



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 19, 2022

Location: Teleconference Public Licensing Committee
Meeting Note: Pursuant to the provisions
Government Code section 11133, neither a public
location nor teleconference locations are
provided.

Board Members

Present: Debbie Veale, Licensee Member, Chair
Seung Oh, Licensee Member, Vice-Chairperson
Lavanza Butler, Licensee Member
Jignesh Patel, Licensee Member
Jason Weisz, Public Member

Staff Present: Anne Sodergren, Executive Officer
Eileen Smiley, DCA Staff Counsel

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

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9:02 a.m. As part of the opening announcements, Chairperson Veale reminded everyone that the Board is a consumer protection agency charged with administering and enforcing Pharmacy Law. Further, the meeting was being conducted consistent with the provisions of Government Code section 11133.

Provisions for providing public comment throughout the meeting were reviewed.

Roll call was taken. Members present: Seung Oh, Lavanza Butler, Jason Weisz, Jignesh Patel, and Debbie Veale. A quorum was established.

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

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

Steven Gray commented that as part of the Enforcement and Compounding Committee meeting, FAQs regarding outsourcing facilities were reviewed. The commenter indicated that during the Chair of Enforcement Committee that some items remained outstanding and should be considered by the Licensing Committee.

DCA Counsel clarified the action taken by the Enforcement Committee and that no action was recommended to be taken by the Licensing Committee.

III. Approval of the October 20, 2021, Licensing Committee Meeting Minutes

Members were provided the opportunity to provide comments on the draft minutes; however, none were provided.

Motion: Approve the October 20, 2021, Licensing Committee meeting minutes.

M/S: Oh/Patel

Members of the public were provided the opportunity to provide public comments; however, none were provided.

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

| Board Member | Vote |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Butler | Support |
| Oh | Support |
| Patel | Support |
| Veale | Support |
| Weisz | Support |

IV. Discussion and Consideration of Business and Professions Code section 4071.1, Board's Waiver to Facilitate Provisions for Remote Processing and Consideration of Possible Changes to Statute or Regulation to Establish Authority Under Specified Conditions

Chairperson Veale reminded members that the item for discussion is a continuation of the prior discussion and assessment of remote processing

by the committee. Chairperson Veale noted that the committee did not answer the larger question if changes are appropriate to make permanent and or expand upon the temporary authorities established in the remote processing waiver for pharmacists, pharmacist interns and pharmacy technicians.

Chairperson Veale indicated that during the committee's last discussion, some stakeholder comments suggested that no changes to the law are required to make permanent the remote processing provisions established in the waiver. Since that time counsel has confirmed that statutory changes are required to expand remote processing provisions beyond those duties established in BPC 4071.1.

Chairperson Veale noted urgency in action and discussed the process the committee would be using to move forward its discussion. Chairperson Veale reviewed the general provisions for remote processing related to pharmacies and pharmacists. Specifically, the Board expanded the authority for pharmacists to perform remote processes, which are generally detailed in the second of the waiver and displayed on the meeting slide. Chairperson Veale indicated that the waiver provisions for pharmacies and pharmacists appear appropriate.

Member Patel provided information on how the provisions of the waiver are currently working in practice and noted that it is working well, especially with increased workload at pharmacies and pharmacy staff required to isolate or quarantine. The committee discussed the benefits of the remote processing waiver and how it will allow pharmacists at a brick-and-mortar pharmacy to provide more clinical services.

Member Oh noted general agreement and that the committee should move forward while ensuring the legislative intent includes recordkeeping requirements.

Member Butler spoke in support of the discussion and the need for guardrails in a permanent solution.

Having reached unanimous consensus to make permanent remote processing for pharmacies and pharmacists, the committee continued its discussion on the necessary guardrails. Considerations included if the provisions should be limited to California licensed pharmacies and California licensed pharmacists.

Further, such pharmacies must have policies and procedures in place that include methods to protect confidentiality and expressly prohibit storage of health information on a device that is outside of the licensed pharmacy.

Chairperson Veale reminded members that the waiver also requires training on the policies related to medication orders and prescription processing and that the pharmacists performing remote functions must have secure access to the pharmacy's patient information systems and other electronic systems that an on-site pharmacist would have access to when the pharmacy is open.

Each remote entry must comply with all recordkeeping requirements, including capturing the positive identification of the pharmacist involved in the remote review and verification of a medication order.

The pharmacy utilizing remote processing is responsible for maintaining the records of all medication orders and prescriptions entered into the pharmacy's information system.

Chairperson Veale indicated that the waiver includes appropriate conditions for use and reviewed and surveyed feedback from members for agreement. Member Oh indicated that the waiver provides good guardrails and questioned if there should be a minimum threshold for in-person supervision of staff otherwise working remotely. Further Dr. Oh suggested requiring a minimum threshold for reviewing the electronic records to ensure appropriateness.

The committee considered if biometrics or something similar would be necessary to confirm identity of pharmacists working remotely.

Members Patel, Butler, and Weisz noted agreement with the guardrails included in the waiver.

Chairperson Veale reviewed some of the consensus items reached during the prior discussion, including that a PIC should be delegated authority to make the decision about the use of the remote processing. Chairperson Veale noted that the remote provisions must be limited to California licensed pharmacies and that the California licensed staff must perform the remote processing within California and that notification of a HIPAA breach is to be reported to the Board. Members Butler, Oh, and Weisz stated agreement with the provisions. Member Patel stated disagreement about requiring the remote processing to be performed within California.

Members considered if remote processing should be limited to when a pharmacy is open and determined that potential issues could be resolved by addressing the issue in the policies and procedures. Members indicated general agreement for allowing functions to be performed even when the pharmacy is closed noting benefits to consumers and employees. Members also agreed with the use of biometrics or another form of assurance that the individual performing the work is used to ensure a robust system to confirm the identity of the remote pharmacist.

Motion: The committee recommends to the Board pursuit of a statutory proposal including directing staff and the President to draft a statutory proposal consistent with the provisions of the waiver and the additional items determined appropriate by the committee:

1. The pharmacy must use biometrics or something similar to ensure the identity of the pharmacist working remotely.
2. The PIC should be delegated with the authority to determine the use of remote processing.
3. The provisions are limited to California licensed pharmacies within California and that pharmacists performing remote functions must do so in California.
4. The Board will be notified of HIPAA breaches.
5. Remote processing functions may be performed even when the pharmacy is closed.

M/S: Oh/Patel

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

Public comment suggested reconsideration of a limitation to the provisions of remote processing to only occur during business hours of the pharmacy as well as flexibility for different work settings and to remove restrictions limiting provisions to only resident pharmacies.

Public comment also suggested that the committee consider the potential impact to call centers, that current prohibitions on controlled drugs should be removed, and provisions for offsite storage of records is necessary (i.e., file servers in an offsite location.)

Support: 4 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Present: 0

| Board Member | Vote |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Butler | Support |
| Oh | Support |
| Patel | Support |
| Veale | Support |
| Weisz | Abstain |

Members took a break from 10:36 a.m. to 10:50 a.m. Roll call taken. Members present: Seung Oh, Lavanza Butler, Jignesh Patel, Jason Weisz, and Debbie Veale.

Chairperson Veale shared some information about authorities for pharmacy technicians performing remote processing. In 2020, NABP surveyed states regarding remote processing. At that time 20 states indicated there were provisions either permanent or temporary to allow technicians to perform some remote functions. Idaho has a remote data entry rule that allows a pharmacy located in Idaho to employ a certified technician to perform data entry in remote practice sites under specified conditions.

Chairperson Veale also reviewed the current provisions of the existing waiver related to pharmacist interns and pharmacy technicians. Under the conditions of the waiver a pharmacist intern or pharmacy technician is authorized to conduct nondiscretionary tasks remotely under specified conditions including that they are entering medication orders or prescriptions from a remote location for a California licensed pharmacy.

The pharmacy has policies and procedures in place as specified and that all pharmacy interns and technicians performing such functions have been trained on the policies and procedures including provisions for remote supervision via technology. The technology must, at a minimum ensure that a pharmacist is readily available to answer questions and verify the work being performed.

The pharmacy must also ensure that any intern or technician performing the remote functions have secure electronic access to the pharmacy's patient information system and other systems to which on-site staff have access.

Current provisions also provide that each remote entry record must comply with all record keeping requirements for pharmacies and the pharmacy is responsible for maintaining all records.

Chairperson Veale surveyed members to determine if provisions of the waiver should be made permanent for pharmacist interns and pharmacy technicians. Member Oh suggested that this discussion may be appropriate to be incorporated into the pharmacy technician summit. Member Butler noted agreement with the comments for Member Oh.

Member Patel noted support for making the provisions permanent noting the benefits to the pharmacy and pharmacist noting that pharmacist interns and pharmacy technicians performing remote processing support pharmacist remote processing. Further provisions for remote work address challenges that staff experience including challenges with childcare, lack of transportation, etc. Pharmacy technician work would be done in a queue and would require review by a pharmacist.

Member Weisz spoke in support of incorporating this information into the technician summit.

Motion: Recommend to Board that the issue related to remote processing by pharmacy technicians be considered as part of the Technician Summit.

M/S: Oh/Butler

Members of the public were provided the opportunity to provide public comment. Commenters spoke in support of moving forward to make the waiver provisions for pharmacist interns and pharmacy technicians permanent.

Comments heard also included the issue of ratios needed to be considered and the extent to which remote supervision by a pharmacist working remotely would be allowed. Members were advised that 19 states have permanent allowances for pharmacy technicians with 45 states allowing temporary authority.

Comments also suggested support for remote work by unlicensed individuals.

Support: 3 Oppose: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Present: 0

| Board Member | Vote |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Butler | Support |
| Oh | Support |
| Patel | Oppose |
| Veale | Oppose |
| Weisz | Support |

V. Discussion and Consideration of Requirements to Serve as a Pharmacist-in-Charge

Chairperson Veale provided background on the issue including consideration if the Board should have minimum requirements for an individual to serve as a pharmacist-in-charge. Chairperson Veale reminded members of the outcome of the discussion including an attestation and development of a training program for proposed PICs as well as require an attestation by a proposed PIC.

Ms. Veale referenced the draft attestation which was included in the meeting materials and displayed on the meeting slide.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that I understand and accept the responsibility for the above referenced pharmacy's compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to the practice of pharmacy as required in Business and Professions Code section 4113(c). Further, I understand it is unlawful for any pharmacy owner to commit any act that would subvert or tend to subvert the efforts of me as the pharmacist-in-charge to comply with the laws governing the operation of the pharmacy as provided in Business and Professions Code section 4330(b).

Chairperson Veale spoke in support of the draft attestation and solicited feedback from members. Members Oh, Butler, Patel, and Weisz spoke in support of the attestation.

Chairperson Veale also reviewed recommended components of a training program noting agreement. Elements included:

1. Legal requirements for a PIC and the Sternberg decision.
2. Legal requirements and overview of the self-assessment process.
3. Information on how to prepare for an inspection.

4. Legal prohibition for a pharmacy owner to subvert or tend to subvert the efforts of a PIC to comply with the laws governing the operation of a pharmacy.
5. Top violations that result in the issuance of a citation and fine.

Chairperson Veale solicited feedback from members. Member Oh spoke in support of training components if approved by the Board. Member Butler spoke in support of the training program elements. Member Patel spoke in support of the training program elements and referral to additional information. Member Weisz also spoke in support of the training elements.

Members considered the proposed regulation language. The committee also considered if the training needs to be prior to each appointment.

Member Oh spoke in support of the training to be Board approved and noted that the attestation should be required every time. Additionally, training should happen at the time of appointment.

Member Butler supported board provided training, attestation should be each time prior to appointment, and training should be required unless the training was completed within the last 12 months.

Member Patel spoke in support of board provided training, but it only needs to be once.

Member Weisz spoke in support of attestation upon each appointment. Additionally, he is open to more flexibility as to when the training needs to be completed.

Chairperson Veale spoke in support of board provided training and noted consensus among members in various areas including an attestation every time, board provided training and a recommendation that the training, must be completed within two years of appointment.

Motion: Recommend initiation of a rulemaking to amend CCR section 1709.1 based on the policy discussions which includes modification to the language to require the training to be completed within two years of appointment. Authorize the chair and executive officer to further refine the language consistent with the policy discussions as may be required by control agencies (DCA or Agency). Additionally, authorize the executive

officer to make any non-substantive changes prior to initiation of the rulemaking. Further, if no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period 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 1709.1 as noticed for public comment.

Title 16. Board of Pharmacy Proposed Text

Proposed changes to current regulation text are indicated with ~~single strikethrough~~ for deletions and single underline for additions.

Amend Sections 1709.1 of Article 4 of Division 17 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read:

§ 1709.1. Designation of Pharmacist-In-Charge

(a) The pharmacist-in-charge of a pharmacy shall be employed at that location and shall have responsibility for the daily operation of the pharmacy. Prior to approval of Board, a proposed pharmacist-in-charge shall complete an attestation confirming their understanding of the roles and responsibilities of a pharmacist-in-charge and the legal prohibitions of a pharmacy owner to subvert the efforts of a pharmacist-in-charge. The proposed pharmacist-in-charge shall also provide proof demonstrating completion of a Board provided training course on the role of a pharmacist-in-charge within the past two years.

(b) The pharmacy owner shall vest the pharmacist-in-charge with adequate authority to assure compliance with the laws governing the operation of a pharmacy.

(c) No pharmacist shall be the pharmacist-in-charge of more than two pharmacies. If a pharmacist serves as pharmacist-in-charge at two pharmacies, those pharmacies shall not be separated by a driving distance of more than 50 miles.

(d) No pharmacist shall be the pharmacist-in-charge of a pharmacy while concurrently serving as the designated representative-in-charge for a wholesaler or a veterinary food-animal drug retailer.

(e) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), a pharmacy may designate any pharmacist who is an employee, officer or administrator of the pharmacy or the entity which owns the pharmacy and who is actively involved in the management of the pharmacy on a daily basis as the pharmacist-in-charge for a period not to exceed 120 days. The pharmacy, or the entity which owns the pharmacy, shall be prepared during normal business hours to provide a representative of the board with documentation of the involvement of a pharmacist-in-charge designated pursuant to this subdivision with the pharmacy and efforts to obtain and designate a permanent pharmacist-in-charge.

(f) A pharmacist may refuse to act as a pharmacist-in-charge at a second pharmacy if the pharmacist determines, in the exercise of his or her professional judgment, that assuming responsibility for a second pharmacy would interfere with the effective performance of the pharmacist's responsibilities under the Pharmacy Law. A pharmacist who refuses to become pharmacist-in-charge at a second pharmacy shall notify the pharmacy owner in writing of his or her determination, specifying the circumstances of concern that have led to that determination.

(g) A person employing a pharmacist may not discharge, discipline, or otherwise discriminate against any pharmacist in the terms and conditions of employment for exercising or attempting to exercise in good faith the right established pursuant to this section.

Note: Authority cited: Section 4005, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 4081, 4113, 4305 and 4330, Business and Professions Code.

M/S: Oh/Patel

Members of the public were provided an opportunity to provide public comments. Comments included support of the motion but requested that the training be Board approved, not Board provided. Comments also suggested that the training should reflect the different practice settings.

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

| Board Member | Vote |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Butler | Support |
| Oh | Support |
| Patel | Support |
| Veale | Support |
| Weisz | Support |

Members took a break from 11:53 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. A roll call was taken. Members present: Seung Oh, Lavanza Butler, Jignesh Patel, Jason Weisz, and Debbie Veale.

VI. Discussion and Consideration of Renewal Requirements of Pharmacists and Possible Changes

Chairperson Veale provided background on the agenda item. As part of the Board's discussion on implementation of provisions of Assembly Bill 1533, it was recommended that the Licensing Committee consider updating the renewal requirements to consolidate the various CE requirements in one place.

Chairperson Veale referenced the proposed language included in the meeting materials and displayed on the meeting slide. Chairperson Veale solicited feedback from members. Members Oh, Butler, Patel and Weisz spoke in support of the draft language.

Motion: Recommend initiation of a rulemaking to amend CCR section 1732.5 as presented. Authorize the chair and executive officer to further refine the language consistent with the policy discussions as may be required by control agencies (DCA or Agency). Additionally, authorize the executive officer to make any non-substantive changes prior to initiation of the rulemaking. Further, if no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period 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 1732.5 as noticed for public comment.

**Title 16 Board
of Pharmacy
Proposed
Text**

Proposed changes to current regulation text are indicated with ~~single strikethrough~~ for deletions and single underline for additions.

Amend Section 1732.5 of Article 4 of Division 17 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read:

§1732.5 Renewal Requirements for Pharmacists

- (a) Except as provided in Section 4234 of the Business and Professions Code and Section 1732.6 of this Division, each applicant for renewal of a pharmacist license shall submit proof satisfactory to the board, that the applicant has completed 30 hours of continuing education in the prior 24 months.
- (b) At least two (2) of the thirty (30) hours required for pharmacist license renewal shall be completed by participation in a Board provided CE course in Law and Ethics. ~~Pharmacists renewing their licenses which expire on or after July 1, 2019, shall be subject to the requirements of this subdivision.~~
- (c) If you are providing the following services you must also complete:
 - (1) At least one (1) hour of approved CE biennially, specific to smoking cessation therapy, as required by Section 4052.9 of the Business and Professions Code, if applicable.
 - (2) At least two (2) hours of approved CE biennially, specific to travel medication, as required by Section 1746.5, if applicable.

- (3) At least one (1) hour of approved CE biennially, specific to immunizations and vaccines, as required by Section 1746.4, if applicable.
- (4) At least one (1) hour of approved CE once every four (4) years, specific to the risks of addiction associated with the use of Schedule II drugs, as required by Section 4232.5 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (d) A pharmacist who provides emergency contraception shall complete at least one (1) hour of approved continuing education as required by Section 4052.3 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (e) All pharmacists shall retain their certificates of completion for four (4) years following completion of a continuing education course demonstrating compliance with the provisions of this section.

Note: Authority cited: Section 4005, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 4052.3, 4052.8, 4052.9, 4231, and 4232, and 4232.5, Business and Professions Code.

M/S: Butler/Oh

Members of the public were provided with the opportunity to provide public comment; however, none was provided.

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

| Board Member | Vote |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Butler | Support |
| Oh | Support |
| Patel | Support |
| Veale | Support |
| Weisz | Support |

VII. Discussion and Consideration of CCR Section 1730.1 Related to Application requirements for Advanced Practice Pharmacist Licensure Including Possible Amendments

Chairperson Veale provided background noting that Assembly Bill 1533 amended Section 4210 to alter the application requirements for advanced practice pharmacist recognition to allow for qualification under a single pathway, if that pathway includes completion of a second criterion. This clarifies the requirements and eliminates the current confusing language.

Chairperson Veale noted that it appears appropriate to make conforming changes to the regulation section to avoid conflicts between the statute and regulation and ensure clear implementation of the policy goal achieved in AB 1533. Chairperson Veale solicited feedback from members on the proposed language included in the meeting materials and displayed on the meeting slide. Members Oh, Butler, Patel and Weisz noted support for the proposed language.

Motion: Recommend initiation of a rulemaking to amend CCR section 1730.1 as presented. Authorize the chair and executive officer to further refine the language consistent with the policy discussions as may be required by control agencies (DCA or Agency). Additionally, authorize the executive officer to make any non-substantive changes prior to initiation of the rulemaking. Further, if no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period 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 1730.1 as noticed for public comment.

**Title 16. Board of Pharmacy
Proposed Text**

Proposed changes to current regulation text are indicated with single strikethrough for deletions and single underline for additions.

Amend Section 1730.1 to Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations, to read as follows:

§ 1730.1. Application Requirements for Advanced Practice Pharmacist Licensure.

- (a) For purposes of Business and Professions Code section 4210, an applicant for advanced practice pharmacist licensure must satisfy two of the following subsections.
 - (1) Demonstrate possession of a current certification as specified in Business and Professions Code section 4210, subdivision (a)(2)(A), by providing either:
 - (A) A copy of the certification award that includes the name of the applicant pharmacist, the area of specialty and date of completion, or
 - (B) A letter from the certification program confirming the award of the certification that includes the name of the applicant pharmacist, the area of specialty and the date of completion.
 - (2) Demonstrate completion of a postgraduate residency earned in the United States through an accredited postgraduate institution as specified in Business and Professions Code section 4210, subdivision (a)(2)(B), by providing either:

- (A) A copy of the residency certificate awarded by the postgraduate institution that includes the name of the applicant pharmacist, the area of specialty, and dates of participation and completion, or
 - (B) A letter of completion of a postgraduate residency, signed by the dean or residency program director of the postgraduate institution and sent directly to the board from the postgraduate institution, that lists the name of the applicant pharmacist, the area of specialty, and the dates of participation and completion. For an applicant who cannot satisfy this documentation requirement, the board may, for good cause shown, grant a waiver for this subsection.
- (3) Demonstrate that experience earned under a collaborative practice agreement or protocol, as required by Business and Professions Code section 4210, subdivision (a)(2)(C), has been earned within 10 years of the time of application for advanced practice pharmacist licensure. Additionally, the one year of experience must include no fewer than 1,500 hours of experience providing clinical services to patients. The experience earned under a collaborative practice agreement or protocol must include initiating, adjusting, modifying or discontinuing drug therapy of patients as authorized by law. An applicant shall demonstrate possession of experience by providing both of the following:
- (A) A written statement from the applicant attesting under penalty of perjury that he or she has:
 - (i) Earned the clinical experience within the required time frame; and
 - (ii) Completed the required number of hours of experience providing clinical services to patients, as specified in subsection (a)(3).
 - (I) The applicant shall provide a copy of the collaborative practice agreement or protocol.
 - (II) If a copy of the collaborative practice agreement or protocol is not available, the applicant shall provide a description of the collaborative practice agreement or protocol, including examples of the clinical services the applicant provided to patients.
 - (B) A written statement from the supervising practitioner, program director or health facility administrator attesting under penalty of perjury that the applicant has completed at least 1,500 hours of experience providing clinical services to patients. For an applicant who cannot satisfy this documentation requirement, the board may, for good cause shown, grant a waiver for this subsection.
- (b) The experience an applicant offers to demonstrate compliance with one of the three criteria in subsection (a) above may not also be used to satisfy another of the criteria. However, if, as a condition of completion of one of the required criteria, fulfillment of a second criterion is also required, that completion shall satisfy this section.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 4005 and 4210, Business and Professions Code.
Reference: Sections 4052.1, 4052.2 and 4210, Business and Professions Code.

M/S: Patel/Oh

Members were provided with the opportunity to provide public comment; however, none were provided.

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

| Board Member | Vote |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Butler | Support |
| Oh | Support |
| Patel | Support |
| Veale | Support |
| Weisz | Support |

VIII. Review and Discussion of Licensing Statistics

Chairperson Veale referenced the quarterly licensing statistics highlighting application statistics and processing times.

Members of the public were provided with an opportunity to provide public comments; however, none were provided.

IX. Future Committee Meeting Dates

Members were reminded of the upcoming Committee meeting schedule including the next meeting scheduled for April 19, 2022.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:19 p.m.