



**California State Board of Pharmacy**  
**Department of Consumer Affairs**  
**DRAFT Public Board Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** March 18, 2026

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

PUBLIC 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  
Jeff Hughes, Public Member  
Kartikya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member  
Claudia Mercado, Public Member  
Jason "Jay" Newell, MSW, Public Member  
Ricardo Sanchez, Public Member  
Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member (via Webex)  
Maria Serpa, PharmD, Licensee Member  
Nicole Thibeau, PharmD, Licensee Member (via Webex)

**Board Members**

**Not Present:** Jeanette Dong, Public Member

**Staff Present:**

Anne Sodergren, Executive Officer  
Julie Ansel, Deputy Executive Officer  
Corinne Gartner, DCA Staff Counsel  
Shelley Ganaway, DCA Staff Counsel  
Deepi Miller, DCA Regulations Counsel  
Julie McFall, Executive Specialist Manager  
Debbie Damoth, Senior Administration Manager (via Webex)

**March 18, 2026**

**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 9:03 a.m.

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 Sacramento: Renee Barker, PharmD, Licensee Member; Trevor Chandler, Public Member; Jeff Hughes, Public Member; KK Jha, RPh, Licensee Member; Jason “Jay” Newell, MSW, Public Member; Ricardo Sanchez, Public Member; Maria Serpa, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Seung Oh, PharmD, Licensee Member. Jessica Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member; Satinder Sandhu, PharmD, Licensee Member; and Nicole Thibeau, PharmD, Licensee Member, participated via Webex. Dr. Crowley, Dr. Sandhu, and Dr. Thibeau 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.

Member Mercado arrived at 9:08 a.m.

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

Members of the public participating from 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. The Board heard a comment from a specialty pharmacist thanking the Board for their continued support of remote processing. Another commenter expressed concerns related to the California Privacy Protection Agency’s Delete Request and Opt-Out Platform (DROP), noting that data broker deletion measures may lead to rejected pharmacy claims and disruption of patient care and asked the Board to consider adding this to a future agenda.

Members noted that the California Department of Health Care Services is making some changes to Medi-Cal that may lead to increased claim rejections. They also reported that more than 76,000 prescribers were not properly registered. While this issue falls outside the Board’s jurisdiction, members suggested that the Board consider issuing alerts to pharmacists to help them prepare for potential impacts.

### **III. Discussion and Possible Action to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1749 Related to Fees, including Presentation by Matt Nishimine, Senior Fiscal Advisor**

Dr. Oh recalled that during the January Board meeting, the Board discussed the structural imbalance in the Board's budget, which made it necessary for the Board to review its current fee schedule to determine if changes were appropriate.

Dr. Oh reported that DCA had completed its fee analysis and concluded that the Board was not fully recovering the costs of its services. He noted the findings were not unexpected, given the significant increase in the cost of operations since the previous fee audit was conducted in 2022.

Dr. Oh welcomed Matt Nishimine, Senior Fiscal Advisor with DCA, to provide a presentation on the DCA audit findings.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment following the presentation. Members discussed the recent fee increases as well as concerns about and possible impacts of further increasing fees.

Members discussed the Board's use of technology, including the limitations of the Board's legacy computer systems and the costs associated with system upgrades aimed at improving staff-level efficiencies. Additionally, members considered the development of a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) resource addressing common licensee application deficiencies to help reduce the time required for staff to process and resolve such issues.

Members also recommended that the Communication and Public Education Committee collaborate with the Licensing Committee to identify strategies to assist the public in accurately completing forms with the goal of reducing application deficiencies.

Members also discussed the potential value of benchmarking fees against those charged by other states.

Dr. Oh noted that as part of the meeting materials, a table was provided that included for each proposed amendment: the current fee, the statutory maximum, the recommended fee, and the audit finding, and noted that in many instances the audit finding was significantly higher than the recommended fee.

Dr. Oh also reminded the Board that Business and Professions Code section 4400 establishes the Board's statutory minimum and maximum fee amounts, and noted the recommended fees set forth in the table cannot exceed the statutory maximums.

Dr. Oh further noted the meeting materials included a transmittal memo that

included recommendations, the various fund conditions, recommended regulation language and DCA audit findings supporting each recommended fee adjustment.

**Motion:** Move to initiate a rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1749 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 step necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at section 1749.

**M/S:** Oh/Crowley

Members of the public participating 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. Commenters expressed concerns about raising fees for nonresident pharmacies, specialty pharmacies, sterile compounding pharmacies, and outsourcing facilities, noting this could result in further limited access to life-saving medications for certain patient populations. Commenters also noted that some of the fee increases being proposed were significant; expressed concerns that the proposal will accelerate pharmacy closures; and urged the Board to find ways to streamline and reduce costs, or consider a tiered/phased approach to increasing fees.

Members were provided a final opportunity to comment. Members discussed the need to move forward with the rulemaking process and noted there would be additional time for stakeholders to provide input.

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

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

The Board took a break from 10:21 a.m. to 10:40 a.m.

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

**IV. Discussion and Possible Action Related to Proposed Addition of California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1717.11 Related to the Remote Processing of Prescriptions, Including Review of Comments Received During the 45-Day Comment Period**

Dr. Oh recalled that as part of the November 2025 Board meeting, the Board approved proposed rulemaking text to add provisions for remote processing of prescriptions for outpatient pharmacies. Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials included the proposed text released for the 45-day comment period, Board staff-prepared summarized comments with recommended responses, Board staff-recommended modified text, and the comments received during the 45-day comment period.

Members were provided an opportunity to comment. Members discussed the waivers the Board had issued in the past allowing for remote processing during emergencies. Members also suggested that CAMER reporting information be updated to include a question about whether remote processing was involved in the error. Some members expressed concern about taking a broad approach to

remote processing and favored a narrower approach that would only permit it in limited situations such as specialty pharmacies.

Members also noted that pharmacies, especially retail chains, continue to experience staffing challenges and some expressed concern that remote processing will compound these issues.

Other members acknowledged that pharmacy staffing issues exist, but supported moving the regulation forward.

**Motion:** Accept the Board staff's recommended comment responses and modified regulation text consistent with the Board's discussion, and initiate a 15-day comment period. Additionally, if no adverse comments are received during the 15-day comment period, authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking process and adopt the proposed regulation text at Section 1717.11. Further, delegate to the executive officer the authority to make technical or nonsubstantive changes as may be required by the Control agencies to complete the rulemaking file.

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

**Modified Regulation Text  
Remote Processing of Prescriptions**

**Legend:** Added text is indicated with an underline.

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

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

§1717.11. Remote Processing of Prescriptions.

(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. The pharmacy and pharmacist enter a written~~

- agreement under which the pharmacist agrees to perform remote processing and designates a specific location or locations to perform such processing.
- (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.
  - (6) Records maintained pursuant to this section shall meet the same requirements as those described in Sections 4081 and 4105 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (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.
- (c) This section does not apply to facilities of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

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

**M/S:** Serpa/Oh

Members of the public participating in Sacramento were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter felt the PIC setting the staffing level does not work and in many instances, the PIC does not have autonomy over staffing decisions. The commenter noted staffing levels had decreased and store pharmacists are drowning. The commenter supported the idea of remote processing but said it would not work in her store.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Board heard comments both in support of and in opposition to the proposed regulation. Opposition comments stated that pharmacists are stretched to the limit and remote processing, which prioritizes the bottom line over patient care, will exacerbate the problem. Comments in opposition also expressed concerns about lack of communication and reduced access to patients, lack of inspections, and potential for HIPAA violations and data breaches. Comments in support noted that professional pharmacy is multifaceted and a new generation is looking for more flexible work opportunities, remote verification technology is far superior than it was in the past, and remote work can help give retail pharmacies more time for patient interaction. One commenter suggested there was confusion in the regulation related to Business and Professions Code section 4071.1, noting the regulation is unclear as to whether the input of a prescription by a prescriber outside of the pharmacy would be part of prescription processing. Another commenter requested the Board clarify that existing documentation can satisfy the proposed regulation's written agreement requirement.

Dr. Oh reiterated that the Board's proposed regulation clarifies the conditions under which a pharmacist may perform remote processing of prescriptions outside a

licensed pharmacy. Dr. Oh further noted that he believed that the approach being proposed strikes an appropriate balance and reflected the Board's strong commitment to consumer protection while creating flexibility for pharmacists seeking to work remotely. He also noted that the regulation creates an option, not a mandate, for remote work.

Members were provided a final opportunity to comment. Members clarified that based on the regulatory text as currently proposed, remote work under the regulation must be performed from a location within California. Members also discussed the generational diversity and patient populations that utilize pharmacies in different ways.

**Support: 10 Oppose: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 1**

<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Vote</b>
Barker	Support
Chandler	Oppose
Crowley	Oppose
Dong	Not Present
Hughes	Support
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Newell	Support
Oh	Support
Sanchez	Support
Sandhu	Support
Serpa	Support
Thibeau	Support

**V. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Awarding Continuing Education Credit for the Following Elective Board-Provided Courses:**

- a. Assembly Bill 1503: Removing Barriers and Improving Patient Safety**
- b. Board Compounding Regulations: Nonsterile Compounding Requirements**
- c. Board Compounding Regulations: Sterile Compounding Requirements**

Dr. Oh explained that over the last several years, the Board had developed a number of elective training courses to assist licensees in understanding statutory and regulatory requirements. Three new Board-provided courses — one related to Assembly Bill 1503, one related to the Board's nonsterile compounding requirements, and one related to the Board's sterile compounding requirements — were being put forward today for the Board to consider if continuing education credit should be awarded to licensees upon course completion.

Dr. Oh agreed with the recommendations indicated in the meeting materials and suggested either Member Serpa or Member Barker be designated to review the

two compounding related trainings given their expertise.

Members were provided an opportunity to comment. Members spoke in support of awarding CE for the three courses and designating Dr. Renee Barker to review the compounding courses. Members discussed looking into adding the courses to the NABP portal.

- Motion:** Approve the following elective Board-provided trainings for continuing education (CE) credit:
- Assembly Bill 1503: Removing Barriers and Improving Patient Safety, for one (1) hour of CE
  - Board Compounding Regulations: Nonsterile Compounding Requirements, for one (1) hour of CE
  - Board Compounding Regulations: Sterile Compounding Requirements, for 1.5 hours of CE
- Further, designate Renee Barker to review the nonsterile and sterile compounding trainings prior to finalization and publication.

**M/S:** Barker/Sandhu

Members of the public participating 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. A member from CPhA noted that entities who wished to be a CPE provider must be accredited by ACPE.

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

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

Dr. Oh noted that he believed the AB 1503 presentation would be available by the end of the month. He also thanked the Board's Chief of Enforcement, Janice Dang, and Supervising Inspectors Acosta and Kalantar for their work on the two compounding presentations.

The Board took a break from 11:55 a.m. to 12:02 p.m.

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

**VI. Hearings on Petitions for Reinstatement of Licensure, Early Termination of Probation, or Other Modification of Penalty**

Administrative Law Judge Christopher Dietrich presided over the following hearing:

- a. Chante Lizette Martinez, TCH 134114

Member Chandler returned at 12:32 p.m.

The Board took a break from 12:52 p.m. to 1:42 p.m.

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

Administrative Law Judge Christopher Dietrich continued presiding over the remaining hearings.

- b. Ying Jin, RPH 81821

Member Chandler left the meeting at 2:12 p.m., returned at 2:17 p.m., and left again at 2:22 p.m.

- c. Touch Lim Uch, RPH 49009

Member Jha left the meeting at 2:32 p.m. and returned at 2:36 p.m. Member Chandler returned at 2:48 p.m., left at 3:10 p.m., and returned at 3:19 p.m.

## **VII. Closed Session**

Open session concluded at approximately 3:26 p.m. The Board entered closed session at approximately 3:30 p.m. and ended closed session at approximately 4:16 p.m.

## **VIII. Reconvene in Open Session to Adjourn for the Day; Adjournment**

The Board reconvened into open session and adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:17 p.m.