

## MEMORANDUM

<b>DATE</b>	July 11, 2025
<b>TO</b>	California Veterinary Medical Board (Board)
<b>FROM</b>	Justin Sotelo, Policy Specialist
<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>Agenda Item 6. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on 2025 Legislation Impacting the Board, DCA, and/or the Veterinary Profession</b>

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 **July 11, 2025**.

### A. Priority Legislation for Board Consideration

#### 1. Assembly Bill (AB) [516](#) (Kalra, 2025) Registered Veterinary Technicians and Veterinary Assistants: Scope of Practice

Status: Senate Floor

Analysis: 6/24/25 – Senate Floor

6/5/25 – Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

4/21/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee

3/28/25 – Assembly Business and Professions Committee

Hearing Date: Unknown

**Summary:** This bill would authorize registered veterinary technicians (RVTs) and veterinary assistants to perform animal health care services not otherwise prohibited by law under the supervision of a veterinarian. The bill would also authorize both RVTs and veterinary assistants to perform animal health care services not otherwise prohibited by law on animals housed in public or private animal shelters, humane societies, or societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals pursuant to an order of a veterinarian.

The bill would also authorize an RVT to perform dental care procedures, including tooth extractions, under the supervision of a veterinarian.

**Staff Comments:** Board Counsel had noted that if no changes to Business and Professions Code (BPC) section [4840.2](#) are made, the Board would need to review California Code of Regulations, title 16, sections [2035](#), [2036](#), and [2036.5](#) for conformity with the amended version of BPC section 4840. It is believed that the Board cannot list additional prohibited acts in regulation that are not otherwise listed in BPC section 4840.2.

2. **AB [867](#) (Lee, 2025) Veterinary Medicine: Cat Declawing**  
**Board Position: [Oppose](#)**

**Status:** Senate Floor

**Analysis:** 7/1/25 – Senate Floor

6/19/25 – Senate Business, Professions and Economic  
Development Committee

4/25/25 – Assembly Floor Analysis

4/21/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee

3/28/25 - Assembly Business and Professions Committee

Hearing Date: Unknown

**Summary:** This bill would include the performance of a tendonectomy, onychectomy, or any type of claw removal on a feline within the practice of veterinary medicine, surgery, and dentistry. The bill would require those procedures to be performed only for a therapeutic purpose, as defined. The bill would authorize the Board to deny, revoke, or suspend a license or registration or assess a fine for performing those procedures for any reason other than a therapeutic purpose.

This bill would exclude the performance of those procedures from the provisions authorizing a person to practice veterinary medicine as an owner of one's own animals. The bill would specify that the bill's provision shall not be interpreted to preempt a local ordinance adopted before January 1, 2026, limiting the performance of the feline declawing procedures identified in the bill.

3. **AB [1458](#) (Wallis, 2025) Physical Therapy and Veterinary Medicine:**  
**Animal Physical Therapy**  
**Board Position: [Oppose](#)**

**Status:** Assembly Business and Professions Committee

**Analysis:** None to date

Hearing Date: Postponed by Committee

**Summary:** This bill would authorize a licensed physical therapist who meets specified education, training, and experience requirements to provide animal physical therapy, as specified. The bill would require the physical therapist to notify the Physical Therapy Board of California (PTBC) of their practice of

animal physical therapy, as prescribed. The bill would require the animal physical therapy to be provided under either of two sets of circumstances involving a licensed veterinarian who has established a veterinarian-client-patient relationship (VCPR) with the animal.

The first set of circumstances would be under the direct supervision of the veterinarian at a premises registered with the Board. The second set of circumstances would be pursuant to a referral from the veterinarian, would require the physical therapist to provide a specified written notification to the owner of the animal patient, and would require the physical therapist to hold an active practice agreement with the licensed veterinarian.

The bill would require the physical therapist to provide a written copy of that active practice agreement to the Board or PTBC upon request. The bill would authorize physical therapy aides to aid the physical therapist in performing animal physical therapy, as specified. The bill would make any physical therapist providing animal physical therapy solely liable for delegated animal physical therapy tasks performed pursuant to a referral from a licensed veterinarian or by a person under the direct supervision of the physical therapist. The bill would specify that a veterinarian who issues an order for treatment for animal physical therapy is not liable for the animal physical therapy provided pursuant to that order by the physical therapist or by an aide or other assistant supervised by the physical therapist.

The bill would make certain disciplinary actions against a Physical Therapy Practice Act licensee by the Board conclusive evidence of unprofessional conduct by the licensee under the Physical Therapy Practice Act. The bill would require the PTBC to immediately notify the Board of any disciplinary actions or practice restrictions placed on the license of a physical therapist who has notified the PTBC of their practice of animal physical therapy. The bill would prohibit a physical therapist whose license is suspended, revoked, or otherwise disciplined by the PTBC from providing animal physical therapy. The bill would specify that these provisions, among other things, do not authorize an unlicensed person to practice animal physical therapy, except for physical therapy aides as described above.

The bill would make a failure to comply with specified supervision requirements imposed by the bill or any regulation adopted pursuant to these provisions unprofessional conduct and grounds for disciplinary action, as prescribed. The bill would prohibit a physical therapist providing animal physical therapy from supervising or delegating any animal physical therapy, except as specified. The bill would specify that these provisions, among other things, do not authorize a physical therapist to provide any other services or perform any acts which constitute veterinary medicine.

The bill would define various terms for the purposes of the above-described provisions.

**4. AB [1502](#) (Berman, 2025) Veterinary Medicine: California Veterinary Medical Board**  
**Board Position: [Support](#)**

Status: Senate Appropriations Committee

Analysis: 6/27/25 – Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

5/28/25 – Assembly Floor

5/19/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee

4/24/24 – Assembly Business and Professions Committee

Hearing Date: August 18, 2025

**Summary:** This is the Board's Sunset bill.

- 1) The bill would extend the existence of the Board from January 1, 2026, to January 1, 2030. It would also add an additional RVT member to the Board and require that at least one of the licensed veterinarian members specialize in equine or livestock care, or both.
- 2) The bill would expand the acceptable qualifications for RVT registration to include graduation from a veterinary college recognized by the Board. It would also require RVT applicants to submit a full set of fingerprints for a state and federal criminal history background check.
- 3) The bill would require applicants for a veterinary assistant controlled substance permit (VACSP) to disclose all U.S. states, territories, and Canadian provinces where the applicant currently holds or has ever held a license, registration, certificate, or permit related to veterinary medicine.
- 4) The bill would revise requirements related to veterinary medical records. Veterinarians would be required to provide clients or their authorized agents with a copy of an animal's medical record upon request. In cases where the animal is in critical condition or a direct transfer of care is recommended, the veterinarian would be required to provide a copy or summary of the written record. If a written record is not available upon release of the animal patient in critical condition or direct transfer for medical care is recommended, the veterinarian would be required to communicate the necessary information to ensure continuity of care.

Upon request, as specified, the bill would also require licensee managers to provide a client or their agent with a record of payments made for veterinary services and retain these records for three years. Additionally, licensee managers would be required to make records of veterinary

services available to the veterinarian who provided them. These changes expand current recordkeeping and disclosure requirements.

- 5) The bill would revise the Board's inspection program by allowing both announced and unannounced inspections of veterinary premises. It would eliminate the requirement to inspect at least 20% of premises annually and instead require the Board to make every reasonable effort to ensure timely inspections. Current law mandates annual inspection of 20% of premises.
- 6) The bill would expand the Board's disciplinary authority to include VACSP holders. It would allow the Board to place permits on probation, issue citations, impose fines, and authorize settlements in administrative actions. The bill would also allow VACSP holders to compound drugs for animal use under veterinarian supervision. Additionally, the bill would align probation and reinstatement rules for VACSPs with those already in place for licenses and registrations, including fingerprinting for reinstatement petitions. It would remove outdated requirements for registering disciplinary actions and would deem a license, registration, or permit canceled if not renewed within five years, though the individual could apply for a new one.
- 7) The bill would revise the Board's fee structure by setting specific fee caps and establishing new fee categories for veterinary premises based on the number of full-time equivalent veterinarians. It would also remove RVT program application and inspection fees. The bill would repeal provisions related to fee reductions under certain fiscal conditions.
- 8) The bill would revise continuing education (CE) requirements for veterinarians and RVTs. It would require licensees and registrants to complete CE relevant to developments in veterinary medicine—36 hours every two years for veterinarians and 20 hours for RVTs—excluding the first renewal period. Applicants would be required to certify CE completion under penalty of perjury, and the Board would have authority to audit CE records. The bill would remove certain previously approved CE sources and allow CE credit for teaching courses or passing the California Veterinary Law Exam. It would also require CE providers to meet new standards and allow the Board to disqualify CE sources for good cause.
- 9) The bill would eliminate the requirement for the Board to approve schools or institutions offering RVT training programs and remove the obligation to provide application forms for school approval. Existing law currently requires such approval and form distribution.

**Staff Comments:** The Board's 2025 Sunset Background Paper is posted on the Assembly Business and Professions Committee's website [here](#).

5. **AB [1505](#) (Committee on Agriculture, 2025) Food and Agriculture: Omnibus Bill**

Status: Senate Appropriations Committee

Analysis: 6/27/25 – Senate Agriculture Committee

5/28/25 – Assembly Floor

5/12/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee

4/29/25 – Assembly Agriculture Committee

Hearing Date: 7/14/25

**Summary:** This bill would extend the state's vertebrate pest control research program through January 1, 2035. It would continue the requirement for counties to pay fees based on vertebrate pest control material activity and allow the Secretary of Food and Agriculture to use those funds for research purposes. Because it continues spending authority from a continuously appropriated fund, the bill would constitute an appropriation.

The bill would also revise rules governing the use of medically important antimicrobial drugs in livestock. It would prohibit administration of these drugs unless ordered by a licensed veterinarian through a prescription or veterinary feed directive that complies with federal and state law. Both labeled and extra label uses would be required to follow a valid veterinarian-client-patient relationship.

Finally, the bill would expand enforcement powers related to certified mobile farmers' markets. It would allow enforcing officers to inspect related locations, vehicles, products, documents, and equipment. Officers would also be authorized to seize and hold certain materials as evidence to support prosecution.

6. **Senate Bill (SB) [602](#) (Cortese, 2025) Veterinarians: Veterinarian-Client-Patient Relationship**

**Board Position:** Support

Status: Assembly Floor

Analysis: 7/7/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee

6/20/25 – Assembly Business and Professions Committee

5/7/25 – Senate Floor

4/17/25 – Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

Hearing Date: Unknown

**Summary:** Existing law authorizes a veterinarian to allow an RVT to act as an agent of the veterinarian for the purpose of establishing the VCPR to administer preventive or prophylactic vaccines or medications for the control or eradication of apparent or anticipated internal or external parasites by

satisfying specified conditions, including, among other things, imposing different requirements relating to the proximity of the veterinarian depending upon where the RVT is administering the vaccine or medication. Specifically, existing law requires either that the veterinarian is physically present at the premises when the RVT is working at a registered veterinary premises, or, if working at a location other than a registered veterinary premises, that the veterinarian is in the general vicinity or available by telephone and is quickly and easily available.

This bill would revise the above-described condition to authorize an RVT to administer the vaccine or medication in a registered veterinary premises that is a public animal control agency or shelter, private animal shelter, humane society shelter, or society for the prevention of cruelty to animals shelter when the veterinarian is in the general vicinity or available by telephone and is quickly and easily available.

**7. SB [687](#) (Ochoa Bogh, 2025) Chiropractors: Animal Chiropractic Practitioners**  
**Board Position: [Oppose](#)**

**Status:** Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

**Analysis:** None to date

Hearing Date: Canceled at the request of author

**Summary:** This bill would prohibit a chiropractor who is not under the supervision of a veterinarian from practicing animal chiropractic, as defined, without being registered as an animal chiropractic practitioner by the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners (SBCE) and satisfying certain requirements, including holding a certificate from one of specified entities, unless otherwise specified by the SBCE. The bill would specify that the SBCE shall establish requirements for registration and would establish conditions and requirements for practicing animal chiropractic.

The bill would require an animal chiropractic practitioner to comply with regulations of the SBCE applicable to chiropractors, would authorize the SBCE to adopt regulations necessary to implement the bill's provisions, and would require the SBCE, if adopting specified regulations, to consult with the Board, including regulations regarding standards of medicine or care for an animal. The bill would make an animal chiropractic practitioner exempt from the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act.

**Staff Comments:** Board staff notes that the Board is not properly titled in this bill (referred to as the "Veterinary Medical Board" rather than "California Veterinary Medical Board") and is concerned about the clarity of the Board being required to "informally vote on whether to adopt, amend, or repeal" a



regulation being adopted, amended, or repealed by the SBCE (prop. BPC, § 1071, subd. (g)(3)).

## **B. Other Board-Monitored Legislation**

### **1. AB [463](#) (Michelle Rodriguez, 2025) Emergency Medical Services: Dogs and Cats**

Status: Senate Appropriations Committee

Analysis: 6/27/25 – Senate Judiciary Committee

6/9/25 – Senate Health Committee

5/5/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee

4/18/25 – Assembly Health Committee

Hearing Date: 7/14/25

**Summary:** This bill would authorize private ambulance license holders, as well as those operating ambulances owned or operated by a fire department of a federally recognized Indian tribe, to transport a police canine or search and rescue dog that is injured in the line of duty to a veterinary clinic or similar facility. This transport would be allowed only if there is no person requiring medical attention or transport at the time.

The bill would require ambulance operators, with specified exceptions, to develop policies for transporting injured police canines or search and rescue dogs. These policies would need to be submitted to and approved by the local emergency medical services agency.

The bill would also authorize an emergency responder to provide basic first aid to a police canine or search and rescue dog that is injured in the line of duty while the dog is being transported to a veterinary clinic or similar facility. The responder would be exempt from civil or criminal liability if the care is provided in good faith and not for compensation, subject to a specified limitation. This builds on existing law that permits emergency responders to render emergency care, including to dogs and cats, and grants them limited immunity when doing so in good faith.

Additionally, the bill would make clarifying changes to the provision of law that allows emergency responders to administer basic first aid to dogs and cats, emphasizing that such care is permissible so long as it is not prohibited by the responder's employer and does not constitute the unlicensed practice of veterinary medicine.

### **2. AB [489](#) (Bonta, 2025) Health Care Professions: Deceptive Terms or Letters: Artificial Intelligence**

Status: Senate Judiciary Committee



Analysis: 6/19/25 – Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee  
5/28/25 – Assembly Floor  
5/5/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee  
4/18/25 – Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee  
3/28/25 - Assembly Business and Professions Committee  
Hearing Date: 7/15/25

**Summary:** This bill would make provisions of law that prohibit the use of specified terms, letters, or phrases to falsely indicate or imply possession of a license or certificate to practice a health care profession, as defined, enforceable against an entity who develops or deploys artificial intelligence (AI) or generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) technology that uses one or more of those terms, letters, or phrases in its advertising or functionality.

The bill would prohibit the use by AI or GenAI technology of certain terms, letters, or phrases that indicate or imply that the advice, care, reports, or assessments being provided through AI or GenAI is being provided by a natural person with the appropriated health care license or certificate.

This bill would make a violation of these provisions subject to the jurisdiction of the appropriate health care profession board, and would make each use of a prohibited term, letter, or phrase punishable as a separate violation.

### **3. AB 667 (Solache, 2025) Professions and Vocations: License Examinations: Interpreters**

Status: Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

Analysis: 5/28/25 – Assembly Floor  
5/5/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee  
4/4/25 – Assembly Business and Professions Committee

Hearing Date: 7/14/25

**Summary:** This bill would, beginning July 1, 2026, require certain boards under the jurisdiction of the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) to permit an applicant who cannot read, speak, or write in English to use an interpreter to interpret the English written and oral portions of the license examination if specified requirements are satisfied.

This bill would require an interpreter to satisfy specified requirements, including not having the license for which the applicant is taking the examination, and would prohibit the assistance of an interpreter under certain circumstances, including when English language proficiency is required for the license.

The bill would also require those boards to post on their internet websites that an applicant may use an interpreter if they cannot read, speak, or write in English, the examination is not offered in their preferred language, and they meet all other requirements for licensure.

**Staff Comments:** On March 24, 2025, Board staff reported to the DCA, Budget Office that this bill only applies to state administered or contracted oral and verbal examinations. The national examinations for veterinarians and RVTs do not fall under the requirements of this bill – the Board does not administer them or have contracts with national vendors. Also, the Board’s Veterinary Law Examination (VLE) is an online exam and is not considered an “oral or verbal” examination.

**4. [AB 742](#) (Elhawary, 2025) Department of Consumer Affairs: Licensing: Applicants Who Are Descendants of Slaves**

**Status:** Senate Judiciary Committee

**Analysis:** 7/3/25 – Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

5/28/25 – Assembly Floor

5/5/25 – Assembly Appropriations Committee

4/24/25 – Assembly Judiciary Committee

4/4/25 – Assembly Business and Professions Committee

Hearing Date: 7/15/25

**Summary:** Existing law requires DCA boards to expedite the licensure process for an applicant who holds a current license in another jurisdiction in the same profession or vocation and supplies evidence that they are married to or in a domestic partnership or other legal union with an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in this state under official active duty military orders.

This bill would require those boards to expedite applications for applicants seeking licensure who are descendants of American slaves once a process to certify descendants of American slaves is implemented, as specified.

This bill would make these provisions operative only if SB 518 of the 2025–26 Regular Session is enacted establishing the Bureau for Descendants of American Slavery, and would make these provisions operative when the certification process is implemented pursuant to that measure. The bill would repeal these provisions four years from the date on which they become operative or on January 1, 2032, whichever is earlier.

**5. [SB 470](#) (Laird, 2025) Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act: Teleconferencing**

**Status:** Assembly Appropriations Committee

Analysis: 7/8/25 – Assembly Governmental Organization Committee  
4/30/25 – Senate Floor  
4/4/25 – Senate Judiciary Committee  
3/24/25 – Senate Government Organization Committee  
Hearing Date: Unknown

**Summary:** Existing law, the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, requires, with specified exceptions, that all meetings of a state body be open and public and all persons be permitted to attend any meeting of a state body. The Act authorizes meetings through teleconference subject to specified requirements, including, among others, that the state body post agendas at all teleconference locations, that each teleconference location be identified in the notice and agenda of the meeting or proceeding, that each teleconference location be accessible to the public, that the agenda provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the state body directly at each teleconference location, and that at least one member of the state body be physically present at the location specified in the notice of the meeting.

The act authorizes an additional, alternative set of provisions under which a state body may hold a meeting by teleconference subject to specified requirements, including, among others, that at least one member of the state body is physically present at each teleconference location, as defined, that a majority of the members of the state body are physically present at the same teleconference location, except as specified, and that members of the state body visibly appear on camera during the open portion of a meeting that is publicly accessible via the internet or other online platform, except as specified.

The act authorizes, under specified circumstances, a member of the state body to participate pursuant to these provisions from a remote location, which would not be required to be accessible to the public and which the act prohibits the notice and agenda from disclosing. The act repeals these provisions on January 1, 2026.

This bill would instead repeal these provisions on January 1, 2030.

The act authorizes a multimember state advisory body to hold an open meeting by teleconference pursuant to an alternative set of provisions that are in addition to the above-described provisions generally applicable to state bodies. These alternative provisions specify requirements, including, among others, that the multimember state advisory body designates the primary physical meeting location in the notice of the meeting where members of the public may physically attend the meeting, observe and hear the meeting, and participate, that at least one staff member of the state body to be present at the primary physical meeting location during the meeting, and that the members of the state body visibly appear on camera during the open portion

of a meeting that is publicly accessible via the internet or other online platform, except as specified. The act repeals these provisions on January 1, 2026.

This bill would instead repeal these provisions on January 1, 2030.

The act, beginning January 1, 2026, removes the above-described requirements for the alternative set of teleconferencing provisions for multimember state advisory bodies, and, instead, requires, among other things, that the multimember state advisory body designates the primary physical meeting location in the notice of the meeting where members of the public may physically attend the meeting and participate.

This bill would instead make these provisions operative on January 1, 2030.

**6. SB [641](#) (Ashby, 2025) Department of Consumer Affairs and Department of Real Estate: States of Emergency: Waivers and Exemptions**

Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee

Analysis: 7/3/25 – Assembly Business and Professions Committee

5/26/25 – Senate Floor

5/9/25 – Senate Appropriations Committee

4/25/25 – Senate Public Safety Committee

4/3/25 – Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee

Hearing Date: Unknown

**Summary:** This bill would authorize the Department of Real Estate and boards under the jurisdiction of DCA to waive the application of certain provisions of the licensure requirements that the board or department is charged with enforcing for licensees and applicants impacted by a declared federal, state, or local emergency or whose home or business is located in a declared disaster area, including certain examination, fee, and continuing education requirements. The bill would exempt impacted licensees of boards from, among other requirements, the payment of duplicate license fees. The bill would require all applicants and licensees of the Department of Real Estate or boards under DCA to provide the board or department with an email address.

The bill would prohibit a contractor licensed pursuant to the Contractors State License Law from engaging in debris removal unless the contractor has one of specified license qualifications or as authorized by the registrar of contractors during a declared state of emergency or for a declared disaster area, has passed an approved hazardous substance certification examination, and complies with certain occupational safety and health requirements concerning hazardous waste operations and emergency

response, as specified. The bill would require the Real Estate Commissioner, upon the declaration of a state of emergency, to determine the nature and scope of any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent practices, as specified, and provide specified notice to the public regarding those practices.

The bill would authorize the commissioner to suspend or revoke a real estate license if the licensee makes an unsolicited offer to an owner of real property to purchase or acquire an interest in the real property for an amount less than the fair market value of the property or interest of the property if the property is located in a declared disaster area, and would also make a violation of that provision a misdemeanor.