

**REG/LEG REPORT**  
Nancy Ehrlich, RVT  
Regulatory/Legislative Advocate, CaRVTA  
April 18, 2019

**The Veterinary Medical Board's Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee (MDC) met on April 16 in Riverside. All members were present.**

**After approving the Minutes, the committee moved on to a lengthy discussion of the implications of corporate practice of veterinary medicine.** The VMB had come to be concerned that non-veterinarians who run large corporations might be making medical decisions for veterinarians. The MDC sent out a survey to all licensed veterinarians (approximately 9000) on the subject. As of the hearing, the survey was still on-going. After receiving about 500 responses, Kristi Pawlowski, RVT, a member of the sub-committee studying the issue, reported that about 30% of respondents reported that they felt their practice was being influenced by corporate ownership. Much discussion ensued about the difference between a small, veterinarian owned corporation and a large, non-veterinarian owned one. It was decided that more data needed to be collected and to bring the issue back at the July meeting.

**After the passage of AB2215, the VMB is required to develop guidelines for veterinarians to discuss to use of cannabis with their clients.** The MDC reviewed the proposed guidelines and recommended a few changes. They will review the proposed guidelines again at their next meeting.

**The next meeting of the MDC will be on July 16 in the Bay Area (Foothill College).** Future agenda items include: Premise Permits, Complaint Process, Cannabis, Corporate Practice.

**The Veterinary Medical Board met on April 17-18 in Riverside. All members were present.**

**After amending and approving the Minutes, the VMB heard the MDC report from Dr. Jeff Pollard, Chair.** Dr. Pollard reported that it was difficult getting information on corporate practice since associates may be unhappy with their contracts whether they work for a corporation or not. He emphasized that the issue of non-veterinarians practicing veterinary medicine also applies to other practice types like shelters. The MDC will continue to work on the issue.

**The VMB reviewed the proposed Cannabis Guidelines.** They concluded that they will have the final version ready for publication by the January 1, 2020 deadline.

**The VMB then reviewed proposed language for Minimum Standards for Animal Shelters.** The Board voted to approve the proposal with a few minor amendments. The proposed language will now move through the regulatory process for approval.

**The next item on the agenda was the appointment of a veterinarian member of the MDC.** Dr. Dick Sullivan, small animal practitioner and former VMB member, and Dr. Jamie Payton, professor at UC Davis veterinary school, were the finalists. Dr. Sullivan was elected by unanimous vote due to his "institutional memory" and familiarity with the issues facing the MDC.

**The VMB went on to review pending legislation.** The VMB voted to oppose AB366, which would forbid maintaining "closed" blood bank colonies where animals spend their lives living at the blood bank in favor of "community" blood banks, where animals are privately owned and brought in periodically to donate blood. The VMB also voted to support SB202, which permits "community" blood bank colonies

but creates more transparency for “closed” colonies. The VMB also voted to oppose AB1230, which would outlaw declawing cats except for therapeutic purposes. The VMB felt that the legislature should not impose restrictions on which procedures veterinarians may perform. The VMB voted to oppose SB627, which would allow veterinarians to recommend medical cannabis for animals. The Board felt that there was insufficient research on cannabis in animals to support recommending its use at this time. They did vote to send the issue to the MDC for further discussion.

**The next item on the agenda was the possible elimination of the California RVT Examination.**

There was considerable discussion about the enabling legislation which states that California candidates are required to take 2 exams – a national exam (VTNE) and a CA exam on job tasks limited to CA RVTs. Jessica Sieferman, Executive Officer of the VMB, determined that there are no longer any tasks limited to CA RVTs and therefore no justification for a second exam. She also determined that the current CA exam was essentially a jurisprudence exam, which was not required by law. After comparing the Practice Analyses for the VTNE and CA RVTs it was determined that all CA job tasks are covered in the VTNE Test Plan.

Nancy Gritman from the AAVSB, the organization that administers the VTNE, stated that they are willing to work with the VMB to insure that all necessary content would be included on the VTNE. A representative from Platt College stated that they are aware of many students who complete the program but end up not taking the exams due to cost. Nancy Ehrlich, RVT, CaRVTA Reg/Leg rep, stated that the current CA Exam plan contains erroneous content. She also reminded the VMB that CA veterinary students are exempt from taking a jurisprudence exam because they must pass a jurisprudence course in school. She stated that RVT students take a similar course and should therefore be exempted as well. Leslie Boudreau, RVT, CVPM, President of CaRVTA, spoke in her capacity as a hospital manager. She reported that students in her practice cannot afford the up-front costs of taking the exam. As President, she said that although CaRVTA would be losing significant income from the discontinued sales of the Study Guides, CaRVTA was happy to give up the income to support RVT candidates.

**After much discussion, the VMB voted to cease offering the CA RVT Exam as a requirement for licensure.** The requirement for an exam limited to tasks performed only by CA RVTs remain, so if the VMB ever gives CA RVTs new job tasks that are not allowed in other states, the exam can be reinstated. The VMB will be reviewing applications from candidates received during the previous year and will inform candidates of their eligibility to become RVTs. For more information, go [HERE](#)

**Pursuant to SB1480, the bill that requires veterinarians to offer drug consultation in outpatient settings, the VMB discussed whether their Drug Consultation Guidelines were clear.** Specifically, the discussion included whether the terms “dispense” or “furnish” include “administer”. In other words, is a veterinarian required to offer a consultation when administering an injectable drug in an out-patient setting? The consensus was no – a veterinarian does not need to offer a consultation when administering an injectable drug. The guidelines can be found here: [https://www.vmb.ca.gov/laws\\_regs/drug\\_consultation.pdf](https://www.vmb.ca.gov/laws_regs/drug_consultation.pdf)

Due to the lengthy discussions of the previous items, the rest of the agenda items were delayed until the following day when our representative was unable to attend. The meeting can be viewed on YouTube.

**The next meeting of the VMB will be on July 17-18 in the Bay Area (Foothill College)**