibilities to Veterinary Premises Owner](#)

This item will be discussed in detail during Board Agenda Item 5.A. Ultimately, the MDC approved, on a vote of 8-1, a recommendation to the Board to submit

the legislative proposal, as amended during the meeting, to the California State Legislature.

B. [Stakeholder Discussion Regarding Above Legislative Proposal](#)

Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to participate as panelists to openly discuss the legislative proposal with the MDC. Participant stakeholders included: Grant Miller, DVM, California Veterinary Medical Association; Stephen Cital, RVT, California Registered Veterinary Technician Association (CaRVTA); and Bonnie Lutz, Esq., Klinedinst.

Overall, participants appreciated the proposal and believed it was necessary to reflect the current industry operations.

Concerns were raised regarding whether corporations will pay attention to or respond to the Board during investigations and what would happen to veterinarians if they are practicing within a veterinary premises when the veterinary premises registration is revoked. The EO clarified that the same disciplinary process that occurs today would remain. If a premises registration is revoked, the premises registrant will have 30 days from the order date before the revocation is effective. This gives this premises registrant time to notify their employees of the premises registration revocation and next steps.

An inquiry was made as to what impact the proposal would have on the regulations requiring the licensee manager to supervise the veterinary assistant controlled substance holders (California Code of Regulations (CCR), tit., 16, §§ [2087.1](#), [2087.2](#)). The EO clarified that, if the legislation becomes operative, the Board would pursue regulatory amendments through a Section 100 and/or standard rulemaking package.

5. Update and Discussion from the Registered Veterinary Technician (RVT) Subcommittee – *Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, and Kristin Spring, RVT*

A. [Analysis of CaRVTA's 2025 Legislative Proposal \(RN 25 01551\) Compared to Current Statutes and Regulations, Including Potential Supervision Level Changes Based on Specialty Certification](#)

Meeting materials, including the RVT Subcommittee's analysis, are available [here](#). The MDC agreed with the Subcommittee's conclusion that additional research is needed before the Board considers whether specified tasks under direct supervision could be performed under indirect supervision by an RVT with a specialty certification.

Public comment on this item was received from:

- [Stephen Niño Cital](#), RVT, Director, CaRVTA
- [Bonnie Lutz](#), Esq., Klinedinst
- [Stephen Niño Cital](#), RVT, Director, CaRVTA (second comment)

6. [Presentations Regarding RVTs Performing Ultrasound Guided Anesthesia](#) – *Stefano Di Concetto, DVM, Margaret E. Wypart, DVM, and Domonique Fortner, RVT*

The PowerPoint presentation from Drs. Wypart and Di Concetto is available [here](#).

Due to the MDC meeting date change, Ms. Fortner was unable to provide a presentation. However, she provided [this statement](#) in response to the concerns raised in Drs. Wypart and Di Concetto's [January 6, 2026 Board letter](#).

After the presentation, the EO clarified that RVTs can perform any health care tasks that are otherwise not prohibited by law. BPC section [4840.2](#) specifies what veterinary health care services RVTs are prohibited from performing. Expanding the prohibitions would require legislation. The Board only has authority to determine appropriate supervision levels for non-prohibited animal health care tasks.

Overall, the MDC members shared similar sentiments that the Board should not specifically list tasks for veterinarians and RVTs to perform.

CaRVTA provided [this written public comment](#) prior to the MDC meeting.

Additional public comment was received from:

- [Stephen Niño Cital](#), RVT, Director, CaRVTA

7. [Update and Discussion from the Enforcement Subcommittee](#) – *Jeni Goedken, DVM, and Colleen Tansey, DVM*

Meeting materials available [here](#).

8. [Committee Chair Report](#) – *Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM*

Public comment was received from:

- [Bonnie Lutz](#), Esq., Klinedinst

9. [Future Agenda Items and Meeting Dates](#)

10. Adjournment

Chair Waterhouse adjourned the meeting at 3:11 p.m.