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 and Consumer Services Agency
Department of Consumer Affairs
Gavin Newsom, Governor

California State Board of Pharmacy
Department of Consumer Affairs
Licensing Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: June 11, 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
Jessi Crowley, PharmD, Licensee Member
Kartikeya "KK" Jha, RPh, Licensee Member
Claudia Mercado, Public Member

Staff Present:
Anne Sodergren, Executive Officer
Julie Ansel, Deputy Executive Officer
Corinne Gartner, DCA Counsel
Deepi Miller, DCA Regulations Counsel
Julie McFall, Executive Specialist Manager

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

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

promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount. 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; Jessica Crowley, 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 members of the public in Sacramento.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Committee heard a comment from an out-of-state applicant who has been unable to pass the CPJE.

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

Dr. Renee Barker joined the meeting at 9:10 a.m.

III. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Minutes of the April 15, 2026 Licensing Committee Meeting

The draft minutes of the April 15, 2026 Licensing Committee meeting were presented for review and approval.

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

Motion: Approve the April 15, 2026 Licensing Committee meeting minutes as presented in the meeting materials.

M/S: Sandhu/Crowley

There were no members of the public in Sacramento.

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

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

Board Member	Vote
Barker	Support
Crowley	Support
Jha	Support
Mercado	Support
Oh	Support
Sandhu	Support

IV. Discussion and Possible Action to Make a Recommendation to the Board to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1707, Related to Waiver Requirements for Off-Site Storage of Records

Chairperson Oh advised that existing law establishes provisions to allow for the Board to grant a waiver to allow for the off-site storage of records. The Board's regulation, at section 1707 of title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), further clarifies the statutory authority. In its current form, the regulation specifies that a waiver may be granted to "an entity licensed by the Board."

Dr. Oh noted that staff are recommending that the Committee and Board consider if the regulation should be broadened to explicitly permit the Board to also grant waivers to entities formerly licensed by the Board.

Dr. Oh further noted that he had reviewed the recommendation offered by staff to amend section 1707 to extend the provision for waivers to former licensees and agreed with the draft language.

Attachment 2 of the meeting materials included a copy of the draft regulation proposal.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members briefly discussed the proposed changes. Dr. Oh clarified that proposed subsection (h) is new and incorporates the substantive changes being offered, while the proposed changes to other sections of the regulation are technical in nature. The general consensus of the Committee was that the proposed changes were appropriate.

There were no members of the public in Sacramento.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter expressed overall support for the proposed regulation changes but raised a concern about striking out "area of the pharmacy" in subsection (a).

Members were provided a final opportunity to comment. Members discussed the public comment and staff explained the general reasoning behind the proposed changes in subsection (a).

The Committee agreed to move the document forward to the Board as written.

V. Discussion of Public Comment Suggesting the Board Establish Requirements for Outsourcing Facilities to Provide Advance Notification of Closure/Cessation of Business Operations in California, Including Possible Action to Make a Recommendation to the Board to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1708.2 Related to Discontinuance of Business

Chairperson Oh recalled that during a prior discussion on the Board's outsourcing program, members received public comment suggesting that the Board should establish mandatory notification requirements for outsourcing facilities that will be closing. It was suggested that such a requirement is necessary to ensure continuity of patient care.

Dr. Oh noted that Attachment 3 of the meeting materials included a draft regulatory proposal to establish such a requirement. Dr. Oh further noted that he had reviewed the proposal and believed it was appropriate.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed closure provisions in disciplinary orders, and staff explained that such orders generally include provisions that ensure continuity of patient care. Members also

discussed the difficulty of measuring the impact of a closure on patients and suggested changing the advance notification from 45 days to 60 days.

There were no members of the public in Sacramento.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. The Committee heard a comment noting that 60 days' notice may still not be enough. The commenter also asked the Committee to consider required notification when an outsourcing facility discontinues a product.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments. Members discussed extending the notification beyond 60 days and reached consensus that 90 days was reasonable and appropriate. The Committee also directed staff to consider the feasibility of requiring outsourcing facilities to also provide advance notice when a product will be discontinued.

VI. Discussion and Possible Action to Make a Recommendation to the Board Regarding Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) Related to Continuing Education Requirements for Pharmacists

Dr. Oh noted that the meeting materials described the relevant laws related to continuing education requirements for pharmacists.

Dr. Oh further noted that as the Board continues to educate licensees through the use of FAQs, and given the recent transition to a more robust standard care of practice model for pharmacists, he believed it was appropriate for the Committee to evaluate the current FAQs related to continuing education requirements for pharmacists.

Attachment 4 of the meeting materials included the proposed updated FAQs. Dr. Oh noted that he had reviewed the updated FAQs and believed they were appropriate.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed adding questions on cultural competency CE requirements and other required CE, provided recommendations to improve the FAQ structure and format, and suggested adding hyperlinks.

Members agreed to designate Dr. Crowley to work with staff on the revisions.

There were no members of the public in Sacramento.

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

VII. 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 his appreciation for the Board's efforts to pursue so many important patient safety provisions and further noted that the Board's legislative report and the final outcome on the measure reflected the Board's strong commitment to California consumers.

Dr. Oh recalled that during the January 2026 meeting, the Committee received the first update on implementation activities undertaken since passage of the measure and received additional updates at the April 2026 meeting.

Dr. Oh reminded members that the Board released a newsletter at the end of January which detailed changes made in AB 1503, released a training webinar in its learning management system which approximately 355 individuals have completed, released several policy statements related to Pharmacy Law updates effected by AB 1503, and continues to provide education on the changes included in AB 1503.

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

Dr. Oh advised that Dr. Satinder Sandhu had been appointed to serve as the Board member on the advisory committee and noted the Board Member Procedure Manual had been updated to reflect the addition of the PTAC. Dr. Oh also noted it was anticipated that the online application portal would be available in July.

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 that implementation activities related to the retitling of Advance Practice Pharmacist to Advanced Pharmacist Practitioner were underway; the technical changes required in the Board's IT systems were completed; and staff prepared the rulemaking documents that were currently undergoing pre-notice review.

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

Amended BPC Section 4036, Pharmacist Defined
Dr. Oh noted that this 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. Dr. Oh reminded members that the Board adopted regulation language at the April 2026 Board meeting and following adoption, Board staff prepared the post adoption rulemaking materials, which were currently undergoing review.

New BPC Sections 4040.6 and 4102, Related to Self-Assessment Process
Dr. Oh reminded members that consideration of revised self-assessment forms was being handled by the Enforcement and Compounding Committee and that several updated forms had already been approved by the Board and were posted on the Board's website. Dr. Oh noted that the Enforcement and Compounding Committee considered changes to additional self-assessment forms for Automated Drug Delivery Systems, Compounding, and Outsourcing Facilities at their June meeting.

Dr. Oh also reminded members that the Board had identified a need to repeal the prior self-assessment regulation sections and had begun the process of repealing those sections through the streamlined Section 100 process, but the Office of Administrative Law had determined that the Board must repeal the sections through the formal rulemaking process. Dr. Oh recalled that at the April 2026 Board meeting, the Board voted to initiate a rulemaking and staff had prepared the rulemaking package, which was currently undergoing pre-notice review.

Amended BPC Sections 4051 and 4052, Related to Standard of Care
Dr. Oh recalled that the Board's policy statement related to the standard of care practice model 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 also removed from the website as the trainings were no longer required by law.

Dr. Oh next noted that the Board had believed the repeal of numerous regulation sections that established protocols and mandatory CE requirements could be completed through the streamlined Section 100 process, but the Office of Administrative Law had determined that the Board must repeal these sections through the formal rulemaking process. Dr. Oh recalled that at the April 2026 Board meeting, the Board voted to initiate a rulemaking and staff had prepared the rulemaking package and it was currently undergoing pre-notice review.

Amended BPC Sections 4081 and 4105, Related to Pharmacy Records
Amended BPC Section 4111, Related to Ownership Prohibitions
Dr. Oh indicated there were no updates to report.

Amended BPC Sections 4112, 4113, and 4113.1, Related to Nonresident Pharmacies
Dr. Oh advised that recent implementation activities included releasing the policy statement approved during the April 2026 Board meeting. He further noted that staff continue outreach efforts both via email and written communication to nonresident pharmacies. More recently, staff had starting calling nonresident pharmacies, prioritizing those facilities with July and August expiration dates.

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

Amended BPC Section 4113, Related to Pharmacist-in-charge, Staffing
Amended BPC Section 4113.6, Related to Chain Community Pharmacy
Amended BPC Section 4115, Related to Pharmacy Technicians
Amended BPC Section 4200.5, Related to Retired Pharmacist License
New BPC Section 4317.6, Related to Mail Order Pharmacy
Amended BPC Section 4400, Related to Fees
Dr. Oh indicated there were no new updates to report.

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

There were no members of the public in Sacramento.

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

VIII. Discussion of Requirements Related to the Use of Automated Patient Dispensing Systems (APDS), Including Provisions in Business and Professions Code Sections 4427.3 and 4427.6 and California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1713, and Possible Action to Make a Recommendation to the Board Regarding Initiation of a Rulemaking to Add Section 1713.1 to Title 16 of the CCR Related to Automated Patient Dispensing System Location

Dr. Oh advised that section 4017.3 of the Business and Professions Code defines an automated drug delivery system as a mechanical system that performs operations or activities, other than compounding or administration, relative to the storage, dispensing, or distribution of drugs.

Dr. Oh recalled that during the April 2026 Committee meeting, the Committee considered requests received to provide clarification about the conditions for use of an APDS when a patient is receiving medical care via telehealth and if such patients can receive their prescriptions from an APDS as opposed to a pharmacy.

Dr. Oh further recalled that during the April 29-30, 2026 Board meeting, the Board clarified that if a patient was prescribed a medication as part of a telehealth appointment, they can receive their medication via an APDS operated by a pharmacy as part of a medical practice.

Dr. Oh noted that attachment 5 of the meeting materials contained a draft regulatory proposal intended to clarify and make more specific the phrase, "medical office or other location where patients are regularly seen for purposes of diagnosis or treatment."

Dr. Oh stated that he had reviewed the proposed language and believed it provided a starting place for the Committee to begin its discussions. Dr. Oh noted he remained concerned that the language may be too broad and might create opportunities for the placement of APDS beyond what was envisioned by legislative policy.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members discussed the proposed language and regulations counsel explained some of the reasoning behind the proposed text.

There were no members of the public in Sacramento.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter suggested adding naturopathic doctors to subsection (a).

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments. Dr. Oh noted his preference for keeping subsection (a) as is for now.

The Committee agreed to move the document forward to the Board as written.

IX. Discussion of Proposal to Establish Definitions for Outpatient Pharmacies Based on Business Model, and Possible Action to Make a Recommendation to the Board Regarding Proposed Regulation Language

Dr. Oh advised that the requirements for pharmacies apply equally among a variety of business models, unless specified, which allows for broad regulation; however, it can become challenging when business models vary but the requirements do not. Dr. Oh 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. BPC section 4001 states, "For the purposes of this subdivision, a 'chain community pharmacy' means a chain of 75 or more stores in California under the same ownership, and an 'independent community pharmacy' means a pharmacy owned by a person or entity who owns no more than four pharmacies in California."

Dr. Oh noted that today the Committee would continue its discussion of this issue and advised that the Committee has the opportunity to consider draft regulation language. Dr. Oh further noted that he believed that the Committee should complete the development of the entire proposal, including identification of possible exemptions from regulation requirements based on identified business models, before making a recommendation to the Board.

Dr. Oh noted that the proposed regulation text in Attachment 6 of the meeting materials included clarifying changes to the previously considered proposed definitions as well as new definitions for "Federally Qualified Healthcare Pharmacy" and "Health System Pharmacy."

Dr. Oh stated that he had reviewed the proposed definitions and believed they were consistent with the Committee's discussions.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members expressed concern about the PIC being responsible for making a determination that a pharmacy meets the definition of chain community pharmacy. Members also considered if definitions are needed for non-chain, "medium size" pharmacy as well as if the definition for specialty pharmacy requires additional changes. Members also noted the need to evaluate if additional language is needed to ensure the Board's proposed definitions do not create any unintended consequences.

There were no members of the public in Sacramento.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter encouraged the Committee to closely examine whether the existing requirements for chain community pharmacies should automatically apply to health system pharmacies and urged members to preserve this distinction when considering exemptions. Another commenter commended the Committee's efforts to modernize pharmacy classifications but raised concerns about overlapping business model categories and questioned the rationale behind the 75% home delivery threshold in the mail order pharmacy definition, noting potential inconsistencies with existing statute. The commenter also suggested refining the closed-door pharmacy definition to focus on public versus non-public access rather than enumerating facility types. Another commenter noted this was a solid starting point and recommended adding a rural pharmacy or pharmacy-desert category to address limited access in underserved areas and noted parallels with existing distinctions for rural hospitals and clinics.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment having heard public comments. Members appreciated the comments and agreed with many concerns raised. Members expressed concern about unintended consequences and the potential impacts from PBMs and their definitions. The Committee gave direction to staff regarding further refinements to the proposed text based on the discussion.

X. Discussion of Licensing Statistics

Dr. Oh noted the meeting materials included a summary of the licensing statistics for the first ten months of the fiscal year and further noted that data for May was not available as of release of the meeting materials. Dr. Oh added that staff would include the licensing data for May as part of the Board meeting materials later in June.

Dr. Oh further 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 exceed the 30-day target. Dr. Oh advised the Board was behind in several areas, including the pharmacy technician applications, and noted that the licensing unit has some vacancies and with the peak in pharmacist exam applications, this made it challenging to meet the 30-day targets.

Dr. Oh thanked licensing staff for working so diligently to process applications.

Dr. Oh noted that in the first ten months of the fiscal year the Board had issued 7,576 individual licenses and 597 permanent site licenses with an additional 821 temporary site licenses and further noted the numbers demonstrated how busy the Board's licensing staff remain. Dr. Oh also noted the significant increase in the number of pharmacy technician applications the Board had received.

Members were provided the opportunity to comment. Members expressed some concerns about pharmacy license numbers going down and technician numbers remaining flat.

There were no members of the public in Sacramento.

Members of the public participating via Webex were provided the opportunity to comment. A commenter requested a topic for a future meeting related to surgery centers. Another commenter noted concerns related to the shortage of pharmacy technicians and suggested a graph showing trends would be helpful.

Dr. Oh reminded members that comparison data for three years or more will be presented at a future meeting.

XI. Advisement of Future Committee Meeting Dates

Dr. Oh announced the next Licensing Committee meeting was currently scheduled for September 23, 2026.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.