



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
 Licensing Committee Meeting Minutes**

Date: January 8, 2026

Location: OBSERVATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT IN PERSON:
 California State Board of Pharmacy
 2720 Gateway Oaks Drive, First Floor Hearing Room
 Sacramento, CA 95833

Board of Pharmacy staff members were present at the observation and public comment location. All Committee members participated from remote locations via Webex.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND COMMENT FROM A REMOTE LOCATION VIA WEBEX

Board Members Present via Webex:

Seung Oh, PharmD, Licensee Member, Chairperson
 Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member, Vice Chairperson
 Renee Barker, PharmD, Licensee Member
 Kartikeya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member
 Claudia Mercado, Public Member

Board Members Not Present:

Jessi Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member

Staff Present:

Anne Sodergren, Executive Officer
 Julie Ansel, Deputy Executive Officer
 Lori Martinez, Chief of Legislation, Policy and Public Affairs
 Sara Jurrens, Public Information Officer
 Debi Mitchell, Senior Licensing Manager
 Corinne Gartner, DCA Counsel
 Jennifer Robbins, DCA Regulations Counsel (via Webex)
 Julie McFall, Executive Specialist Manager

I. Call to Order, Establishment of Quorum, and General Announcements

Chairperson Oh called the meeting to order at approximately 9:01 a.m. Dr. Oh welcomed KK Jha as a member of the Committee. 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. Department of Consumer Affairs' staff provided instructions for participating in the meeting.

Roll call was taken. The following members were present via Webex: Satinder Sandhu, Licensee Member; Renee Barker, Licensee Member; KK Jha, Licensee Member; Claudia Mercado, Public Member; and Seung Oh, Licensee Member. A quorum was established.

Dr. Oh reminded Committee members to remain visible with cameras on throughout the open portion of the meeting. Dr. Oh advised if members needed to temporarily turn off their camera due to challenges with internet connectivity, they must announce the reason for their nonappearance when the camera was turned off.

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

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

III. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Minutes of the October 15, 2025 Licensing Committee Meeting

The draft minutes of the October 15, 2025 Licensing Committee meeting were presented for review and approval.

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

Motion: Approve the October 15, 2025 Licensing Committee meeting minutes as presented in the meeting materials.

M/S: Sandhu/Barker

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Support: 5 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Crowley	Not Present
Jha	Support
Oh	Support
Sandhu	Support
Mercado	Support

IV. Discussion of Proposal to Establish Definitions for Pharmacies Based on Business Model, Including Presentations on the Following Business Models:

- a. Home Health Services, Janice Dang, PharmD, Chief of Enforcement for the Board
- b. Skilled Nursing Facilities, Janice Dang, PharmD, Chief of Enforcement for the Board
- c. Infusion Centers, Sam Martinez, PharmD, BCOP, Outpatient Infusion Pharmacy Manager, UC San Diego Health

Chairperson Oh advised the requirements for pharmacies apply equally among a variety of business models, unless specified, which allows for broad regulation; however, Dr. Oh noted it can become challenging when business models vary but the requirements do not. Dr Oh further noted that 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, 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 Business and Professions Code section 4001 for the definition.

Dr. Oh recalled that during the Committee's October 2025 meeting, the Committee considered various pharmacy business models as well as a distinct model related to infusion centers and following the Committee's discussions, these items were combined.

Dr. Oh also recalled during prior discussions, the Committee noted that development of definitions could allow for more precise regulations and provide better transparency to patients regarding the types of services a pharmacy provides.

To assist in the Committee's discussions, the Committee heard three presentations. The first presentation was from Sam Martinez, PharmD, BCOP, Outpatient Infusion Pharmacy Manager at UC San Diego Health regarding infusion center operations.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members appreciated the thorough presentation. Members requested additional information on changes that could be ahead. Dr. Martinez responded that he believed with inpatient hospitals being overwhelmed the direction is to get patients treated in the ambulatory space, and that infusion centers can play a huge role in that as complex therapies can be given in infusion centers. Members and Dr. Martinez next discussed prescription labeling requirements, noting that the limited space and required elements including font size can cause challenges for infusion center pharmacies. Members then requested clarification on the pharmacist to technician ratio for infusion center pharmacies. Dr. Martinez indicated that infusion center pharmacies are similar to hospital pharmacies and ideally ratios applicable to infusion center pharmacies should align with hospital pharmacy ratios. Members agreed that infusion centers should be treated differently but noted that the Board needed to be mindful of the possible unintended consequences.

Dr. Oh recalled during the last Committee meeting, the Committee was not looking to create a new license type, but rather to take an exemption based approach where certain regulations would not apply based on the business model. Members agreed with the exemption-based model.

Dr. Martinez noted appreciation for the Committee and encouraged the Board to consider the approach taken by Maryland.

Members noted similarities between infusion center pharmacy practice and hospital practice and noted understanding with the labeling challenges.

Dr. Oh requested a list of the specific Business and Professions Code sections and California Code of Regulation sections from Dr. Martinez that pertain to the challenges mentioned in his presentation to help guide future Committee discussions.

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A representative of Kaiser agreed with issues flagged by Dr. Martinez and noted support of the exemption-based approach.

The Committee next heard a presentation on Home Health Services from Janice Dang, PharmD, Chief of Enforcement for the Board.

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

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

The Committee next heard an additional presentation from Dr. Dang on Skilled Nursing Pharmacies, also known as Long-Term Care Pharmacies.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members expressed appreciation for the presentations and noted that long-term care does not have its own distinct set of regulations, unlike retail or hospital settings, which creates certain challenges. Members also requested clarification regarding the on-site destruction of medications, and Dr. Dang spoke on this topic. Members suggested that the Board take action to expand the use of Drug Take Back receptacles.

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials included draft definitions for the Committee's discussion. Dr. Oh further noted he had reviewed the draft definitions and believed they were an appropriate place to start the discussion. Dr. Oh reiterated he envisioned there would be no change to license categories but that definitions of pharmacy business models could be added and provide

an exemption-based approach in regulations. Staff acknowledged changes made would be dependent on the specific statutory language and how it fits within the Board's regulatory authority.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members appreciated all three presentations. A member suggested a simplified definition for a specialty pharmacy: "A specialty pharmacy is a pharmacy that provides high-cost medications for complex conditions which require special handling, monitoring, and patient support." Members discussed that some pharmacies have overlapping practices and suggested inclusive language such as "the majority activity of this pharmacy..." noting that models may need to be reportable on an annual basis or asked about in the self-assessment. Further discussions included that perhaps a percentage needed to be defined and whether that would be self-reported or audited for compliance. A member noted that the Online Pharmacy definition was vague and members discussed adding "only through a digital platform." Members discussed how the transition to specified models could be accomplished and noted enforcement concerns if a pharmacy self-determines.

Members noted a need to define outpatient pharmacy and reconcile with community pharmacy and possibly provide a definition for independent pharmacy and correctional pharmacy.

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Committee heard a comment from a representative of CPhA who appreciated the discussions and noted that as pharmacy practice evolves, there was a need to define the kiosk model as well.

The Committee took a break from 10:46 a.m. to 11:01 a.m.

Roll call was taken. The following members were present via Webex; Renee Barker, Licensee Member; KK Jha, Licensee Member; Claudia Mercado, Public Member; Satinder Sandhu, Licensee Member; and Seung Oh, Licensee Member. A quorum was established.

V. Discussion of Pharmacy Practice Experience Requirements Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 4209, Including Possible Action to Make a Recommendation to the Board to Remove Potential Barriers to Earning Experiential Training Outside of ACPE Accreditation Requirements and Consider a Draft Policy Statement

Chairperson Oh indicated the meeting materials provided background information including pharmacy law requirements that establish a requirement for an intern pharmacist to complete 1,500 hours of pharmacy practice experience before applying to take the pharmacist licensure examination. He noted the statute further provided that an applicant who had graduated after January 1, 2016, from an accredited college of pharmacy is deemed to have satisfied the pharmacy practice experience requirement.

The meeting materials also included the provisions in Business and Professions Code section 4114, that provide that a pharmacist may not supervise more than two intern pharmacists at one time, as well as background information on the updated ACPE standards accredited pharmacy school programs must satisfy. The standards establish rotation requirements and require completion of a total of 1,740 hours of experience.

Dr. Oh recalled the Committee initiated discussions in response to comments that suggested the Board should consider reestablishing a requirement for an intern to complete internship hours outside the practice experience gained as part of pharmacy education. Dr. Oh further recalled that during the October 2025 meeting, the Committee received three presentations and brief summaries of the presentations were included in the meeting materials.

Dr. Oh recollected that during the Committee and Board meetings, it was decided that the Board should not take action at this time to update the current legal requirements for intern experience, but rather focus on an approach that encouraged intern pharmacists to gain experience outside of the experiential training gained through pharmacy education.

Attachment 2 of the meeting materials included a draft policy statement that could be used to memorialize the Board's position on the importance of earning such experience. Dr. Oh noted he believed the draft statement achieved an appropriate balance by directing its messaging to both intern pharmacists and employers.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members noted agreement with the draft language.

Dr. Oh further explained that Pharmacy Law established a pharmacist to intern pharmacist ratio and noted he believed there may be opportunity to expand flexibility to increase the ratio to 1:3, although such a ratio may not be feasible in

all pharmacies. Dr. Oh noted that if the Committee agreed that an increase in the ratio may be appropriate, he could work with staff to discuss potential statutory language that increases the ceiling for the ratio and defers to the PIC to make a determination for their respective practice site.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members spoke in support of the PIC determining the ratio.

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Committee heard a comment from a pharmacy school dean on the proposed policy statement. The commenter appreciated the Board's effort but noted concern with the language and suggested it be relabeled as guidance or a support statement rather than a policy. A representative of CPhA spoke in support of the draft statement and agreed with the comment regarding a policy versus guidance. The commenter also recognized the pharmacy intern hours earned outside of experiential learning would be helpful and bring real world practice but also noted clarification was needed on tracking qualified hours so there was not added burden to preceptors and students. The commenter also suggested the Board consider incentives for preceptors such as continuing education credits, tax exemptions or licensure fee discounts. The commenter further asked the Board to clarify the hours would be complementary and not duplicative to the current experiential learning.

Member Jha dropped off Webex at 11:17 a.m.

VI. Discussion of Changes in Pharmacy Law Included in Assembly Bill 1503 (Berman, Chapter 196, Statutes of 2025) Including Updates on Implementation Activities

Dr. Oh reminded members that Governor Newsom signed the Board's sunset measure, Assembly Bill 1503, on October 1, 2025, and that with this action, significant changes to Pharmacy Law became effective January 1, 2026.

Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials reflected implementation activities undertaken since the November Board meeting and noted that the Board would be releasing a special edition newsletter that specifically addresses the changes made in AB 1503. In addition, the Board posted the statutory changes for 2026 on its website and the Board's webinar describing legal changes for 2026 would be available by the end of January. Dr. Oh further noted the Enforcement and Compounding Committee was beginning its review of updates to the various self-assessment forms and anticipated an update on that Committee's work during the January 2026 Board meeting.

New BPC Section 4001.5, Related to the Pharmacy Technician Advisory Committee (PTAC)

Dr. Oh advised that Dr. Safinder Sandhu had been appointed to serve as the Board member on the advisory committee. Dr. Oh was hopeful the application process would be available in advance of the April Board meeting.

In addition, Dr. Oh noted that the draft updates to the Board Member Procedure Manual would be considered by the full Board during the January 2026 meeting.

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

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

Dr. Oh noted implementation activities related to the retitling of Advance Practice Pharmacist to Advanced Pharmacist Practitioner were underway and that section 100 regulation materials were prepared and were undergoing review by DCA prior to submission to the Office of Administrative Law. Updates to identified applications and instructions have also been made and posted to the website.

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

Amended BPC Section 4036, Pharmacist Defined

Dr. Oh noted the statutory amendment clarified that pharmacists are not restricted to practicing only within the four walls of a licensed pharmacy and recalled that the Board voted to initiate a rulemaking to establish parameters for remote processing of prescriptions in the community pharmacy setting. Staff prepared the rulemaking materials and the rulemaking file was submitted to the Office of Administrative Law for publication. Dr. Oh further noted the 45-day comment period would begin later in January and the Board should be positioned to consider comments during the March 2026 Board meeting.

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

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

Dr. Oh advised consideration of revised self-assessment forms is being handled by the Enforcement and Compounding Committee. Additional implementation activities require the Board to complete a Section 100 regulation change and staff had prepared materials, which are currently undergoing review by DCA prior to filing with the Office of Administrative Law.

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

Amended BPC Sections 4051 and 4052, Related to Standard of Care

Dr. Oh noted that the Board's policy statement related to standard of care had been posted on the Board's website and conforming changes were made to the Board Member Procedure Manual. Board trainings related to HIV PEP and PrEP as well as naloxone were removed as the trainings were no longer required. Section 100 changes had been prepared and were undergoing review by DCA prior to filing with the Office of Administrative Law.

Amended BPC Sections 4081 and 4105, Related to Pharmacy Records

Dr. Oh noted that the draft FAQs regarding digitizing records were not yet available and was hopeful staff would have a draft ready for review and consideration at the next meeting. Dr. Oh expressed interest in developing a consistent landing page for FAQs, along with a standardized format for all FAQ documents for easy access compiled in a centralized location, with a target completion sometime in 2026.

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

Member Jha returned at 11:25 a.m.

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

Dr. Oh highlighted that many of the relevant provisions related to nonresident pharmacies do not become effective until July 1, 2026, and noted that additional dates for the CPJE were added. In addition, outreach to nonresident pharmacies regarding changes had occurred through the Board's Subscriber Alert System as well as via email, and additional reminder communications would be sent as Board staff monitored implementation.

Dr. Oh further noted that the Board's policy statement related to the role of the PIC was posted and conforming changes to the Board Member Procedure Manual would be reviewed by the Board at the January 2026 Board meeting.

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

Amended BPC Section 4113, Related to Pharmacist-in-charge, Staffing

Dr. Oh reiterated the Board's policy statement related to the role of the PIC had been posted and the FAQs related to staffing had been updated and posted on the Board's website.

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

Amended BPC Section 4113.6, Related to Chain Community Pharmacy

Dr. Oh advised the sample notice recommended by the Communication and Public Education Committee will be discussed at that Committee's meeting later today.

Amended BPC Section 4115, Related to Pharmacy Technicians

Dr. Oh noted that FAQs had been updated and posted to reflect the clarifying changes made for specially trained pharmacy technicians.

Amended BPC Section 4200.5, Related to Retired Pharmacist License

Dr. Oh advised the retired pharmacist license application had been updated to incorporate the new pathway to restore a retired pharmacist license.

New BPC Section 4317.6, Related to Mail Order Pharmacy

Dr. Oh noted there were no updates related to implementation of the new fine authority for mail order pharmacies.

Amended BPC Section 4400, Related to Fees

Dr. Oh noted that staff had developed processes to waive fees for a new pharmacy that opens and provides in-person patient care services in medically underserved areas.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed the identification process of rural pharmacies.

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A representative of CPhA appreciated the Board's ongoing work on AB 1503 and noted support of the retitled advanced practice pharmacist to advanced pharmacist practitioner but suggested there may be confusion regarding the abbreviations between APP vs APH.

Staff noted the abbreviation would not be changed.

VII. Discussion of Statutory Proposal to Establish Provisions for a Retired Advanced Pharmacist Practitioner License and Clarify Provisions Regarding Cancellation of an Advanced Pharmacist Practitioner License

Dr. Oh advised the Committee now had the opportunity to consider a statutory proposal to establish provisions for a retired advanced pharmacist practitioner license that would also clarify provisions related to cancellation of such a license and was hopeful the Board will be positioned to sponsor legislation this year.

Dr. Oh noted Attachment 3 of the meeting materials included the draft proposal, which would add new section 4212 to establish provisions for an advanced pharmacist practitioner to request a retired license under specified conditions, including that the license had not been revoked. The approach mirrors the recently implemented retired pharmacist license provisions, and the proposal also amends section 4402 to clarify that an advanced pharmacist practitioner license is cancelled when the underlying pharmacist license is canceled or not renewed, or when a retired pharmacist license is issued, unless a retired advanced pharmacist practitioner license is also issued.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members noted agreement with the draft proposal.

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

VIII. Discussion of Licensing Statistics

Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials included a summary of the licensing statistics for the first 5 months of the fiscal year and noted that data for December was not available as of release of the meeting materials. Dr. Oh

noted that staff would include the licensing data for December as part of the Board meeting materials later in January.

Dr. Oh noted processing times for the various facility business types vary and continue to fluctuate. While a few of the licensing programs are within the Board's performance targets, others exceeded the 30-day target. Dr. Oh reminded members the processing time noted in the meeting materials represented the oldest application of each type and the average processing time is lower. Dr. Oh thanked licensing staff for working so diligently to process applications.

Dr. Oh noted that in the first five months of the fiscal year the Board issued 4,637 individual licenses and 262 permanent site licenses with an additional 656 temporary site licenses and further noted the numbers demonstrated how busy the Board's licensing staff remain.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed business modernization in achieving efficiencies.

There were no public members in the Sacramento location. Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment; however, no comments were made.

IX. Advisement of Future Committee Meeting Dates

Dr. Oh announced the next Licensing Committee meeting was currently scheduled for April 15, 2026.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:48 a.m.