



## VETERINARY MEDICAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES OCTOBER 16–17, 2024

In accordance with Government Code section 11122.5, the Veterinary Medical Board (Board) met in-person with additional public participation available via a teleconference/WebEx Event on **Wednesday, October 16, 2024** and **Thursday, October 17, 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 1–16, 26.B., and 26.E. (<https://youtu.be/CA7KDvZPW4c>)
- Agenda Items 17–28 (excluding items 26.B. and 26.E.) (<https://youtu.be/-WSq01A9Rtl>)

**10:00 a.m., Wednesday, October 16, 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 9:59 a.m. Executive Officer (EO), Jessica Siefertman, called roll; six members of the Board were present, and a quorum was established. Dianne Prado, Esq., was absent from the meeting.

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.

Dr. Bradbury welcomed new Board Member, Steven Manyak, DVM. She also recognized National Veterinary Technician Week by thanking all registered veterinary technicians (RVTs) for their contribution and dedication to the profession.

### **Members Present**

Christina Bradbury, DVM, President

Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, Vice President (VP)  
Patrick Espinoza, Esq.  
Barrie Grant, DVM  
Steven Manyak, DVM  
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT

### **Student Liaisons Present**

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

### **Staff Present**

Jessica Siefertman, EO  
Matt McKinney, Deputy EO  
Alicia Hernandez, Administration and Licensing Manager  
Patty Rodriguez, Enforcement Manager  
Ashley Sanchez, Enforcement Manager  
Justin Sotelo, Policy Specialist  
Rob Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager  
Keith Betchley, Enforcement Analyst  
Melissa Caudillo, Enforcement Analyst  
Kellie Fairless, Licensing Analyst  
Brett Jarvis, Enforcement Analyst  
Amber Kruse, Enforcement Analyst  
Anh-Thu Le, Enforcement Analyst  
Jeff Olguin, Administration Analyst  
Kim Phillips-Francis, Enforcement Analyst  
Robert Rouch, Enforcement Analyst  
Bryce Salasky, Enforcement Analyst  
Daniel Strike, Enforcement Analyst  
David Bouilly, Moderator, Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA), Strategic  
Organizational Leadership and Individual Development (SOLID)  
Alex Cristescu, Television Specialist, DCA, Office of Public Affairs  
Elizabeth Dietzen-Olsen, Regulations Counsel, Attorney III, 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  
Mark Nunez, DVM, Director, AAVSB  
Richard Sullivan, DVM, Chair, Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC)  
Marie Ussery, RVT, Vice Chair, MDC

## **Guests Present**

JC

Kristina Baucom

Dan Baxter, Executive Director, California Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA)

Danny Cuellar

Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, California Registered Veterinary Technicians Association (CaRVTA)

Anita Levy Hudson, RVT, CaRVTA

Connor Kelligrew

Karen Kolber

Bonnie Lutz, Esq., Klinedinst

Grant Miller, DVM, Director of Regulatory Affairs, CVMA

Katie Murray, DVM, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), Animal Health and Food Safety Services (AHFSS)

Maggie O'Brian

Terri Masterson

Priscilla Nguyen

Jeff Pollard, DVM

Jeff Shomey

Kristy Underwood, EO, California Board of Barbering and Cosmetology

Beth Venit, DVM, Chief Veterinary Officer, American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB)

Kristin Walker, EO, California Board of Chiropractic Examiners

Alison White

Scott Young

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

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

- [JC](#) provided the following comment:

### **Chiropractic Veterinary Care**

JC stated that as a California resident, she believes it should be her right to decide what kind of care her pet should get. She claimed she is having a hard time getting care for her animal for chiropractic services. She said it was due to her vet[erinerian] being unable to supervise her chiropractor performing animal chiropractic [Services]. She asked the Board to consider direct access to certified animal chiropractors, so she could have access to get her pet care. She said her options are very limited.

### 3. Review and Approval of Board Meeting Minutes

#### A. July 24–25, 2024

The Board had no changes to the [July 24–25, 2024 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 July 24–25, 2024 meeting minutes.

**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 5-0-1 with Dr. Manyak abstaining.

Members	Vote			
	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Christina Bradbury, DVM, President	X			
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP	X			
Patrick Espinoza, Esq.	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Steven Manyak, DVM			X	
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado, Esq.				X

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

Melissa Gear, Deputy Director, DCA, Board and Bureau Relations, welcomed new Board Member Dr. Manyak and presented the Board with the following updates from DCA:

- **Travel Policy and Reimbursement Updates:** California Department of Human Resources (CalHR) updated its travel policy to align with the federal policies outlined by the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA).

Effective October 1, 2024, DCA will use the federal standard meals and incidental expense rates for in state and out-of-state travel. DCA will also use the federal standard and non-standard reimbursement lodging rates. Board members were encouraged to become familiar with the new travel expense reimbursement program and rates.

- **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI):** DCA's DEI Steering Committee will meet on October 25, 2024, which will include: the election of a Chair and Vice

Chair, discuss language access and workforce development, and review the DEI Committee's membership application.

- **Unconscious Bias Training for Board Members**: DCA is updating its current "Unveiling Unconscious Bias" training to specifically focus on Board Members, their critical roles, and how unconscious bias can affect decision-making authority. The training is self-paced, available in DCA's Learning Management System (LMS), and anticipated to launch in early 2025. Board Members are required to take the training annually.

Board Members were reminded and strongly encourage to take DCA's online DEI training optional courses, which exceeds 20 course offerings.

- **Our Promise Campaign to Pledge Funds for Nonprofits**: The annual Our Promise campaign allows State employees and Board Members to pledge their support of nonprofits that provide critical services to local communities. From October through December 31, 2024, employees and Board Members can give a one-time donation or monthly payroll deduction to a non-profit of their choice. These contributions have a positive impact by providing vital resources to those experiencing poverty, homelessness, and food insecurity, and offering support to causes such as veterans, animals, the environment, and more. This year, DCA's Our Promise efforts will be led by Monica Vargas, Deputy Director of Communications, and Karen Navarro, Assistant Deputy Director of Communications.

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

## 5. **Update, Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB)—Mark Nunez, DVM, AAVSB, Board of Directors**

### A. **2024 Annual Meeting and Conference**

Dr. Nunez, Dr. Bradbury, and Ms. Siefertman provided the Board with the following updates from the AAVSB, which was held between September 24–28, 2024, at the Loews Coronado Bay Resort in San Diego, and focused on:

- **Increase in Delegates**: Out of the 68 AAVSB Member Boards, there were 54 delegates who attended in 2024, which is an increase from 52 delegates in 2023, and 50 delegates from 2022. Costs for the conference were paid for by the AAVSB.
- **Allied Organizations in Attendance**: Representatives included the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), American Board of Veterinary Toxicology (ABVT), Canadian Veterinary Medical Association,

International Council for Veterinary Assessment (ICVA), National Association of Veterinary Technicians in America (NAVTA), Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, Student American Veterinary Medical Association (SAVMA), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and Veterinary Council of New Zealand.

- **Committee Meetings Open to the Public:** Excluding the Examination Development Workshop, all meetings were open to provide transparency with the various activities of the AAVSB.
- **Nominations for AAVSB Officers and Board Members:** The call for nominations of new AAVSB Officers and Board Members were held and elected during the conference and the [election results](#) were provided.

Frustration from the delegates at the AAVSB with a lack of details on why they could not nominate Michelle Shane, Executive Director, Kentucky Board of Veterinary Examiners as one of the AAVSB's Directors.

- **Veterinarians in Cognitive Decline:** A lecture on veterinarians in cognitive decline discussed requiring veterinarians, starting at age 60, to pass a cognitive test. This would allow the licensee to retire before complaints, disciplinary action, or harm occurred to an animal patient.

**Screening Option:** Preliminary screening and full screening options provide similar tests conducted by the DMV for a driver's license. However, it was noted that age discrimination, high costs (\$3,000–\$5,000), and long waiting periods (6–8 months) were limiting factors.

**Peer Discussion Option:** Peer discussions to assist veterinarians with having difficult conversations with colleagues and mentors about cognitive issues by starting the conversation early.

**Petition to Compel and Evaluation:** Ms. Sieferman noted the Board currently has the ability to issue a petition to compel a medical or mental diagnostic evaluation, where the licensee has to submit to an evaluation, which is paid by the Board. She added that the Board will be looking into how the human health care fields handle this issue.

**Optional Continuing Education (CE):** Ms. Welch noted that the Dental Board of California (Dental Board) recently requested a statutory change that permitted licensees to earn optional CE credit for licensee mental health and wellness courses. She suggested that through those courses, the conversation could be brought up and discussed with licensees for their consideration.

Ms. Welch added the Dental Board does not have a mandatory requirement for the evaluation of licensees at any age, but they use the petition to

compel in a similar manner as the Board. For instances where the licensee of the Dental Board does not get the medical or psychiatric evaluation, the Dental Board proceeds through the disciplinary process, which often results in individuals losing their license.

- **Veterinary Technician National Examination (VTNE) Policy Updates:** The AAVSB streamlined the early eligibility process to allow applicants to take the VTNE before graduation. In addition, there will be additional examination window dates.
- **Alternate Route RVT Programs:** The AAVSB is in the process of evaluating Alternate Route RVT Programs from non-AVMA Committee on Veterinary Technician Education and Activities (CVTEA) accredited programs.
- **Strategic Plan Objectives:** The AAVSB's Strategic Plan will be held in Kansas and updated by the end of October 2024. In addition, a survey was sent to all AAVSB Member Boards inquiring on the concerns and needs of each jurisdiction. The AAVSB requested responses as soon as possible.
- **Proclamations:** Dr. Nunez suggested that the Board review Proclamations that thank individuals for their service to the veterinary community. He suggested that the Board acknowledge Kathy Bowler for her work as a public member representing California.
- **Executive Officer Summit:** The Executive Officer Summit included topics on telemedicine, unlicensed practice (including criminal penalties and fines of up to \$50,000), and scope of practice for RVTs (such as equine dentistry).

**Unlicensed Practice:** Ms. Sieferman noted that the MDC's Unlicensed Practice Subcommittee was researching ways to provide the Board with options to combat unlicensed practice.

- **Current Authority:** She noted that the Board currently has the authority to issue a citation, shut down telephone lines used in illegal advertising (no other state has this authority), and use the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) to file an injunction (expensive, time consuming, and possibly unsuccessful). She noted unlicensed practice is a misdemeanor in California but relies on District Attorneys (DAs) to take on those cases. She added that the Board can issue a fine between \$2,000 and \$5,000 per occurrence, with an overall cap of \$5,000 per investigation. She added that the Board is looking at raising the \$5,000 cap since the larger caps have been a large deterrent for other states.

- **Unlicensed Activity Information Shared Among States:** Ms. Sieferman noted that not one state shares its unlicensed activity with the AACSB. She stated that the AAVSB is researching if a portal, where states can upload unlicensed practice actions, provided to member boards with the unlicensed activity information.

**Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) to Share Investigative Files:**

Ms. Sieferman stated that the Board was researching the ability to have MOUs between states to share investigative files, and possibly conduct joint investigations with other government agencies. She also added that the Board already works with the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) to share disciplinary information.

**Discussion:** The Board discussed the background of the AAVSB, along with following:

- An overview of the AAVSB Model Practice Act, and its impacts to the AAVSB Member Board jurisdictions, including California.
- Communication and involvement on important issues within the AAVSB.
- Concerns of senior practitioners to find an appropriate successor for their veterinary practice before they leave the field of veterinary medicine. The Committee requested that succession planning be added to the Cognitive Decline discussion.

**Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC) Experience:** The MDC Chair and Vice Chair informed the Board of their experience at the AAVSB Meeting and Conference and provided the following update:

- **Pre-Conference Training:** Marie Ussery, RVT, MDC Vice Chair, stated the pre-conference training provided a lot of useful information, and training like it would be helpful for individuals before they are appointed to the MDC.
- **AAVSB Model Regulations and Policies:** Richard Sullivan, DVM, MDC Chair, noted he was on the AAVSB's Regulatory Task Force, which handles policy issues (e.g., telemedicine, Cannabidiol (CBD) regulations, expanding RVT animal health care tasks, corporate practice, and artificial intelligence (AI), etc.) and develops the Practice Act Model (PAM). He noted the PAM is being updated to remove the model regulations out of the statutory sections. He joined the AAVSB's committee for reviewing AI regulations to determine how to incorporate the tool, while also determining the liability and responsibility for the actions of the AI.

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



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

A. **[Overview of October 15, 2024 MDC Meeting](#)**

Dr. Sullivan provided the Board with an overview of the [October 2024 MDC meeting](#) and expanded upon the action items in the subsequent agenda items.

**Discussion:** The Board discussed the following:

- **VTNE Pass Rates:** The Board inquired about the posting of the VTNE pass rates to the Board's website.

Ms. Siefertman noted the Board does not have it posted to its website due to the perception that the Board approves alternate route programs. She advised the Board that there is not a universal website for posting pass rates of RVT or veterinarian programs, but AVMA accredited programs are required to post pass rates on their students/graduates on the school's website.

- **VTNE Committee Composition:** The Board inquired if there was discussion about having more equal representation of the VTNE Committee Composition.

Dr. Sullivan and Ms. Pawlowski responded that it was mentioned in the MDC meeting, and he notified the Board that the AAVSB is actively recruiting a more diverse group of veterinary practitioners.

- **Unlicensed Individuals on Dairy Farms:** The Board inquired about the exemptions for unlicensed individuals under Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 4827 and how the MDC can look at ways to address unlicensed practice.

Dr. Sullivan, Ms. Pawlowski, and Ms. Siefertman responded the MDC was looking into ways of addressing the issue, and they will provide the Board with future updates on the topic.

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

**B. Recommendation on Legislative Proposal to Amend Sections 4836.2, 4839, 4841.5, 4875, 4875.1, 4875.2, 4883, 4885, 4886, 4901.2, and 4902, Repeal Sections 4837, 4841.4, 4842, 4845.5, 4876, and 4881, and Add Section 4882 to the Business and Professions Code (BPC) Regarding Registration and Permit Applications and Disciplinary Action**

Dr. Sullivan presented from the [meeting materials](#), including changes to the proposed legislation text approved by the MDC noted below. Dr. Sullivan, Ms. Sieferman, and Ms. Welch answered Board questions.

**Changes to the Text:** The following includes the changes to the meeting materials that were discussed and approved by the MDC to the following sections (proposed additions are in [double underline blue text](#); proposed deletions are in ~~double red strikethrough text~~):

**§ 4836.2.**

[...]

(b) The applicant shall disclose each state, Canadian province, or United States territory in which the applicant currently holds or has ever held a license, registration, [certificate](#), or permit to practice veterinary medicine. License verification, including any disciplinary or enforcement history, shall be confirmed through electronic means or direct submission from each state, Canadian province, or United States territory in which the applicant has identified the applicant holds or has ever held a license to practice veterinary medicine.

[...]

**§ 4841.5.**

[...]

(c) The applicant shall disclose each state, Canadian province, or United States territory in which the applicant currently holds or has ever held a license, registration, [certificate](#), or permit to practice veterinary medicine. License verification, including any disciplinary or enforcement history, shall be confirmed through electronic means or direct submission from each state, Canadian province, or United States territory in which the applicant has identified the applicant holds or has ever held a license to practice veterinary medicine.

[...]

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

**Motion:** Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, seconded a motion to submit to the California State Legislature the legislative proposal to amend sections 4836.2, 4839, 4841.5, 4875, 4875.1, 4875.2, 4883, 4885, 4886, 4901.2, and 4902, repeal sections 4837, 4841.4, 4842, 4845.5, 4876, and 4881, and add section 4882 to the BPC regarding registration and permit applications, certificates, and disciplinary actions.

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

- **Bonnie Lutz**, Esq., Klinedinst, introduced herself to the new Board Members and thought the work on the changes to clean up the statutes were great.

### **Opposed to Placing VACSP Holders on Probation**

Ms. Lutz had a problem with the placement of VACSP [holders] on probation. She claimed the individuals will not have any insurance to cover her defense, and it is going to cost the Board a lot to file accusations against the VASCP [holders] when they are placed on probation. She said prior to the changes to [BPC section] 4883, the Board could suspend or revoke the permit, issue a fine, or issue a citation, which she thought was appropriate. She had a problem with placing VACSP [holders] on probation, which she based off the amount of staff time the Board takes in for monitoring veterinarians on probation. She said to add VACSP [holders] seemed a little bit overwhelming. She understood the Board's intentions by making the statute uninform, but she thought it could be a problem.

**Response to Public Comment:** The following response was made to public comment:

- **Current Authority:** Ms. Welch responded that under existing law, BPC section 4836.2, the Board can issue a probationary VACSP and also revoke a VACSP. She stated typically with a revocation, it can come with terms of probation, and the Board follows this procedure with respect to disciplining a permit. She noted while probation occurs, it is infrequent.
- **Due Process Proceeding Recommendation:** Ms. Welch noted the issue could be argued that the permit is a property right because it is issued by the Board. She advised the Board that it should have a due process proceeding, if probation is warranted based on case-by-case details and rehabilitation criteria that the Board normally uses for any license or registration; the same criteria should be applied to a VACSP. If probation is warranted, she advised against limiting the ability to place a VACSP holder on probation. It would allow the permitholder the option to determine whether or not they want to go on probation or surrender the permit. The

Board would be better covered going through due process and applying its guidelines and rehabilitation criteria to determine the appropriate level of discipline, which may include probation. She understood it was expensive, but noted it is part of the process, which would allow the permitholder the option to determine whether or not they want to go through probation.

**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			
Patrick Espinoza, Esq.	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Steven Manyak, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado, Esq.				X

**7. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Regulations**

**A. Status Update on Pending Regulations**

Justin Sotelo provided the Board with a presentation from the [meeting materials](#), and he answered Board questions.

**Discussion:** The Board discussed the following:

- **Medical Record Keeping and Stakeholder Input:** Ms. Siefertman noted there was a separate legislative proposal in the Board’s Sunset Review Report requiring a copy of the payment within 30 days.

Ms. Siefertman noted the California Horse Racing Board (CHRB) was involved in the Board’s record keeping language for records of a single animal. She added, the Board held multiple stakeholder meetings for the medical record keeping regulation, which the CHRB was a part of, and a lot of the modernization of medical records requirement were already implemented in the horse racing field.

Dr. Bradbury noted many of the Board’s requirements are also required for electronic medical records under the Horseracing Integrity and Safety Act (HISA).

- **Regulatory vs. Statutory Process:** Mr. Espinoza inquired as to why some regulatory proposals appeared similar to legislative proposals, such as the language regarding RVT animal vaccinations.

Ms. Sieferman noted the differences between the Board's pursuit of the regulatory route versus a legislative route when updating the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act (Practice Act). She stated the Board attempts to provide input and work with bill authors on legislative bills prior to the passing of a bill.

Ms. Welch noted the Board created RVT vaccination regulations prior to the introduction of Senate Bill (SB) 669 [(Cortese, Chapter 882, Statutes of 2023)]. Even though SB 669 appeared very similar to the Board's regulatory text, it was very different in application. She noted the Board had conversations about the bill and attempted to work with stakeholders and the author of the bill. Ultimately, the Board was unsuccessful in making the proposed statutory provisions to align with the Board's regulatory language.

Dr. Bradbury also noted that regulations typically are a multiyear process, whereas once a statute is passed, it typically becomes effective January 1 of the following year. She added that sometimes bill authors often adopt regulatory language developed by the Board in order to get changes to the Practice Act implemented sooner. In the case of SB 669, advocates were attempting to enact improvements to access veterinary care, which is why the bill was passed before the regulation could be adopted.

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

## 8. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Potential 2025 Legislation Impacting the Board, DCA, and/or the Veterinary Profession

### A. Potential Legislation Related to Licensed Chiropractors Practicing on Animals

Dr. Bradbury, Ms. Sieferman, and Dr. Grant provided the Board with the following updates from the meeting with the California Board of Chiropractic Examiners (Chiropractic Board). Dr. Bradbury noted she and Chiropractic Board's Chair, David Paris, Doctor of Chiropractic (DC), were unable to meet with their respective Board Members prior to the meeting.

- **Background:** In early 2024, the Board was informed that Senator Rosilicie Ochoa Bogh was considering a bill that would potentially allow for chiropractors to practice on animals, indirectly, with a referral from a veterinarian. While a bill for 2024 was not approved, a new bill is expected to be proposed in 2025. Senator Ochoa Bogh asked the Chiropractic Board if it would support the bill, which resulted in the Chiropractic Board reaching out to the Board for a discussion.

- **Board President Letter Expressing Concerns:** Independent of the Board, Dr. Bradbury submitted a letter to the Chiropractic Board indicating the anatomical differences between humans, bipeds, quadrupeds, dog breeds, and species. The letter also included concerns, including medical emergencies either related or unrelated to the procedures, that could occur when there is no veterinary professional to address the emergency.
- **Direct Supervision by a Veterinarian and Proper Pre-Screening:** Ms. Siefertman and Dr. Grant represented the Board and presented Dr. Bradbury's letter at the Chiropractic Board meeting. During the meeting, it was emphasized that:
  - A veterinarian should maintain direct supervision to ensure availability if an issue or medical emergency occurs.
  - The Board wanted to ensure proper pre-screening of the animal to ensure the animal is healthy enough to receive chiropractic care.
- **Chiropractic Advocate's Arguments:** In response, the chiropractic advocates argued that it is better to have licensed professionals versus untrained individuals providing these services, and it was reported or claimed during the meeting that:
  - Roughly 50 chiropractors have certification in animal chiropractic care, and they are seeing harm done to animals by non-certified animal chiropractic care chiropractors.
  - The animal chiropractic care certification program is the same program veterinarians go through.
  - Chiropractic treatment is not taught in veterinarian schools.
  - Training is led by veterinarians.
  - The veterinarian supervising the chiropractor has little to no knowledge of chiropractic care on animals and therefore why should consumers bare the additional costs of a veterinarian.
- **Emergencies During Treatment and Additional Training Recommendation:** Ms. Siefertman stated the Board understood their perspectives, but if an emergency occurred, there are no 911 services to provide assistance for animals.

Advocates of chiropractic care for animals responded that it was an issue the Board would need to address with the bill's author and sponsors. However, the advocates stated they would be willing to go through training to learn techniques to mitigate potential emergencies.

- **Importance of Pre-Screening Before the Treatment of the Animal:** Dr. Grant provided information during the meeting about the prescreening required, such as X-rays, before an animal patient would be considered a

good candidate for chiropractic care. He provided information on the physical complications that could occur in animals, primarily horses and handlers.

Dr. Grant noted the chiropractic care advocates knew enough to differentiate between an infectious disease and an orthopedic disease, but there were certain infections that would require a veterinarian's expertise, which added additional expense.

- **Chiropractic Board Chair's Remarks:** According to Dr. Bradbury, Dr. Paris informed her that he heard the reasons for the bill included:
  - Advocates could not get veterinarians to provide direct supervision of the animal patient for the chiropractic services.
  - Due to the shortage of equine veterinarians, these veterinarians were unable to oversee horses receiving chiropractic services.
  - Small animal veterinary premises lacked room for chiropractic services.
- **Lack of Certification Requirements for Chiropractors Providing Services on Animal Patients:** According to Dr. Bradbury, Dr. Paris also noted there lacked a certification requirement for chiropractors before providing chiropractic services on animals. He also provided Dr. Bradbury with the following process chiropractors take when providing services to the animal:
  - Get a history of the animal patient.
  - Perform an examination.
  - Make a diagnosis.
  - Treat the animal patient.

Dr. Bradbury noted those items would be considered the practice of veterinary medicine. She also noted different examples provided by Dr. Grant and Dr. Miller of broken necks occurring with horses after receiving chiropractic treatment. She also expressed the following concerns:

- Progression or worsening of an animal patient's condition that might not be caught by the chiropractor on a recheck or referral, and treatment in that setting could cause decompensation or damage.
  - Continued rechecking, but things are progressing or not getting better, could delay the owner from seeking the appropriate treatment (e.g., neoplastic condition, Equine Protozoal Myeloencephalitis (EPM), etc.).
- **Identifying "Red Flags":** According to Dr. Bradbury, Dr. Paris discussed that in human chiropractic training, chiropractors are required to complete training, which includes identifying "red flags," stop treatment, do not move

forward, and refer the human patient to go back to the referring physician. He suggested that training for “red flags” in animals could be required to remedy Dr. Bradbury’s concerns.

- **Emergencies Outside a Veterinary Premises**: Dr. Bradbury reflected on challenges of arguing about medical situations occurring while chiropractic services were provided, since medical emergencies could occur at any time, including at the beach or at the groomers. She added even if emergencies occurred at a groomer, it would not be a reason to prevent grooming services.

She also noted that it might not be an issue for small animals where the owners could take the animal to an emergency animal hospital, but it would be an issue for a large animal, where a veterinarian might need to come on-site for treatment or before the animal could be transported elsewhere for treatment.

- **Time Limit Between Referrals and Treatments**: According to Dr. Bradbury, Dr. Paris noted for most referrals there is a 120-day time limit between the time the patient is referred and chiropractic treatment is provided. Dr. Paris suggested similar language could be added to a new proposed bill. Consumers would be required to have their animal brought to a veterinarian for re-evaluation and possible re-referral every 120 days to ensure proper treatment is applied to the animal’s health issues.
- **Specialty Certification for Human Subspecialties**: Dr. Bradbury stated Dr. Paris noted that chiropractors require an additional 300 hours of specialty training for certification for human subspecialties, and he suggested the same requirement for animal chiropractic services certification.
- **American Veterinary Chiropractic Association (AVCA) Animal Chiropractic Certification Commission (ACCC) Certification Program**: The AVCA was established in 1989 by a veterinarian who then became a chiropractor. The AVCA has been developed based on input and oversight from both professions and oversees the ACCC. Dr. Bradbury reported to the Board the following findings on the certification from the AVCA ACCC:
  - There are seven approved certification programs worldwide, which are only valid for two years and then must be reassessed.
  - Only veterinarians or chiropractors can apply or attend the certification program.
  - Certification requires individuals attend the basic postgraduate animal chiropractic program and have a minimum of 210 hours of coursework.
  - Individuals must pass the exit examination from the approved postgraduate animal chiropractic program.



- Individuals have a 3-day window to go to Tulsa, Oklahoma and earn a 75% or higher score on each the following examinations:
    - Written, knowledge-based examination.
    - Clinical (Practical) competency examination; the clinical examination only covers canines and equines.
  - Members (veterinarians and chiropractors) must maintain their regular chiropractor or veterinarian license in their state/province.
  - Certification is valid for three years.
  - Certification must be maintained through a minimum of 30 hours of CE.
  - Members must practice within the laws and regulations of the licensure requirements of the regulatory boards in their state/province.
- **Chiropractic Services for Animals in Other States:** Dr. Bradbury reached out to other states to identify if they accept chiropractic services on their animals. Dr. Bradbury and Ms. Siefertman provided the information below but will also provide the Board with an updated report in January 2025.

Jurisdiction	Notes and Permissions for Chiro Services
Colorado	Issues with chiropractic services on animals.
Kansas	Either direct or indirect supervision by veterinarian.
Massachusetts	Requires a written referral by a veterinarian.
Minnesota	Allows for services.
Nevada	Vet Med Board regulates and allows only AVCA ACCC certified individuals to provide services.
Ohio	Board of Chiropractic Examiners issues the certificate for animal chiropractic services.
Oklahoma	Allows for services.
Oregon	Unclear; possibly requires a referral by a veterinarian.
Utah	Requires a referral by a veterinarian.
Wisconsin	Has been working on regulations since 2019; regulations are similar to Ohio's requirements.
<b>Note:</b> Many states have direct supervision requirements similar to California's requirements.	

- **Closing Remarks:** Dr. Bradbury noted that the AVCA ACCC Certification Program was more rigorous than other certification programs, such as Animal Physical Rehabilitation (APR), and based on her interaction with Dr. Paris, consumer protection could still be maintained with the proper guardrails in place.

**Discussion:** The Board discussed the following:

- **Protecting Consumers and Horses from Unscrupulous Individuals:** Dr. Grant noted that while there may be reports of chiropractors providing services on horses, he felt it was rare that a horse did not have routine

veterinarian visits prior to treatment. However, he was concerned over unlicensed individuals failing to provide complete services, taking the consumers money, and possibly leaving the horse in a worse condition.

- **Against Establishing a Precedent:** Dr. Manyak agreed with most of the comments made by the Board. He noted allowing this would set up a precedent that other non-veterinary professions could establish similar programs. He also provided an example where veterinarians were provided training and certification on human chiropractic services but noted they still would be unable to provide those services to humans.
- **Maintaining Veterinarian Supervision over the Chiropractor:** Dr. Manyak advocated for keeping veterinarians as the supervisors over the chiropractors to ensure the proper handling of the animal. He emphasized the importance of the animal's safety. Since the work is on animals, he also advocated that certification and regulation should come from the Board and not the Chiropractic Board.
- **Access to Veterinary Care Issue:** Dr. Solacito believed the AVCA ACCC Certification program would provide greater training than training provided to veterinarians. She understood the concerns over human practitioners providing services on animals, but she noted the differences in human verses animal care. In her experience, roughly 75% of owners come to her when it is an emergency; this is caused by the costs of veterinary care and the availability of practitioners. She advocated for minimum standards and for information to be provided to the consumer on the expected outcome of the chiropractic services.
- **Increase Access for Direct Supervision:** Ms. Pawlowski echoed Dr. Manyak's concerns. She noted the education requirements of veterinarians, and the fact veterinarians have had to defend themselves significantly in the last couple of years. However, she advocated for the protection of animals by continuing to require veterinarians to have direct supervision over the chiropractor.
- **Future Discussion:** The Board discussed the current processes, options for the Executive Committee to discuss the Board's concerns, and agendaize the item for future discussion with stakeholder presentations.

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

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, Regulatory Director, CVMA, provided the following comments:

## **Opposition to Expanded Practice by Non-Veterinary Individuals**

The CVMA has no official position on a chiropractic scope expansion bill. He stated mainly because the CVMA has not seen any specific language, but traditionally, the CVMA has been opposed to any attempt by the human health care profession to expand its scope into veterinary medicine. At the CVMA's recent Board Action Planning Retreat in San Diego, it went over its legislative priorities, and it appears that the CVMA's number one priority is to use its resources to fight "scope creep". He anticipates that the CVMA will be strongly opposed to any type of legislation that would expand scope of practice for a healthcare practitioner.

## **Concerns Over Chiropractic Board Involvement**

In relation to this particular situation, the CVMA has an early concern that the Chiropractic Board is involved at this level. The CVMA does not view that a DCA board has the responsibility to devote its resources to expanding what the profession it governs can do. As an example, he provided the Board's response to expanding the scope of practice for RVT requests in which the Board defers to the professional associations. He believed that all DCA boards are supposed to objectively govern the rules and regulations of the profession they are assigned to oversee. He said to hear that the Chiropractic Board is expanding its resources and potentially supporting a bill that would expand the scope of practice for chiropractors is of great concern to the CVMA. He added the CVMA will note it in the Chiropractic Board's Sunset Review.

## **Direct and Indirect Supervision**

Dr. Miller reminded the Board that when the scope creep is occurring, the advocates are attempting to use indirect and direct supervision in a way that it is not intended. He issued caution as he noted the terms are specific in the Practice Act. He added, if those terms provide infrastructure on which the Board bases its laws and regulations, and if those were to be taken out of context in statute, the results could be really devastating.

Dr. Miller added direct and indirect supervision were written within the scope of a registered veterinary premises setting. The concept is that the person who is overseeing the staff has some employment power over the person they are supervising.

## **Request for Referral**

In the case of this circumstance, Dr. Miller claimed the request is not for direct or indirect supervision, but it is a request for referral. He stated there needed to be a rephrase of the context because there are always

unforeseen consequences, such as stating the action was under indirect supervision. He emphasized it is not indirect supervision, and it is a referral.

### **Current Requirements Under California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Section 2038**

Dr. Miller added that under the Board's current regulations, [\[CCR, title 16\] section 2038](#), it states that muscular skeletal manipulation (MSM) is done under direct supervision, but specifically states that if MSM is taking place in a registered veterinary premises, the supervising veterinarian is on the premises, but in the case of the field, such as in a range setting, the regulation states that the veterinarian has to be in the general vicinity.

Dr. Miller stated the notion that the arguments that it was unnecessary for the veterinarian to be standing right there are not valid since the Board does not require the veterinarian to stand next to the chiropractor. He advocated that the Board already had a good regulation that was worked on in conjunction with input from chiropractors and passed by the Board several years earlier. He added the regulation has worked for many years.

### **Hypothetical Issues**

Dr. Miller stated the devil in these changes can be in the details. He provided a hypothetical where he inquired if human beings and animals would be seen in the same building and using the same equipment (e.g., adjustment table). This hypothetical also inquired if chiropractors would be using radiography to interpret and provide treatment in the same premises as human beings. He inquired if the premises would have all the minimum standards for infectious disease control or the same minimum standards required of veterinary premises. He inquired as to which board would regulate these professionals. He added the implementation costs of this change could be pretty extensive, and the details could have a huge impact in the way it would implemented.

### **Concerns As an Equine Practitioner and Chiropractor**

Dr. Miller stated that as an equine practitioner and a chiropractor, he routinely sees patients for chiropractic work. He had concerns about the concept of a certification course that is only on dogs and horses, which then would allow an individual to practice on all species because there are vast anatomical differences.

Dr. Miller stated that he often receives calls perceived as chiropractic issues but turn out to be other medical issues. He provided examples of gastric ulcers, bone fragility syndrome, and arthritis in 12 year old horses.

## Ohio Law for Animal Chiropractic Care

Dr. Miller stated the Ohio law that he was familiar with does not have supervision at all and only requires the chiropractor to be ACCC certified. Once the chiropractor is ACCC certified, they can open their own business and begin providing services. A veterinarian might not be involved and people can walk in right off the street.

- [Dan Baxter](#), Executive Director, CVMA, supported Dr. Miller's, Dr. Manyak's, and Ms. Pawlowski's statements and provided the following comments:

### Concerns Over Animal Chiropractic Care

Mr. Baxter was concerned the push is founded on two fundamental misconceptions, with the first notion that a spine is a spine. As the CVMA Executive Director, pet owner, and consumer of veterinary services, he is concerned that the results are counterproductive, contrary to the interests of animal welfare, and potentially injurious. Even though it is a rather obvious point that a spine is not a spine, he thought it was important for to get out in front of that notion before it gains too much steam.

### Access to Veterinary Care Meaning

The other misconception was the concept that it is an access to [veterinary] care issue. He added APR and veterinary chiropractic care is not an access to care issue. He stressed his concerns that access to [veterinary] care is now being used remotely as an access point for other stakeholder groups to come into veterinary medicine and try to apply their trade. He emphasized access to [veterinary] care has a very specific meaning with no outcry for APR or additional veterinary chiropractic services, and nobody in an underserved community is wondering where they are going to get their next chiropractic appointment services. He stressed caution when using the term in discussion.

### Access to Veterinary Care Meaning

In reference to Dr. Miller's statement to CCR, title 16, section 2038, Mr. Baxter stated the regulation works. The framework was put together with the advice and consent of the chiropractic profession, and there has not been any indication, much less a widespread one, that the existing supervisory structural framework is somehow inadequate to meet the needs of California consumers and their animals.

**Response to Public Comment:** The Board provided the following response to public comment:

- [Dr. Bradbury](#) emphasized the Chiropractic Board did not push the bill. They were asked on their opinion, and they graciously included the Board in the conversation. Dr. Bradbury added the Chiropractic Board did not know if it was going to support the bill, but her impression was the Chiropractic Board was open to discussion with the Board before making any decision.

Ms. Sieferman reiterated Dr. Bradbury’s comment and emphasized that the Chiropractic Board was initiating similar steps that the Board would do when posed with potential bills (e.g., thoughts of the Board, fiscal impacts, consumer protection concerns, etc.) and not necessarily supporting the bill.

- [Dr. Bradbury](#) appreciated Mr. Baxter’s comments and noted that she has used the term “access” in her discussion; she agrees the overall term “access to care” that has been investigated by the Board with subcommittees and the CVMA has done so much work on, is related to underserved communities and what is preventing access to care in that framework. Her use of the term “access” is for lack of a better word; it was more the unavailability of veterinarians and, therefore, people are unable to find chiropractors. She knows of challenges in getting APR, but it is not “access” in the way the Board has been using the term. She does not feel “access to care” just means underserved communities, but that has been how the Board has used the term lately.
- Dr. Solacito noted the Board needed to consider pet owners since pet owners are going to find someone who will be willing to provide these services. She added it was an opportunity for the Board to ensure guardrails are in place and to ensure qualified individuals are providing the services, either under the direct supervision of the veterinarian or under a specific license. She stressed the Board should pursue the conversation.
- Dr. Bradbury suggested that the Board consider thinking about adding certification to the requirements of CCR, title 16, section 2038.

## 9. [Update and Discussion on Telehealth and Federal Prescription Requirements](#)

Ms. Welch presented on the [meeting materials](#). Dr. Bradbury provided a background of the telehealth history to the Board. Ms. Welch, Dr. Bradbury, and Ms. Sieferman answered the Board’s general questions.

With respect to potential legislation to clarify the veterinarian-client-patient (VCPR) reference in Food and Agricultural Code (FAC) section 14401 noted in the meeting memo, Ms. Sieferman provided the following plan, which the Board accepted. She noted the Board’s MDC Subcommittee meets quarterly with the CDFA. The Subcommittee would inquire if the CDFA has any concerns with the potential legislation, clarify those concerns, and discuss whether or not it is something that the CDFA would like to propose, or potentially have the Board include in its Sunset

Review if there were no concerns with the language. The Board could then have an update and discussion at the Board's January 2025 meeting.

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

#### 10. Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on 2025 Sunset Review Report

Ms. Sieferman presented the [meeting materials](#) and noted the substantive changes with track changes within the draft Sunset Review Report.

**Discussion:** The Board discussed the following:

- On page 23, the Board requested adding to the list the AAVSB Board of Directors appointment of Mark Nunez, DVM.
- Under question 58 starting on page 62, the Board requested adding information that the Board got the AAVSB to increase the number of testing windows for the VTNE. Ms. Sieferman recommended, and the Board accepted, a note that RVT applicants can take a different version of the examination within the same testing window.
- Under question 61 on page 63, the Board requested adding information about its desire to add a Practical (On-the-Job) Experience Pathway for California RVT applicants without requiring the applicant to have an out-of-state registration.
- Under item 9 on page 95, Ms. Welch recommended the Board include a clarifying amendment to BPC section 4826.6, subdivision (i), paragraph (3), to require a veterinarian practicing telehealth and prescribing medications through telehealth comply with all relevant state and federal laws.

Ms. Sieferman noted that any changes to the Board's *Administrative Procedures Manual* under Agenda Item 11, would also be changed in the Sunset Review Report.

**Public Comment:** Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on the proposal to amend BPC section 4826.6, subdivision (i), paragraph (3). There were no public comments made on the item.

**Motion:** Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, moved and Christina Bradbury, DVM, seconded a motion to approve the 2025 Sunset Review Report, as modified, direct the Executive Officer to correct any factual inconsistencies and make any technical or non-substantive changes to the Sunset Review Report and submit the Sunset Review Report to the appropriate legislative committees, and delegate to the Executive Committee and Executive Officer authority to communicate and work with legislative committees and stakeholders on drafting and amending the Board's sunset 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			
Patrick Espinoza, Esq.	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Steven Manyak, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado, Esq.				X

11. **Update, Discussion, and Possible Action on Board Administrative Procedure Manual**

Ms. Sieferman presented the [meeting materials](#) and suggested the Board adopt a policy to have MDC Members take the Board Member Orientation Training (BMOT) at the same frequency as Board Members, which would be upon appointment and reappointment. Ms. Sieferman noted training would be virtual and include the daily per diem.

**Discussion:** The Board discussed the following:

- Throughout the document change instances of “he” and “her” to “their.”
- Consolidation the Northern and Southern California physical location requirement. However, it was noted that this requirement is set in statute, so no changes were made.
- Removing examination preparation. However, it was noted the Board still has the Veterinary Law Examination, so no changes were made.
- Ms. Welch recommended changing all instances of “B&P Code” to “BPC,” which the Board accepted.
- On page 7 of the meeting materials, under Board Member Attendance at Board Meetings, change “...are unable to participate via teleconference” to state “...are unable to participate *solely via telephonic means.*”
- On page 7 of the meeting materials, under Board Member Participation, change “...who have missed *three* consecutive meetings...” to state “...who have missed *two* consecutive meetings.”
- On page 17 of the meeting materials, under Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee, sixth paragraph, to remove the first sentence which states “Recruitment efforts for upcoming vacancies on the MDC shall begin at least 12 months prior to the expiration of the said term.”



- Throughout the document change instances of “DEC” to “WEC.”
- On page 18 of the meeting materials, under Wellness Evaluation Committee, seventh paragraph, to remove the first sentence which states “Recruitment efforts for upcoming vacancies on the DEC shall begin at least 12 months prior to the expiration of the said term, if possible.”
- On page 20 of the meeting materials, under Disciplinary Actions, second paragraph, reviewing and possibly modifying or striking the language in the last two sentences to ensure compliance with BPC section 27.
- On page 20 of the meeting materials, under Disciplinary Actions, third paragraph, updating “All final decisions by the Board following formal disciplinary proceedings of alleged violations of the Practice Act shall be published on the Board’s Web site and in its newsletter after the effective date of the decision” to match the requirements of BPC section 27. In addition, changing the word “National” to “AAVSB” in the final sentence to read “Final decisions shall be reported to the AAVSB Disciplinary Database within 30 days of the effective date.”

**Motion:** Dr. Bradbury requested a motion. Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, moved and Barrie Grant, DVM, seconded a motion to approve the revisions made today to the Board’s *Administrative Procedures Manual*.

**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			
Patrick Espinoza, Esq.	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Steven Manyak, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado, Esq.				X

## 12. Student Liaison Reports

### A. University of California, Davis, Liaison—*Holly Masterson*

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

- **UC Davis Receives 2024 Health Professions, Higher Education Excellence in Diversity Award:** UC Davis has focused on introducing to veterinary medicine students from low income and rural areas through a

welcoming and supportive environment, providing a lower cost tuition than a majority of veterinary schools in the country, and offering more than a \$120 million in scholarships for students each year.

- **Class of 2028 Composition**: The class of 2028 has a record high of 58% first generation college students and an increase of 29% in under-represented in medicine students, which includes students with Hispanic, African American, American Indian, or Alaska Native heritage. This is also the most diverse class of students in the UC Davis Veterinary Medicine Program.
- **Global Programs Office**: The UC Davis Global Programs Office is made of international staff members who have connections with schools and facilities all over the world that excitedly take in students. Scholarships support the students each year, and in the past summer, Ms. Masterson had the opportunity to take part in one of the fully funded programs in Otjiwarongo, Namibia. She noted her experience with the Cheetah Conservation Fund. However, the scholarship also allowed students to go to Vietnam, South Korea, Thailand, and Ireland to work on research, gain clinical skills, and experience new perspectives. Students who travelled globally made short video presentations on their global experience that were presented at a film festival a few weeks prior to the Board meeting, and the videos are available on the UC Davis, Global Programs website.
- **Spectrum of Care Update**: UC Davis recently hired a new Chair of the Access to Care Program, Dr. Emily McCobb, who is currently looking into where spectrum of care can be added and enhanced in the curriculum. She noted the MDC's Outreach Subcommittee will be meeting with UC Davis faculty in November to provide resources to new veterinarians.
- **Recruiting Veterinarians**: Current veterinarians are welcomed and encouraged to participate in UC Davis's Access to Care Programs all over Northern California or serve as a mentor for UC Davis's client communications program. This program gives students practice simulated appointments with clients played by actors, tools for navigating critical care, difficult decisions, and euthanasia. The program is especially short of mentors who are large animal experts.

**Discussion**: The Board thanked Ms. Masterson for her report. The Board asked her if she had any concerns over the topics discussed at the meeting. She discussed the UC Davis integrative medicine program, including chiropractic and acupuncture. She shared her experience learning more about the legal restrictions on chiropractic care and echoed concerns over unlicensed individuals providing services without having any veterinary experience.

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

**B. Western University of Health Sciences, Liaison—Anna Styles**

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

- **National Veterinary Scholars Symposium:** In August, 21 students from the Veterinary Summer Research Program presented their scientific posters at the National Veterinary Scholars Symposium in St. Paul, Minnesota. The students presented original research on topics including wildlife, conservation, biochemistry, pharmacology, one health, and oncology.
- **Veterinary Medicine Collaborative Education Day:** In August, doctors Peggy Barr and Pedro Diniz went to the University of Wisconsin, School of Veterinary Medicine to speak at the Veterinary Medicine Collaborative Education Day where they provided professional development and discussed active learning in veterinary medicine. In addition, Dr. Diniz discussed AI, while Dr. Barr discussed how to create a case-based learning model.
- **Simulation Models Veterinary Education:** In July, Gary Wiser, Senior 3D Design Engineer, Prisma Martinez, RVT, and Zachary Morris, RVT, visited the Lincoln Memorial University of Veterinary School in Tennessee, and they learned how to build better simulation models for veterinary education. The 3D models help minimize the harm placed on live animals, while still allowing for the students to gain practical clinical skills using the models.
- **Class of 2028 Composition:** 20 new students were welcomed to the class of 2028, which is the largest class in the history of the college. Ms. Styles noted the incoming class was highly engaging.
- **Loan Repayment Program:** Ms. Styles indicates she is still working with Dr. Edie Marshall to coordinate and share information on the loan repayment program. The focus also being to provide students with information as soon as possible.
- **Factors Impacting Individuals Pursuing Veterinary Medicine:** The study of students at UC Davis and Western University is wrapping up, and a conference poster is expected in the upcoming weeks, which she expects to have for the January 2025 Board meeting.
- **Alumni Spotlight:** Yvonne Cornejo became a Diplomate for American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (DACLAM) where she noted that her third year at Western University helped her decide on a career in laboratory animal medicine. Ms. Stiles highlighted how important the third

year has been for individuals in the Western University veterinary medicine program.

**Discussion:** Ms. Styles and the Board discussed the importance of voting, and their favorite parasite.

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

- [Grant Miller](#), DVM, Regulatory Director, CVMA, shared his favorite parasite.

### 13. **Board President Report**—*Christina Bradbury, DVM*

Dr. Bradbury presented the Board with the following updates:

- **Recent Meetings:** She noted the Board’s attendance at the AAVSB Annual Meeting and the Chiropractic Meetings that were mentioned earlier. In addition, she attended the CVMA Board of Governor’s Meeting.
- **Impact of Board Members:** She reiterated the gift and importance of the impact Board Members have on people’s lives.
- **Resourcefulness vs. Resources:** She thanked Ms. Siefertman for doing more with the resources she has and for her role in being efficient and more effective with the funds available to the Board. She added that DCA has requested boards to utilize state property and attend meetings virtually to save costs to the State. Although the MDC has been permitted to attend virtually, she praised the MDC Members for volunteering to show up for in person meetings at their own expense.
- **Language Access:** She discussed the minimum standards for developing forms and updating webpages to ensure language was accessible for individuals where English was not their first language. She noted that it was already part of the Strategic Plan 1.3. She also advised the Board it needed to consider the top non-English languages it needs to consider, and she inquired if a Subcommittee needed to be established in order to identify those languages.

**Discussion:** The Board thanked Dr. Bradbury for her dedication and service as the Board President.

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

### 14. **Registered Veterinary Technician Report**—*Kristi Pawlowski, RVT*

Ms. Pawlowski thanked RVTs as part of the National Veterinary Technician Week.

**Discussion:** The Board thanked Ms. Pawlowski for her dedication and service to both the MDC and Board.

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

15. **\*Future Agenda Items and Next Meeting Dates**

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

- **California Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI) Survey Data:** The Board will request a presentation of the HCAI demographic data, which may include top languages used by licensees within the data.
- **Additional RVT CE Opportunities for Providing Spay and Neutering Services:** During a review of the CE requirements under CCR, title 16, section 2086.4 for RVTs to gain credit for providing spay and neutering services, there were additional issues that were identified during the regulatory review, which now require stakeholder input prior to a legislative proposal to address those concerns. It is anticipated it will be included in the January MDC meeting, Board meeting, and Sunset Review Report.
- **Retake Policy of the North American Veterinary Licensing Examination (NAVLE):** The Board will be reviewing the NAVLE retake policy, which currently limits an applicant to five attempts without an appeal. After the five attempts, the applicant must get a state board's approval to retake the examination. She noted some states cap the attempts at five, but she noted California does not have a cap on attempts. She was informed by the ICVA that some applicants are selecting states where there is no cap. She has requested the ICVA present to the Board on the ramifications of not having a limitation on the number of attempts on the NAVLE.
- **Presentation from Proponents for Animal Chiropractic Care:** Based on the Board meeting, Ms. Sieferman will request a presentation be provided to the Board from the proponents for animal chiropractic care.
- **Spectrum of Care Initiative:** The MDC's Outreach Subcommittee is working with UC Davis to discuss the initiative, and it is scheduled to be brought to a future Board meeting.
- **CDFA Request for Updates Every Other Meeting:** Dr. Bradbury and Dr. Grant requested the CDFA provide an update to the Board every other meeting, which includes updates on animal blood banks, rendering, H5N1 influenza outbreak, and the dairy cow outbreak.

Ms. Sieferman provided the following proposed future meeting dates:

- January 15–16, 2025
- April 16–17, 2025
- July 16–17, 2025
- October 15–16, 2025

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

\*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 26.B](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

## **16. Recess Open Session until October 17, 2024, at 9:00 a.m.**

Dr. Bradbury recessed open session at 4:53 p.m.

**9:00 a.m., Thursday, October 17, 2024**

### **Webcast Links:**

- Agenda Items 26.B. and 26.E. (<https://youtu.be/CA7KDvZPW4c>)
- Agenda Items 17–28 (excluding items 26.B. and 26.E.) (<https://youtu.be/-WSq01A9Rtl>)

## **17. Reconvene Open Session – Establishment of a Quorum**

Board President, Christina Bradbury, DVM, called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. EO, Jessica Sieferman, called roll; six members of the Board were present, and a quorum was established. Dianne Prado, Esq., was absent from the meeting.

### **Members Present**

Christina Bradbury, DVM, President  
Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, VP  
Patrick Espinoza, Esq.  
Barrie Grant, DVM  
Steven Manyak, DVM  
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT

### **Student Liaison Present**

Anna Styles, Western University

### **Staff Present**

Jessica Sieferman, EO  
Matt McKinney, Deputy EO

Alicia Hernandez, Administration and Licensing Manager  
Patty Rodriguez, Enforcement Manager  
Ashley Sanchez, Enforcement Manager  
Justin Sotelo, Policy Specialist  
Rob Stephanopoulos, Enforcement Manager  
Rachel Adversalo, Enforcement Technician  
Kellie Fairless, Licensing Analyst  
Marlenne Gonzalez, Licensing Technician  
Kimberly Gorski, Enforcement Analyst  
Brett Jarvis, Enforcement Analyst  
Amber Kruse, Enforcement Analyst  
Anh-Thu Le, Enforcement Analyst  
Rachel McKowen, Enforcement Analyst (Probation Monitoring)  
Jeff Olguin, Administration Analyst  
Kim Phillips-Francis, Enforcement Analyst  
Daniel Strike, Enforcement Analyst  
Catherine Bachiller, Manager, DCA, Office of Human Resources (OHR)  
David Bouilly, Moderator, DCA, SOLID  
Alex Cristescu, Television Specialist, DCA, Office of Public Affairs  
Harmony DeFilippo, Budget Manager, DCA, Fiscal Office  
Elizabeth Dietzen-Olsen, Regulations Counsel, Attorney III, DCA, Legal Affairs  
Division  
Melissa Gear, Deputy Director, DCA, Board and Bureau Relations  
Tara Welch, Board Counsel, Attorney IV, DCA, Legal Affairs Division

### **Guests Present**

James Christian Coghlan, DVM, Petitioner  
Seth Curtis, Deputy Attorney General (DAG), Office of the Attorney General (OAG),  
Department of Justice (DOJ)  
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, CaRVTA  
Christine Howson, Klinedinst  
B. Irwin  
Bonnie Lutz, Esq., Klinedinst  
Michael Manno, DVM  
Brooke Mills, Witness for Mukand S. Sandhu  
Priscilla Nguyen, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)  
Heather Rowan, Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH)  
Mukand S. Sandhu, DVM, Petitioner  
Jeff Shomey  
Malissa Siemantel, DAG, OAG, DOJ  
Olivia Trejo, Human Resources Chief, DCA, OHR  
Kristy Underwood, EO, California Board of Barbering and Cosmetology  
Brian Weisel, ALJ, OAH

**18. Special Order of Business**

**A. Hearing on Petition for Reinstatement of Mukand Sandhu, Revoked License No. VET 11634**

ALJ Brian Weisel presided over the petition for reinstatement at 9:06 a.m.

DAG Malissa Siemantel updated and presented the case against Petitioner Mukand Sandhu, DVM.

Dr. Sandhu attended the hearing and was represented by Bonnie Lutz, Esq. Dr. Sandhu answered questions from the DAG and Board Members. Brooke Mills appeared as a witness.

ALJ Brian Weisel closed the hearing at 11:57 a.m.

**B. Hearing on Petition for Early Termination of Probation of James C. Coghlan, DVM, License No. VET 9742**

ALJ Brian Weisel presided over the petition for early termination of probation at 12:32 p.m.

DAG Seth Curtis, participating remotely, updated and presented the case against Petitioner James C. Coghlan, DVM.

Dr. Coghlan, participating remotely, attended the hearing and answered questions from the DAG and Board Members.

ALJ Brian Weisel closed the hearing at 2:32 p.m.

**19. Recess Open Session**

Dr. Bradbury recessed open session at 2:41 p.m.

**20. Convene Closed Session**

Dr. Bradbury convened closed session at 2:44 p.m.

**21. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(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**

In the Matter of the Petition for Reinstatement by Mukand S. Sandhu; Board Case No. 4602017000760; OAH No. 2024090850.

The Board granted the petition for reinstatement, with terms and conditions of probation.



In the Matter of the Petition for Early Termination or Modification of Penalty by James Christian Coghlan, Board Case No. 4602021001042; OAH Case No. 2024090853.

The Board denied the petition for early termination and modified the petitioner's terms of probation.

**22. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(e)(1) and (2)(A), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to Confer and Receive Advice From Legal Counsel Regarding the Following Matter: *Gurdeep Deol, DVM v. Veterinary Medical Board*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVPS2402058**

This item was not discussed.

**23. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(a)(1), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to Discuss the Executive Officer Evaluation**

The Board discussed the EO evaluation.

**24. Adjourn Closed Session**

Dr. Bradbury adjourned closed session at 3:56 p.m.

**25. \*Reconvene Open Session**

Dr. Bradbury reconvened open session at 4:01 p.m.

\*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 27](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

**26. \*Executive Management Reports**

**A. [Administration](#)**

This item was not discussed.

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

**B. \*[Examination/Licensing](#)**

Matt McKinney presented the [meeting materials](#). Mr. McKinney and Ms. Sieferman answered Board questions about the report.

**[Public Comment](#):** Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on this item. There were no public comments made on [October 16, 2024](#) or [October 17, 2024](#).

\*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 26.E](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

**C. Enforcement**

This item was not discussed.

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

**D. Outreach**

This item was not discussed.

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

**E. \*Strategic Plan**

Ms. Siefertman presented the [meeting materials](#) and answered Board questions about the report.

**Public Comment:** Dr. Bradbury requested public comment on this item. There were no public comments made on [October 16, 2024](#) or [October 17, 2024](#).

\*Agenda items for this meeting were taken out of order, and the Board moved to [Agenda Item 16](#). The order of business conducted herein follows the publicly noticed Board meeting Agenda.

**27. Election of 2025 Board Officers**

Dr. Bradbury nominated Dr. Solacito for 2025 Board President. Dr. Solacito accepted the nomination. There were no other nominations.

**Motion:** Christina Bradbury, DVM, moved and Barrie Grant, DVM, seconded a motion to appoint Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, as the Board's 2025 President.

**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			
Patrick Espinoza, Esq.	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Steven Manyak, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado, Esq.				X

Dr. Grant nominated Ms. Pawlowski for 2025 Board Vice President. Ms. Pawlowski accepted the nomination. There were no other nominations.

**Motion:** Barrie Grant, DVM, moved and Maria Preciosa S. Solacito, DVM, seconded a motion to appoint Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, as the Board's 2025 Vice President.

**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			
Patrick Espinoza, Esq.	X			
Barrie Grant, DVM	X			
Steven Manyak, DVM	X			
Kristi Pawlowski, RVT	X			
Dianne Prado, Esq.				X

## 28. Adjournment

Dr. Bradbury adjourned the meeting at 4:07 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.