



VETERINARY MEDICAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES APRIL 17–19, 2024

In accordance with Government Code section 11123.2, the Veterinary Medical Board (Board) met via a teleconference/WebEx Event on **Wednesday, April 17, 2024**, **Thursday, April 18, 2024**, and **Friday, April 19, 2024** with the following location available for Board and public member participation:

Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 N. Market Blvd., Hearing Room
Sacramento, CA 95834

Webcast Links:

- Agenda Items 1–9, 11.A.1, and 15 (<https://youtu.be/2mXqBTDAcdw>)
- Agenda Items 10, 11.A.2–14, and 16–26 (<https://youtu.be/So-ndOesJWI>)
- Agenda Items 27–35 (<https://youtu.be/wPIAlsXmEzc>)

10:00 a.m., Wednesday, April 17, 2024

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

Board President, Christina Bradbury, Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM), called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Executive Officer (EO), Jessica Siefertman, called roll; all six members of the Board were present, and a quorum was established.

Dr. Bradbury made a land acknowledgement to publicly recognize the indigenous peoples who have been dispossessed and displaced from their ancestral homelands and territories, and the culture, history, and continued contributions of the original caretakers of the land on which the meeting was held, including the Nisenan, Southern Maidu, Valley and Plains Miwok, Patwin Wintun Peoples, and the Wilton Rancheria tribes. She noted the Board’s continued commitment to working with the tribes on issues of mutual concern.

Members Present

Christina Bradbury, DVM, President
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, Vice President (VP)
Barrie Grant, DVM
Jaymie Noland, DVM
Kristi Pawlowski, Registered Veterinary Technician (RVT)
Dianne Prado

Student Liaisons Present

Holly Masterson, University of California, Davis (UC Davis)
Anna Styles, Western University of Health Sciences (Western University)

Staff Present

Jessica Siefertman, EO
Matt McKinney, Deputy EO
Kim Phillips-Francis, Administration/Licensing Manager
Patty Rodriguez, Hospital Inspection Program Manager
Rob Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager
Susan Acklin, Licensing Technician
Keith Betchley, Enforcement Analyst
Bryan Brahms, Licensing Technician
Melissa Caudillo, Enforcement Analyst
Nellie Forget, Enforcement Analyst
James Howard, DVM, Board Veterinarian Consultant
Brett Jarvis, Enforcement Analyst
Amber Kruse, Enforcement Analyst
Rachel McKowen, Enforcement Analyst (Probation Monitoring)
Jeff Olguin, Administration Analyst
Robert Rouch, Enforcement Analyst
Bryce Salasky, Enforcement Analyst
Ashley Sanchez, Enforcement Analyst
Justin Sotelo, Policy Specialist
Daniel Strike, Enforcement Analyst
Ali Sultanzada, Enforcement Technician
Mychael Thompson, Enforcement Technician (Hospital Inspection)
Elizabeth Dietzen-Olsen, Regulations Counsel, Attorney III, Department of
Consumer Affairs (DCA), Legal Affairs Division
Tara Welch, Board Counsel, Attorney IV, DCA, Legal Affairs Division

Guest Presenters

Melissa Gear, Deputy Director, DCA, Board and Bureau Relations
Annette Jones, DVM, State Veterinarian and Director, California Department of
Food and Agriculture (CDFA), Animal Health and Food Safety Services
(AHFSS)
Sarah le Jeune, DVM, UC Davis, School of Veterinary Medicine
Richard Sullivan, DVM, Chair, Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC)

Guests Present

Vanessa Aberman, DVM
Paula Batarseh, Environmental Program Manager I (Supervisory), CDFA

Dan Baxter, Executive Director, California Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA)
David Bouilly, Moderator, DCA, Strategic Organizational Leadership and Individual Development (SOLID)
Kathy Bowler, MDC Member
Loren Breen, Founder and Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Animal Policy Group
Pamela Collier, RVT, Ethos Veterinary Health
Dayana Cuellar, DVM
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, California Registered Veterinary Technicians Association (CaRVTA)
Peter Fournier, Information Officer I, DCA, Office of Public Affairs (OPA)
Darlene Geekie, RVT
Jeni Goedken, DVM, Board Consultant
Richard Johnson, DVM, Founder and CEO, All God's Creatures Teaching Hospital and Surgery Center
Elizabeth Isaacs, Animal Policy Group, Government Relations
Jennifer Loreda, RVT
Bonnie Lutz, Esq., Klinedinst
Judie Mancuso, Founder, CEO, President, Social Compassion in Legislation (SCIL)
Michael Manno, DVM
Edie Marshall, Research Scientist Supervisor II, CDFA, AHFSS, Antimicrobial Use and Stewardship (AUS)
Terri Masterson
Grant Miller, DVM, Director of Regulatory Affairs, CVMA
Tracey Mumby, RVT
Katie Murray, DVM, CDFA, AHFSS
Mark Nunez, DVM
Bryce Penney, Television Specialist, DCA, SOLID
John Perry, Manager, DCA, Legislative Affairs Division
Jeff Pollard, DVM
Nickolaus Sackett, Director of Legislative Affairs, SCIL
Marissa Silva, DVM, CDFA, AHFSS
Sam Silverman, DVM
Marie Ussery, RVT, Vice Chair, MDC
Matthew Vahabi, DVM, CDFA, AHFSS
Matthew Wainwright, Legislative Manager, DCA, Legislative Affairs Division
Lisa Wogan, News Team Director, Veterinary Information Network, Inc. (VIN)

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

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment. There were no public comments made on this item.

3. Review and Approval of Board Meeting Minutes

A. October 18–19, 2023

The Board made minor changes to the October 18–19, 2023 Board meeting minutes.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, seconded a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

4. Report and Update from Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA)

Ms. Gear thanked outgoing Board Member Dr. Noland for her many years of service and commitment to protecting California’s consumers. Ms. Gear presented the Board with updates from DCA, which included:

- **Federal Title IV Financial Aid Funding:** Prior to July 1, 2024, colleges and universities could offer programs that exceed a state’s minimum hour requirements, and the institutions could offer their students federal financial aid. Starting July 1, 2024, a new U.S. Department of Education (DOE) regulation impacts students who earn a degree from a non-accredited program recognized by the Board. The new U.S. DOE regulation limits the program length to 100% of the state's minimum requirements, making the minimum requirement the maximum. As a result, non-compliant programs will not be eligible for federal Title IV funding after July 1, 2024. The program length must be equal to the state’s minimum hour requirements. There can no longer be any deviations or the entire program will lose federal financial aid. Ms. Gear noted that as of April 9, 2024, the U.S. DOE issued a notice that allows for the delay of the enforcement and implementation of the 100% requirements for Title IV financial

aid funding until January 25, 2025. She added that DCA will continue to work with the U.S. DOE, California's Legislature, and the Board's EO on this issue.

- **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)**: DCA's DEI Steering Committee held a meeting on April 5, 2024, to discuss DEI actions, priorities, and language access. The Board was advised that DCA's Learning Management System has many DEI-related training courses available to Board Members.
- **Outreach**: DCA's OPA staff will participate in two Facebook Live events hosted by the Consulate of Mexico during its Financial Education Week. Staff will present "Get to Know DCA" in Spanish and share a broad overview of consumer and licensing resources. The first event will be held with the Consulate of Mexico in Sacramento, and the second event will be held with the Consulate of Mexico in Fresno.
- **Workforce Development**: DCA will be developing workforce development outreach opportunities for all boards and bureaus to participate in the future.
- **Complaint Prioritization and Referral Guidelines for Healing Arts Boards**: In March, DCA's Division of Investigation's (DOI) updated the [Complaint Prioritization and Referral Guidelines for Healing Arts Boards](#). The new guidelines are effective and should be used to evaluate complaint referrals.
- **Executive Leaders Meet and Greet**: On April 30, 2024, DCA will host an in-person meet and greet with California Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency (BCSH) Secretary Tomiquia Moss and executive leaders. The meet and greet will serve as an opportunity to meet the new Secretary and hear her vision for the BCSH and DCA. An invite was sent to the EO, and Board Members were encouraged to submit questions to the EO to be forwarded to the Secretary.
- **Statements of Economic Interests (Form 700) Filings**: DCA thanked the Board Members and the EO for achieving compliance with the requirement.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment. There were no public comments made on this item.

5. **Presentation on Barbiturates Use in Performing Humane Euthanasia in Bovine/Cattle**—*California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), Animal Health Food Safety Services Division (AHFSS), Meat, Poultry and Egg Safety Branch*

Annette Jones, DVM, provided the Board with background information, provided a presentation from the meeting materials into the record, and answered Board questions. Dr. Jones' presentation included:

- An overview of [California Code of Regulations \(CCR\), title 3, section 1180.43.1](#) (Euthanized Animals), which required “B” markings on the forehead of animals euthanized with barbiturates.
- Providing outreach education to veterinarians on the requirements and their responsibilities.
- Viable options for disposal of animal carcasses, including shifting away from the use of chemicals for euthanasia, while reducing organic matter in landfills.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

6. [Presentation on Holistic Medicine Within Veterinary Curriculum](#)—*University of California, Davis, School of Veterinary Medicine and Western University of Health Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine*

University of California, Davis, School of Veterinary Medicine

Sarah le Jeune, DVM, provided the Board with background information, provided a presentation from the meeting materials into the record, and answered Board questions. Dr. le Jeune’s presentation included:

- An overview of UC Davis’s integrative veterinary medicine.
- Providing learning outcomes for students to recognize, understand, formulate, and implement a treatment plan for each animal patient.
- Noting the school is not promoting alternative medicine, but it is promoting integrated medicine.
- Noting most students are taking integrated medicine courses in their final year of veterinary school after learning the requirements of conventional veterinary medicine.
- Course collaboration with the Chi University, which is based in Florida, to provide these courses on the West Coast.
- Providing a background of orthobiologics and its use in veterinary medicine.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comment was made on this item:

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, thanked the Board for allowing Dr. le Jeune to familiarize the Board with the areas of integrated medicine. He thought the presentation served a dual purpose in refuting the accusation that the veterinary profession has been accused of being deficient with integrated medicine education by individuals who want to practice veterinary medicine without having to go to veterinary school. He noted it shows how robust the training is at both UC Davis and at Western University. He thought it was a reminder for the things that might be coming in the near future. He noted that veterinarians have extensive training in all of these areas, and they are capable of providing these services to their clients.

Western University of Health Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine

This item was not discussed. John Tegzes, DVM, was unable to join the meeting due to technical difficulties.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment. There were no public comments made on this item.

7. Review, Discussion, and Possible Action on Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC) Report—*Richard Sullivan, DVM, Chair, MDC*

A. Overview of January 16 and April 16, 2024 Meetings

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with an overview of the January and April 2024 MDC meetings, which were expanded upon in the subsequent agenda items.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

B. Recommendation on Previously Approved Text to Amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Sections 2030, 2030.05, 2030.1, 2030.2, and 2030.3 (Minimum Standards for Alternate Veterinary Premises)

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with background information from the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record. He presented the Board with updates, which focused on:

- Removing building standards referenced in CCR, title 16, sections 2030–2030.3 and maintaining those requirements in CCR, title 24, section 1251.
- Cross referencing any applicable building standards requirement to CCR, title 24, section 1251.
- Informing the Board that the effective date of all proposed changes would take effect January 1, 2026, due to the California Building Standards Commission’s (CBSC’s) Triennial Code Adoption Cycle.

Discussion: The Board discussed and accepted the MDC’s recommendation, including changes approved at the April 16, 2024 MDC meeting. The Board discussed the existing requirement for equipment to view images of radiographs, and the technological advances that have occurred since the existing language was written. Board Counsel suggested replacing proposed renumbered subsection (b)(3) with new language to help modernize the language. The Board discussed proposed revisions to the text to accommodate other types of diagnostic imaging, such as Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRIs) and ultrasounds, and requiring the images to be available during surgery, if needed, because there are some surgical centers, such as high

volume spay and neuter clinics, that do not need diagnostic imaging during surgery. The proposed revisions are included below.

Changes to the Text: The following includes the changes to the meeting materials that were approved by the MDC on April 16, 2024, and the changes discussed in the meeting to CCR, title 16, sections 2030, 2030.2, and 2030.3 (proposed additions are in double underline blue text; proposed deletions are in ~~double red strikethrough text~~):

[...]

§ 2030. Minimum Standards - ~~Fixed~~ Veterinary Premises.

[...]

(gb)(63) ~~The surgery room shall be well lighted, shall have equipment for viewing radiographs and shall have effective emergency lighting with a viable power source.~~ Provide a means for viewing diagnostic imaging during surgery, if applicable.

[...]

Rationale: The revised language strikes redundant lighting requirements, which are incorporated in CCR, title 24, section 1251.1, item 1, removes the outdated radiographic equipment requirement to instead accommodate other types of diagnostic imaging, such as Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRIs) and ultrasounds, and requires the images to be available during surgery, if needed, because there are some surgical centers, such as high volume spay and neuter clinics, that do not need diagnostic imaging during surgery.

§ 2030.2. Minimum Standards - Small Animal Mobile-Clinic Veterinary Premises.

[...]

(a) (3) A name, telephone number, and location of a veterinary premises where after-hours emergency care ~~is~~ may be available.

[...]

Rationale: The change of “is” to “may be” available is to accommodate areas where emergency services may not be immediately available or nearby. In circumstances where there is no emergency services locally, the mobile veterinary premises would not be required to identify local emergency services. In addition, emergency services for large animals may not be available for referral.

§ 2030.3. Minimum Standards - Small-Animal Vaccination-Clinic Veterinary Premises.

[...]

- (a) ~~The term~~ For purposes of this section, an “small-animal vaccination-clinic veterinary premises” shall mean a privately or publicly supported vaccination-clinic location at a scheduled vaccination event where a veterinarian or designated veterinary personnel administers ~~only~~ performs vaccinations and/or immunizations against disease and performs preventative procedures for parasite control on multiple animals, ~~and where the veterinarian or designated veterinary personnel may also perform preventative procedures for parasitic control at a scheduled vaccination event.~~

[...]

Rationale: The revisions are intended to reduce confusion raised by stakeholders during the MDC meeting regarding when the regulation applies and the maintenance of vaccination records. The inserted text “at a scheduled vaccination event” clarifies the situations when the regulation is applicable. The regulation would not apply to a clinic providing vaccinations for walk-in animal patients; rather, the regulation is intended to apply to scheduled events where multiple animals are expected to receive one or more vaccinations and parasite control.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Barrie Grant, DVM, seconded a motion to take the following actions:

- Rescind the Board’s prior motions approving proposed amendments to CCR, title 16, sections 2030, 2030.05, 2030.1, 2030.2, and 2030.3 and adopting sections 2030.15 and 2030.4.
- Approve the proposed regulatory text for CCR, title 16, sections 2030, 2030.05, 2030.1, 2030.2, and 2030.3 as set forth in Attachment 2 and revised at this meeting.
- Direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review, and if no adverse comments are received, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the text and the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested.
- If after the 45-day public comment period, no adverse comments are received, and no public hearing is requested, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking, and adopt the

proposed regulations as described in the text notice for CCR, title 16, sections 2030, 2030.05, 2030.1, 2030.2, and 2030.3.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion. The following public comment was made during agenda item 7.B. motion but was only applicable to agenda item 7.C.:

- **Jeni Goedken**, DVM, former Board inspector, noted that emergency lighting for Cal Building is different than what [Board] inspectors are enforcing during inspection as emergency lighting. She stated there is a standard for inspectors to make sure that when they inspect for number 25, surgery lighting, x-ray emergency, that they are making sure that there is functional emergency lighting with backup battery operated lighting sufficient to illuminate the surgical field as well. She pointed out it is being enforced that veterinary premises have backup lights in surgery. She stated if the lights go out, and the veterinarian is elbow deep in an abdomen, the wall lights are not going to do anything. She said the Board’s inspectors have been enforcing that adequate lighting illuminates the surgical field, which she believed is different than the Cal Building regulation intent. She believed that what was being looked at during Board inspections contains a component that is not addressed in regulation, which is emergency lighting sufficient to illuminate a surgical field.

Response to Public Comment: Ms. Sieferman noted that CCR, title 24, section 1251.1 currently requires adequate lighting for the intended purposes, which would include lighting for the surgical field, so no further changes needed to be made to the text.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

C. **Recommendation on Proposal to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend CCR, Title 24, Section 1251 (Veterinary Facilities)**

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with background information from the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record. He presented the Board with updates, which focused on:

- Removing veterinary practice management requirements in CCR, title 24, section 1251 and maintaining those requirements in CCR, title 16, sections 2030–2030.3.
- Replacing “facility” with “veterinary premises.”

Discussion: The Board discussed the process of submitting revisions to building standards. Ms. Siefertman informed the Board that the existing language was initially provided by the Board to the CBSC, and the Board is able to submit changes to the CBSC. In addition, the Board considered public comment made during agenda item 7.B. on the issue of indoor lighting to CCR, title 24, section 1251, item 1, to replace “with a viable power source” with “sufficient to illuminate the surgical field.” However, after discussion, the Board was comfortable with the current proposed language.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, seconded a motion to take the following actions:

- Approve the regulatory text for CCR, title 24, section 1251.
- Direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review and if no adverse comments are received, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the text and the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested.
- If after the 45-day public comment period, no adverse comments are received, and no public hearing is requested, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking, and adopt the proposed regulations as described in the text notice for CCR, title 24, section 1251.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion. There was public comment on agenda item 7.C. during public comment on agenda item 7.B.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

D. Recommendations Regarding Medical Records

1. Proposed Legislation to Amend Business and Professions Code (BPC) Sections 4826.6 and 4855
2. **Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend CCR, Title 16, Section 2032.3**

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with background information from the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials for both agenda items into the record.

Discussion: The Board discussed the importance for the integrity of the medical records, including payment information, to protect the animal patients and clients. They wanted to ensure that only specific individuals may request or receive the medical records. The Board also discussed the challenges of veterinarians/consumers to receive summaries or medical records between different veterinary practices or other veterinarians. In reviewing the timeframe of five calendar days for the client to receive a copy or summary of the records, the Board determined that the timeframe was sufficient to have ready for the client. The Board discussed consumer protection by examining the different challenges for enforcement between written and verbal records requests.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comment was made on this item:

- Bonnie Lutz, Esq., provided the following public comment:

Summary vs. Copy of the Medical Records

Ms. Lutz stated that as far as the summary or copy of the medical records, it was her understanding that if it is an emergency situation, either a summary can be provided, or a copy of the medical record needs to be provided within five days. She said the problem is that there used to be a definition and now there is no definition of what is in the summary. She believed the definition was still in the regulations. She said she has done a lot of the summaries, and it is pretty detailed stuff. She said if the reason for allowing veterinarians to provide a summary under emergent conditions is to be able to get a

quick, double down to the issues, so the veterinarian can transfer [the records] over to another facility and then to have to put all those details that are listed in what has to be in a summary, essentially the summary parroted what had to be in the record. She thought that the Board might want to change the regulation regarding what has to be in the summary if the intent is to provide fast information, so the client can get it over to another facility.

Invoices and Client Information

As far as invoice and client information, Ms. Lutz said her understanding that the [Frequently Asked Questions] FAQs on the Board's website will need to be updated since there is an FAQ that states the Board does not have any authority over financial matters. She said if the invoices and client payment information are going to be given to the client, she assumes that when the Board asks for her veterinarian clients' records, the veterinarians are going to assume they are going to have to provide the invoices and payment information; she had a problem with that requirement, including client confidentiality and redaction requirements of a client's [Social Security Number] SSN and credit card information. She stated even with computerized records, it is not a simple thing of doing a task, billing it, invoicing it, and getting paid. She said it is not how it works in veterinary hospitals. She stated there is an estimate, the practice tries to get payment upfront, provide the surgery, different issues are discovered during the surgery, the treatment changes, changes get made to the invoices, clients do not have the money, and the veterinarian states that they can come back later and pay. The client comes back, pays in cash, the cash transition does not get transferred to the client's record right away, and it becomes a mess, even in computerized records. She did not believe the Board has the authority to look at that kind of private information.

Information Transmitted to Other Veterinarians/Corporations

Ms. Lutz raised concern with having invoices or client information in the hands of other veterinarians because veterinarians, now with corporate takeovers, are very competitive. She was unsure whether one veterinarian would want another veterinarian in competition knowing how much the veterinary office is charging for services.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Lutz emphasized her concerns about invoices and client payment information being included in the medical record. She has received requests from the Board's enforcement staff to have her clients in individual cases provide invoices, which they have happily provided. She expressed that requiring this information to be part of the medical record, that then gets sent all over the place, is a real problem.

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, provided the following public comment:

Cautioned on Placing Requirements into Statute

In reference to the statutory amendments to [BPC section] 4855, Dr. Miller cautioned the Board that whenever items are taken out of regulation and placed in statute, the Board effectively loses it, because to change statutes, it requires a legislator, the Legislature to pass it, and the Governor. When the Board does regulations, it is just the Board. He stated the Board should be careful about what it was putting into statute because once it is there, it is gone. He thought if the Board were to make a statutory change, the Board could make the change with less wording and leave a lot of it back in regulation. He thought the proposed language was excessive in the way it was currently written. He stated he assisted with the language as part of the [MDC Equine Practice Subcommittee (Subcommittee)]. However, he was not aware of some of the changes.

Requirements for Equine Practitioners

Dr. Miller repeated a discussion he had with the Subcommittee about the requirement when there is an emergency, and the client needs the records. He stated providing the records at the time of request can be very onerous for equine practitioners. He stated that when he is out in the field, he may only have cell [phone] service 50% of the time, even with multiple calls. He said he knows what his choice is going to be when the challenge comes between choosing to write out the medical record for a patient versus taking care of a horse that is in an emergency. He noted that he may get penalized for that decision. He said on the equine side, if he is referring a case to a hospital, he is calling the hospital and telling them he is sending the horse. He then provides the veterinary hospital with information on the veterinary services he provided, including medication (e.g., Banamine, sedation, etc.), and then he sends the animal patient off. He said to sit down and write the summary, it is implausible, and all the equine people know that. He claimed part of the upset with the equine community with the Board, is that it only thinks about small animal clinics. He noted that equine practitioners do not have the same setups as a small animal clinic that has a computer system, veterinary assistant(s), and RVT(s) to provide assistance; the equine practitioners are on their own.

Invoices and Client Payments and CVMA's Position

In reference to newly inserted CCR, title 16, section 2032.3(b)(2)(K), Dr. Miller claimed 100% of veterinarians in California are deficient in their medical records—none of them are done correctly and none are ever sufficient. He stated the additional requirement will be too much for practitioners to handle. He provided an example of where he provides

charity to clients where the client does not receive an invoice and pays what they can afford. He stated that in instances where he does provide an invoice, it is handwritten on a tablet. He noted that the medical records are on a computer, so the new requirement will mean he will have to take time to synthesize the payment information of each appointment into the record. He stated the purpose of the medical record for both clients and doctors is to understand what happened to the animal; it is not about money. He stated it represents a far greater requirement for veterinarians on a record-by-record basis to have to synthesize this information, and CVMA is not interested in supporting it.

- [Judie Mancuso](#), SCIL, provided the following public comment:

Transfer of Medical Records Between Veterinarian Offices

Ms. Mancuso stated that two weeks prior to the meeting, her cat was seen by the first veterinarian who then referred her to a dermatologist veterinarian. The dermatologist veterinarian could not see her cat for a couple of weeks. She needed to resolve her cat's issue that seemed important and needed to be taken care of, so she went to another veterinarian. She stated the second veterinarian inquired about certain veterinary services and medications provided to the cat. Ms. Mancuso responded she did not know if certain veterinary services were provided for her cat, so she called and requested the medical records from the first veterinarian be sent to the second veterinarian. She claimed the receptionist at the first veterinarian's office responded that the records would be sent later, and that the receptionist was not aware if it was okay to send the records. Ms. Mancuso responded that she was taken back by the receptionist's response. She waited for the medical records, but had to call a second time, where the receptionist stated the first veterinarian said it was okay to send the medical records, in order for the medical records to the second veterinarian. The second veterinarian received the records, made recommendations, and administered medications to the cat patient. She said the process was flawless after she got the record. She would have liked to have received the medical records immediately.

Her Experience and Position on the Proposed Language

Ms. Mancuso said as a consumer, she has issues when a veterinarian office is not complying with the requirement in a timely manner. She said in her experience, it is veterinarian offices that have "shoddy records" who do not want to step up and send the medical records. She supports the proposed language.

- [Jeni Goedken](#), DVM, provided the following public comment:

Her Experience as Part of the Board's Enforcement Program

Dr. Goedken commented as a consultant to the Board and veterinarian who has access to consumer complaints that are pending investigation, some as far back as 2019. She agreed with Dr. Miller that the Board has to consider the non-small animal veterinary premises. She said she had seen quite a few complaints that are in that category, so it is important to see it from all sides. She stated that the Board does receive complaints about individuals not receiving records in a timely fashion. She noted that it is not the crux of many consumer complaints she is reviewing now. She said without the request being in writing, it becomes a "he said", "she said" situation. She stated by the time she gets to the case; it might be a few years old, and that part of the issue is not really discoverable.

The Board's Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)

Dr. Goedken stated one of the Board's goals is recruiting and maintaining a pool of quality and consistent SMEs to review consumer complaint cases as the Board receives them. She said the current feedback is that the records the Board receives are superfluous. She claimed that many times, the SMEs are looking at a date or narrow range of dates and some clinics will provide several dozen pages, which the SMEs must go through to find one date.

Financial Information and Medical Records

Dr. Goedken agreed with the points made against having the financial requirements added to all the other medical records requirements. She stated the financials do not seem to be the issue, but rather the medicine or veterinary services that were used. She stated adding in more paperwork for SMEs to review and compare, when the crux of the complaint is not necessarily financially related, would be more onerous to the review process. She agreed with Dr. Miller's cautionary advice on placing requirements into statute verses having the requirements in regulation. She advised that it might bind the Board's cases, where it might want to handle the requirement on a case-by-case basis dependent on the complaint.

Response to Public Comment: The Board noted that the addition of the financial requirements is based on consumer requests and needs for consumers to have the information for insurance claims and not intended to go to other veterinarians. The Board expressed their willingness to work with the various practices, including equines and large animal practitioners, to build statutes inclusive to their needs.

In response to the issue of whether a medical record needed to be requested either verbally or in writing, Board Counsel advised that for human records,

[Health and Safety Code \(HSC\) section 123110\(a\)](#), only requires that a request be made; it does not specify it has to be a written or verbal request.

The Board discussed the concerns expressed by Dr. Miller about the remoteness of large animal practitioners and the limited access to computers to document or provide that information. The Board noted that in large animal practice, often the first equine veterinarian will call another veterinary premises, talk to the receptionist, and try to get the horse down to the surgery room.

Ms. Sieferman noted that in regard to the financial requirements proposed, the information would only be required to be provided to the defined client and the Board; it would not be required to be sent to other veterinary premises. She further noted the Board does not get involved in financial disputes between a veterinarian and client, but the Board has the ability to award restitution to clients in disciplinary decisions.

Board Counsel advised that a receipt for services rendered is available to clients today. She advised that since it is the Board's goal to [provide the ability of the client to] send the receipt to the insurer so funds may be reimbursed or provided as restitution to the consumer, that the requirement could be limited to a detailed receipt of client payment related to services and treatment provided. She stated that modifying the language is less onerous and provides information that the client is entitled to as a paying customer. Board Counsel advised that if the Board sends this item back to the MDC, the Board should clarify if it is requesting the MDC to find exemptions for equine practice, limit the proposal to certain records, or revise the whole text.

The Board responded that if there is a request for invoices, it should be by a separate request. They also noted that it is the client's responsibility to keep track of their own paperwork.

The Board inquired as to why the requirements were moved from regulation to statute. Ms. Sieferman stated it was her understanding that the Board lacked authority to require the items, which is why it was added to the statutory proposal.

Board Counsel also noted that amendments to the statute started because it only required a summary and not a copy of the medical record. Due to special circumstances when a copy or summary is required in a shorter period than five days, it was her recommendation that the statute be changed.

The Board discussed the issues of receiving records between veterinarians with referrals and the exact requirements of verbal requests of veterinarians asking for medical records.

Referred back to the MDC: The Board referred agenda items 7.D.1. and 7.D.2. back to the MDC for re-review on the financial and verbal request provisions and work with large animal practitioners to resolve their concerns and make sure the proposals accomplish what was intended.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comment was made on this item:

- **Bonnie Lutz**, Esq., emphasized the financial information that the Board is asking to be placed on all the medical records is going to be deferred to the consumer. She stated there is no way veterinarians can keep those types of records to be sent on a real time basis. As far as client information and all the invoices, she suggested the Board review that wording. From her standpoint on restitution, she is happy to provide the invoices; it is not that the invoices could not be provided. Based on Dr. Goedken's comments, Ms. Lutz claimed it could increase the Board's SME costs. She added that when she gets records that have all the financial information, it takes her some time to go through the records.

E. Recommendation to Amend BPC Sections 4826.7, 4857, and 4886 to Change Instances of "Oral" to "Verbal" Regarding Client Communication, Authorization, and Examination

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with background information from the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record.

Discussion: The Board reviewed the meeting materials and accepted the MDC's recommendation.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Christina Bradbury, DVM, seconded a motion to ratify the MDC recommendation to the California State Legislature to amend BPC sections 4826.7, 4857, and 4886.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

F. [Recommendation on Proposed Text to Amend CCR, Title 16, Sections 2036.5, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, and 2094 Regarding Drug Compounding](#)

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with background information from the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record. Dr. Sullivan answered Board questions and comments on the agenda item.

Discussion: The Board inquired into the 24-hour expiration requirement compounded drugs. Dr. Sullivan clarified that continuous use drugs would not have to be thrown out after 24 hours, but if the compounded drug was not in continuous (immediate) use, the 24-hour expiration applies and was intended to reflect human medicine requirements. Concern was raised as to how to figure out when the 24 hours begin, such as stopping and starting a subcutaneous (SQ) fluid. Dr. Sullivan noted that non-compounded fluids would not fall under these regulations.

The Board also discussed the expiration date labelling requirements. Board Counsel noted the regulation for intravenous (IV), intramuscular (IM), and SQ compounded drug preparations would require labels with the date and time of initial preparation, which provides the information that starts the 24-hour time expiration period.

Dr. Sullivan noted that for office stock, the label would require the expiration date (see CCR, title 16, section 2094) to be included based on either 30 days for an IV product, 60 days if not, or the shortest date for any ingredient (see CCR, title 16, section 2093); this is why the office stock label would require the expiration date to be included.

The Board reviewed information that the CDC Guidelines establish a 24-hour expiration for compounded IV fluids. The Board noted that UC Davis often stores medications for 72 hours for medications used in their barn. In addition, the Board reviewed information from the University of Wisconsin, Madison’s information on [determining expiration dates for substances used in research animals](#), which allows for IV fluids to be stored up to 72 hours and SQ fluids up to two weeks. The Board considered changing the compounded IV or SQ drug expiration language to state “not to exceed 72 hours.”

The Board also considered “medically appropriate expiration date” since there could be nuances that might make a difference. It was noted the veterinarian is ultimately responsible for the standard of care of the animal patient. The Board discussed establishing a firm expiration rather than leaving the expiration up to the veterinarian, considering consumers and the cost of care and variables that impact the quality of the compounded drug. The Board also discussed wording the expiration “within” or “up to” 72 hours and chose “up to” 72 hours since some compounded drugs may expire within 24 hours. The Board also discussed a minor clarifying revision to CCR, title 16, section 2094, subsection (c), to change “specifications” to “requirements.”

Changes to the Text: The following includes the changes to the meeting materials that were approved by the MDC on January 16, 2024 and the changes discussed in the meeting to CCR, title 16, sections 2093 and 2094 (proposed additions are in double underline blue text; proposed deletions are in ~~double red strikethrough text~~):

[...]

§ 2093. Expiration Dates.

[...]

(c) For a compounded intravenous (IV) or subcutaneous (SQ) drug preparation that does not satisfy the definition of “immediate use,” the preparation shall expire ~~24 hours~~ up to 72 hours after the preparation is initially compounded.

[...]

§ 2094. Labeling of Compounded Drug Preparations.

[...]

(ac) In addition to the label ~~specifications~~ requirements specified above, All labeling of any dispensed compounded drug preparation shall comply with subsection (b) of section 2032.2.

[...]

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Jaymie Noland, DVM, moved and Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, seconded a motion to:

- Rescind the Board’s prior January 25, 2023, motion approving proposed amendments to CCR, title 16, sections 2036.5, 2090, 2091, 2092, and 2094 and approve the proposed regulatory text for Sections 2036.5, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093 and 2094 as set forth in Attachment 2 and as amended today.

- Direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review and if no adverse comments are received, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the text and the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested.
- If after the 45-day public comment period, no adverse comments are received, and no public hearing is requested, authorize the Executive Officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking, and adopt the proposed regulations as described in the text notice for CCR, title 16, sections 2036.5, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, and 2094.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

G. Recommendation on the Board’s Guidance on Veterinary Drug Compounding

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with background information from the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record.

Discussion: The Board reviewed the meeting materials and accepted the MDC’s recommendation. The Board suggested minor updates to the guidance including:

- Replacing “July 2021” with “July 2024” in the last sentence of the introduction paragraph.
- Updating the definition of “office stock” under VII. Definitions, item 3.

Board Counsel informed the Board that those changes could not be made until the regulations become enacted.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Christina Bradbury, DVM, moved and Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, seconded a motion to replace the existing Guidance on Veterinary Drug Compounding with Attachment 1.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

H. Recommendations on Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

- 1. Assembly Bill (AB) 1399 (Friedman, Chapter 475, Statutes of 2023)**
- 2. Senate Bill (SB) 669 (Cortese, Chapter 882, Statutes of 2023)**

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with background information from the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials for both agenda items 7.H.1. and 7.H.2. into the record. He noted that on April 16, 2024, the MDC did not approve the hypothetical scenarios on as part of the SB 669 FAQs.

Discussion: The Board reviewed the meeting materials and accepted the MDC’s recommendation.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, seconded a motion to:

- Publish the AB 1399 FAQs on the Board’s website and disseminate the FAQs to stakeholders.
- Publish the SB 669 FAQs on the Board’s website and disseminate the FAQs to stakeholders.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

8. Interviews, Discussion, and Possible Appointment to Fill Vacant MDC Registered Veterinary Technician (RVT) Member Position

The Board received 10 RVT applications. Upon review, the Board’s Executive Committee selected the following top three candidates for an interview to be selected for an interview to be appointed to the one RVT member vacancy on the Board’s MDC:

- [Darlene Geekie, RVT, Registration No. 5966](#)
- [Tracey Mumby, RVT, Registration No. 3911](#)
- [Marie Ussery, RVT, Registration No. 11871](#)

Discussion: The Board thanked all the candidates for applying to the Board’s MDC, and the Board noted that it was a difficult selection process.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Jaymie Noland, DVM, seconded a motion to appoint Marie Ussery, RVT, to the MDC to serve through June 30, 2027.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

9. Interviews, Discussion, and Possible Appointment to Fill Vacant MDC Veterinarian Member Positions

The following candidates applied to the Board and were selected for an interview to be appointed to the two veterinarian member vacancies on the Board’s MDC:

- [Vanessa Aberman, DVM, Veterinarian License No. 14258](#)
- [Jeni Goedken, DVM, Veterinarian License No. 19730](#)
- [Mark Nunez, DVM, Veterinarian License No. 11841](#)
- [Sam Silverman, DVM, Veterinarian License No. 4307](#)

Discussion: The Board thanked all the candidates for applying to the Board’s MDC, and the Board discussed the strengths of each candidate.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, moved and Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, seconded a motion to appoint Jeni Goedken, DVM, to the MDC to serve through June 30, 2027.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Dianne Prado moved and Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, seconded a motion to appoint Mark Nunez, DVM, to the MDC to serve through June 30, 2027.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 5-1 with Dr. Grant voting no.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM		X		
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

†Due to time constraints, agenda items 10 and 11.A.2–14 were moved to Thursday, April 18, 2024. *Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 11.A.1](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

Webcast Link:

- Agenda Items 10, 11.A.2–14, and 16–26 (<https://youtu.be/So-ndOesJWI>)

10. †*[Update and Discussion on Pending Regulations](#)

This item was not discussed.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 19](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

11. Update and Discussion on 2023–2024 Legislation Impacting the Board, DCA, and/or the Veterinary Profession

A. [Priority Legislation for Board Consideration](#)

1. *[Assembly Bill \(AB\) 2133 \(Kalra, 2024\) Veterinary Medicine: Registered Veterinary Technicians](#)

Board’s Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: Referred to Assembly Committee on Appropriations

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo and Dr. Bradbury presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record.

Ms. Sieferman advised she reached out to the author and sponsors of the bill to inform them of concerns on how the Board would implement the approval of the RVT prior to the performance of cat neutering surgery since the bill language does not require an application, evidence of completing training, or fee. She provided information to the author on how other healing arts boards have implemented similar requirements. She also informed both the author and sponsors that it was not her opinion on the policy of the bill, and the Board would provide their opinion on the bill at the April 2024 Board meeting.

Board Counsel noted the bill would allow the RVT to perform cat neuter surgery upon reviewing the animal patient's history to ensure the neuter surgery is appropriate. She noted that in animal shelters, there typically is no animal patient history. She stated even though the RVT is required to be under the direct supervision of a veterinarian, there was no examination requirement of the animal patient. She noted that the Board may have difficulty enforcing the examination requirement as specified in regulations (e.g., direct supervision requirements, anesthesia requirements, etc.) as the statute overrides the regulations. Board Counsel advised that the veterinarian would be required to come up with written protocols and procedures. She noted the Board would not have the authority to define or review those protocols and procedures. She stated that while the Board would have to create Board-approved curriculum of the training regulations, which could take many years to implement due to the regulatory process.

Discussion: The Board discussed the utilization of RVTs and the skills, training, and practical experience they have in performing certain animal health care tasks. Board members noted that RVTs lack the veterinary medical expertise to handle emergency veterinary medical situations during a neuter procedure. In addition, the Board noted that cat neutering is a complicated veterinary medical procedure involving a review of the cat's health/history and also the anesthesia requirements before starting the neuter procedure. The Board expressed their desire to expand access to veterinary care by allowing RVTs to perform other animal health care tasks more suitable to their training and education. In addition, the Board was opposed to a piecemeal approach to addressing the overpopulation issue but suggested that the education system develop an additional veterinary professional level that is at a higher level than an RVT, but lower than a veterinarian, to handle the more complex veterinary procedures. While the Board supported the intent of the bill to address the overpopulation of cats within California and their impact on animal shelters, the Board stated it would be difficult to implement the requirements, including the education requirement for RVTs, identifying specific RVTs who are educated in providing the services, addressing the direct supervision concerns, and enforcement against the individual(s) who fails to meet the minimum standard of veterinary care when there are complications with a cat neuter procedure.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comments made on the item:

- [Nickolaus Sackett](#), Director of Legislative Affairs, SCIL, sponsor of AB 2133, noted the bill is intended to expand spay and neuter in California. He stated they were receptive of input from the Board, including technical assistance, to improve the bill to reduce the work of the Board, so it does not take years to be implemented. He noted that spay and neuter services were unique veterinary medical procedures to reduce the animal overpopulation crisis. He noted triple overlapping issues among the animal overpopulation crisis, societal issues, and medical issues. He added that the Board’s piecemeal perspective could be justified in this case.
- [Bonnie Lutz](#), Esq., Klinedinst, provided the following public comment:

Background Based on Defending Clients

She stated in the 24 years she has defended cases of botched spay and neuters. She was very concerned about AB 2133 because it applies to privately owned animals, and if there is a complication, a complaint will be filed with the Board, or a lawsuit will be filed. She claimed there was currently an influx of small claims lawsuits, and AB 2133 would increase those small claims lawsuits. She stated that there were very few RVTs who have any kind of liability insurance. Ms. Lutz added that there were not many [insurance] carriers that focused on that service, and it was not something the carriers were going to want to jump on. She stated if something goes south and the RVT has a small claims or complaint filed against them with the Board, the RVT will either be without any insurance or the RVT will have to hire an attorney and pay the attorney themselves. In addition, she stated the supervising veterinarian will likely be sued and there will also be a complaint against the veterinarian with the Board. While veterinarians usually have insurance, she stated the Board will be dealing with two different claims. She stated it will be a lot of money, and there is a possibility that if this happens, the rates RVTs have to pay just to be an RVT will skyrocket. In addition to those concerns, she wanted to address concerns over “direct supervision” as she does regulatory work for multi-state companies. She stated other states have the term “immediate supervision,” which means the veterinarian is standing next to the RVT during the process. Ms. Lutz stated in this case, if “immediate supervision” was used, it would be ridiculous, since the veterinarian is standing there and could perform the surgery. She noted that “direct supervision” only means that the veterinarian is on the premises. She added that if something goes wrong, it could take the veterinarian some time to take over as the procedure could be performed at a large premises. She noted the law does not require the veterinarian to be available to help the RVT.

Position on the Bill

Ms. Lutz expressed concern that the bill also applies to cats privately owned.

[Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, provided the following public comment:

Position on the Bill

Dr. Miller noted the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) and CVMA opposition letters in the Board's meeting materials that indicate the AVMA's and CVMA's strong opposition to AB 2133. He appreciated the Board's comments and thoughtful reflection on the bill.

Impacts to the Board

Dr. Miller noted the amendments to the bill would require the Board to develop training requirements, which include a training curriculum and approving the RVTs to perform these animal health care tasks. He noted approval is traditionally in the form of an examination. He stated there has been great progress to remove barriers to veterinary licensure in California by eliminating the state examinations. He could not see how the Board could approve these RVTs [to perform these services] without some measure of competency through an examination. He stated for licensure, the Board relies on graduates from [Committee on Veterinary Technician Education and Activities] CVTEA approved programs, in which students are all taught the same way, and passage of the national examination. He stated if the Board has to develop training requirements, the Board will have to go back to creating the entire program.

Costs to the Board and Licensees

Dr. Miller claimed the expenses to the Board will be far beyond what the RVT licensees could endure. He noted that the CVMA and other stakeholders voluntarily offered to raise the licensing fees on veterinarians to the statutory maximum in order to offset the high RVT licensing fee that was driving RVTs out of the profession. He noted the RVT licensing fee was lowered down to \$225. He stated if the RVT is now performing surgery and a program has to be developed, he could not see a way that the RVT's licensing fees would not increase to a very high level. He was also concerned that within the licensing fee, the Board would still have financial impact in implementing the requirements of the bill. He inquired where the money would come from. He noted the CVMA would not be in support of increased fees.

Request of the Board

Dr. Miller requested the Board consider the appropriation impact as it considered the bill.

[Richard Johnson](#), DVM, Founder and CEO, All God's Creatures Teaching Hospital and Surgery Center, provided the following public comment:

Education Statistics

Dr. Johnson informed the Board that their first class had 12 out of 12 students passed the national examination. Their second class has had 3 students pass the national examination as well, and the third class is now in session with 24 students.

Background Information

Dr. Johnson stated he has been anxious to expand the scope of practice for RVTs. He provided his educational background, which included graduating from UC Davis, and his residency at the Animal Medical Center in New York City, and he taught RVTs from the University of Maine. He stated he was also an assistant professor at the University of Illinois, Department of Surgery, and he was in charge of teaching veterinary technician students from Parkland [Community] College and also was an instructor at San Diego Mesa College. He stated he was part of the Veterinary Technician Committee for nine years prior to it being merged with the Veterinary Medical Board, and he was also appointed as a Board member for three years. He stated he was the recipient of the CVMA's California Registered Technicians Outstanding Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.

Position on the Bill

Dr. Johnson supported the bill, which will have a dramatic effect on the cat overpopulation they have been battling against for decades.

Spay-Neuter Action Project (SNAP)

Dr. Johnson stated SNAP did a hypothetical study that said if one intact male and one intact female and their offspring, within a six-year period of time, will produce 420,000 offspring. He claimed the numbers were there in the pet population, all the feral cats, and animal shelters.

RVT Animal Health Care Tasks and the Cat Neuter Procedure

Dr. Johnson stated all the procedures required to do a cat neuter are already permitted under [CCR, title 16, section 2036](#)(b), paragraphs (1) and (3). He said the only additional item the RVT would have to learn to do for

the cat neuter procedure is to tie a ligature on the spermatic cord. He added the RVT can create a relief hole in the scrotum over the testicle that is being removed. He stated when the spermatic cord is cut, there is about a 2-to-3-inch cord that remains visible; it does not retract but remains visible in the open sack from the removed testicle. He stated with all of this together, a cat neuter is complete. He said “we” are already doing this. He added if you do not address the cat neuter and do not agree with him on those procedures, look at what they have done with dental extractions. He claimed the dental extractions in veterinary medicine has been done for 40 to 50 years. He stated compared to the two procedures, they are already doing these things. He added there is no reason not to affect the overpopulation issue.

- [Judie Mancuso](#), SCIL, provided the following public comment:

Related Cases While Appointed to the Board

Ms. Mancuso stated she spent eight years on the Board, and the Board received several cases; she never saw a cat neuter. She said to Ms. Lutz’s point, the Board saw spays all the time and anesthesia problems. She has watched hundreds of cat neuters at spay days. She claimed the spay procedure is simple. She said anesthesia is a bigger issue than a cat neuter.

RVT Animal Health Care Tasks

Ms. Mancuso said she paid \$1,500 for veterinary dental services that was only ever done by RVTs. She said the dental is more complicated. She said RVTs can provide this service and the RVTs are already doing much of the procedures as stated by Dr. Johnson.

Suggestions for the Implementation and Where to Place the Language

Ms. Mancuso suggested that the Board not wait. She said while she was on the Board in 2010, when the Board was talking about telemedicine, the [veterinarian-client-patient relationship] (VCPR), and RVTs helping. She said that the changes were made through statute. She claimed the changes were made in statute because the industry blocks items to protect their industry. She said bills have to be submitted to move the ball forward. She thanked Ms. Welch for her knowledge and expertise. She was hoping the Board, including Ms. Welch, would have had a meeting in January 2024, supported the bill, and wrote language that would be rock solid. She suggested that since there are accredited veterinary programs in California, any of the schools could provide the training. She suggested a notation on the Board’s website that indicates the RVT is trained to perform neuters once the RVT received their training. She said the language was not meant to be left out; it was purposely left out because they wanted the Board’s input to make it perfect and not have to go through regulations. She said when she was a

Board Member, the regulations were a 12-to-18-month process. She stated her understanding now is that regulations can go out to three years. She did not want this language placed in regulations. She said they want it in the bill, and there is no time to wait; hundreds of thousands of animals were being killed. She claimed the CVMA and AVMA does not come up with any solutions. She said high volume spays and neuters would take years to develop and launch. She asked if it was okay to keep killing millions of animals at taxpayers' expense when the Board is supposed to be helping consumers and animals.

Position on the Bill

Ms. Mancuso said the bill is a way to help. She urged the Board to help them to make it right and get the bill where it should be so it can be signed into law to start making a difference.

- [Jeni Goedken](#), DVM, provided the following public comment:

Supports the Intent of the Bill

Dr. Goedken stated that the bill is a great example of great intentions all across the board. She believed that everyone would agree that overpopulation is an issue that everyone wants to address. She claimed there are a lot of enforcement issues related to this issue. She said the main point of the bill is to curb overpopulation.

Hypothetical Issues for Veterinarians

As someone who volunteers with rescues and has done shelter work, Dr. Goedken said it is a routine procedure until something goes wrong. She stated veterinarians are trained in surgery. She suggested individuals not in the profession might not understand the "routine" procedure. She stated that due to the direct supervision requirement on RVTs, she has to be on the veterinary premises. She then is delegating the cat neuters, which may take her two minutes each, to an RVT. Then she is performing another task. She inquired as to what happens when something goes wrong. She said she can perform 20 cat neuters because she is experienced and trained in surgery in less time than a large dog spay. She said with all the codes and regulations surrounding veterinary medicine, the veterinarian cannot be eliminated from being involved with this procedure. As a shelter veterinarian, she could not see how this bill would help reduce the overpopulation because the procedure is something many shelter veterinarians have experienced. If something goes wrong, she hesitates since the task could be delegated to an RVT while she is elbow deep in a spay. She inquired if something goes wrong on the cat neuter because she is not within immediate arm's length

supervision of the RVT, what is going to happen to that pet. If she is within immediate arms reach supervision, she is doing the procedure herself.

Suggestion to Advocates

Dr. Goedken suggested that advocates talk to shelter veterinarians and high volume spay and neuter veterinarians who are performing the work to see if the proposal as written would help with the spay and neuter numbers when the veterinarians still have to be involved in the procedure on the premises.

- [Nancy Ehrlich](#), RVT, CaRVTA, provided the following public comment:

Cat Neuter Training

Ms. Ehrlich inquired as to how much training veterinarian students receive in cat neuters because she had been told the students are lucky to perform one while they are in veterinary school. She suspected that with the training program, it would require RVTs to have more training in cat neuters than veterinarians.

Veterinarian and RVT Responsibilities

Ms. Ehrlich believed that people have forgotten that the veterinarian is responsible to determine if they are going to allow any particular RVT to perform this task. In addition, the RVT has to want to perform the task and not every RVT is going to be capable of doing the task. She stated not all veterinarians are going to want an RVT to perform this task. It is only the RVTs who want to perform this task and if the veterinarian feels they are qualified.

RVT Animal Health Care Tasks

Ms. Ehrlich stated RVTs are already inducing and maintaining anesthesia, which several speakers have stated are more dangerous than a cat neuter procedure. She said those two items have been performed since the creation of the RVT registration.

Cat Neuter Training at Schools

In response to public comment about schools implementing a training program, Ms. Ehrlich stated it will not matter for the schools to implement a training program unless the bill is passed. RVTs will only be able to perform this procedure if the bill is passed. She stated the schools will have to be in consultation with the Board to decide what type of training is required.

Direct Supervision of the RVT

Ms. Ehrlich stated direct supervision absolutely requires the veterinarian to be available; she provided the wording from [CCR, title 16, section 2034\(e\)](#). She noted the veterinarian cannot be in the middle of some other surgery while the RVT is performing this task. The veterinarian would have to be doing a task that would allow them to be readily available if the RVT needed the veterinarian to intervene.

Position on the Bill

Ms. Ehrlich stated people are a little worried about stuff they should not be worried about. She believed it is an opportunity to decrease the cat population, increase the RVT population, and possibly increase the veterinarian population. She said California is losing both veterinarians and RVTs. She hoped the bill would take pressure off veterinarians and elevate RVTs to make them want to stay in the field.

Response to Public Comment: The Board discussed whether this would have helped veterinarians if RVTs had been able to perform these tasks. The Board determined that it may be counterproductive since the veterinarian still has to be available to handle complications that may arise. Additionally, it could lead to veterinarians being overworked.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Jaymie Noland, DVM, moved and Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, seconded a motion to oppose AB 2133 as it is written.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. The following public comment was made on the motion:

- **Judie Mancuso**, SCIL, stated in the many years she sat on the Board, it would take a watch over an oppose position. She stated it gave people more time to modify their legislation. As far as people not understanding how this bill would be helpful, she stated cat neuters are quick. She stated in a shelter situation, there could be a veterinarian provide a day of the week that is cat neuter day. Then the veterinarian would go around and take care of all the animals and doing other things. She said the veterinarian will be available in the shelter while the RVTs are performing the cat neuters. She stated cats are being released from shelters unaltered, even when it is a mandate in law for the animal to be spayed or neutered. She stated shelters cannot keep up with the volume; there is too much capacity. She claimed the Board was being very short sighted, and she was disappointed in the conversation. She said the RVT could be performing these tasks while the veterinarian is doing other tasks. She said it is not about the veterinarian doing it faster; it is about taking the task out of the veterinarian's hands. In private practice, she stated if the veterinarian states they do not want to do

this procedure or they do not want their RVTs to perform these tasks, the law allows for that. She said there is no mandate that the veterinarian or the RVT perform these tasks. She stated the bill sets a framework where there can be education and there can be a pathway for the RVT to perform this task. Shelter veterinarians or private practice veterinarians who are comfortable with their RVT(s) are implementing it, that they are allowed to. She stated it is not okay to delay this bill and allow all the animals to continue to die. She said the animals are leaving the shelters unaltered, which results in more animals. She asked the Board to rethink their position. She suggested the Board take a watch position on the bill and help them.

Response to Public Comment: The Board suggested that Senate Bill (SB) 1233 may resolve some of the issues raised during discussion.

The Board also noted that some shelter veterinarians were asked why they did not have veterinarian students come in rotation to perform spays and neuters. The response received from the shelter veterinarians indicated that they could perform these procedures faster and students slow them down. The shelter veterinarians also felt the same way about allowing RVTs to perform these procedures.

The Board supported the intention of the bill, and it noted that the Board had limited conversation with the bill’s authors. The Board was promised that if either it or the CVMA opposed the bill, the bill author would not seek a sponsor, yet the bill has moved forward. The Board noted that opposing the bill does not preclude further conversations.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 5-0-1 with Dr. Solacito abstaining.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP			X	
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

Board’s Position at the End of the Meeting: Oppose

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 15](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

2. †[AB 2265 \(McCarty, 2024\) Animals: Spaying, Neutering, and Euthanasia](#)

Board's Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: From Assembly Committee on Business and Professions: Amend, and Do Pass as Amended and Re-Refer to Committee on Appropriations

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record.

Discussion: The Board discussed the impacts of the bill, including fee impacts to shelters, shelter posting requirements regarding animals scheduled for euthanasia, and changes to the Hayden Act. The Hayden Act impacts shelter funding, imposes requirements on shelters for animals deposited in their care, and sets euthanasia requirements.

Board's Position at the End of the Meeting: Watch

3. †[AB 2954 \(Carrillo, 2024\) Cats: Declawing Procedures: Prohibition](#)

Board's Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Similar Bills Proposed in Prior Legislative Years: [AB 2606](#) (Carrillo, 2022) and [AB 1230](#) (Quirk, 2019)

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: In Assembly Committee on Business and Professions: Set, First Hearing. Hearing Canceled at the Request of Author.

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record.

Discussion: The Board discussed similar bills to AB 2954 that were submitted in prior years. For consumer and animal protection, the Board sought to retain the rights of qualified veterinarians to perform these veterinary services.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Jaymie Noland, DVM, moved and Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, seconded a motion to grant the Board's Executive Committee authority to oppose any potential legislation during the 2024 legislative session that prohibits veterinarians from performing any cat declawing procedures.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 5-1 with Ms. Prado voting no.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado		X		

Board’s Position at the End of the Meeting: Watch but grant the Board’s Executive Committee authority to oppose any potential legislation during the 2024 legislative session that prohibits veterinarians from performing any cat declawing procedures.

4. [†SB 1478 \(Nguyen, 2024\) Veterinary Medicine: Registered Veterinary Technicians](#)

Board’s Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: In Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development: Set for Hearing on April 22, 2024.

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record. He noted amendments to the bill since the meeting materials were posted included changes to BPC section 4840(b)(2) to replace “shall, at a minimum, include” to “may include any.”

Discussion: The Board reviewed the bill to determine if the veterinary services are acceptable for the veterinarian to allow an RVT to provide under BPC section 4840(b)(2). The Board discussed the importance of having an established order by the veterinarian, and it discussed opposing the bill unless amended.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comment was made on this item:

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, stated he wrote the bill and provided the following public comment:

Current Positions of Other Entities

He noted the CVMA has a watch position on the bill. He stated if the Board opposed the bill, it would be the only ones opposing the bill. He stated while the bill analysis was not available, the change from “shall” to “may” lifted the opposition from the [California Animal Welfare Association] (Cal Animals), [San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals] (SF SPCA), and the San Diego Humane Society.

Vice Chair of the Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development

Dr. Miller advised that the Vice Chair of the Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development was upset about procedures that may or may not be occurring within the Orange County Animal Shelter. He stated that the Vice Chair felt that the problem was with the veterinarians in the shelter. Dr. Miller responded to the Vice Chair’s claim by stating that veterinarians do not run shelters. He added that shelters are run by shelter directors, and the veterinarians do not have control over (1) all of the employees in the shelter and (2) sometimes even with the veterinarian’s own employees, as some employees may be union members, prisoners, or volunteers. He stated that the Vice Chair expressed concerns over what happens to the animals once they go into the shelters, and how long it takes for the animal to be seen. He claimed the Vice Chair was equating the concerns to an emergency room at a hospital. Dr. Miller stated the CVMA recognized the Vice Chair was moving towards a punitive direction towards veterinarians. He stated the CVMA responded to the Vice Chair by referencing a 2021 study performed by Cal Animals and UC Davis that showed that 60% of animal shelters have open positions for veterinarians that they cannot find anyone to hire. The study also indicated that close to 50% of animal shelters are seeking RVTs. The CVMA informed the Vice Chair that if she created a bill that was excessively punitive in mandating more requirements for veterinarians, it would disincentivize veterinarians from wanting to work in shelters. The Vice Chair told the CVMA that her concerns were related to the time period by which an impounded animal is required to be assessed at intake and how often the animal is being looked at when the animal is in the shelter.

Previously Board Approved Regulatory Language

Dr. Miller noted that the Board wrote and approved the language in BPC section 4840, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), subsections (B), (C), and (D). He stated the language was approved under CCR, title 16, section 2035.5 (duties of the supervising veterinarian in an animal shelter) as part of the Board’s alternate veterinary premises – minimum standards package.

He also noted the stakeholders at the time stated subsections (B), (C), and (D) would work for the profession.

Current Practice Standards

Dr. Miller stated there is a [list of common protocols](#), established by the Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV), that an RVT can perform. He noted that because there is no “client” in an animal shelter, the VCPR does not apply. He added that the VCPR only applies when it is a domestic animal that has a known owner. When it is a wild animal or the animal is unknown, then the VCPR does not apply to shelters.

California Animal Welfare Association (Cal Animals)

Dr. Miller stated when the [State Humane Association of California] SHAC and [California Animal Control Directors Association] CACDA joined to create Cal Animals, they changed their position on the previously Board approved regulatory language to CCR, title 16, section 2035.5. Due to Cal Animal’s position change, the duties and tasks language were removed from the alternate veterinary premises regulatory package.

Closing Comments on the Proposed Amendments to the Statute

Dr. Miller reiterated the Board’s approval of the language in BPC section 4840, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), subsections (B), (C), and (D). He stated the language in subsections (E) and (F) were introduced to address the concerns of the Vice Chair of the Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development. He stated that in discussion with shelters, a lot of the protocols are encompassed in written protocols established by the ASV. He claimed Cal Animals stated the bill would be more tenable if the language was a “may” instead of a “shall.” Upon that recommendation, the Vice Chair accepted that change to the language in order to get the bill into the next committee. He advised the Board about the expected response if the Board opposed the bill.

Discussion: The Board discussed the impact of the statute on RVTs, and it contemplated its opinion on a position of the bill.

Board Counsel advised that some of the Dr. Miller’s statements that the Board previously approved the language was inaccurate, and that the Board had previously approved provisions, but each had conditions. She provided the Board with examples of the missing language from the Board’s [October 2023 MDC meeting](#).

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Jaymie Noland, DVM, moved and Dianne Prado seconded a motion to support the bill.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

Board’s Position at the End of the Meeting: Support

B. Other Board-Monitored Legislation

1. †AB 3029 (Bains, 2024) Controlled Substances

Board’s Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: Referred to Assembly Committee on Business and Professions.

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record. He noted that there was an amendment to the bill on April 11, 2024, that impacted its implementation once xylazine is placed on Schedule III of the Federal Controlled Substances Act.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comment was made on this item:

- Grant Miller, DVM, CVMA, stated the CVMA had worked with the author and had a position of support of the bill. He noted that at the same time SB 1502 was proposed, AB 3029 was written separately by Assemblymember Bains, who is a human physician who specializes in addiction. He noted the bills are not identical, but they are similar. He stated AB 3029 had components to it that are tangential to the veterinary profession, and there is a chance that the xylazine portion of the bill may be dropped since it would be part of SB 1502. He stated the author may amend the bill to include testing of corpses since there is no accurate measure of how many individuals are dying from xylazine overdoses. Dr. Miller noted that bill author was reluctant to move ahead with changing the Schedule at the state level for xylazine before the

U.S. Drug and Enforcement Agency changes the Schedule for xylazine at the federal level; once the change goes into effect at the federal level, it will also become scheduled at the state level, which will give the state more control to pursue and control xylazine diversion.

Discussion: The Board noted the importance for the exemption in the bill for non-human use.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Jaymie Noland, DVM, moved and Barrie Grant, DVM, seconded a motion to support the bill.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

Board’s Position at the End of the Meeting: Support

2. †[SB 1233 \(Wilk, 2024\) University of California: Western University of Health Sciences: Veterinary Medicine: Spay and Neuter Techniques](#)

Board’s Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: Referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Jaymie Noland, DVM, moved and Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, seconded a motion to support the bill.

Board Discussion: The Board inquired about budget appropriations and effective dates for the bill.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. The following public comment was made on the motion:

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, provided the following responses:

Funding Allocation and Future Funding

Dr. Miller responded to Board inquiry regarding any pushback on funding allocation for the program. He noted that California is in its third worst budget deficit in modern history. He stated the bill is double referred to two policy committees, and it has made it through its first policy committee on a unanimous vote with a do pass recommendation to its second committee. He stated it is anticipated that it will pass its second committee with no opposition and widespread support from all stakeholders. He said it bodes well for it moving into the Appropriations Committee. However, he noted that there will likely be recommendations made to limit the amount of spending in the bill. He stated that funding did not necessarily need to come from the General Budget, and it could be reapportioned from other programs. He stated the schools are enthusiastic on expanding these services to help the situation. He said the schools know only veterinarians should be performing spay and neuter surgeries, so they have been very conservative with the amount of money they think it will take for them to provide these services. He admitted he could not provide exact figures. He stated that there might be a pilot project, including a sunset report to the Legislature, which determines the effectiveness of the program. He stated at that time, it might gain the attention of enough private donors where the program can sustain itself through private donations. He noted donors want to ensure their money goes to helping the problem; other programs have tried and not been successful. He noted even if the bill fails to pass, it is written and could be reintroduced when times are better. He said there is hope the bill will get through, and there was a strategy to get the bill passed.

Student Allocation and Certification for Veterinary Professionals

He also informed the Board that only 60% of university students are able to take shelter medicine clinical rotation because it is limited. He stated shelter veterinarians cannot slow down to teach students; they have to spay and neuter 30 or more animals a day. He stated the idea is the schools would embed additional faculty and have expanded veterinary premises to provide students with longer rotations with additional training. He stated the certification would establish a set number of hours to give students confidence in performing these procedures. He stated there would also be a Continuing Education (CE) component to the program where veterinarians could also get certification. He noted that RVTs would also get certification on how to perform all the pre-operation, provide assistance, and post-operation procedures as well. He praised the new techniques, which are similar to an assembly line to provide the procedure on the animal based on a set criterion (e.g., size, if the animal is pregnant). He stated the new

techniques allow for 10 times the number of spays or neuters in the same amount of time compared to the time it takes in private practice.

Discussion: The Board reviewed the bill, meeting materials, and considered public comment and decided to support the bill. The Board praised the bill for being complete, which includes initial education for students and RVTs or CE for practicing veterinarians to tackle the problem. The Board noted that new graduates are scared to perform spays, and this is a solution to the problem.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

Board’s Position at the End of the Meeting: Support

3. †*[SB 1459 \(Nguyen, 2024\) Animal Shelters: Veterinarians](#)

Board’s Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: Referred to Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record.

Discussion: The Board reviewed the bill, meeting materials, and discussed concerns with the bill. The Board expressed concerns related to the shelter websites data requirement, and the effectiveness of showing how many kennels were available, as there could be high turnover of animals at the shelter. The Board also noted that unlicensed individuals, including shelter staff not licensed by the Board, could return or release a cat into the community.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Dianne Prado moved and Barrie Grant, DVM, seconded a motion to support the bill.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. The following public comment was made on the motion:

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, stated the CVMA has a watch position on the bill. He stated the author, who also wrote SB 1478, is angry at her local animal shelter for not being transparent. He stated the shelters have also expressed concerns over the data requirement. He noted that the fluidity of animals may change throughout the month and suggested the reporting requirement be quarterly. He added that shelters are working with the authors on the specific reporting information required, so the data could help identify where pet overpopulation exists. He noted the data would be collected and analyzed, but that is part of two other bills. He said the shelters currently do not have a position on the bill, since they are working with the author to get the amendments to the bill.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion failed 2-4 with Dr. Bradbury, Dr. Solacito, Dr. Noland, and Ms. Pawlowski voting no.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President		X		
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP		X		
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM		X		
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT		X		
Dianne Prado	X			

Discussion: Since the motion failed, the Board agreed to watch the bill.

Board’s Position at the End of the Meeting: Watch

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 11.B.5](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

4. †*[SB 1502 \(Ashby, 2024\) Controlled Substances: Xylazine](#)

Board’s Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: Referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record. Ms. Siefertman noted the desire of states and the federal government to address the fentanyl and xylazine substance-abuse crisis, while also allowing veterinarians to have access to xylazine as it has legitimate use for treating animal patients.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comment was made on this item:

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, stated the CVMA had worked with the author and had a position of support on the bill. He informed the Board that in November 2023, the Governor issued an announcement for [new legislation to prevent illicit use and trafficking of xylazine](#). He stated the Governor asked the CVMA what they needed in the bill for it to be a tenable situation for veterinarians. Dr. Miller thanked Ms. Sieferman for her relentless work on representing the Board and veterinary profession to educate the Governor’s Office on the xylazine issue. He stated the Governor’s Office was well informed by the time it reached out to the CVMA. He added, the Governor chose the Chairs of both the Assembly and Senate Business and Professions Committees to help in adding to the success of the bill.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Jaymie Noland, DVM, moved and Barrie Grant, DVM, seconded a motion to support the bill.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

Board’s Position at the End of the Meeting: Support

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 11.B.2](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

5. [†SB 1526 \(Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development, 2024\) Consumer Affairs](#)

Board’s Position at the Time of the Meeting: N/A

Bill Status at the Time of the Meeting: In Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development: Set for Hearing on April 22, 2024

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record. He noted that since the meeting materials were posted, the bill was amended to change instances of “oral/orally” to “verbal/verbally” in BPC sections 4826.7, 4857, and 4886.

Discussion: The Board reviewed the bill and meeting materials and noted the changes were reasonable.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Christina Bradbury, DVM, seconded a motion to support the bill.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Siefertman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

Board’s Position at the End of the Meeting: Support

C. †*[Legislative Proposal to Amend BPC Section 4856 to Require Registered Veterinary Premises to Make Records Available for Inspection by Treating Veterinarian](#)

Staff Update: Mr. Sotelo presented the Board with the meeting materials and read the memorandum from the meeting materials into the record.

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, seconded a motion to approve the legislative proposal to amend BPC section 4856 for submission to the California State Legislature.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. The following public comments were made on the motion:

- [Bonnie Lutz](#), Esq., Klinedinst, supported the legislative proposal. She stated that with corporations buying veterinary facilities, she is finding her clients are having a terrible time getting copies of their records.

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, stated he was unable to make the CVMA aware of the proposal, but he would make a recommendation to the CVMA to support the proposal.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 12.B](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

12. †Student Liaison Reports

A. *[University of California, Davis, Liaison](#)—*Holly Masterson*

Ms. Masterson presented the Board with the following updates from UC Davis:

- DEI Initiative: Expanding summer enrichment programs for undergraduates.
- Outreach for middle school and high school students.
- People First Initiative: Mental health resources faculty and students.
- Facilities Initiative: Renovation of the Carlson library.
- Research Initiative: Data analytics capabilities and grant writing infrastructure.
- Grant Partnership with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA): Livestock focused students in high school have the ability to explore the livestock field.
- Access to Veterinary Care: Mercer Veterinary Clinic in Sacramento County and Covelo Veterinary Clinic in Mendocino County provided veterinary services for unhoused and low-income individuals.

Her presentation also included a request for veterinarians to serve as in-person mentors to students to gain practical experience in communicating between the client and the veterinarian in hypothetical scenarios in veterinary practice.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 17](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

B. [Western University of Health Sciences, Liaison](#)—*Anna Styles*

Ms. Styles presented the Board with the following updates from Western University of Health Sciences:

- On October 22, 2023, the student chapters of the Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association and the Association of Shelter Medicines joined to provide veterinary services as part of the Pomona Street Dog Coalition Clinic.
- Zoological, Exotic Companion, and Wildlife Medicine Society held a two-day symposium in January on conservation medicine.
- According to an Office of Outcomes Assessment of academic year 2022–2023, year 3 and year 4 veterinary students had nearly 80,000 case encounters.

[Public Comment](#): Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

13. †[Board President Report](#)—*Christina Bradbury, DVM*

Dr. Bradbury presented the Board with the following updates:

- The salary increase for the Board’s EO was approved.
- The Executive Committee met with Ms. Mancuso to discuss the idea of RVTs providing neutering services.
- The Executive Committee and CVMA met with Senator Ochoa Bogh about legislation she was considering expanding the scope of practice for chiropractors to provide veterinary services without the direct supervision of a veterinarian. Senator Ochoa Bogh decided not to pursue legislation.
- The Executive Committee attended DCA leadership and CVMA Board of Governors meetings.

Dr. Bradbury thanked Dr. Noland, Dr. Sequoia, and Dr. Lazarcheff for their service to the Board; each doctor was provided a plaque for their service. She also thanked Alexandra Ponkey, who served as the student liaison for the Western University of Health Sciences, for her service and noted that a Certificate of Appreciation would be mailed to her.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comment was made on the item:

- [Jim Penrod](#), CEO, American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB), invited, encouraged, and provided an application for Dr. Noland to apply to the AAVSB's Board of Directors.

14. †*[Registered Veterinary Technician Report](#)—*Kristi Pawlowski, RVT*

Ms. Pawlowski, RVT, presented the Board with the following updates:

- She attended AAVSB's Veterinary Technician National Examination (VTNE) Committee meeting, which focused on item writing, minimal competency requirements for RVTs, and rules and responsibilities with keeping up with the VTNE.
- She will attend the practice review for the VTNE on April 19, 2024.
- AAVSB's diversity award will be announced on May 1, 2024.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 18](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

15. Adjournment

Dr. Bradbury adjourned the meeting at 6:26 p.m.

9:00 a.m., Thursday, April 18, 2024

Webcast Link:

- Agenda Items 10., 11.A.2.–14, and 16.–26. (<https://youtu.be/So-ndOesJWl>)

16. [Reconvene Open Session – Establishment of a Quorum](#)

Board President, Christina Bradbury, DVM, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. EO, Jessica Siefertman, called roll, and all six members of the Board were present; a quorum was established.

Members Present

Christina Bradbury, DVM, President
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP

Barrie Grant, DVM
Jaymie Noland, DVM
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT
Dianne Prado

Student Liaison Present

Holly Masterson, UC Davis
Anna Styles, Western University

Staff Present

Jessica Siefertman, EO
Matt McKinney, Deputy EO
Kim Phillips-Francis, Administration/Licensing Manager
Patty Rodriguez, Hospital Inspection Program Manager
Rob Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager
Andrea Amaya-Torres, Enforcement Analyst
Keith Betchley, Enforcement Analyst
Nellie Forget, Enforcement Analyst
Kimberly Gorski, Enforcement Analyst
Brett Jarvis, Enforcement Analyst
Alexander Juarez, Enforcement Analyst (Probation Monitoring)
Amber Kruse, Enforcement Analyst
Rachel McKowen, Enforcement Analyst (Probation Monitoring)
Jeff Olguin, Administration Analyst
Robert Rouch, Enforcement Analyst
Ashley Sanchez, Enforcement Analyst
Justin Sotelo, Policy Specialist
Daniel Strike, Enforcement Analyst
Tara Welch, Board Counsel, Attorney IV, DCA, Legal Affairs Division

Guest Presenters

Mark Nunez, DVM, Director, AAVSB
James Penrod, DVM, AAVSB

Guests Present

Lori Aldrete
Emmett Barnard, Court Reporter
David Bouilly, Moderator, DCA, SOLID
Kathy Bowler, MDC Member
Loren Breen, Founder and CEO, Animal Policy Group
Pamela Collier, RVT, Ethos Veterinary Health
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, CaRVTA

Michael Firestone, Esq.
Peter Fournier, Information Officer I, DCA, OPA
Sean Gavin, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH)
Melissa Gear, Deputy Director, DCA, Board and Bureau Relations
Summer Haro, Deputy Attorney General (DAG), Office of the Attorney General (OAG), Department of Justice (DOJ)
Jeffrey Javinar, ALJ, OAH
Don Jones, DVM, Witness
Brina Lopez, Veterinarian Specialist (General), CDFA, AHFSS, AUS
Jennifer Loreda, RVT
Bonnie Lutz, Esq., Klinedinst
Edie Marshall, Research Scientist Supervisor II, CDFA, AHFSS, AUS
Terri Masterson
Grant Miller, DVM, Director of Regulatory Affairs, CVMA
Katie Murray, DVM, CDFA, AHFSS
Sunhee Paik
Bryce Penney, Television Specialist, DCA, SOLID
Heather Rowan, ALJ, OAH
Alan Ryu, Korean Interpreter
Won Peter Seung, DVM, Petitioner
Michael J. Sterns, DVM, Petitioner
Marie Ussery, MDC, Vice Chair
Matthew Vahabi, DVM, CDFA, AHFSS
Negin Yamini, Esq.

17. **[*Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on American Association of Veterinary State Boards \(AAVSB\)](#)**—*Jim Penrod, AAVSB CEO, and Mark Nunez, DVM, AAVSB Board of Directors*

Mr. Penrod and Dr. Nunez presented the Board with background information from the meeting materials and provided the presentation from the meeting materials into the record. The presentation included important updates, including:

- 2024 AAVSB Annual Meeting and Conference in San Diego from September 25, 2024, through September 28, 2024.
- Updates on the AAVSB's national disciplinary database as part of the Veterinary Information Verification Agency (VIVA) database.
- Updates to the Registry of Approved Continuing Education (RACE) to focus on veterinary education rather than products.
- AAVSB taking over the administrative process of examination eligibility in 2025 for member boards. There will be no costs to the member boards for this service.

- Review of the foreign education requirements, including the AAVSB’s Program for the Assessment of Veterinary Education Equivalence (PAVE).

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 10](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

18. [*Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Board’s 2024–2028 Strategic Plan](#)

Ms. Siefertman presented the Board with background information from the meeting materials and provided the presentation from the meeting materials into the record.

Discussion: The Board reviewed the meeting materials and discussed the following strategic plan objectives:

- [Strategic plan objective 3.5](#)—Clarifying and creating specific disciplinary guidelines for RVTs and Veterinary Assistant Controlled Substance Permit (VACSP) holders since the current Disciplinary Guidelines primarily apply to veterinarians.
- [Strategic plan objective 4.8](#)—Only applicable to boarding facilities that provide veterinary services (e.g., animal shelters).
- [Strategic plan objective 4.9](#)—Removing the Board from approving schools for alternate route programs for veterinary technicians.
- [Strategic plan objective 4.11](#)—Removing the Board from approving CE coursework for RVTs and placing the approval of CE coursework on specific entities similar to the requirement for veterinarians.
- [Strategic plan objective 4.16](#)—Revising the current statutory definition of livestock to include commercial equines.
- [Strategic plan objective 4.18](#)—Accepting Board Counsel’s recommendation to replace “BPC Section 4887 (B)” with “BPC Section 4887, subdivision (b).”

Motion: Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Jaymie Noland, DVM, moved and Barrie Grant, DVM, seconded a motion to adopt the Board’s 2024–2028 Strategic Plan, as amended at this meeting.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the motion. There were no public comments made on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Dr. Bradbury called for the vote on the motion. Ms. Sieferman took a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-0.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Jaymie Noland, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado	X			

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 21](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

19. [2025 Sunset Review Process Overview and Draft Report](#)

This item was not discussed.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

20. Executive Management Reports

A. [Administration](#)

This item was not discussed.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

B. [Examination/Licensing](#)

This item was not discussed.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

C. [Enforcement](#)

This item was not discussed.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

D. [Outreach](#)

This item was not discussed.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. There were no public comments made on the item.

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

Ms. Sieferman presented this item and noted that the Board will have the following agenda item in the future:

- Medical Records Legislation and Rulemaking

She provided the following proposed future meeting dates:

- July 24–25, 2024
- October 16–17, 2024
- January 15–16, 2025
- April 16–17, 2025
- July 16–17, 2025
- October 15–16, 2025

Discussion: The Board requested that the [Spectrum of Care Initiative](#) be added to the future agenda items.

Public Comment: Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the item. The following public comment was made on the item:

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, CVMA, stated there was a lot of confusion regarding the VCPR statutes and regulations, and he requested that the Board and MDC review them in the future.

22. [Special Order of Business](#)

A. Hearings on Petitions for Early Termination of Probation

1. [Won Peter Seung, DVM](#), License No. [VET 8855](#)

ALJ Sean Gavin presided over the petition for early termination of probation at 1:14 p.m.

DAG Summer Haro updated and presented the case against Petitioner Won Peter Seung, DVM.

Alan Ryu provided Korean to English translation services.

Dr. Seung attended the hearing and was represented by Negin Yamini, Esq.; Dr. Seung and Ms. Yamini participated remotely. Dr. Seung answered questions from the DAG and Board Members.

ALJ Gavin closed the hearing at 3:15 p.m.

2. Michael J. Sterns, DVM, License No. VET 8662

ALJ Sean Gavin presided over the petition for early termination of probation at 3:27 p.m. Emmett Barnard attended as the Court Reporter for the hearing.

DAG Summer Haro updated and presented the case against Petitioner Michael J. Sterns, DVM.

Dr. Sterns attended the hearing and was represented by Michael Firestone, Esq. Dr. Sterns answered questions from the DAG and Board members. Don Jones, DVM, appeared as a witness.

ALJ Gavin closed the hearing at 4:49 p.m.

23. Recess Open Session until April 19, 2024, at 9:00 a.m.

Dr. Bradbury recessed open session at 4:50 p.m.

24. Convene Closed Session

Dr. Bradbury convened closed session at 5:00 p.m.

25. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11226(c)(3), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to Deliberate and Vote on Disciplinary Matters, Including the Above-Identified Petitions, Stipulated Settlements, and Proposed Decisions

The Board met in closed session to deliberate and vote on the above identified petitions.

In the Matter of the Petition for Early Termination of Probation Against Won Peter Seung, DMV, Veterinarian License No. VET 8855; Board Case No. 4602020000383; OAH Case No. 2024030273.

The Board granted the petition for early termination of probation.

In the Matter of the Petition for Early Termination of Probation Against Michael J. Sterns, DVM, Veterinarian License No. VET 8662; Board Case No. 4602017001022; OAH Case No. 2024030275.

The Board granted the petition for early termination of probation.

*Discussion of the following stipulated settlements was continued to April 19, 2024.

*In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation Against Juan Campos, DVM, Veterinarian License No. VET 13721; Board Case No. 4602019001340

The Board adopted the stipulated settlement.

In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation and Petition to Revoke Probation Against Davinder Singh Sandhu, DVM, Veterinarian License No. VET 11425, and American Pet Hospital, Premises Registration Nos. HSP 5404 and HSP 38141; Board Case No. 4602023001213

The Board adopted the stipulated settlement.

26. Adjourn Closed Session

Dr. Bradbury recessed closed session at 5:55 p.m.

9:00 a.m., Friday, April 19, 2024

Webcast Link:

- Agenda Items 27–35 (<https://youtu.be/wPIAlsXmEzc>)

27. Reconvene Open Session – Establishment of a Quorum

Board President, Christina Bradbury, DVM, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. EO, Jessica Siefertman, called roll, and five members of the Board were present; a quorum was established. Ms. Pawlowski was absent at the time of roll call but joined the meeting at 12:56 p.m.

Members Present

Christina Bradbury, DVM, President
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP
Barrie Grant, DVM
Jaymie Noland, DVM
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT
Dianne Prado

Staff Present

Jessica Siefertman, EO
Matt McKinney, Deputy EO
Kim Phillips-Francis, Administration/Licensing Manager
Patty Rodriguez, Hospital Inspection Program Manager
Rob Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager
Keith Betchley, Enforcement Analyst
Nellie Forget, Enforcement Analyst
Kimberly Gorski, Enforcement Analyst
Brett Jarvis, Enforcement Analyst
Alexander Juarez, Enforcement Analyst (Probation Monitoring)

Rachel McKowen, Enforcement Analyst (Probation Monitoring)
Jeff Olguin, Administration Analyst
Robert Rouch, Enforcement Analyst
Ashley Sanchez, Enforcement Analyst
Justin Sotelo, Policy Specialist
Daniel Strike, Enforcement Analyst
Tara Welch, Board Counsel, Attorney IV, DCA, Legal Affairs Division

Guests Present

Phillip Arthur, DAG, OAG, DOJ
David Bouilly, Moderator, DCA, SOLID
Sheronda Edwards, DAG, OAG, DOJ
Natalie Freitas, Paralegal, Klinedinst
Peter Fournier, Information Officer I, DCA, OPA
Melissa Gear, Deputy Director, DCA, Board and Bureau Relations
Gobind Gill, DVM, Witness
Summer Haro, DAG, OAG, DOJ
Jeffrey Javinar, ALJ, OAH
Marcie Larson, ALJ, OAH
Bonnie Lutz, Esq., Klinedinst
Teresa McCaffray, Petitioner
Katie Murray, DVM, CDFA, AHFSS
Bryce Penney, Television Specialist, DCA, SOLID
Dr. Mait Ranjan, Witness
Mischa Routon, Associate Dean of Faculty Development, California Baptist
University
Heather Rowan, ALJ, OAH
Amandeep Singh, DVM, Petitioner
Karamjeet Singh, DVM, Witness
Matthew Vahabi, DVM, CDFA, AHFSS

28. Special Order of Business

A. *Hearings on Petitions for Reinstatement

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 28.A.2](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

1. *Haroon Mohiuddin, DVM, Surrendered License No. VET 7124

ALJ Larson presided over the petition for reinstatement of Dr. Mohiuddin's veterinarian license at 11:43 a.m.

ALJ Larson took notice that Petitioner Haroon Mohiuddin, DVM, failed to appear at the hearing. ALJ Larson referred the matter to the Board for further action and closed the hearing at 11:45 a.m.

The Board took official notice of its records and the fact that Petitioner failed to appear at hearing. Pursuant to Government Code section 15520, the Board found Petitioner in default and took action without further hearing. Pursuant to Government Code sections 15520, subdivision (a), and 11522, and good cause not appearing to grant the petition, the Board ordered the petition for reinstatement denied.

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 29](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

2. [Amandeep Singh, DVM](#), Revoked License No. [VET 16252](#)

ALJ Larson presided over the petition for reinstatement of Dr. Singh's veterinarian license at 9:04 a.m. A quorum of five Board Members was established; Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, was absent.

DAG Haro provided the Board with an overview of Petitioner Amandeep Singh, DVM's, license history related to disciplinary matters, exhibits, and presented the case against Dr. Singh on behalf of the people of California.

Dr. Singh was represented by Bonnie Lutz, Esq. Ms. Lutz presented a petition for reinstatement, including calling witnesses and providing letters of recommendation, of Dr. Singh's veterinarian license. Dr. Singh answered questions from the DAG, members of the Board, and Ms. Lutz. Dr. Mait Ranjan appeared as a witness in the matter. Drs. Karamjeet Singh and Gobind Gill appeared remotely as witnesses in the matter.

ALJ Larson closed the hearing at 10:54 a.m.

3. *[Teresa McCaffray](#), Surrendered Registration No. [RVT 12323](#)

ALJ Larson presided over the petition for reinstatement of Ms. McCaffray's RVT registration at 11:09 a.m. A quorum of five Board Members was established; Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, was absent.

DAG Haro provided the Board with an overview of Petitioner Teresa McCaffray's registration history related to disciplinary matters, exhibits, and presented the case against Ms. McCaffray on behalf of the people of California.

Ms. McCaffray represented herself and presented a petition for reinstatement, including letters of recommendation, of her RVT registration. Ms. McCaffray answered questions from the DAG and members of the Board.

ALJ Larson closed the hearing at 11:42 a.m.

*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 28.A.1](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

29. Recess Open Session

Dr. Bradbury recessed open session at 11:45 a.m.

30. Convene Closed Session

Dr. Bradbury convened closed session at 12:01 p.m.

31. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11226(c)(3), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to Deliberate and Vote on the Above-Identified Petitions

The Board met in closed session to deliberate and vote on the above identified petitions.

In the Matter of the Petitions for Reinstatement Against Haroon Mohiuddin, Veterinarian License No. VET 7124; Board Case No. 4602023001725; OAH Case No. 2024030277.

The Board denied the petition for reinstatement.

In the Matter of the Petitions for Reinstatement Against Amandeep Singh, Veterinarian License No. VET 16252; Board Case No. 4602024001100; OAH Case No. 2024030279.

The Board granted the petition for reinstatement.

In the Matter of the Petitions for Reinstatement Against Teresa McCaffray, RVT Registration No. RVT 12323; Board Case No. 4602019000094; OAH Case No. 2024030281.

The Board granted the petition for reinstatement.

32. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11226(e)(1) and (2)(A), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to Confer and Receive Advice From Legal Counsel Regarding the Following Matter: *San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, et al. v. Jessica Sieferman*, United State District Court, Case No. 2:21-cv-00786-TLN-KJN

The Board met in closed session to confer and receive advice from Board Counsel.

33. Adjourn Closed Session

Dr. Bradbury adjourned closed session at 2:27 p.m.

34. Reconvene Open Session

Dr. Bradbury reconvened open session at 2:28 p.m. Board Counsel noted that Ms. Pawlowski joined the meeting at 12:56 p.m., for discussion of two stipulated settlements.

35. Adjournment

Dr. Bradbury adjourned the meeting at 2:29 p.m.

Hyperlinks to the webcast are controlled by a third-party and may be removed at any time. They are provided for convenience purposes only and are not considered part of the official record.