



**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:** July 19, 2023

**Location:** OBSERVATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT IN PERSON:  
Department of Consumer Affairs  
1625 N. Market Blvd, First Floor Hearing Room  
Sacramento, CA 95834

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND COMMENT FROM A  
REMOTE LOCATION:  
WEBEX

**Board Members**

**Present:** Seung Oh, Licensee Member, Chair  
Jig Patel, Licensee Member, Vice-Chairperson  
Renee Barker, Licensee Member  
Trevor Chandler, Public Member  
Jessi Crowley, Licensee Member  
Jason Weisz, Public Member

**Staff Present:** Anne Sodergren, Executive Officer  
Julie Ansel, Assistant Executive Officer  
Corinne Gartner, DCA Counsel

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

Chairperson Oh called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00 a.m. As part of the opening announcements, Chairperson Oh reminded everyone that the Board is a consumer protection agency charged with administering and enforcing Pharmacy Law. Department of Consumer Affairs' staff provided instructions for participating in the meeting.

Roll call was taken. Members present: Jig Patel, Licensee Member; Renee Barker, Licensee Member; Trevor Chandler, Public Member; Jessi Crowley, Licensee Member; Jason Weisz, Public Member, and Seung Oh, Licensee Member. A quorum was established.

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

Members of the public were provided the opportunity to provide comment.

No public comment was made by meeting participants in the Sacramento location.

Public comment was received via WebEx. The Committee heard comment from a specialty pharmacist thanking the Board for including specialty pharmacy in the remote pharmacy discussion.

**III. Approval of the January 24, 2023, and April 5, 2023, Licensing Committee Meeting Minutes**

Chairperson Oh advised as the Committee was unable to approve the January 24, 2023, Licensing Committee minutes at the previous Committee Meeting due to quorum issues, the January 24, 2023, Licensing Committee minutes were presented for review and approval.

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

**Motion:** Accept the January 24, 2023, Licensing Committee Meeting minutes as presented.

**M/S:** Crowley/Patel

Members of the public were provided the opportunity to comment in Sacramento and via WebEx; however, no comments were made.

**Support: 6 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 0**

<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Vote</b>
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Oh	Support
Patel	Support
Weisz	Support

Chairperson Oh advised the April 5, 2023, Licensing Committee minutes were presented for review and approval.

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

**Motion:** Accept the April 5, 2023, Licensing Committee Meeting minutes as presented.

**M/S:** Crowley/Patel

Members of the public were provided the opportunity to comment in Sacramento and via WebEx; however, no comments were made.

**Support: 6 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 0**

<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Vote</b>
Barker	Support
Chandler	Support
Crowley	Support
Oh	Support
Patel	Support
Weisz	Support

#### **IV. Discussion and Consideration of Provisions for Remote Processing**

Chairperson Oh recalled the Committee discussed remote processing several times over the past year, including during the January 2023 Committee Meeting where the Committee considered several policy questions and received significant public comment in support of making permanent provisions for remote processing for pharmacists working in hospitals and community pharmacies while other public comments expressed concern with the Board taking such action. Dr. Oh added as part of the April 2023 Licensing Committee Meeting, the Committee reviewed what could be a possible legislative framework. However, as the Committee didn't have quorum at the April meeting, no recommendations were offered to the Board from that discussion, but again, significant public comment was received.

Chairperson Oh added related to this issue during the February 2023 Board Meeting, the Board voted to sponsor legislation to make permanent limited provisions related to remote medication chart order review for inpatients as included in the provisions of Assembly Bill 1557.

Chairperson Oh noted the Committee had previously committed to continue the consideration of potential provisions to allow for remote processing for pharmacists working in community pharmacies. Dr. Oh added during the prior discussion, the Committee did not reach consensus on whether remote processing was appropriate for pharmacists working in community pharmacies. Dr. Oh noted the Committee received public comment from pharmacists that were currently working in a remote capacity under the Board's waiver and provided potential consequences if provisions were not made permanent.

Chairperson Oh acknowledged the complexity of the issue before the Committee. Dr. Oh added the services pharmacists provide varied greatly as do their work environments. Dr. Oh thought it might be helpful to consider fundamental questions related to the issue in the hopes that consensus on some of these questions could be reached. Dr. Oh believed if the Committee was able to reach consensus, and the Board as part of its discussion agreed, there would be a path forward for future discussions.

Chairperson Oh thanked the stakeholders that have provided feedback during all of these meetings and noted this input was very important to the consideration of the issue. Dr. Oh added the Committee and Board needed to determine what was best for consumers consistent with the Board's mandate.

**Policy Question #1: Does the Committee believe there is a benefit to consumers to allow for pharmacists to work from remote locations?**

Chairperson Oh acknowledged while this seemed like a simple question, the answer was quite difficult. Dr. Oh believed there was a great potential for pharmacists to work from remote locations to the benefit of patients, but only if the remote work did not come at the expense of pharmacists

working directly in community pharmacies, providing direct patient care services, consultations, etc. Dr. Oh could envision opportunities, but regrettably, was concerned that the market would move away from staffing pharmacists in community pharmacy. Dr. Oh was concerned that remote provisions could further exacerbate the problem thereby reducing patient access to pharmacists which would be a significant detriment to patients.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment.

Member Chandler agreed with Dr. Oh's concerns and the need for remote processing. The number of good practices added increased Mr. Chandler's comfort in remote processing. Mr. Chandler added the Board needs to be very clear and specific on what counts as remote processing and put safeguards in place to ensure pharmacists were not overworked or pressured to generate a high number of prescriptions. Mr. Chandler wanted to ensure there was accountability for billing and ensuring pharmacists aren't pressured to fulfill a quota number.

Member Patel agreed with remote processing helping consumers and Mr. Chandler's comment on having guardrails in place. Mr. Patel noted California has a lot of remote and rural areas where there has been significant reduction in hours of operation and access due to lack of pharmacists' availability in these areas. Mr. Patel added if remote processing was allowed, it would help increase access for consumers. Mr. Patel added there was a historically low enrollment of students in pharmacy school and was concerned that this problem for recruiting in rural areas. Mr. Patel added opportunities for pharmacists across hospitals were increasing so the clinical roles were multiplying further adding to stress of recruiting retail community pharmacists. Mr. Patel noted the number of specialty prescriptions have quadrupled in the last five years. Mr. Patel noted this was especially helpful with long-acting mental health injections that was a large part of specialty pharmacy and helped the homeless crisis.

Member Crowley agreed with previous comments especially being as clear as possible regarding what was included in remote processing duties. Dr. Crowley noted remote processing pharmacists assist at her store with long-acting anti-psychotics medications and unique consultations required for the medications. Dr. Crowley thought the discussion was good moving forward and wanted to ensure that the one-on-one interaction with the pharmacist and patient was not impacted by any remote processing changes.

Member Weisz commented in agreement with the Committee that it would be a benefit but wanted to make sure guardrails and safety measures were in place.

Member Barker agreed with previous comments noting there was definitely a role for remote processing noting it was important to defining the process so that the consumers continue to have the physical personal interaction.

Members of the public in Sacramento were provided the opportunity to comment.

A pharmacist commented agreeing with the great benefit in remote processing specifically for load balancing and accessing expertise for specialized medications. The pharmacist expressed concern that the pharmacist doing the remote dispensing has to be an employee of the pharmacy which may be an unintended consequence. The pharmacist wanted to ensure the Committee and Board didn't do anything to the current law that allows prescribers including pharmacists who are prescribers to enter that information into the pharmacy computer directly.

A representative of the California Community Pharmacy Coalition (CCPC) spoke in support of a statutory proposal to provide permanent authorization to allow for remote processing for community pharmacies. The representative noted some pharmacists lost their jobs after the waiver ended. When possible some were offered jobs in the pharmacy but some pharmacists couldn't make the shift due to disability, childcare, distance,

etc., and CCPC would like to see those pharmacists get back to working remotely. The representative didn't think there would be a case to remove jobs from the pharmacy but rather thought it would help to take the pressure off the staff in the pharmacy.

A representative of Walgreens commented remote processing was a way to offer different types of options for employees. The representative noted it also allowed for response to a public health crisis by expanding reach into the community and providing on-demand services quickly for pharmacists or in the event of natural disasters (e.g., hurricane, tornados, etc.). The representative recommended keeping the language broad.

A representative of CVS recalled most states allow pharmacists to work from home. The representative was concerned with the overregulation of the proposed language and list of duties noting a concern of not being able to stay current as the practice of pharmacy changes over time. The representative was not certain the Board had the authority to regulate insurance billing. The representative was concerned with the statement that remote working could only be used to improve patient care where most of the duties were related to maintaining patient care. The representative voiced concerns about the statement that staffing levels couldn't be reduced and the restriction on laptops.

Members of the public participating via WebEx were provided the opportunity to comment.

A pharmacist who worked at a specialty pharmacy for 16 years working remotely and on site noted the primary difference lies in the quality of the patients' care. The pharmacist noted working remotely provided improved quality of care for patients including prompt intervention of patient's medicine regimens when issues arise eliminating time spent commuting on-site to log into computer; undivided attention to patients during consultations without the normal distractions of an office environment; and less missing of work due to illness thereby increasing productivity and efficiency.

A clinical pharmacist in specialty pharmacy who had worked at home for four years commented that working at home improved the workflow and lessened the load for those in the pharmacy. It allowed for increased face-to-face time with patients, completed clinical duties at all times of the day, and reduced the commute time.

A computer analyst commented working from home allows 24/7 access to provide support and the customer should be first.

A pharmacist representative from Kaiser commented the Board's remote processing waiver that expired May 2023 was the best framework for the statutory changes needed to authorize remote processing of prescriptions on a permanent basis and felt the guardrails in the waiver were sufficient. The representative referenced a 2022 study that found certain traditionally underrepresented groups have a stronger than average preference for remote or hybrid work. The representative encouraged the Board to consider the diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) implications for any proposed language. The representative thought remote work allowed for the employment of individuals who otherwise would not be able to work in a pharmacy. The pharmacists in the pharmacies also benefit from the support of their remote pharmacists. The pharmacies are able to dynamically provide support where it is most needed. Remote working allows for pharmacies to stay open by getting creative about how staffing will be done. Remote work was seen as a win-win for pharmacists, pharmacies, and consumers.

The Committee heard several comments in support of remote working for specialty pharmacists.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment after receiving public comment.

Member Patel commented on the requirement requiring the pharmacist being licensed in California and working in a pharmacy in California noting a clerk can be trained to do data entry in three days without any formal education and yet the pharmacist licensed in another state who would be



less risk to consumers than the clerk could not do it unless licensed in California as a pharmacist. Mr. Patel noted it could be worded in a manner to not limit to California licensed pharmacists only. If the pharmacist is not licensed in California but not touching controlled substances that should be acceptable.

Chairperson Oh reminded the Committee that the legislative proposal from 2021 did not advance because of the controversy and if it was opened up, a path forward would be difficult to complete. Dr. Oh thought it was a great concept and agreed in many ways but wanted the Committee to be mindful of past obstacles and was concerned with opening it up to out-of-state.

Member Crowley agreed with Dr. Oh and Mr. Patel. Member Crowley agreed with Dr. Oh and Mr. Patel. Specifically, Dr. Crowley agreed with the concept Mr. Patel said in terms of an out-of-state licensed pharmacist probably had more training and more reliability than an unlicensed clerk but ultimately Dr. Crowley agreed that any remote processing work should be done by a California-licensed pharmacist. Dr. Crowley expressed interest in DEI demographic data if available. Dr. Crowley expressed interest in DEI demographic data if available.

Member Chandler inquired about the employee issue raised and the laptop issue. Dr. Crowley provided examples of when a pharmacist from a specialty pharmacy was an employee versus not an employee. Executive Officer Sodergren explained that proposed statutory or regulatory language could be updated based on where the policy decision lands once consensus was reached.

Member Chandler inquired how the remote processing was done prior to the waiver, during the waiver, and after the waiver. Ms. Sodergren provided high level that there were provisions for specialty pharmacy to be working in a different pharmacy performing some services. There were provisions in the hospital setting still being done because there was a specific waiver tied to the federal declaration and legislation moving forward in AB 1557 related to the chart ordering. The Board was hopeful that people were following the law.

Member Weisz didn't want to impede what pharmacists were doing now but saw this as a great opportunity to expand patient care and keep people working. Mr. Weisz was not in favor of having out of state workers doing the processing but offered if considering the type of medication (e.g., controlled versus noncontrolled substance) was being processed remotely.

Chairperson Oh added it would be nice for pharmacists to take real time evaluating controlled substances because it did take extra time in the pharmacy but there were real concerns about diversion and more fraudulent activity too.

Member Crowley was more comfortable having a registered California pharmacist performing any data verification and was not comfortable at all with a controlled substance from a legal perspective as laws vary from state to state.

Member Patel added roughly 80 percent of prescriptions are for non-controlled substances and if controlled substances were removed, the horizons would be expanded for remote processing quite a bit. If controlled substances were removed, it wouldn't be detrimental to a lot of categories of disease states and the treatment plan.

**Policy Question #2: Does the Committee believe there is a benefit to consumers, but only for specific types of pharmacy models, e.g., closed door pharmacies, specialty pharmacies?**

Chairperson Oh acknowledged that this was a challenging question and that he was conflicted generally about the best approach to regulate the various pharmacy practice settings. Dr. Oh noted pharmacy law has already drawn some distinctions between authorities in hospitals, for example. Dr. Oh expressed concerns with taking such an approach for remote processing but believed the concerns stated previously about pharmacist accessibility in community pharmacies was not equal across the broad spectrum of different types of community pharmacies (e.g.,

closed door, specialty, or retail, etc.). Dr. Oh noted the Board did not have definitions of these types of pharmacies, which may in part make this more complicated.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment.

Member Crowley asked how the Board could specify differences for specialty pharmacy when there wasn't a separate license type for specialty pharmacy.

DCA Counsel Gartner believed if that was the chosen path, statutory definitions for the types would need to be developed.

Member Patel spoke in favor of keeping it simple as a licensed pharmacy as it also assisted in natural disasters. Dr. Oh agreed.

Member Crowley was conflicted with understanding at the community pharmacy level, the liability of the pharmacist-in-charge (PIC) and the disconnect for someone who was verifying a prescription and someone who was counseling the patient. Dr. Crowley noted chain pharmacies had infrastructures in place to assist with natural disasters. Dr. Crowley was torn in a broad versus specific allowance of remote processing and what activities would be allowed. Dr. Crowley was uncomfortable with the final verification piece in terms of actually verifying the final product and having someone else do that function.

Member Chandler's inclination was to keep it pharmacy in general without specifics.

Members of the public in Sacramento were provided the opportunity to comment.

A pharmacist recommended keeping it general for all pharmacies highlighting many pharmacists manage drug therapies in assisted living facilities. The pharmacist referenced Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 4071.1 noting it did not allow remote order entry into a hospital or

pharmacy system of controlled substances for pharmacists which would need to be changed if allowing remote order entry for controlled substances. The commenter added it also required licensure in California but allowed for licensed personnel to be located outside of California.

A representative of CVS commented that decisions made impact California employees. The representative added people working remotely can't divert medication. The representative noted that most diversion was done by pharmacy technicians and over half of the states allow pharmacy technicians to work outside of the pharmacy.

Members of the public participating via WebEx were provided the opportunity to comment.

A representative of CCAP agreed with previous comments about long-term care consultant pharmacists and skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities that were required to be there and weren't typically employees of pharmacies any longer. Assisted living facilities were required to have a pharmacist go to the facilities periodically but not as extensive as long-term care facilities. Pharmacists providing services for these facilities should be included in remote processing. The representative stated the pharmacy technician should be able to work remotely and recommended changing the law that a pharmacy technician was only a pharmacy technician when in the pharmacy.

A pharmacist representative of Kaiser agreed in allowing remote work for all pharmacies. The representative suggested writing the provisions so that it wouldn't interfere with the provisions allowed for remote work by hospital pharmacists as allowed by AB 1557 when signed by the governor.

A representative of Albertsons commented in support of remote work from home as mentioned by previous colleagues and universally applied across all disciplines.

Multiple specialty pharmacists commented in support of allowing specialty pharmacists to work remotely.

Chairperson Oh clarified there was a Board-sponsored bill, AB 1557, pending in the legislature. Dr. Oh clarified the discussion was about remote processing of prescriptions dispensed.

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

**Policy Question #3: Does the Committee believe that discussion on these questions should be postponed until after passage of Assembly Bill 1286, the Board's patient protection measure?**

Chairperson Oh believed that some of the current concerns would be resolved if requirements proposed to be established in AB 1286, most notably related to staffing, were secured with passage of the measure. Dr. Oh noted a level of comfort expanding remote processing if AB 1286 was in place.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment.

Member Chandler recommended looking in totality but noted if the bills are passed, it would relieve some concerns (e.g., staffing, ensuring the quality of pharmacies, etc.) noting if AB 1286 didn't pass it would make it that much more important that this particular bill had robust protections contained in AB 1286.

Member Weisz commented the Committee should move forward regardless of the status of AB 1286. If AB 1286 passed and was signed by the governor, the Board would know where the Board stood but the Board could also plan ahead to be nimble.

Member Crowley agreed the legislative process was long and agreed with having the ongoing discussion simultaneously as the bill moved forward. Dr. Crowley agreed with Member Chandler in that the protections provided in AB 1286 would address some of the concerns regarding staffing and support in the physical pharmacies.

Member Barker agreed with the members' comments that it was really important to get those patient protections provided in AB 1286 and if AB 1286 didn't pass, this could be addressed.

Members of the public in Sacramento were provided the opportunity to comment.

A representative of CCPC commented in opposition to AB 1286 but appreciated working with the Board and the amendments that had been worked out so far. The representative added the discussion on remote processing should be separate from AB 1286 noting that remote processing was consistent with the goals of AB 1286 in trying to protect patients and reduce medication errors. Allowing remote processing would help move toward the goal of protecting patients. The representative added the remote processing should be expanded to all settings of pharmacy and not limited to certain settings.

A member of the public commented the discussion should be continued regardless of the outcome of AB 1286 adding that remote processing was all about dispensing. The commenter noted the remote site dispensing pharmacy where final product approval was done remotely which could be a model for future discussions. The commenter cautioned about comparing California to other states as the definition of pharmacy technician was different than other states' definitions.

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

Members were provided the opportunity to comment after receiving public comment; however, there were no comments.

**Policy Question #4: Does the Committee believe the Board should sponsor legislation in this area?**

Chairperson Oh believed the answer to this question in part would depend on if the Committee reached consensus that changes were appropriate. Dr. Oh noted even if the Board did reach consensus, the question of whether the Board should actively sponsor legislation or rather use these discussions to develop a policy that could be relied upon by the Board to respond to legislation sponsored by others should be considered. Dr. Oh believed consensus among stakeholders may be a challenge because of competing interests. Dr. Oh noted as Member Chandler has reminded the Committee on occasion, an alternative to sponsoring legislation could be for the Board to have a solution ready should the legislature ask. Dr. Oh believed there were pros and cons to both approaches and that given the varying opinions among stakeholders, this could be an area that the Board identifies through the Sunset review noting that wouldn't be for a few years.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment.

Member Chandler agreed moving ahead as if the Board would be pursuing legislation and could adapt to however the legislation was pursued (e.g., recommendation, sponsoring legislation, Sunset, etc.).

Member Weisz agreed with Member Chandler and noted the Board was a conduit to pharmacists and multiple stakeholders adding it was important to make a stake in the issue.

Members of the public in Sacramento were provided the opportunity to comment; however, there were no comments.

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

**Policy Question #5: Does the Committee believe the Board would benefit from additional flexibility to develop regulations in this area by securing broader regulation authority specific to remote processing?**

Chairperson Oh believed this question posed an interesting policy area. Generally, where the Board has rulemaking authority, it was easier at times for the Board to parse out issues and respond more dynamically through rulemaking. Expanding rulemaking authority in this area may provide the Board and stakeholders with greater flexibility in developing potential authority in this area. Dr. Oh was inclined to agree that the Board would benefit from flexibility to develop regulations in this area adding the details can be unclear but would imagine the Board could start with the legislature by requesting amendment to give clear authority to promulgate regulations. Dr. Oh hoped it would be a landing spot to agree upon some path forward as flexibility would be very important.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment.

Member Crowley asked for clarification regarding authority. Dr. Oh explained it was very clear that there was no statutory authority to promulgate regulations in this area and a statutory change would be necessary. Dr. Oh further explained this was an option to request statutory authority to promulgate regulations versus having a specific statutory proposal.

Member Chandler agreed with the regulatory process being a better venue especially when related to technology and constant innovations in technology. Mr. Chandler supported the concept.

Member Crowley agreed from a broad perspective but had questions about processes, timing, and possible further delay. Dr. Crowley asked about the likelihood of being granted the authority to promulgate regulations. Dr. Oh noted the Board could try.

Member Barker agreed with the concept and the key part was to be flexible with minimizing the time.

Member Weisz agreed with the flexibility of the approach.

Member Chandler commented the Board should continue on multiple tracks for pursuing remote processing.

Members of the public in Sacramento were provided the opportunity to comment.



A member of the public commented historically there had been too much detail in the pharmacy statute and preferred regulations noting there had been times where regulations took longer than the legislative process. The commenter recommended looking into what statutory authority was needed. The commenter advised looking at what current statutes and regulations might be in the way of pursuing the regulation.

Members of the public participating via WebEx were provided the opportunity to comment.

A pharmacist representative of Kaiser commented the approach to ask the legislature for the authority to pursue regulations was sensible. If the approach was taken, another item to consider was to ask the legislature for the authority to write regulations on remote final product verification specifically for compounded sterile products. The representative reviewed safeguards and studies that supported remote final product verification of sterile compounded products.

Chairperson Oh provided a summary of the discussion noting agreement relative to question 1 that some sort of remote processing, with guardrails and definitions, would benefit consumers. Regarding question 2, Dr. Oh noted the consensus seemed to be that it was probably best to keep it simple and not limit remote processing to only specific types of pharmacy models. On question 3, Dr. Oh noted the Committee agreed with looking at the opportunity separate from AB 1286 but noted the passage of AB 1286 would make it easier. On question 4, Dr. Oh noted the Committee agreed it would be best for the Board to sponsor the legislation. And on question 5, Dr. Oh added the consensus seemed to be that it would be good to have flexibility to develop regulations.

Chairperson Oh summarized paths forward. Dr. Oh saw a path forward as flexibility asking for the legislature to give the Board the authority to promulgate regulations that could be brought to the October Licensing Committee Meeting. Dr. Oh also noted it would be great for an experimental program but the limitation is that the Board could only waive regulatory requirements but not statutory requirements. Dr. Oh also added opening the opportunity for petitioning the Board to perform remote processing but that would require statutory change as well which would allow for additional flexibility.

Ms. Sodergren commented on the value in developing the authority through regulation noting that there was authority in CCR 1706.5 that allows for studies to allow for innovation. It was the authority for the Board to suspend regulation that does not extend to statute. If the provisions were in regulation, the Board could consider research in this area and suspend some of the regulations to understand the impact. Ms. Sodergren provided an example of tech-check-tech where the Board was able to suspend some of the regulations for purposes of studying the issue and evaluate if changes in the law were appropriate.

Chairperson Oh concluded the next step would be to have a statutory proposal that would include the regulatory authority and other language.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment after receiving public comment. Member Barker added in order to have flexibility it would be helpful to understand who was doing remote processing and who wanted to do remote verification.

## **V. Discussion and Consideration of Committee's Strategic Objectives**

Chairperson Oh referred to the Licensing Committee's nine strategic objectives in the meeting materials noting that included were updates on the objectives, highlighting efforts over the past year. Dr. Oh noted that Objective 1.6 was complete. As the Chair of the Licensing Committee, Dr. Oh intended to focus more review on objective 1.2 in the coming year and believes additional discussion on the pharmacy technician program could be addressed in the coming year consistent with objective 1.3. Dr. Oh noted that objectives 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9 were tied to the Board's business modernization activities. Dr. Oh believed the remaining objectives were appropriate and didn't believe any changes were appropriate.

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

Members of the public in Sacramento 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.

## **VI. Discussion and Consideration of Licensing Statistics**

Chairperson Oh referenced meeting materials that included a summary of the licensing statistics for the year. Dr. Oh reported the Board has issued 7,619 licenses to individuals and 1,105 site licenses, which includes 335 temporary licenses. Dr. Oh indicated a review of processing times showed improvement in some areas; however, improvement was needed in most areas. The data report reflected the oldest application of each application type. Dr. Oh highlighted this so members understood that the Board's average processing time was shorter than what was reported. Dr. Oh noted the most significant improvement was in the pharmacy technician licensing program where the time dropped from 81 days to 38 days. Dr. Oh recalled that, as the Committee has discussed on several occasions, staff vacancies were a primary driver of the processing times. As of July 1, there were five vacancies in the licensing unit. Dr. Oh thanked licensing staff for their efforts and requested that an update of the pending times be provided during the August 2023 Board Meeting so members can continue to monitor the progress.

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

Members of the public in Sacramento were provided the opportunity to comment.

A member of the public requested data on the number of active licensees and how many pharmacies have closed be included in future reports. Dr. Oh noted the information was included in the meeting materials.

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 after receiving public comment.

Member Chandler asked what a designated paramedic license was as the Board only issued one license. Ms. Sodergren provided it was a very specific license type for a very specific type of automated drug delivery system that was used by the fire department which the Board had issued one license.

## **VII. Future Committee Meeting Dates**

Chairperson Oh thanked everyone for participating and noted the next Licensing Committee Meeting was scheduled for October 18, 2023, adding the meeting would be conducted in person with stakeholders again having the option to participate via Webex. However, Dr. Oh requested attendees monitor the Board's website for updates.

#### **VIII. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.