



**MEETING MINUTES  
VETERINARY MEDICAL BOARD**

**July 26-27, 2017  
1747 N. Market Blvd. – 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Hearing Room  
Sacramento, California**

**10:00 a.m. Wednesday, July 26, 2017**

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

Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse called the Veterinary Medical Board (Board) meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. Executive Officer, Annemarie Del Mugnaio, called roll; eight members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

Ms. Del Mugnaio swore in and welcomed Alana Yanez as the newest member of the Board.

**2. Introductions**

Board Members Present

Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM, President  
Richard Sullivan, DVM, Vice President  
Kathy Bowler, Public Member  
Jennifer Loreda, RVT  
Judie Mancuso, Public Member  
Jaymie Noland, DVM  
Mark Nunez, DVM  
Alana Yanez, Public Member

Staff Present

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer, Veterinary Medical Board  
Nina Galang, Administrative Program Coordinator  
Ethan Mathes, Administrative Program Manager  
Candace Raney, Enforcement Manager  
Jennifer Iida, DCA Webcast  
Tara Welch, Legal Counsel

Guests Present

Valerie Fenstermaker, California Veterinary Medical Association  
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, California Registered Veterinary Technicians Association  
Paul Hansbury, Lovingly and Legally  
Tameka Island, California Physical Therapy Association  
Grant Miller, DVM, California Veterinary Medical Association  
Jon Pascoe, University of California Davis  
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee  
Cindy Savely, RVT, Sacramento Valley Veterinary Technician Association  
Marshall E. Scott, DVM, California Veterinary Medical Association

Dianne Sequioia, DVM  
Leah Shufelt, RVT, California Veterinary Medical Association  
Diann Sokoloff, Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
Susan Tibbon, Lovingly and Legally  
Linda Tripp, Sacramento Valley Veterinary Technician Association  
Erin Troy, DVM

### **3. Review and Approval of April 19-20, 2017 and June 19, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes**

Dr. Waterhouse and Tara Welch suggested minor changes to the meeting minutes.

- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to approve the April 19-20, 2017 and July 19, 2017 meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried 7-0-1. Alana Yanez abstained.

### **4. Discussion on Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee Appointment – Recruitment Process**

Ms. Del Mugnaio noted the Board's Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC) member David Johnson's, RVT term expired in June and will be serving a one-year grace period. She advised recruitment should begin immediately to give the Board time to interview and select new MDC membership. Ms. Del Mugnaio also suggested beginning the recruitment of additional MDC terms expiring in 2018; Dr. Jon Klingborg, Dr. Bill Grant and Diana Woodward Hagel's terms will expire in June 2018. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT can be reappointed to the MDC in June 2018. The Board agreed and solicitation for MDC membership will be added to the Board's website and notification emailed to the subscription list. Resumes will be reviewed at the October 2017 meeting and interviews conducted at the February 2018 meeting.

The Board discussed the interview process for open positions. They agreed to mandate in-person interviews for MDC membership. Ms. Del Mugnaio will bring the Board's *Administrative Procedures Manual*, with agreed amendments, to the next meeting for review of updates.

### **5. Proposed Regulations**

#### **A. Status of Pending Regulations**

Ms. Del Mugnaio reported the proposed Animal Control Officer (ACO) regulations are currently with the Department for final review and should be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) within a month. The Department Director will issue an extension for filing the ACO regulations with OAL.

The proposed Consumer Protection Enforcement Initiative and Disciplinary Guidelines regulations are currently at the Department for their initial review. The Board will discuss other proposed rulemaking later in the meeting.

#### **B. Discussion and Possible Board Action on Regulatory Proposal Regarding Section 2032.1(e) of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Regarding Telemedicine and Review American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) Proposed Guidelines**

Dr. Richard Sullivan reviewed the included Telehealth Talking Points and noted there appears to be a push within a small segment of the profession that proposes authority to establish a veterinarian-client-patient relationship via telemedicine. The Board discussed the idea of establishing a veterinary-client-patient relationship via telemedicine and agreed the need in veterinary care for a face-to-face examination is distinctly different than human medicine. Valarie Fenstermaker noted she's seen websites currently

advertising for animal telemedicine. Ms. Del Mugnaio noted she has seen this issue in Board enforcement cases.

Dr. Sullivan suggested additional proposed language clearly noting the establishment of a veterinary-client-patient relationship. The Board discussed whether the proposed language should be under another section of regulation and whether the definition of telemedicine in the proposed language is enough to prevent this practice. Dr. Sullivan opined there is some flexibility to the regulation as written and that it should be made clear a veterinary-client-patient relationship needs to be established first.

- Kathy Bowler moved and Judie Mancuso seconded the motion to accept the proposed telemedicine language as amended. The motion carried 8-0.
- Jennifer Loreda, RVT moved and Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to notice the proposed text for a 45-day public comment period and to be set for hearing if one is requested by the public, and to delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to adopt the proposed regulatory changes, as modified, if there are no adverse comments received during the public comment period, and also delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file. The motion carried 8-0.

**C. Discussion and Possible Board Action on Regulatory Proposal Regarding Sections 2036.1, 2064, 2065, 2065.2, 2065.6, 2065.7, 2065.8, 2066, 2066.1, and 2068.5 of Title 16 of the CCR Regarding Registered Veterinary Technician (RVT) School Approval and RVT Student Exemption**

Ms. Del Mugnaio reviewed the history of the proposed regulations; they were drafted to better define the Board's responsibility for oversight of American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) accredited veterinary technology programs in California while not duplicating the AVMA's accreditation process. There were compliance issues identified in the Board's review of California accredited veterinary technology programs, such as student reporting and disclosure notifications. The intent of the proposed language is to not be duplicative of the accreditation process, but to maintain educational standards for California veterinary technology programs through monitoring and inspections, as needed. The Board agreed there is a need for program audit and inspection as necessary.

The Board discussed the cost to maintain an oversight program. Ms. Del Mugnaio noted the rulemaking process would identify costs to the Board and that it may be necessary to submit a budget change proposal to fund the oversight program.

- Judie Mancuso moved and Jennifer Loreda, RVT seconded the motion to accept the proposed RVT student exemption language. The motion carried 8-0.
- Dr. Mark Nunez moved and Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to notice the proposed text for a 45-day public comment period and to be set for hearing if one is requested by the public, and to delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to adopt the proposed regulatory changes, as modified, if there are no adverse comments received during the public comment period, and also delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file. The motion carried 8-0.

## **D. Discussion and Possible Board Action on Regulatory Proposal Regarding Sections 2070 & 2071 of Title 16 of the CCR Regarding Proposed Fee Increases**

Ethan Mathes reviewed the Capitol Accounting Partners' (CAP) audit report and presented the staff's fee increase recommendation. The proposed increase would bring the Board into statutory Fund reserve compliance of three to 10 months of reserve, and reverse the Board's ongoing structural imbalance. The Board discussed reasons for the current negative Fund condition that includes increased staffing, BreZE implementation, increased veterinary premises inspections, and higher enforcement-related expenditures.

Mr. Mathes noted that there are two main revenue sources for the Board, initial application fees and renewal fees. The proposed fee increases could be phased in over two years or wholly increased effective upon regulatory approval. Due to the timeline to implement regulations, any fee increase would occur in 2018 at the earliest. The Board and staff discussed the history of past regulatory fee increases; the last fee increase occurred in 2012, before the doubling of Board staff and the need to increase Board revenue expeditiously due to the current Fund condition. Staff's analysis of the fee increase considered the volume of initial versus renewal applications as a factor for increasing fees in specific revenue areas. Ms. Del Mugnaio added that staff considered comparative fees from other similar Boards.

The Board discussed its options and was in favor of implementing a fee increase immediately but suggested a review of internal management to ensure Board costs are appropriately considered. Ms. Del Mugnaio noted the CAP audit provided clear justification to increase staffing levels due to increasing workload volume. The Board discussed the direct impact of fee increases on applicants and licensees, the criticality of funding veterinary premises inspections, and increasing veterinary premises renewal fees to the statutory maximum.

- Judie Mancuso moved and Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to accept staff proposal 1 and increase veterinary premises fees to the statutory maximum. The motion carried 7-1. Dr. Richard Sullivan opposed the motion.
- Kathy Bowler moved and Judie Mancuso seconded the motion to notice the proposed text for a 45-day public comment period and to be set for hearing if one is requested by the public, and to delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to adopt the proposed regulatory changes, as modified, if there are no adverse comments received during the public comment period, and also delegate to the Executive Officer the authority to make any technical or non-substantive changes that may be required in completing the rulemaking file. The motion carried 8-0.

## **6. Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee Report – Dr. Jon Klingborg**

### **A. Review, Discussion, and Possible Board Action on Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee Items and Recommendations**

Dr. Jon Klingborg reported on the Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC) discussion; they assigned further research and discussion regarding registered veterinary technician extended duties to a subcommittee. Work continues on minimum standards for shelter medicine and the MDC hopes to have more information for the Board at its next meeting. Proposed language for drug compounding, drug information to clients, registered veterinary technician emergency aid, and sedatives in emergency situations has been completed and is ready for Board discussion at its next meeting.

- Jennifer Loreda, RVT moved and Kathy Bowler seconded the motion to accept the MDC report. The motion carried 8-0.

Dr. Klingborg noted the MDC's continuing priorities include the complaint audit task force and review and discussion of the California Veterinary Medical Association's (CVMA) Veterinary Premises Task Force. Ms. Del Mugnaio added that discussion on veterinary student exemptions (formerly part of Senate Bill 546) may be added to the MDC's priorities.

- Dr. Richard Sullivan moved and Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse seconded the motion to task the Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee to research, discuss and recommend action on the veterinary student exemption in Business and Professions Code Section 4830. The motion carried 8-0.

## **7. Review, Discussion, and Possible Board Action on Potential Legislation and Regulations Proposals Regarding Animal Physical Rehabilitation**

Ms. Del Mugnaio reviewed the previous actions of the Animal Physical Rehabilitation Task Force and the specific motion regarding the supervision of veterinary assistants that was not adopted by the Board from the Board's April 2017 meeting.

- Dr. Richard Sullivan moved and Jennifer Loreda, RVT seconded the motion that a veterinary assistant must be under direct supervision of the veterinarian if they are delegated to provide animal physical rehabilitation. The motion carried 7-1. Alana Yanez opposed the motion.

The Board discussed and agreed to assign staff to draft regulations based on its motion. The Board continued discussion on the authority of licensed physical therapists to administer animal physical rehabilitation. Ms. Del Mugnaio reminded the Board it only has authority over veterinary medicine licensees in its Practice Act and any change to this authority would be required in statute. Discussion continued on the establishment of a veterinary-client-patient relationship (VCPR) in order to administer and delegate animal physical rehabilitation. The Board agreed that it would be advisable to establish a Frequently Asked Questions on the Board's website to help remind licensees of the provisions for the establishing a VCPR prior to providing animal physical rehabilitation.

## **8. Review and Discussion Regarding Veterinarians Prescribing/Using Medicinal Marijuana for Animals**

Dr. Waterhouse reviewed the current Board policy regarding veterinarians prescribing/using medicinal marijuana on animals and reiterated the Board does not have a formal position but has summarized its understanding of the law with regard to the practice of veterinary medicine and medicinal marijuana. The Federal Drug Administration and Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) continue to list cannabis and cannabinoid products as Schedule I drugs. The public and Board discussed the challenges of regulating this drug, options for reclassifying medicinal marijuana, the availability of hemp products for animal treatment, and whether veterinarians could address questions from consumers or make recommendations. The Board reiterated that due to the Federal scheduling of this drug, it cannot offer guidance to veterinarians.

Tara Welch offered to conduct research on laws exempting physicians from federal enforcement and how veterinarians may be in a similar position in terms of treating their clients. Prescribing and dispensing is a DEA issue but she offered to research whether a veterinarian discussing medicinal marijuana usage would be a violation of law.

## **9. Review and Update on the Board's 2015-2019 Strategic Plan/Accomplishments**

Ms. Del Mugnaio reviewed and updated progress on the Board's 2015-2019 Action Plan. Staff will provide a summary of the Board's customer satisfaction survey at the October meeting; the Board's website redesign has been put on hold due to redirection of staff workload. *The Hospital Standards Self-Evaluation Checklist* has recently been approved by legal for publication and will go to print shortly. The *Checklist* will be distributed to inspected premises and Board members. Dr. Sullivan requested the development of a form specifically addressing unlicensed activity complaints.

## **10. Discussion and Possible Board Action Regarding RVT Validation Study and Transition to Veterinary Technician National Examination**

Ms. Del Mugnaio and Mr. Mathes updated on the history of the Board's transition to the Veterinary Technician National Examination (VTNE) and whether the Board should choose to return to a California-only examination. The comparison between the national and California veterinary technician occupational analyses will begin in late-2017. Jennifer Loredo noted the VTNE, combined with the California examination, is expensive for veterinary technician applicants.

Nancy Ehrlich testified that during the Board's transition to the VTNE, it was understood that examination fees would be reduced. She also questioned whether there are an appropriate number of items on the VTNE and whether there is appropriate content on the VTNE based on the examination plan in the *Candidate Information Bulletin*. She suggested the Board consider incorporating the California veterinary technician examination into the VTNE or adopt any other feasible possibility to assist veterinary technician applicants. Ms. Del Mugnaio cautioned that combining the National and State examination would still incur the expense of developing the California portion of the examination while not recouping the costs through the administration of an examination.

Tracy Montez noted the Board's administration of separate National and California examinations is consistent with other California licensing boards. She reviewed the examination development process and offered to provide more information on the Office of Professional Examination Services' policy for selection of subject matter experts who develop examination content. The examination plan dictates the content and number of examination items, there is no specific number of items that an examination should contain, but the number of items should be enough to obtain robust statistics and a create a large bank of examination questions

Ms. Loredo suggested the Board continue this discussion once the comparison between national and California veterinary technician occupational analyses is complete.

## **11. Review, Discussion, and Possible Board Action on Statutory Change Regarding the Elimination of the Veterinary Law Examination**

Ms. Del Mugnaio provided background on the item and the OPES's recommendation to consider elimination of the Veterinary Law Examination (VLE) under certain circumstances. Mr. Mathes noted that the elimination of the VLE entirely would impact the basis for eligibility for veterinary reciprocity and university licensure applicants as required in Business and Professions Code. The VLE is used primarily as a teaching tool and should not be likened to a formal examination. Ms. Del Mugnaio added the terminology for the VLE could be changed in future legislation to reflect its use as a teaching tool.

The Board discussed the efficacy of the VLE and agreed it should be kept as a teaching tool. Ms. Del Mugnaio pointed out staff is exploring other means to administer the VLE, such as secure online administration, that would cut down on staff time devoted to administering the examination by paper.

## **12. Review, Discussion, and Possible Board Action Regarding Fee Audit Report**

Dan Edds reviewed CAP's fee audit report and recommendations of Board revenues and expenditures. He explained CAP's method of determining and assigning costs to various Board functions and how its proposed fee increases were derived. CAP recommended the Board increase licensing fees to recover the actual cost of operations as well as generate additional revenue for mandated reserves.

The Board discussed the recent increase in enforcement expenditures, including Attorney General and Office of Administrative Hearings expenditures and that a fee increase would be justified and necessary to recover these ongoing expenditures.

*Note: Additional discussion on this item took place under Board Item 5.D.*

## **13. Review, Discussion, and Possible Board Action Regarding Board Size and Structure**

Ricardo De La Cruz reported the last increase the Board size and exempt level salary increase, "Level M", occurred in 2014. He noted that the Board size and exempt level (Executive Officer) salary increase process starts with Board meeting discussion. Through a vote in open session, the Board may request a Board size and exempt salary level increase; the request would then go through the Department's review.

Dr. Waterhouse noted that this topic came up due to the increase in license types, staffing, and workload. The Board discussed how it would determine an appropriate size and exempt level salary, the need for new classifications with a parallel look at the Executive Officer level and allow Board staff to grow if it is determined staffing levels are not appropriate. Mr. De La Cruz noted that it is up to the Board to decide on its size designation keeping in mind the volume of its licensing population, potential for growth, recent legislation and impact to the Board's budget. The Board requested Mr. De La Cruz initiate a comparative study to determine an appropriate Board size designation. Mr. De La Cruz agreed he could provide information on comparative Department boards and Executive Officer salaries. Dr. Sullivan suggested the Executive Officer evaluation is added to the October meeting agenda.

## **14. 2017 Legislation Report; Possible Board Action to Adopt Positions on Legislative Items**

### **A. SB 673 (Newman) Pet Lover's specialized license plates**

Ms. Del Mugnaio updated that Senate Bill (SB) 673 is in Appropriations. The Board supported the transfer of the responsibility in the Bill to the California Department of Food and Agriculture.

### **B. SB 547 (Hill) Professions and vocations: weights and measures**

Ms. Del Mugnaio reported certain provisions in SB 546 were moved to SB 547 and stated the addition of language in BPC Section 27 regarding address of record privacy; the Bill is in Appropriations.

### **C. AB 485 (O'Donnell) Pet store operators: dogs, cats, and rabbits**

Ms. Mancuso updated Assembly Bill (AB 485) is moving to the Senate floor.

#### **D. AB 942 (Mathis) Personal income taxes: credit: veterinary costs**

Ms. Del Mugnaio updated AB 942 failed in appropriations.

#### **15. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda**

Ms. Ehrlich noted that she believed certain sections of the California veterinary technician test plan are irrelevant to regular professional practice and should not be tested on the examination. Ms. Mugnaio requested Ms. Ehrlich formally forward her concerns in writing to the Board and staff will research the matter.

#### **16. Recess until July 27, 2017, at 9:00 a.m.**

**9:00 a.m. Thursday, July 27, 2017**

#### **17. Reconvene - Establishment of a Quorum**

Dr. Waterhouse called the Board meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Executive Officer, Ms. Del Mugnaio, called roll; eight members of the Board were present and thus a quorum was established.

#### **18. Introductions**

##### Board Members Present

Cheryl Waterhouse, DVM, President  
Richard Sullivan, DVM, Vice President  
Kathy Bowler, Public Member  
Jennifer Loreda, RVT  
Judie Mancuso, Public Member  
Jaymie Noland, DVM  
Mark Nunez, DVM  
Alana Yanez, Public Member

##### Staff Present

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer  
Nina Galang, Administrative Program Coordinator  
Dean R. Grafilo, DCA Director  
Jennifer Iida, DCA Webcast  
Ethan Mathes, Administrative Program Manager  
Candace Raney, Enforcement Program Manager  
Tara Welch, Legal Counsel

##### Guests Present

Nancy Ehrlich, California Registered Veterinary Technicians Association  
Valerie Fenstermaker, California Veterinary Medical Association  
Dean Grafilo, Director, Department of Consumer Affairs  
Kristen Hagler, National Association of Veterinary Technicians in America  
Grant Miller, California Veterinary Medical Association

## **19. Department of Consumer Affairs Update – Dean R. Grafilo, Director**

Dean R. Grafilo, new Director to the Department of Consumer Affairs Director, introduced himself to the Board and provided an overview of his professional background. He considers staff the most important part of the Department and inquired how he could help the Board achieve its mission to protect consumers. The Board requested Mr. Grafilo help the Board continue to grow and look in to the Governor’s travel ban, as it can be overly restrictive to the Board’s participation in national associations and professional issues.

## **20. Board Chair Report – Dr. Cheryl Waterhouse**

Dr. Waterhouse reviewed recent and upcoming outreach and training activities attended by the Board and Board staff. There was discussion on California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) regulation of animal blood banks at the Pacific Veterinary Conference and concern whether veterinarians are complying with the law. Ms. Del Mugnaio confirmed the use of privately owned animals are lawful for animal blood banking.

Dr. Waterhouse continued that the American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB) held a webinar on telemedicine and unlicensed practice. The Governor has also restricted State employee travel to certain states. Dr. Waterhouse requested staff agendaize the CDFA’s Antimicrobial Use and Stewardship Policies for the next Board meeting.

## **21. RVT Report – Jennifer Loredo**

Ms. Loredo reported that the AAVSB’s Job Analysis of the national veterinary technician profession is ongoing, there has been ongoing discussion regarding licensing foreign veterinary technicians, and the National Association of Veterinary Technicians in America (NAVTA) has formed an initiative to pursue state legislative changes to recognize the professional title of “veterinary nurse”. She requested drug compounding be added as an allowable veterinary technician duty in the proposed drug compounding regulation.

### **A. National Association of Veterinary Technicians of America Specialty Recognition of the Academy of Physical Rehabilitation Veterinary Technicians**

Kristen Hagler reported on NAVTA’s Academy of Physical Rehabilitation Veterinary Technicians (APRVT) program, described the content of the program, requirements for the specialty, and program examination requirements. The first APRVT program examination will be held in August 2018. There are a set of requirements, referenced on NAVTA website, including specialty education, being a recognized expert in the field, and having practical experience. The APRVT specialty program renewal process is every five years.

The Board discussed the APRVT program and how it compares to existing animal rehabilitation programs, the cost of completing the program, and the potential of the program examination becoming hands-on instead of multiple choice.

Ms. Hagler noted the APRVT program is nationally recognized and that its high number of program applicants reflects the professional interest in veterinary technician physical rehabilitation skills. NAVTA is supportive of direct supervision for registered veterinary technicians performing animal rehabilitation.

## **22. Report on the International Council for Veterinary Assessment Survey – Kathy Bowler**

Kathy Bowler requested the Board defer the International Council for Veterinary Assessment (ICVA) Survey item to the next Board meeting.

## **23. Executive Officer & Staff Reports**

### **A. Administrative/Budget**

Mr. Mathes reported on the Board's Expenditure Report and recent Budget Change Proposal (BCP). The BCP has increased the Board's Attorney General and Office of Administrative Hearing appropriation due to historical growth in these expenditures.

Ms. Ehrlich asked how many Veterinary Assistant Permit holders have been rejected due their background check. Mr. Mathes noted there are several hundred Permit holders with fingerprint issues to date. The Board requested information on the staff's application process when an applicant has a fingerprint response on their background check.

The Board discussed the tight budget condition and whether it would be able to reduce some expenditures. Mr. Mathes noted most Board expenditures are encumbered, however some contracts with the Board are liquidated at Fiscal Year-end which would reflect additional funds available in the budget. Ms. Del Mugnaio noted that an increase in the volume of complaints to the Board have led to an increase in enforcement-related expenditures.

### **B. Enforcement**

Candace Raney reported on enforcement personnel changes, complaint intake, and enforcement case aging history. The Board requested additional historical information including number of complaints, number of cases, and days to process cases. Ms. Raney noted that an unlicensed activity complaint form may be added to the Board's website as a separate form if necessary. Attorney General (AG) expenditures have gone up due to increased cases being sent to the AG's office for adjudication. Aging cases are being completed and the average time to close these cases has gone down significantly as staff focuses on these aged cases. Dianne Sokoloff offered that she could provide case aging statistics.

Ms. Raney reported the probation unit is monitoring 94 probationers. The Board asked whether any probationers have failed their probation requirements; Ms. Raney noted four have had issues and are in the process of being referred to the Attorney General's Office to revoke probation.

The Board asked how many complaints include unlicensed activity and requested staff break down complaint numbers to include both licensed and unlicensed activity. Ms. Raney noted staff has stopped issuing cease and desist letters for unlicensed activity and now issues citations and fines to these individuals.

### **C. Licensing/Examination**

Mr. Mathes reported on recent personnel changes. He was unable to provide veterinary technician pass rates by school, but will provide those statistics at the next Board meeting. The Board reviewed the historical licensing population graphs; Mr. Mathes noted the spike in veterinary technician applicants was due to the temporary Limited Term Examination Window application pathway in 2009-2010.

## **D. Hospital Inspection**

Patty Rodriguez updated on personnel changes, inspector training and outreach. The Board's annual inspector training is scheduled in August and among the speakers the Drug Enforcement Administration will be presenting. Inspections did not meet their 20% goal due to budget constraints, however all complaint-related inspections have been sent out for inspection. The Board discussed their concern for inspection funding and ensuring the Board's inspections mandate. Ms. Del Mugnaio noted staff has attempted to obtain additional inspection program funding through the budgetary process and by making inspections required in statute. The Board agreed hospital inspections are mission critical and are also a good method to educate veterinary hospitals.

Ms. Del Mugnaio reviewed common inspection violations and noted that inspectors make recommendations in common compliance areas such as record keeping. Dr. Grant Miller offered that the California Veterinary Medical Association has published a list of the top 10 violations and the Board is welcome to resource the article.

### **24. Future Agenda Items and Next Meeting Dates – October 18-19, 2017 (Fresno)**

#### **A. Agenda Items for Next Meeting –**

#### **B. Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee Meetings – October 17, 2017 (Fresno)**

Ms. Del Mugnaio noted future meeting dates in October 2017 and 2018. The following will be agenda items at upcoming meetings:

Legislative Report	Tattooing Spay and Neutered Animals
Drug Compounding Language	Medicinal Marijuana and Animals
Drug Counseling Language	SB 27 Update
RVTs in Emergency Situations	RVT Examination Validation Study
ICVA Survey Report	Facility DEA Licenses
Pathways for Foreign Educated RVTs	Telemedicine
C DFA Antimicrobial Stewardship Use	Corporate Practice of Veterinary Medicine

### **CLOSED SESSION**

### **25. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3), the Board met in closed session to deliberate and vote on disciplinary matters, including stipulations and proposed decisions.**

#### AV 2015 33

The Board adopted the Stipulated Settlement.

#### 460 2017 000 337

The Board adopted the Stipulated Settlement.

#### AV 2016 16

The Board adopted the Stipulated Settlement.

AV 2015 45

The Board non-adopted the Stipulated Settlement and proposed a modification.

AV 2009 10

The Board non-adopted the Stipulated Settlement and proposed a modification.

1002459421

The Board adopted the Stipulated Settlement.

460 2016 000 404

The Board adopted the Proposed Decision.

460 2017 0000 145

The Board adopted the Proposed Decision.

1002508871

The Board adopted the Proposed Decision.

AV 2015 1

The Board non-adopted the proposed decision and proposed a modification.

### **RECONVENE OPEN SESSION**

#### **26. Adjournment**

*The Board adjourned at 3:08pm.*