

**California State Board of Pharmacy**

2720 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 100

Sacramento, CA 95833

Phone: (916) 518-3100 Fax: (916) 574-8618

www.pharmacy.ca.gov

Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency

Department of Consumer Affairs

Gavin Newsom, Governor

**California State Board of Pharmacy
Department of Consumer Affairs
Public Board Meeting Minutes****Date:** November 5-6, 2025**Location:** OBSERVATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT IN PERSON:
Embassy Suites by Hilton Anaheim South
11767 Harbor Blvd, Garden Grove, CA 92840PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND COMMENT FROM A
REMOTE LOCATION: Webex**Board Members****Present:** Seung Oh, PharmD, Licensee Member, President
Jessica Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member, Vice President
(via Webex)
Trevor Chandler, Public Member, Treasurer
Renee Barker, PharmD, Licensee Member
Jeanette Dong, Public Member
Kartikeya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member
Claudia Mercado, Public Member (via Webex)
Jason "Jay" Newell, MSW, Public Member
Ricardo Sanchez, Public Member
Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member
Maria Serpa, PharmD, Licensee Member (via Webex)
Nicole Thibeau, PharmD, Licensee Member (via Webex)**Board Members****Not Present:** Jeff Hughes, Public Member**Staff Present:**Anne Sodergren, Executive Officer
Julie Ansel, Deputy Executive Officer
Corinne Gartner, DCA Staff Counsel
Jennifer Robbins, DCA Regulations Counsel (via Webex)
Julie McFall, Executive Specialist Manager

November 5, 2025

I. Call to Order, Establishment of Quorum, and General Announcements (Including Possible Notifications, Actions, and Disclosures Pursuant to Government Code section 11123.2(j))

President Oh called the Board meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. President Oh welcomed Jeanette Dong as the newest appointee to the Board.

President Oh reminded all individuals present that the Board is a consumer protection agency charged with administering and enforcing Pharmacy Law. Where protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount.

Roll call was taken. The following Board members were physically present in Garden Grove: Trevor Chandler, Public Member; Renee Barker, PharmD, Licensee Member; Jeanette Dong, Public Member; Kartikeya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member; Jay Newell, MSW, Public Member; Ricardo Sanchez, Public Member; Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Seung Oh, PharmD, Licensee Member. Jessica Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member; Claudia Mercado, Public Member; Maria Serpa, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Nicole Thibeau, PharmD, Licensee Member participated via Webex. Dr. Crowley, Ms. Mercado, Dr. Serpa, and Dr. Thibeau each disclosed that no persons over 18 years old were present in the room with them as they participated in the meeting remotely via Webex. A quorum was established.

II. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda/Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Members of the public participating from Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment requesting information regarding the requirements of remote data entry and pharmacist verification given compliance with protecting patient information.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from a member of the public who spoke about concerns regarding COVID-19 vaccines. The Board heard a comment recommending an update to the licensure requirements for intern pharmacists. The commenter requested the intern license not be tied to enrollment and provide a 365-day period for leaves of absence. The Board also heard from commenters related to the written comments on medical terminology translation.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members agreed the medical terminology translation item should be forwarded to the Communication and Public Education Committee and the written comment regarding the exception to the consultation requirement be forwarded to the

III. Recognition and Celebration of Pharmacists Licensed in California for 40 Years

President Oh advised the Board's recognition of pharmacists licensed in California for over 40 years was posted on the Board's website and pharmacists were provided with a certificate when they reach this significant milestone. President Oh invited pharmacists licensed for 40 years or more to identify themselves and be recognized by the Board. President Oh recognized a pharmacist present in the meeting room and thanked him for his 40 years of service. President Oh then thanked all pharmacists who worked in pharmacy serving the consumers of California.

IV. Discussion of and Possible Action to Approve Board Meeting Minutes

a. June 19-20, 2025 Board Meeting

President Oh referenced the draft minutes from the June 19-20, 2025 Board meeting. Members were provided an opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Motion: Approve the June 19-20, 2025 Board meeting minutes as presented in the meeting materials.

M/S: Chandler/Jha

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter thanked the Board for their presentation at a recent meeting and appreciated that the Board shows how versatile the pharmacy professions can be.

Support: 11 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Abstain
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

b. September 11, 2025 Board Meeting

President Oh referenced the draft minutes from the September 11, 2025 Board meeting. Members were provided an opportunity to comment. Member Serpa asked that the minutes be updated to reflect that she left the room upon recusing herself.

Motion: Approve the September 11, 2025 Board meeting minutes as corrected.

M/S: Sanchez/Sandhu

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Support: 11 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Abstain
Hughes	Not present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

V. Report by the California Department of Consumer Affairs

The Board heard a report from Shelly Jones on behalf of the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA).

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. A member asked if there were any updates regarding Senate Bill 702, which passed on October 8, 2025, as well as engagements among the governor's office and the Senate rules committee to fill vacant positions within DCA boards and bureaus. Ms. Jones noted that DCA has regular communications with all three appointing authorities and will look at SB 702 and send information to the executive officer. Ms. Jones also reported that the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency is undergoing reorganization and will be splitting into two separate agencies as of July 1, 2026, and indicated that more information will be provided at a future meeting.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

VI. Discussion of and Possible Action Regarding Government Code Section 11340.6 Petition Requesting Amendment of California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1709.1 Related to Designation of Pharmacist-in-Charge

President Oh noted that Government Code section 11340.6 provides authority for any interested person to petition a state agency requesting the adoption, amendment, or repeal of a regulation, with some exceptions.

As provided in the law, when such a petition is received, the agency must within 30 days either deny the petition in writing or schedule the matter for public hearing.

On October 7, the Board received a petition requesting the adoption or amendment of a regulation to clarify section 1709.1. Specifically, the petition referenced the first sentence of section 1709.1, which states “the pharmacist-in-charge (PIC) of a pharmacy shall be employed at that location.” President Oh noted the meeting materials include the petition received and further noted that the petition did not provide any proposed regulation language for the Board to consider; however, the Board was required to act on the petition to ensure the Board meets its obligations to respond within the timeframe established in the Government Code.

President Oh agreed with the recommendation offered by staff to schedule this matter for hearing to receive comments and/or recommended language for the Board to consider. The hearing would be conducted by staff and comments received during the hearing would be provided to the Board for consideration at a future meeting.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Motion: Authorize the executive officer to set the matter for a hearing.

M/S: Sandhu/Sanchez

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support

VII. Closed Session

Open session concluded at approximately 1:40 p.m. The Board entered closed session at approximately 1:50 p.m. Closed session ended at 3:52 p.m.

VIII. Reconvene in Open Session to Recess for the Day

The Board reconvened into open session and recessed the meeting for the day at 3:53 p.m.

November 6, 2025

President Oh called the Board meeting to order at approximately 9:00 a.m. Dr. Oh reminded all individuals present that the Board is a consumer protection agency charged with administering and enforcing Pharmacy Law. Where protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount.

Dr. Oh reminded individuals participating in the meeting via Webex that consistent with the Board's policy and with implementation of the Board's new learning management system, pharmacists and pharmacy technicians attending the meeting via Webex may be awarded up to six hours of CE. Dr. Oh referred individuals to the information on the agenda for additional information. Individuals seeking CE were required to register through the Board's learning management system.

Roll call was taken. The following Board members were physically present in Garden Grove: Trevor Chandler, Public Member; Renee Barker, PharmD, Licensee Member; Jeanette Dong, Public Member; Kartikeya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member; Jay Newell, MSW, Public Member; Ricardo Sanchez, Public Member; Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Seung Oh, PharmD, Licensee Member. Jessica Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member; Claudia Mercado, Public Member; Maria Serpa, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Nicole Thibreau, PharmD, Licensee Member participated via Webex. Dr. Crowley, Ms. Mercado, Dr. Serpa, and Dr. Thibreau each disclosed that no persons over 18 years old were present in the room with them as they participated in the meeting remotely via Webex. A quorum was established.

Dr. Oh reminded members participating via Webex to keep their cameras on throughout the open portion of the meeting. Dr. Oh requested members announce the reason for their nonappearance if they needed to turn their camera off temporarily due to internet connectivity issues.

IX. Discussion and Possible Action Related to Proposed Amendment to California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1708.2 Related to Discontinuance of Business, Including Review of Comments Received During the Third 15-Day Comment Period

President Oh referred to meeting materials that included background on the rulemaking package initiated by the Board to amend California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1708.2 related to discontinuance of business. Dr. Oh noted that, following initial adoption of the regulation text, the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) requested that the Board further clarify language. The changes requested by OAL were consistent with the Board's policy and generally reword language and restructure the text of the regulation. The requested changes did not alter the requirements. Dr. Oh further noted that consistent with the direction from OAL, staff initiated the 15-day comment period, which ended on October 22, 2025. No comments were received during this additional comment period.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Motion: Move to ratify the modifications to the regulation text published during the third 15-day comment period from October 6, 2025, through October 22, 2025. Additionally, direct Board staff to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking process.

Department of Consumer Affairs Title 16. Board of Pharmacy

Third Modified Regulation Text Discontinuance of Business

Proposed changes made to the current regulation language are shown by strikethrough for deleted language and underline for added language.

Modified changes made to the proposed regulation language are shown by double strikethrough for deleted language and double underline for added language.

Second modified changes made to the proposed regulation language are shown by italicized double strikethrough for deleted language and italicized double underline for added language.

Third modified changes made to the proposed regulation language are shown with a bold double strikethrough with dotted underline for deleted language and a bold dotted underline for added language.

Amend section 1708.2 of Article 2 of Division 17 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read as follows:

(a) Any permit holder shall contact the bBoard prior to transferring or selling any dangerous drugs, devices, or hypodermics inventory as a result of termination of business or bankruptcy proceedings individually or collectively referred to as a "closure" and shall follow official instructions given by the bBoard applicable to the transaction. **For purposes of this section, a "closure" includes the cessation or substantial cessation of the business.**

(b) In addition to the requirements in subsection (a), a pharmacy that shall cease operations due to a closure **(cessation or substantial cessation)** shall complete the following:

- (1) At least 30-45 days in advance of the closure, provide written notice to patients that have received a prescription within the last year, in a form in which the pharmacy regularly communicates or advertises to its patients. At a minimum, this notice shall include:
 - (A) the name of the patient and if one exists and is known to the pharmacy, the name of the legal representative of the patient,
 - (B) the name and physical address of the pharmacy closure,
 - (C) the name of the pharmacy where patient records will be transferred and maintained, and
 - (D) information on how to request a prescription transfer prior to closure of the pharmacy.
- (2) Reverse all prescriptions for which reimbursement was sought but the prescriptions are not picked up by patients,
- (3) Provide the Board with a copy of the notice specified in subsection (b)(1),
and
- (4) The owner shall be responsible for compliance with the requirements of this section. The owner, or the pharmacist-in-charge, if available, shall certify compliance with the requirements in this section. In the event the pharmacist-in-charge is no longer available, the owner must certify the compliance, along with a pharmacist retained to perform these functions.
- (5) Post a written notice of the closure, which shall include with the planned closure date, in a conspicuous location at the pharmacy's entrance.
- (6) A general acute care hospital pharmacy that is owned by a health facility as defined in Section 1250 of the Health and Safety Code, and meets the requirements of Business and Professions Code section 22949.92(a)(1)(B)(iii), and a licensed correctional pharmacy dispensing only to patients of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, shall be exempt from the requirements of subdivision (b).

(c) The following pharmacies shall be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b):

- (1) A general acute care hospital pharmacy that is owned by a health facility as defined in Section 1250 of the Health and Safety Code; and
- (2) A licensed correctional pharmacy dispensing only to patients of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 4005, Business and Professions Code.
Reference: Sections 4080, 4081, 4113, 4332, and 4333, 22949.92, and
22949.92.1, Business and Professions Code; and Section 11205, Health and Safety Code.

M/S: Serpa/Mercado

Member Crowley stepped away from the meeting.

Members of the public in Garden Grove and participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Support: 11 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 2

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Not present
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibreau	Support

X. Discussion of Proposed Changes to Application Questions for Individual Licenses and Possible Action to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1793.5 Related to Pharmacy Technician Application

President Oh referred to meeting materials and noted that the federal Lorna Breen Health Care Provider Protection Act was enacted in March 2022 to address mental health challenges faced by health care professionals. The Act included several components with the goal of reducing stigma, enhancing support systems, and ultimately improving the wellbeing of health care workers.

Dr. Oh further noted that the Board previously considered this issue and agreed the Board should update its questions consistent with best practices. Subsequent to this direction, staff initiated changes and sought review and feedback by the representatives of the Wellbeing First Initiative, stemming from the Act. Staff received

feedback and additional changes to the questions were recommended. With this additional feedback, staff can move forward to update the questions on several application forms consistent with this feedback without formal action by the Board.

Dr. Oh continued that today the Board would be considering proposed changes to the pharmacy technician application, which is incorporated by reference in California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1793.5. Given that the application form is incorporated by reference, the formal rulemaking process is necessary to update this application form.

Member Crowley rejoined the meeting at approximately 9:13 a.m.

Dr. Oh noted that in addition to changes to the application questions related to mental and physical health conditions, staff were recommending additional changes to the application that are nonsubstantive, seeking to remove instructional language in the application form itself in favor of including such information in the application instructions, as well as updating the education affidavit to provide clarity and reduce deficient applications stemming from possible confusion. The revised application also reflects the updated questions regarding mental and physical health conditions. Dr. Oh noted that he agreed with the changes recommended by staff.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members expressed concerns regarding the removal of any reference to substance use disorder treatment or alcohol treatment from the questions regarding mental and physical health conditions and discussed keeping the second question or adding to the first question in such a way that doesn't discourage people who are in recovery from applying, but also includes a reference to substance abuse to ensure this isn't missed, given the job involves working with/being surrounded by drugs daily.

Motion: Move to initiate a rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 1793.5 consistent with the Board's discussion, to 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 authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any technical or nonsubstantive changes to the package, and set the matter for hearing, if requested. If, during the 45-day comment period, the Board does not receive any comments providing objections or adverse recommendations specifically directed at the proposed action or to the procedures followed by the Board in proposing or adopting the action, and no hearing is requested,

authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at section 1793.5.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Title 16. Board of Pharmacy

Proposed Regulatory Language
Pharmacy Technician Application

Proposal to Amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 1793.5 as follows:

§ 1793.5. Pharmacy Technician Application.

The “Pharmacy Technician Application” (Form 17A-5 (Rev. 12/2024 11/2025)), incorporated by reference herein, required by this section is available from the Board of Pharmacy upon request.

- (a) Each application for a pharmacy technician license shall include:
 - (1) Information sufficient to identify the applicant.
 - (2) A description of the applicant's qualifications and supporting documentation for those qualifications.
 - (3) A criminal background check that will require submission of fingerprints in a manner specified by the board and the fee authorized in Penal Code section 11105(e).
 - (4) A sealed, original Self-Query from the National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB) dated no earlier than 60 days of the date an application is submitted to the board.
- (b) The applicant shall sign the application under penalty of perjury and shall submit it to the Board of Pharmacy.
- (c) The board shall notify the applicant within 30 days if an application is deficient; and what is needed to correct the deficiency. Once the application is complete, and upon completion of any investigation conducted pursuant to section 4207 of the Business and Professions Code, the board will notify the applicant within 60 days of a license decision.
- (d) Before expiration of a pharmacy technician license, a pharmacy technician must renew that license by payment of the fee specified in subdivision (r) of section 4400 of the Business and Professions Code.

Credits

Note: Authority cited: Sections 114.5, 115.4, 115.5, 4005, 4115 and 4202, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 144, 144.5, 163.5, 4005, 4007, 4038, 4115, 4202, 4207, 4400 and 4402, Business and Professions Code; and Section 11105, Penal Code.

M/S: Chandler/Jha

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. One commenter appreciated seeing mental health addressed.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

XI. Discussion of and Possible Action to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1793.65 Related to Pharmacy Technician Certification Programs Approved by the Board

President Oh recalled that Pharmacy Law establishes four separate pathways to licensure as a pharmacy technician, one of which is certification by a pharmacy technician certifying organization offering an accredited pharmacy technician certification program that is approved by the Board. Dr. Oh further noted that as the statute (i.e., Business and Professions Code section 4202) does not specifically identify the acceptable certification programs, the Board has regulations at title 16, section 1793.65, that identify the specific pharmacy technician certification programs approved by the Board. To allow for required ongoing review of

acceptable certification programs and to ensure compliance with requirements included in Business and Professions Code section 139, the regulation section includes a sunset date, which is currently June 30, 2026.

Dr. Oh added that given recent changes in authorized functions of pharmacy technicians, efforts undertaken by the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) were delayed and it was anticipated that necessary work will be concluded; however, this will not occur in sufficient time for the Board to consider audit findings and also pursue a regulation change as necessary. Dr. Oh provided that Board staff recommend a one-year extension of the current sunset date to ensure completion of a pharmacy technician certification program remains a viable pathway to licensure while the OPES audits are completed and considered by the Board. Dr. Oh added that he agreed with the staff recommendation.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Motion: Initiate a rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1793.65 as proposed. 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 authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any technical or nonsubstantive changes to the package, and set the matter for hearing, if requested. If, during the 45-day comment period, the Board does not receive any comments providing objections or adverse recommendations specifically directed at the proposed action or to the procedures followed by the Board in proposing or adopting the action, and no hearing is requested, authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulation at section 1793.65.

**Department of Consumer Affairs
Title 16. Board of Pharmacy**

**Proposed Regulation Text
Pharmacy Technician Certification Programs**

Proposed changes made to the current regulation language are shown by ~~strikethrough~~ for deleted language and underline for added language.

Amend section 1793.65 to Article 11 of Division 17 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read as follows:

§ 1793.65. Pharmacy Technician Certification Programs Approved by the Board.

(a) Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4202(a)(4), the Board approves the pharmacy technician certification program offered by:

- (1) The Pharmacy Technician Certification Board, and
- (2) The National Healthcareer Association.

(b) Approval of these programs is valid through ~~June 30, 2026~~. June 30, 2027.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 4005 and 4202, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 4038 and 4202, Business and Professions Code.

M/S: Chandler/Jha

Members of the public in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from CPhA in support of the motion.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

XII. Enforcement and Compounding Committee Report

Chairperson Serpa provided the report on the Enforcement and Compounding

Committee's meeting on October 16, 2025. Dr. Serpa thanked fellow Committee members Vice-Chair Renee Barker, Jeff Hughes, Seung Oh, Ricardo Sanchez and Nicole Thibeau.

a. Summary of Presentation on Board's Outsourcing Program

Chairperson Serpa noted that during the October meeting, Dr. JK Fujimoto, Supervising Inspector for the Board, provided an overview of the outsourcing program, including Board licensure requirements, a comparison of 503A versus 503B facilities, types of drugs compounded, and information on outsourcing inspections conducted by the Board. Dr. Fujimoto also spoke about how outsourcing facilities can provide patient specific prescriptions.

At the October meeting, members noted the important role outsourcing facilities serve for hospitals in providing various compounded products for patients. The Committee also noted that post implementation of the outsourcing program, there may be opportunity for some possible changes to law that may be appropriate to address at future Committee meetings.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Member Barket encouraged all Board members to view Dr. Fujimoto's presentation.

Members of the public in Garden Grove and Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

b. Summary of Presentation on Duty to Consult and Discussion of California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1707.2

Chairperson Serpa referred to the meeting materials that included background on the item. Dr. Serpa noted that during the October meeting, Deputy Executive Officer Julie Ansel gave a presentation on the duty to consult, which focused on the value of consultation, associated regulations, barriers to consultation, and Board actions that support patient consultation. The Committee discussed if the Board's current consultation requirements remain appropriate and considered barriers that exist to pharmacist-provided consultation. During the October meeting, members expressed concern that without reimbursement for consultation, it continues to be difficult for pharmacies to prioritize time for consultations and noted that it may be appropriate to consider whether the current regulation might be amended to be less prescriptive and to empower pharmacists to use their professional judgement to determine what a patient needs to know and how they receive information. Public comment during the meeting similarly expressed the

importance of consultation, that barriers articulated in the presentation are real, and that without proper reimbursement for consultation services, challenges will remain.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members agreed that oral consultations have barriers and challenges but are important for patient care, and that a less prescriptive, standard of care approach to consultation should be considered. Members also agreed that consultation needs to be specific to the setting requirements and discussed possible exemptions for prescriptions that are dispensed and administered on-site. Members also suggested that nuances exist for mail order pharmacies and a different approach to consultation in that context may be appropriate. A member suggested that technology advances should be considered as well and that it would be appropriate to learn from the industry about how technology may interplay with patient consultation.

Members of the public in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment. A representative from Walgreens noted that Arizona is considering this issue as well and is considering allowing pharmacy technicians to make the offer of consultation and also accept declinations. Another commenter agreed that there should be some discretion with future technology and was more cautious about technology in the retail setting. The commenter described a current application being used and felt safeguards still need to be in place.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. One commenter suggested that the flow of the pharmacy and staffing challenges creates more opportunities for mistakes to happen by taking pharmacists away from duties that only a pharmacist can do and that the current model creates frustration for patients waiting for a pharmacist. The commenter suggested that the Board consider allowing screening by a clerk or pharmacy technician.

Another commenter agreed that consultation is important, noting that consultation is an excellent way for patients to access a pharmacist's care, but urged the Board to be cautious about requiring proactive consultation for mail order pharmacies. The commenter spoke in support of taking a standard of care approach to consultation and wondered if the changes in BPC 4051 under AB 1503 already provide for this.

A representative from CPhA noted appreciation for the Board's continued discussion of duty to consult and its real-world barriers. The commenter discussed the importance of consultation and suggested that lack of reimbursement, and

lack of bi-directional access to health information to document the care, are also barriers. The commenter noted CPhA looks forward to collaborating with the Board of Pharmacy and its stakeholders to modernize the regulation.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments. A member disagreed with the idea of allowing technicians to screen for consultation and provided an example and noted that until there is more autonomy in the law that removes the responsibility from the pharmacist, it is not a good idea to allow technicians to screen. Members thanked the public for their comments and generally agreed with the concept of less prescriptive requirements in some environments.

President Oh provided an example of consulting on GLP-1 medications where a standard of care approach may now be appropriate.

c. Summary of Discussion on Hospital Pharmacies and Business and Professions Code Section 4113.1 Medication Error Reporting, Including Possible Action to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1710

Member Chandler stepped away from the meeting at approximately 9:58 a.m.

Chairperson Serpa referred to background information provided in the meeting materials. Dr. Serpa noted that the Board refers to medication error reporting under Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 4113.1 as the California Medication Error Reporting (CAMER) program. She added that subdivision (c) of BPC section 4113.1 defines "community pharmacy" for purposes of section 4113.1 to include any pharmacy that dispenses medication to an outpatient. Dr. Serpa continued that existing regulation, California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1710, establishes the conditions and sets volume limits under which a hospital pharmacy may furnish drugs to outpatients or employees of the hospital or to walk-in customers.

Dr. Serpa reported the Enforcement and Compounding Committee agreed that the Board had previously expressed its policy and intent that CAMER reporting would not require hospital pharmacies to register. She noted that there are existing requirements that already apply to hospitals under the Health and Safety Code, including requirements to report adverse events and to adopt a formal plan to eliminate or substantially reduce medication-related errors. Dr. Serpa added that the Board has received comments from

stakeholders during previous Enforcement and Compounding Committee and Board meetings asking for clarity on whether hospital pharmacies are required to register and report to CAMER.

Dr. Serpa reported that during the October 2025 Enforcement and Compounding Committee meeting, the Committee considered a possible change to the regulatory text of 16 CCR section 1710 to provide further clarity to the Board's regulated public that the term "community pharmacy," as defined in BPC section 4113.1, does not include a hospital pharmacy operating consistent with subdivision (a) of section 1710. During the meeting, the Committee discussed this issue and there was general consensus that the proposed language was representative of the Board's policy and agreement to refer the draft language to the full Board.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members agreed this clarification would be helpful to stakeholders.

Motion: Initiate a rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1710 as proposed. Authorize the executive officer to further refine the language consistent with the Board's discussion. 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 authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any technical or nonsubstantive changes to the package, and set the matter for hearing, if requested. If, during the 45-day comment period, the Board does not receive any comments providing objections or adverse recommendations specifically directed at the proposed action or to the procedures followed by the Board in proposing or adopting the action, and no hearing is requested, authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulation at section 1710.

**Department of Consumer Affairs
Title 16. Board of Pharmacy**

Proposed Regulatory Language

Legend: Added text is indicated with an underline.

Amend 16 CCR § 1710 to Article 2 of Division 17 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read as follows:

16 CCR § 1710

§ 1710. Hospital Pharmacy.

(a) A hospital pharmacy which predominantly furnishes drugs to inpatients of that hospital may furnish drugs to outpatients or employees of that hospital or to walk-in customers, provided that sales to walk-in customers do not exceed one (1) percent of all the pharmacy's prescriptions. Such a pharmacy is exempt from the requirements of Business and Professions code section 4113.1.

(b) A hospital pharmacy may process an order for filling patient cassettes by another pharmacy within this state, provided:

(1) The pharmacy that is to fill the cassettes either has a contract with the ordering hospital pharmacy or has the same owner as the ordering inpatient hospital pharmacy,

(2) The filled cassette is delivered directly from the filling pharmacy to the ordering hospital pharmacy,

(3) Each cassette or container meets the requirements of Business and Professions Code section 4076,

(4) Both pharmacies are responsible for ensuring that the order has been properly filled.

(5) Both pharmacies shall maintain complete and accurate records of each cassette fill transaction, including the name of the pharmacist checking the cassettes at each pharmacy.

(6) Prescription information shall be electronically transferred between the two pharmacies.

Credits

Note: Authority cited: Sections 4005 and 4118 Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 4005, 4029, 4076, 4113.1, 4118 and 4380, Business and Professions Code.

M/S: Barker/Oh

Members of the public in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard comments from a medication safety officer at an academic medical center and a registered pharmacist representative from Kaiser Permanente expressing support for the proposed modification of the regulation to provide clarity on this issue.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments, but no comments were made.

Support: 11 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 2

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Not Present
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibreau	Support

d. Summary of Discussion on Frequently Asked Questions Related to Assembly Bill 1286 (Haney, Chapter 470, Statutes of 2023), Including Possible Action to Approve Proposed Updates to FAQs

Chairperson Serpa referred to background information provided in the meeting materials. Dr. Serpa noted that the Committee is offering a recommendation to approve the proposed updates to the FAQs, including additional updates made after the committee's discussion to reflect changes resulting from the Board's sunset bill, AB 1503.

Committee Motion: Recommend approval of the updated FAQs related to Assembly Bill 1286 consistent with the Committee's discussion.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter noted appreciation for the revised FAQ section to promote clarity for CAMER medication error reporting.

Support: 11 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 2

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Not Present
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

The Board took a break from 10:13 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

Roll call was taken. The following Board members were physically present in Garden Grove: Trevor Chandler, Public Member; Renee Barker, PharmD, Licensee Member; Jeanette Dong, Public Member; Kartikeya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member; Jay Newell, MSW, Public Member; Ricardo Sanchez, Public Member; Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Seung Oh, PharmD, Licensee Member. Jessica Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member; Claudia Mercado, Public Member; Maria Serpa, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Nicole Thibeau, PharmD, Licensee Member participated via Webex. A quorum was established.

e. Summary of Discussion on Recently Signed Legislation Impacting the Practice of Pharmacy, Including Possible Discussion and Action on Proposed Implementation Activities

Chairperson Serpa noted that at the October meeting the Committee discussed enrolled legislation that was either signed or vetoed by the governor. Measures that were vetoed by the governor are not included in this report.

i. Assembly Bill 82 (Ward, Chapter 679, Statutes of 2025) Health Care: Legally Protected Health Care Activity

Dr. Serpa noted that Assembly Bill 82 expands the address confidentiality program to a gender-affirming health care provider, employee, or volunteer who faces threats of violence or harassment from the public because of their affiliation with a gender-affirming health care services facility. The bill also prohibits a prescription for, or the dispensing of, testosterone or mifepristone from being reported to the Department of Justice, CURES, or a contractor, as specified. The Committee noted agreement with the implementation activities offered by staff.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members expressed that they were proud of the Board of Pharmacy's support on this measure to protect gender affirming care and reproductive health access. A member also provided an update on federal actions to further prohibit providing gender affirming care.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from a representative of CPhA in support of the implementation activities.

ii. Assembly Bill 144 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 105, Statutes of 2025) Health

Dr. Serpa noted Assembly Bill 144 authorizes pharmacists to independently initiate and administer immunizations that, as of January 1, 2025, had a federal Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) recommendation or are recommended by the California Department of Public Health. The Committee noted agreement with the implementation activities offered by staff.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members expressed support that California was proactive in its response to federal actions and noted this is an important step to provide consumers with consistent messaging about vaccines based on science. Members appreciated the Board's notification to licensees regarding what was legally authorized.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from a representative of CPhA noting appreciation of the Board's communication. The commenter also suggested the alert on the website caused some confusion and recommended clarifying the overlapping provisions of AB 144 and AB 1503.

iii. Assembly Bill 260 (Aguiar-Curry, Chapter 136, Statutes of 2025) Sexual and Reproductive Health Care

Dr. Serpa noted Assembly Bill 260 authorizes pharmacists to dispense medication abortion drugs such as mifepristone, without including the patient's name, the prescriber's name, or pharmacy identifying information on the label. It also provides legal protections for pharmacists, protecting them from criminal or civil liability and professional discipline when dispensing these medications in compliance with California law. Dr. Serpa noted that members discussed the importance of the legislation to maintain access to reproductive healthcare and agreed with staff recommended implementation activities.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed software systems and workarounds for labeling without a name. Members noted that some software links to other states as well as in systems like EPIC. Members discussed implementation and potential changes and noted that some of the operational challenges may be different depending on each organization.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A representative from Kaiser noted that their current system cannot support omitting information from prescription labels and that it would be costly to change the system to allow for this.

iv. Assembly Bill 309 (Zbur, Chapter 685, Statutes of 2025) Hypodermic Needles and Syringes

Dr. Serpa noted Assembly Bill 309 makes permanent the allowance for pharmacists to furnish hypodermic needles and syringes to persons over 18 without a prescription or permit. Additionally, the measure makes permanent the requirement for pharmacies that furnish nonprescription hypodermic needles or syringes to provide written or verbal counseling to consumers at the time of furnishing or selling. Committee members noted agreement with implementation activities recommended by staff.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Dr. Oh noted that with the passage of AB 1503, the landscape has now changed to allow pharmacists to initiate and furnish medical devices consistent with the standard of care, allowing pharmacists to be able to use their authority to dispense such devices as hypodermic needles and syringes via their own prescribing authority.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter noted that many retail stores are surrounded by schools and suggested it may be appropriate to require photo IDs before dispensing needles to ensure only persons 18 and older are receiving the items.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments. A member reminded the public that the reason clean needles are provided is for harm reduction. Another member noted that disposing of used needles properly in safety containers can be expensive and would like to see an option for free safety containers as well.

A member of the public participating in Garden Grove noted that some

counties and cities offer free sharps containers to individuals which can be a resource pharmacies and pharmacists can provide to their patients when providing hypodermic needles.

v. Assembly Bill 447 (Gonzalez, Chapter 363, Statutes of 2025) Emergency Room Patient Prescriptions

Dr. Serpa noted Assembly Bill 447 allows prescribers to dispense the unused portion of a dangerous drug as defined—excluding controlled substances—that the hospital pharmacy acquired, to emergency room patients upon discharge, provided it is necessary to continue treatment. Dr. Serpa noted the meeting materials contain details regarding the medication limitations and labeling required and further noted the measure also exempts certain automated unit dose systems (AUDS) from licensure requirements when used to dispense drugs to emergency room patients. The committee members agreed with implementation activities recommended by staff.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed if these would be considered out-patient prescriptions for purposes of the 1% limitation in 16 CCR section 1710. Legal counsel noted the regulation is worded such that the one percent limitation applies to walk-in patients. Members also discussed whether a consultation is required when a patient is discharged to home, and whether additional education or clarification of the new rules was needed. Staff suggested waiting to see how the bill is operationalized before making a determination as to whether additional guidance is needed.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from a pharmacist who works with community medical centers noting concerns that inpatient pharmacies do not have the ability to meet the labeling requirements described in 4076 and requested further clarification on whether this counts as an outpatient prescription and whether it applies to the one percent rule in 16 CCR section 1710.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments. Chairperson Serpa provided additional clarity that there are hospitals already doing this via a pharmacy program, where the pharmacy prelabels medications and has documentation that the medication goes prelabeled correctly to the patient. Dr. Serpa further noted that under this law facilities may bypass the pharmacy; however, prescribers would still be required to label medications in the same manner as they currently do when dispensing from their offices and reiterated it must be a multidose single patient use product. Members also discussed recordkeeping considerations.

vi. Senate Bill 40 (Wiener, Chapter 737, Statutes of 2025) Health Care Coverage: Insulin

Dr. Serpa next discussed Senate Bill 40 related to health care coverage and cost restrictions for insulin, noting that Committee members agreed with staff recommended implementation activities. Additionally, during the Committee meeting, members highlighted that for Federally Qualified Health Centers that purchase insulin at 340B prices, there are separate requirements based on a White House Executive Order.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members noted that Federally Qualified Health Centers must adhere to both SB 40 and the Executive Order.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

vii. Senate Bill 41 (Wiener, Chapter 605, Statutes of 2025) Pharmacy Benefits

Dr. Serpa noted Senate Bill 41 relates to pharmacy benefit managers and prohibits them from requiring patients to use only affiliated pharmacies or from discriminating against nonaffiliated pharmacies in dispensing drugs. Beginning January 1, 2027, PBMs must be licensed by the Department of Managed Health Care (DMHC). Committee members noted agreement with staff recommendation implementation activities. Dr. Serpa noted that in response to a recommendation by the Committee, staff has contacted counterparts at DMHC for coordination purposes.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from a representative of CPhA who strongly supports implementation of SB 41 and encouraged attendance at Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI) and DMHC public meetings and stakeholder meetings to support implementation.

viii. Senate Bill 306 (Becker, Chapter 408, Statutes of 2025) Health Care Coverage: Prior Authorizations

Dr. Serpa noted this bill requires health care service plans and insurers to temporarily exempt certain services from requiring prior authorization if 90% or

more of requests for those services were approved in the previous calendar year. Committee members noted agreement with the staff-recommended implementation activities.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed implementation of consumer-facing education activities.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

ix. Senate Bill 470 (Laird, Chapter 222, Statutes of 2025) Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act: Teleconferencing

Dr. Serpa noted Senate Bill 470 authorizes state bodies and advisory boards to conduct public meetings via teleconference through January 1, 2030. Committee members agreed with staff recommended implementation activities. Dr. Serpa further noted that after the Committee meeting, staff suggested that the Board consider updating the Board Member Procedure Manual regarding the Frequency of Meetings policy from an interim to a permanent policy through January 1, 2030.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment.

Motion: Move to approve the proposed update to the Board Member Procedure Manual Frequency of Meetings policy from an interim to a permanent policy through January 1, 2030, and if the bill is also extended at that time, we would automatically be allowed to continue the policy.

M/S: Oh/Sanchez

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support

Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

x. Senate Bill 497 (Wiener, Chapter 764, Statutes of 2025) Legally Protected Health Care Activity

Dr. Serpa noted Senate Bill 497 prohibits health care providers, insurers, contractors, and employers from disclosing medical information in response to civil or criminal actions based on laws from other states that penalize such care. It also bars cooperation with out-of-state or, where permitted, federal law enforcement agencies attempting to identify individuals involved in legally protected health care activities. Committee members noted agreement with staff recommended implementation activities and suggested that some education or guidance on this topic may be appropriate.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

xi. Senate Bill 568 (Niello, Chapter 322, Statutes of 2025) Pupil Health: Epinephrine Delivery Systems: Schoolsites and Childcare Programs

Dr. Serpa noted Senate Bill 568 expands the authority of pharmacies to provide a broader range of epinephrine delivery devices, including those other than auto-injectors, to local educational agencies, including school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools—under existing safety and training requirements. Committee members agreed with staff recommended implementation activities.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members appreciated the expansion and noted with AB 1503 pharmacists can initiate and furnish epi pens.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

f. Summary of Discussion of Enforcement Statistics

Dr. Serpa noted the meeting materials include a summary of enforcement statistics for the first three months of fiscal year 2025/26. The Board has initiated 914 complaints and closed 747 investigations. As of September 30, 2025, the Board has 1,736 field investigations pending. The materials provide a breakdown of the

average timeframe for the various stages of the field investigation process.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Due to technical difficulties, the Board heard a comment submitted to the moderator regarding agenda item XII (b) that noted appreciation for a consultation she received for her son's medication.

The Board took a break from 11:28 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.

Roll call was taken. The following Board members were physically present in Garden Grove: Trevor Chandler, Public Member; Renee Barker, PharmD, Licensee Member; Jeanette Dong, Public Member; Kartikeya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member; Jay Newell, MSW, Public Member; Ricardo Sanchez, Public Member; Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Seung Oh, PharmD, Licensee Member. Jessica Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member; Claudia Mercado, Public Member; Maria Serpa, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Nicole Thibeau, PharmD, Licensee Member participated via Webex. A quorum was established.

XIII. Licensing Committee Report

Chairperson Seung Oh provided a report on the Licensing Committee's meeting held on October 15, 2025. Dr. Oh thanked fellow committee members, Trevor Chandler, Renee Barker, Jessi Crowley, Claudia Mercado, and Satinder Sandhu.

a. Summary of Presentations and Discussion of Pharmacy Practice Experience Requirements Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 4209

Dr. Oh recalled that section 4209 establishes a requirement for an intern pharmacist to complete 1,500 hours of pharmacy practice experience before applying to take the pharmacist licensure examination. The statute further provides that an applicant that has graduated after January 1, 2016, from an accredited college of pharmacy is deemed to have satisfied the pharmacy practice experience requirement.

Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials include information on the updated ACPE standards that all accredited pharmacy school programs must satisfy. This includes completion of Introductory and Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience. The standards establish rotation requirements and require completion of a total of 1,740 hours of experience.

Dr. Oh noted that members of the Board have received comments suggesting that the Board should reestablish a requirement for an intern to complete internship hours outside of the practice experience gained as part of their pharmacy education and

that during the October 2025 Committee meeting, members received three presentations on the issue. Following the presentations, the Committee discussed the issue and considered if there is a potential means to incentivize, rather than mandate, pharmacy students to complete intern experience outside of their pharmacy education.

Dr. Oh noted the Committee is not offering any recommendations, but is looking to the Board for any recommendations or further direction and may need to schedule subsequent discussions.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. A member suggested development of a certification indicating an individual is ready to work. Members agreed that experience gained by working helps round out experience and noted concerns with having sufficient employment opportunities and challenges with finding time to work due to schooling.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter expressed his view that mandating additional experience hours is not a solution, but agreed with many of the members' comments including finding sufficient intern opportunities and noted concern for the burden placed on students, interns, schools of pharmacy, employers, and staff dedicated to verifying hours.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. Commenters noted this is a complex issue. Commenters generally supported ensuring graduates are practice ready, but not all commenters supported a mandate for students to obtain additional practice experience beyond the hours gained as part of their pharmacy education. Commenters also generally agreed that locating placements for interns causes challenges. One commenter noted that students do not get sterile compounding experience. Another commenter suggested having interns become teacher assistants to earn credits and learn skills. The Board heard from a current student who wants to complete an internship but has been unable to due to the lack of internship opportunities in the area and noted it was easier to keep his previous job that pays more than an internship. Another commenter noted that reinstatement of mandatory hours in lieu of incentives could create inequitable financial and logistical burdens and suggested the Board explore incentive-based models.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments. Members appreciated the comments and discussed possible incentives for licensees, preceptors, and pharmacies. Dr. Oh noted that as a next step, a draft policy statement will be developed for consideration by the Board.

b. Summary of Discussion on Changes in Pharmacy Law Included in and Proposed Implementation Activities Regarding Assembly Bill 1503 (Berman, Chapter 196, Statutes of 2025), Including Possible Discussion and Action to
i. Approve Policy Statements Regarding

- 1. The Transition to a Standard of Care Practice Model**
- 2. The Role of the Pharmacist-in-Charge**

ii. Initiate Rulemaking to Add Section 1717.11 Related to Remote Processing of Prescriptions to California Code of Regulations, Title 16

Dr. Oh noted that during the October 2025 meeting, the Committee discussed recommended activities to implement the various and significant changes made in Assembly Bill 1503. The meeting materials provided a summary of the Committee's discussion and public comment received. Dr. Oh then proceeded to highlight several new and amended sections of law included in the bill.

New Section 4001.5, Related to a Pharmacy Technician Advisory Committee

Dr. Oh noted that new section 4001.5 will require the Board to establish an advisory committee to advise and make recommendations to the Board on matters related to pharmacy technicians. The committee shall consist of four licensed pharmacy technicians representing a range of practice settings; two licensed pharmacists, one of whom shall be a member of the Board and shall be appointed by the Board president; and one public member.

The Licensing Committee recommended the Board establish an online application process. The Committee further recommended that appointment terms generally be four years, with the first appointments for some positions shortened to allow for staggered terms over the long term. The Committee also recommended that the licensee appointments have at least three years of experience as either a pharmacist or pharmacy technician with a single employer; that the application process include one letter of intent along with two letters of recommendation and a CV or resume; and that the pharmacy technician appointees represent different pharmacy practice settings. Dr. Oh noted the Committee is seeking guidance from the Board on the appointment process.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed if the three-year work experience must be earned in a specific timeframe, whether the experience should be with a single employer versus a single setting, and that applicants must be currently licensed in California and in good standing and currently practicing as a technician and not in an administrative role. Members also discussed what the State's requirements are for committees such as this, for example, what training requirements might apply, and how application reviews and appointments to the should be conducted. Members further discussed the unspecified practice positions and whether that should exclude community and hospital since those two settings are defined.

Motion: Establish the Pharmacy Technician Advisory Committee based on the following parameters:

1. In addition to the pharmacist Board member who is appointed by the Board president, positions will include:
 - a. Pharmacy technician representing community pharmacy practice
 - b. Pharmacy technician representing hospital practice
 - c. Pharmacy technician, unspecified
 - d. Pharmacy technician, unspecified
 - e. Pharmacist, unspecified
 - f. Public member
2. Applicants for licensee positions must have at least three years of experience as a pharmacist or pharmacy technician gained in a single type of pharmacy setting.
3. Applicants will be appointed for a term of four years, provided that the first appointments for some positions will be shortened to allow for staggered terms over the long term.
4. Except for the pharmacist Board member who is appointed by the Board president, appointments to the committee will be made through four committees of two Board members each as assigned by the Board president.
5. A member of the committee may be removed by action of the Board if necessary.

M/S: Oh/Sandhu

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter requested information on whether members of the advisory committee would be able to participate more during Board meetings. The Board also heard a comment from a representative of CPhA in support of the proposed committee structure. The commenter encouraged the Board to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of advisory committee members and further suggested the Board take a competency-based selection approach. A current pharmacy technician requested clarification regarding the three-year setting for the unspecified positions.

Dr. Oh explained the expectation for the unspecified positions would also be three years in a single setting such as sterile compounding.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibreau	Support

The Board took a break from 12:47 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Roll call was taken. The following Board members were physically present in Garden Grove: Trevor Chandler, Public Member; Renee Barker, PharmD, Licensee Member; Jeanette Dong, Public Member; Kartikeya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member; Jay Newell, MSW, Public Member; Ricardo Sanchez, Public Member; Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Seung Oh, PharmD, Licensee Member. Jessica Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member; Claudia Mercado, Public Member; Maria Serpa, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Nicole Thibreau, PharmD, Licensee Member participated via Webex. A quorum was established.

Dr. Oh noted that due to time constraints, the Board would not be discussing items in agenda item XIII b that do not require action.

Amended Sections 4016.5, 4210, and 4233, Related to Advanced Pharmacist Practitioners (Formerly Known as Advanced Practice Pharmacists)

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Amended Section 4036 Pharmacist Defined

Dr. Oh advised amendments to Business and Professions Code section 4036 update the definition of “pharmacist” to provide that the holder of an unexpired and active pharmacist license issued by the Board is entitled to practice pharmacy, as defined by the chapter, within or outside of a licensed pharmacy. Dr. Oh continued that with this change in definition, the Licensing Committee recommended that the Board promulgate regulations to more broadly establish provisions for remote processing. Dr. Oh referenced meeting materials that contained draft regulation language that the Committee was recommending.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members expressed concerns about the proposed requirement (in the draft language) that the pharmacist's workspace outside of a licensed pharmacy be open to Board inspection, and about whether to require a designated workspace. A member also raised concerns about the feasibility of requiring approval by the pharmacist-in-charge (in subsection (a)(4)), and whether clarification is needed regarding the meaning of “dispensing of a drug” (in subsection (b)). President Oh reminded members that the draft language could serve as a starting point for the formal rulemaking process, which would provide the opportunity to discuss potential issues and make changes/clarify where needed.

Motion: Initiate a rulemaking to add California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 1717.11 as proposed. 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 authorize the executive officer to take all necessary steps to initiate the rulemaking process, make any technical or nonsubstantive changes to the package, and set the matter for hearing, if requested. If, during the 45-day comment period, the Board does not receive any comments providing objections or adverse recommendations specifically directed at the proposed action or to the procedures followed by the Board in proposing or adopting the action, and no hearing is requested, authorize the executive officer to take all necessary steps to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at section 1717.11 as noticed.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Title 16. Board of Pharmacy

Proposed Regulatory Language

Remote Processing

Proposal to Add CCR section 1717.11 to Division 17 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read as follows:

§1717.11 Remote Processing

(a) A pharmacist located and licensed in the state may perform remote processing of prescriptions, from a location outside of a licensed facility, under the following conditions:

(1) The pharmacy is responsible for ensuring all appropriate and necessary security and confidentiality provisions are in place, including compliance with HIPAA requirements, and specified in its policies and procedures.

(2) The pharmacist has agreed to perform remote processing and designates the space to perform such processing in a written agreement with the pharmacy. Such space shall be open for inspection by the Board consistent with the provisions of Business and Professions Code section 4008.

(3) The written agreement (including modifications) required in (a)(2) of this section shall be maintained, for at least three years following the pharmacist's employment, in a readily retrievable format and shall be available for inspection by the Board.

(4) The duties for remote processing of prescriptions shall be approved by the pharmacist-in-charge and specified in the pharmacy's policies and procedures.

(5) A pharmacy shall maintain a record of all the pharmacist's activities performed pursuant to this section.

(b) For purposes of this section, "remote processing of prescriptions" does not include final product verification, supervision of pharmacy personnel, or the dispensing of a drug.

Authority cited: Sections 4005 and 4036, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 4005, 4008 and 4036, Business and Professions Code.

M/S: Sandhu/Sanchez

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard comments from multiple specialty pharmacists in support of the proposed language. A pharmacist representative of Kaiser spoke in support of the concept of remote prescription processing but expressed concerns about the proposed Board inspection requirement.

Support: 11 Oppose: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
---------------------	-------------

Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Oppose
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

New Sections 4040.6 and 4102, Related to Self-Assessment Process

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Amended Sections 4051 and 4052, Related to Standard of Care

Dr. Oh noted section 4051 will define “accepted standard of care” and transitions some provisions for pharmacist-provided health care services to a standard of care practice model as specified in section 4052. He further noted that repeal of several regulations will be required, and that this will be achieved under the executive officer’s delegated authority. The Committee recommended that the Board release a policy statement related to the standard of care practice model in the specified areas of preventative health care. A draft policy statement was included in the meeting materials.

Motion: Approve the Transition to a Standard of Care Practice Model policy statement as proposed.

M/S: Crowley/Chandler

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter noted that there was some confusion caused by guidance the Board put out about pharmacist authority to administer vaccines but the commenter appreciated the clarity on the Board’s website regarding new section 4052(a)(12). The commenter added that past public comments have noted that some pharmacists have encountered issues with health plans rejecting their prescriptions. The commenter asked the Board to provide education on BPC 4040 to clarify that the definition of a prescription is inclusive of pharmacist-initiated prescriptions under standard of care under the new provisions of 4052.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to

comment; however, no comments were made.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibreau	Support

Amended Sections 4081 and 4105, Related to Pharmacy Records

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Amended Section 4111, Related to Ownership Prohibitions

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Amended Sections 4112, 4113, and 4113.1, Related to Nonresident Pharmacies

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Amended Section 4113, Related to Pharmacist-in-Charge, Staffing

Dr. Oh noted changes in section 4113 provide that the Pharmacist-in-Charge (PIC) "shall" (instead of "may") make staffing decisions at the pharmacy. Further, section 4113, as amended, requires the PIC to determine the appropriate pharmacist to technician ratio, which may not exceed 1 pharmacist to 3 pharmacy technicians (1:3). The Committee determined it to be appropriate for the Board to develop and release a policy statement related to the Role of a PIC. A draft policy statement was included in the meeting materials.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members appreciated the Board creating the policy statement.

Motion: Approve the Role of the Pharmacist-in-Charge policy statement as proposed.

M/S: Serpa/Crowley

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from a representative of Walgreens encouraging the Board to add additional CPJE testing dates to help nonresident pharmacies comply with the coming requirement that the PIC be licensed in California.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments. A member noted feedback from other nonresident pharmacy license holders that the CPJE dates may be a barrier and would like to see if the Board could add test dates.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

Amended Section 4113.6, Related to Chain Community Pharmacies, and Amended Section 4115, Related to Pharmacy Technicians

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Agenda item XIII.d was discussed prior to item XIII.c.

d. Summary of Discussion of Pharmacist to Pharmacy Technician Ratio in the Inpatient Setting, Including Possible Discussion and Action to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend

California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1793.7

Dr. Oh reported that at its October 2025 meeting, the Committee continued its consideration of the current pharmacist to pharmacy technician ratio and if an update to the ratio in the inpatient setting is appropriate. Dr. Oh reminded members that unlike the ratio in the outpatient setting, which is set in statute, the Board establishes the ratio for the inpatient setting via regulation, and that currently, the Board's regulations have established a fixed ratio. The Committee recommended that the Board should consider providing greater flexibility for the PIC of a hospital to establish the appropriate pharmacist to pharmacy technician ratio.

Dr. Oh noted that the meeting materials included proposed regulation language that would allow the PIC to establish the appropriate ratio, and that such an approach appears consistent with the PIC delegation authority to establish a ratio in the community pharmacy setting. The proposed language also included some nonsubstantive changes to reflect updates in some state department names.

Member Chandler stepped away from the meeting at approximately 2:00 p.m.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. A member spoke in support of the regulations and noted the presentations received during the Committee meeting showed the diversity of the hospital setting.

Motion: Initiate a rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1793.7 as proposed. 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 authorize the executive officer to take all necessary steps to initiate the rulemaking process, make any technical or nonsubstantive changes to the package, and set the matter for hearing, if requested. If, during the 45-day comment period, the Board does not receive any comments providing objections or adverse recommendations specifically directed at the proposed action or to the procedures followed by the Board in proposing or adopting the action, and no hearing is requested, authorize the executive officer to take all necessary steps to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at section 1793.7 as noticed.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Title 16. Board of Pharmacy

Requirements for Pharmacies Employing Pharmacy Technicians

Proposal to Amend CCR section 1793.7 of Division 17 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read as follows:

§ 1793.7. Requirements for Pharmacies Employing Pharmacy Technicians.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in section 1793.8, any function performed by a pharmacy technician in connection with the dispensing of a prescription, including repackaging from bulk and storage of pharmaceuticals, must be verified and documented in writing by a pharmacist. Except for the preparation of prescriptions for an inpatient of a hospital and for an inmate of a correctional facility, the pharmacist shall indicate verification of the prescription by initialing the prescription label before the medication is provided to the patient.

(b) Pharmacy technicians must work under the direct supervision of a pharmacist and in such a relationship that the supervising pharmacist is fully aware of all activities involved in the preparation and dispensing of medications, including the maintenance of appropriate records.

(c) A pharmacy technician must wear identification clearly identifying him or her as a pharmacy technician.

(d) Any pharmacy employing or using a pharmacy technician shall develop a job description and written policies and procedures adequate to ensure compliance with the provisions of Article 11 of this Chapter, and shall maintain, for at least three years from the time of making, records adequate to establish compliance with these sections and written policies and procedures.

(e) A pharmacist shall be responsible for all activities of pharmacy technicians to ensure that all such activities are performed completely, safely and without risk of harm to patients.

(f) For the preparation of a prescription for an inpatient of a licensed health facility and for a patient of a licensed home health agency, the pharmacist to pharmacy technician ratio shall be established by the pharmacist-in-charge, not be less than one pharmacist on duty for a total of two pharmacy technicians on duty. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4115(g)(1), this ratio shall not apply to the preparation of a prescription for an inmate of a correctional facility of the Department of Youth Authority or the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, or for a person receiving treatment in a facility operated by the State Department of Mental Health State Hospitals, the State Department of Developmental Services, or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 4005, 4007, 4038, 4115 and 4202, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 4005, 4007, 4038, 4115 and 4202, Business and Professions Code.

M/S: Barker/Serpa

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Support: 11 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 2

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Not Present
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

c. Summary of Discussion of California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1793.8 Related to Technicians in Hospitals with Clinical Pharmacy Programs, Including Possible Discussion and Action to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend Section 1793.8

Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials highlight several relevant provisions of pharmacy law and provide background to remind members about the actions the Board has undertaken to evaluate the critical role pharmacy technicians play in supporting pharmacists and the changes made to the authorized functions of pharmacy technicians. Dr. Oh further reminded members that as part of the Committee's June 2025 meeting, the Committee received four presentations from different hospitals on the evolving role of pharmacy technicians in the inpatient/health system setting. The information shared during these presentations, and the discussions that followed, served as the framework for the changes to section 1793.8 being presented to the Board today.

Dr. Oh noted the proposed regulation changes being recommended by the Committee develop a regulatory model to allow for a hospital's pharmacist-in-charge to determine additional nondiscretionary tasks that a pharmacy technician

may perform in a hospital with a clinical pharmacy program.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. A member suggested striking "to fill unit dose distribution systems, and floor and ward stock" from subdivision (b), noting similar language was struck from subdivision (a) and to be consistent it should be struck from subdivision (b) as well. The member also suggested creating a new subdivision (c), which would include some of the language proposed to be struck from (a) and read "All patient orders must be previously reviewed and verified by a licensed pharmacist prior to being filled by the technician." The member also recommended that the phrase "inpatient care" in subdivision (a)(2) be changed to "patient care" or "hospital patient care."

Member Chandler returned at approximately 2:10 p.m.

Members expressed concern about the term "nondiscretionary tasks" in subdivision (a) and discussed this issue. Members also discussed restoring the "tech check tech" concept as a new, standalone subsection.

Motion: Initiate a rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1793.8 consistent with the Board's discussion. 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 authorize the executive officer to take all necessary steps to initiate the rulemaking process, make any technical or nonsubstantive changes to the package, and set the matter for hearing, if requested. If, during the 45-day comment period, the Board does not receive any comments providing objections or adverse recommendations specifically directed at the proposed action or to the procedures followed by the Board in proposing or adopting the action, and no hearing is requested, authorize the executive officer to take all necessary steps to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at section 1793.8 as noticed. Further, delegate to Member Serpa to work with the executive officer and staff to finalize the language prior to notice.

M/S: Serpa/Barker

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibreau	Support

e. Summary of Discussion of Proposal to Establish Definitions for Pharmacies Based on Business Model

Dr. Oh noted the Committee initiated discussion and consideration on a proposal to establish definitions for pharmacies based on business models. He further noted the requirements for pharmacies apply equally among a variety of business models, unless otherwise specified, and that this approach allows for broad regulation yet can become challenging when business models vary but requirements many times do not. Within existing law there are several instances where a more specific definition is referenced, but only when applying to a specific provision of the law. For example, as noted in the meeting materials, Pharmacy Law does not currently include a general definition of "chain community pharmacy"; rather, in specified sections of statute and regulation, the law refers to BPC section 4001 for the definition of this term.

Dr. Oh noted different jurisdictions nationally have taken varying approaches, with some jurisdictions (such as Texas) issuing separate licenses for different classes of pharmacy licenses, while others (such as Nevada) issue a single pharmacy license that covers a variety of different types of business models but requires disclosure of the types of services.

The Committee noted some of the benefits of developing definitions, which include providing better transparency to members of the public about services available, as well as allowing for more precise regulation of some requirements. Any proposal to add definitions will need to be implemented either through regulation or statutory changes.

Dr. Oh added that the Committee intends to continue its discussion during its next meeting and will also review the written comment submitted by a stakeholder at a future Committee meeting.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

f. Summary of Discussion of Infusion Center Pharmacies and Possible Changes to Pharmacy Law to Create a New Licensing Program

Dr. Oh referred to the meeting materials, which note that the Board has previously received comments that the Board's current requirements for pharmacies create barriers to patient care for pharmacies that prepare infusions for administration to patients in infusion centers.

Dr. Oh noted that as part of the Committee's discussion at the October 2025 meeting, members requested that stakeholders provide specific examples of barriers caused by the Board's current regulation of infusion center pharmacies. He further noted that written comments submitted provided examples of barriers to patient care and current requirements that are established for infusion center pharmacies that are not necessary, such as patient-centered labeling requirements, noting that the infusions are provided in infusion centers administered by health care providers.

Dr. Oh further noted the conclusions from this letter suggest that the current licensing framework fails to capture the operational realities of modern infusion centers and that creation of a distinct infusion center pharmacy license would modernize oversight, remove irrelevant retail obligations and focus regulatory oversight on areas most directly related to patient safety such as clinical safety, compounding and sterility practice and patient access.

Dr. Oh reported that the Committee is not offering a recommendation at this time and is seeking guidance from the Board. If the Board does not believe creation of a new license type is necessary, the Committee will consolidate this issue with its discussion with the prior agenda item related to definitions for pharmacy business models.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. A member noted that all

infusions centers are not all the same, and that she looks forward to further discussions on the topic.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made. A written comment was received by the moderator which will be forwarded to the Board.

g. Summary of Discussion of Application Requirements for Advanced Practice Pharmacist Licensure, Including Possible Discussion and Action to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1730.1

Dr. Oh referred to relevant sections of pharmacy law provided in the meeting materials and noted since implementation of the Board's advanced practice pharmacist licensure program, the Board has performed post implementation review to evaluate barriers to licensure. Given the scope of practice for an advanced practice pharmacist expands beyond initiating, adjusting, and discontinuing therapy, the Licensing Committee believes it is appropriate to amend the requirements in California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1730.1(a)(3) to more accurately reflect relevant experience earned as part of a collaborative practice agreement in preparation for advanced practice pharmacist licensure.

Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials include possible changes to regulation text recommended by the Committee. In addition to the substantive changes reflected in the attachment, nonsubstantive changes to update the title to advanced pharmacist practitioner will also be necessary.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Motion: Initiate a rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1730.1 as proposed. 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 authorize the executive officer to take all necessary steps to initiate the rulemaking process, make any technical or nonsubstantive changes to the package, and set the matter for hearing, if requested. If, during the 45-day comment period, the Board does not receive any comments providing objections or adverse recommendations specifically directed at the proposed action or to the procedures followed by the Board in proposing or adopting the action, and no hearing is requested, authorize the executive officer to take all necessary steps to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at section 1730.1 as noticed.

M/S: Chandler/Jha

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment. An advanced practice pharmacist spoke in support of the amendment and motion, noting it will reduce barriers to entry.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from a representative of CPhA respectfully requesting clarification on the acronym APH versus APP and spoke in support of the proposed amendments.

Support: 12 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Dong	Support
Hughes	Not Present
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

h. Summary of Discussion of Licensing Statistics

Dr. Oh referred to the meeting materials, which contain a summary of the licensing statistics for the first three months of the fiscal year and three-year fiscal year comparison data, and noted that processing times for the various facility business types vary, and while a few of the licensing programs are within the Board's performance targets, others exceed the 30-day target. Dr. Oh reminded members that the processing time noted in the meeting materials represents the oldest application of each type, and that the average processing time is lower.

Dr. Oh noted that overall, the licensing statistics reflect a 2% decrease in the number of individual applications received and a 44% increase in facility applications received, which is primarily driven by changes of ownership for chain community pharmacies. The number of individual licenses renewed increased by 4% and the number of facility licenses renewed increased by 3%.

Members were provided an opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

XIV. Organizational Development Committee Report

Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials included budget information for the new fiscal year that began on July 1, 2025, as well as final budget figures for fiscal year 2024/25, which ended June 30, 2025. The Board's authorized expenditures are anticipated to be about \$35.2 million this year.

The Board's fund condition is expected to increase slightly at the end of the current fiscal year. According to the report provided by the DCA, the Board's fund currently has 8.2 months in reserve, which is a slight increase. Under the provisions of Business and Professions Code section 4400(p), the Board shall seek to maintain a reserve equal to approximately one year's operating expenditures. Dr. Oh noted this increase in the Board's fund condition reflected in part the Board's new fee structure that became effective in January 2025, and further noted the Board will continue to monitor the fund and if necessary make adjustments in future years.

Dr. Oh noted that Board member attendance and mail vote information is included in attachments 2 and 3 to the meeting materials.

Dr. Oh further noted the Board currently has 5 vacant staff positions and recruitments are ongoing. Dr. Oh receives regular updates on recruitments as part of weekly meetings with the executive officer and monthly as part of the Organizational Development Committee meetings.

Members were provided an opportunity to comment. Members discussed the fund balance.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard a comment from a representative of CPhA thanking the Board and noting the commenter looks forward to conversations in 2026.

XV. Executive Officer Report

Ms. Sodergren noted that included in the Executive Officer Report are updates on a number of items, including CURES data, CAMER reporting data, status of regulations, information on the joint listening session that was convened with the California Veterinary Medical Board on October 1, 2025, and implementation of Proposition 34. Ms. Sodergren also referenced the information on the Joint Forum

on Controlled Substances and Medications for Opioid Use Disorder Access occurring December 17.

Members were provided an opportunity to comment. Dr. Oh noted that Ms. Sodergren was elected as the NABP District 8 chairperson. Another member noted the success of the joint listening session with the Veterinary Medical Board, encouraged people to read the Executive Officer Report on this item, and thanked those who participated in the meeting.

Members of the public participating in Garden Grove and via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

XVI. Closed Session Matters

The Board did not meet in closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 2:51 p.m.