



# Board of Veterinary Examiners

Alaska Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing

April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025, at 9:00 AM AKST via Zoom

**These minutes were approved by the Board of Veterinary Examiners via Onboard on May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2025.**

Members Present: Denise Albert, DVM; Hal Geiger, PhD; Robert Gerlach, VMD, Chair; Ciara Vollaro, DVM; Sarah Johnson, DVM.

Staff Present: Tami Bowman, Occupational Licensing Examiner II; Keri Mell, Occupational Licensing Examiner III; Rachel Billet, Program Coordinator I; Reid Bowman, Program Coordinator II; Melissa Dumas, Administrative Operations Manager 1; Glenn Saviers, Deputy Director; Billy Homestead; Investigator 3.

## Call to Order

## Attendance

Members Present: Denise Albert, DVM; Hal Geiger, PhD; Robert Gerlach, VMD; Ciara Vollaro, DVM; Sarah Johnson, DVM

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM by Chair Dr. Gerlach and a quorum was established; he then read the board's mission statement onto the record. When asked if any board members had any conflicts of interest to declare, none were heard.

## Review and Approve Agenda

### Motion:

RESOLVED to APPROVE the agenda as written.

Motion moved by Dr. Geiger and motion seconded by Dr. Albert.

The motion passed unanimously.

## Review and Approve Meeting Minutes

March 21, 2025, Special Meeting Minutes and April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, Special Meeting Minutes.

### Motion:

RESOLVED to APPROVE the March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2025, and April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, meeting minutes.

Motion moved by Dr. Albert and motion seconded by Dr. Vollaro.

The motion passed unanimously.

## **Division Update**

### **Licensing Report – Examiner Update**

Licensing Examiner Tami Bowman provided her licensing report. She informed the board that the amount of veterinarian license applications they are currently seeing is higher than ever, and that the Iditarod courtesy licenses were lower than she's seen previously but added that more Alaskan veterinarians participated this year, which influences the numbers as they hold permanent licenses already. She is still planning an Iditarod debrief with herself, Program Coordinator Rachel Billiet, Licensing Examiner Keri Mell, and Karen McNaught of the Iditarod to ensure a seamless transition for next year. Dr. Albert asked whether Ms. Bowman had heard that there may be a change in the description of duties for Iditarod Veterinarians next year and added that she would like to see that updated to be more thorough, and Ms. Bowman stated that it was on her radar. She is hoping we can get that change in wording by late fall. Dr. Gerlach asked if we are seeing a decrease this year overall for veterinarians or veterinary technicians, and Ms. Bowman reported that we are right on target for veterinarians compared to prior years, and seeing a large increase in veterinary technicians.

Ms. Bowman told the board that Ms. Mell has officially taken over as the licensing examiner for the program and this will likely be her last meeting, though she will be training Ms. Mell as needed. She thanked the board for working with her over the last 2 and a half years and for their support. The board thanked her for her hard work and wished her well.

## **Investigations**

### **Investigative Report**

Billy Homestead, the new supervising investigator for the Veterinary Program, presented the investigative report for February 01, 2025, through April 22, 2025. Investigator Homestead reported that there are currently 24 open cases, and 2 have been recently closed. There were no questions from the board.

## **Safe Haven Program**

Dr. Beth Venit with the American Association of Veterinary State Boards (AAVSB) joined the board to present on the Safe Haven Program, which aims to get providers with substance abuse disorders into some kind of help as opposed to sanctioning their license. She took the board through a PowerPoint presentation which included several statistics on the prevalence of substance use disorders in human physicians, as that is where the bulk of data is currently at. Dr. Venit pointed out that though she was speaking to human physicians, many of the concerns shared by those choosing not to seek treatment (risking disclosure to the medical board, concerns for their license, etc.) are present in the Veterinary community as well. She recommended that the board look at their statutes and what is defined as "impairment", as well as their professional fitness questions, as these are often written too general, and should

include language about *current* suffering of impairment or treatment being sought to align with ADA standards, stressing that illness does not equal impairment and should be differentiated. Program Coordinator Reid Bowman informed Dr. Venit and the board that the division recently changed the professional fitness questions to align this way with the ADA.

Dr. Venit told the board about the Federation of State Physician Health Programs (FSPHP), which are programs that operate with regulatory or licensing boards to provide confidential assessments of potentially impaired individuals and potentially refers them for treatment or monitoring. Details on the FSPHP include:

- It is a national organization, with each state having its own Physician Health Program (PHP). They vary state by state on funding and licenses that are supported. Currently in Alaska the PHP covers MDs, DOs, and PAs. The PHP covers more than substance disorders, including general mental illness such as anxiety, suicidal thoughts, and PTSD.
- The PHP removes responsibility from the board, as members often report they are not competent assessors of impairment and would rather refer to professionals. Dr. Albert and Dr. Geiger spoke on a case from several years ago where they had to decide on discipline for an impaired licensee and did not feel they were the correct entity to be making such decisions.
- The PHP is an exception to mandated reporting in some states. For example, in Ohio if you're going to mental health treatment your doctor is required to report it to your licensing board, but the Ohio Veterinary Board determined that if they are reported to the PHP instead of the board, that fulfills the requirement. In these instances, the board does not know the licensee is going through treatment, so it lowers the barriers and fears of losing their license. This is if the individual seeks treatment on their own, not if they're reported via complaint.
- The PHP works independently but in collaboration and within the laws of each state.
- They're highly successful, with markedly high recovery rates for physicians.

Returning to the topic of the Safe Haven Program, Dr. Venit spoke on the model regulations that have been created, which cover how and when the board is notified of an impaired provider, reporting requirements, and deferring license actions if approved treatment is established. She confirmed that the Safe Haven Program does not mean that the board cannot still discipline a licensee.

At some point during discussion, Dr. Geiger fell off the meeting due to connectivity issues. A quorum was maintained, and he rejoined the meeting after a short absence.

Board members were curious as to whether some states have similar regulations that utilize local rehabilitation organizations, to which staff were unsure. Ms. Billiet informed the board that under Alaska centralized statute 08.01.050(d)(11), the Veterinary Board is listed as one of the boards that can request the department to contract with public agencies and private professional organizations to provide assistance and treatment to persons licensed by the board who abuse alcohol, other drugs, or other substances, noting that this statute does not

speak to mental health issues. At this stage, the board asked Ms. Billiet to get in touch with the Alaska PHP and try and secure a guest speaker at their next meeting to answer questions and continue research on other states and what programs they have implemented, and their costs, as funding is a huge barrier. Dr. Venit concluded by informing the board that at the Annual AAVSB meeting in September there will be a 2-hour session on mental health and how to have difficult conversations surrounding the topic.

## **Regulations**

### **12 AAC 68.910, 12 AAC 68.080, and 12 AAC 68.140 – Update from Subcommittee**

Dr. Vollaro and Dr. Albert met earlier this month to discuss the three main questions the board had during the March 21<sup>st</sup> Special Regulations Meeting. Those questions were:

1. Should herd health be defined? In their research, they found that none of the states looked at further defined herd health, and that it seems self-defined in the regulation as-is. Further defining seems redundant and would likely be deemed as such by the regulations specialist as well. The parenthetical portion of the regulation says “i.e.” and lists a few groups of herd animals, and Dr. Geiger pointed out that since the list is not exhaustive, it should read “e.g.”. The board agreed.
2. Are large animal sedation and anesthesia records being kept? Both Dr. Vollaro and Dr. Albert talked to several large animal veterinarians and found that these records are already being kept, and it’s not a concern to mandate this in regulation since large animal practitioners are already practicing this way.
3. Should the option to add strikethrough edits to paper records be added to the regulation? The board briefly discussed this and found that it would be a moot point to add strikethroughs, since more practitioners are moving towards digital records, and strikethroughs on a finalized record would still require an addendum anyways.

The board was happy with the overall content of these regulations, and Ms. Bowman offered to assist in editing and formatting the document for final review at the next board meeting. Ms. Billiet will send her the current draft after the meeting so she can begin editing.

### **12 AAC 68.310(b)(4)(B)**

At the March 21<sup>st</sup> Special Regulations Meeting, Ms. Billiet was tasked with researching whether a subsection could be added to regulation 12 AAC 68.310(b)(4)(B) to allow only the current University of Alaska (UAA) Veterinary Technician cohort to use their schooling hours to qualify for licensing via on-the-job training, in the event the program does not receive accreditation. Ms. Billiet reported to the board that their best option would be to edit subsection (A) to read as “official transcripts showing successful completion of a veterinary technician training program accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association or the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association, **or other program approved by the board.**” She stressed that doing so would require the

board to determine what would be required to receive board approval and how the board would evaluate these other programs.

Some board members opposed making any change to allow academic hours to count as hours that would be earned working in a clinic, citing that the work in a classroom versus the work in a clinic differs substantially, and that the hours needed to meet the on-the-job training requirements only equal about 14 hours a week. Others didn't agree with this assessment, stating that it's then effectively pointless to go through schooling if they can just do on the job training. Overall, the board agreed that a change should be made to help these students at UAA. It was decided that Dr. Vollaro will make an edit to subsection (A) to allow "other programs approved by the board" and the board will review at their next meeting to consider starting a regulation project.

The board was ahead of schedule and opted to discuss agenda item 9 next.

## **Recap of AAVSB Meetings**

### **Board Basics and Beyond Training**

Dr. Johnson and Dr. Gerlach attended the AAVSB Board Basics and Beyond Training back in March and reported on their experience. They both stated that the training was great for building a foundation of board functions and learning the benefits of the board with respect to what the AAVSB provides with their VAULT and VIVA services and how they help streamline the licensing process. It was also beneficial to meet people from all over the country, especially younger or inexperienced board members that felt in over their head at the beginning of their tenure.

Some topics discussed at the training were how different states are addressing telemedicine, the creation of the veterinary assistant position in Colorado and potentially Florida next, the use of EMT services on animals, the use of AI, and the RACEtrack for tracking continuing education credits.

Ms. Billiet told the board that she is working on the travel plan for the board in fiscal year 2026 (FY26) and has added two lines of travel to next year's training for board members or staff given the continued value of this training.

### **Executive Directors Summit**

Ms. Billiet attended the AAVSB Executive Directors Summit in March and reported on topics covered that were relevant to the board.

- NAVLE Retake Policy: Currently, if someone does not pass the NAVLE in five tries, they must apply for an appeal to take it a 6<sup>th</sup> time. The ICVA will potentially be moving towards handling appeals for a 6<sup>th</sup> attempt to take the exam themselves as opposed to requiring a board to approve a 6<sup>th</sup> attempt. They are finding that some test takers are seeking out states that do not have a limit in statute or regulation on how many times

an applicant can take the test (like Alaska) and asking boards to use their time and resources to complete an appeal when the applicant has no intention of ever applying in that state.

- Education Requirements: Ms. Billiet stated that the topic of time specific education requirements is coming up in the regional AAVSB meetings she attends, as the AVMA House of Delegates unanimously passing a policy statement supporting licensing portability, and states are considering amending their statutes and regulations to support this. This is timely, as Deputy Director Glenn Saviers spoke to the board at their February 14<sup>th</sup> meeting and proposed a potential statute change which would remove time specific licensing requirements from statute, like the amount of time in active practice prior to applying or the amount the time since the applicant passed the NAVLE. Dr. Albert conducted research after Ms. Saviers' presentation and reported that 60% of states have anywhere from a 2 to 5 years requirement for active practice, most being in the 5-year range, and 40% of states require no active practice, but do have unique requirements for when the NAVLE was taken. She added that the boards intention is to establish or ensure competency with these requirements, and as they've discussed in the past, continuing education does not do that the same way practicing does. Some board members shared concern that the current requirements bar those that have stepped away from the profession for a length of time, such as mothers that take time off to raise children, from having an achievable way to reenter the profession, stating that retaking the NAVLE is a big barrier. Other board members thought that practicing veterinary medicine is a "use it or lose it" situation. Licensing Examiner Keri Mell informed the board that in her short time with the program she has already had to inform two potential applicants that they did not qualify for licensure based on their lack of recent active practice and time since they've taken the NAVLE. The board had questions as to what specifically led to that determination, and Ms. Billiet said she would follow up after the meeting with an email explaining each situation. She clarified that these were not applicants denied by staff or withheld from the board, but inquiries from potential applicants looking to clarify eligibility requirements for licensure prior to applying.

### **Break**

The board went off the record at 11:15 AM and returned at 11:30 AM.

### **Attendance**

Members Present: Denise Albert, DVM; Hal Geiger, PhD; Robert Gerlach, VMD, Chair; Ciara Vollaro, DVM; Sarah Johnson, DVM.

### **Application Reviews**

#### **Veterinarian Renewal – J.G. – Failure to Complete Continuing Education**

This exemption was previously seen by the board in Onboard where members voted to table it for discussion at this meeting. Board members stated that the licensee attested on his late renewal application in January that he had completed all required continuing education (CE) but then completed some of the required CE after signing that attestation. They agreed that they cannot approve of this exemption and must forward him to investigations for further review.

**Motion:**

RESOLVED to APPROVE the continuing education exemption for J.G. under 12 AAC 68.047(e) and (f).

Motion moved by Dr. Albert and motion seconded by Dr. Johnson.

The motion failed unanimously via roll call vote. Dr. Johnson, no. Dr. Albert, no. Dr. Vollaro, no. Dr. Geiger, no. Dr. Gerlach, no.

Before moving on to the next topic, Dr. Albert had a procedural question for staff regarding the legislative session and how bills move through the different houses, which was explained by Mr. Bowman

The board was ahead of schedule and opted to discuss agenda item 15 next.

**Board Administrative Business**

**Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting will be Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2025, via zoom. Ms. Billiet also asked if the board wanted to schedule their annual in-person meeting for the fall around the dates for the Alaska Veterinary Medicine Association (AKVMA) Annual Symposium, which they did. The board will meet in-person in Anchorage on October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

**FY 2025 Annual Report**

Ms. Billiet explained to the board that the fiscal year 2025 Annual Report is required by statute to be complete by June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Since the board is not meeting before then, it was decided that Board Secretary Dr. Johnson will complete a draft of the report by May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025, for staff to upload to Onboard for approval. Staff will send Dr. Johnson last year's report along with the report template after today's meeting.

**FY 2026 Travel Plan**

Ms. Billiet presented her draft of the fiscal year 2026 Travel Plan to the board for feedback, as it is due to the division on April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2025. She explained that on the plan she had accounted for two members attending the AAVSB Annual Meeting in

September, and the board discussed who should go. Dr. Albert stated that she is already going as a committee member and does not wish to serve as a delegate, as did Dr. Geiger. As the newest members, it was the consensus that Dr. Gerlach and Dr. Johnson should attend, if they're available.

**Motion:**

RESOLVED to APPROVE sending Dr. Gerlach and Dr. Johnson to the AAVSB Annual Meeting, with Dr. Vollaro as an alternate member if either cannot attend.

Motion moved by Dr. Albert and motion seconded by Dr. Geiger.  
The motion passed unanimously.

The board asked that she add travel for one board member to stay in Anchorage after October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2025, board meeting and attend the AKVMA Annual Symposium on behalf of the board, which they did.

**Motion:**

RESOLVED to APPROVE sending Dr. Gerlach to the annual AKVMA symposium as a representative of the Board of Veterinary Examiners.

Motion moved by Dr. Geiger and motion seconded by Dr. Vollaro.  
The motion passed unanimously.

The board is in support of Dr. Gerlach presenting anything he sees fit to the AKVMA at this meeting, as historically the board has not pre-approved of what will be presented. Dr. Gerlach will also be reaching out to AKVMA to see if they would be willing to formally invite a board member and potentially waive registration fees.

**Lunch**

The board went off the record at 12:22 PM and returned at 1:01 PM.

**Attendance**

Members Present: Denise Albert, DVM; Hal Geiger, PhD; Robert Gerlach, VMD, Chair; Ciara Vollaro, DVM; Sarah Johnson, DVM.

**Public Comment**

There were no members of the public present to speak, so the board opted to discuss agenda item 14 while they awaited any public testimony.

**Correspondence**



## **Student Permit Education Requirements**

Ms. Billiet provided background to the board on this topic, explaining that staff had received email correspondence from a member of the public asking about the statutory requirement that applicants for a veterinarian student permit must have “completed three years of study” and whether the board is considering changing this requirement as there are several programs that are only three years long, and the popularity of these accelerated programs is expected to increase. The board stated they are presently aware of a program in Arizona that is only three years in length, but they don’t believe that program is accredited yet. There was discussion that changing the wording of the statute and regulation to say a student must be in their “final year of school”. Dr. Geiger did question whether the board should be encouraging shorter programs, but Dr. Albert explained that these shorted programs do not mean less schooling, just that the program does not take the standard breaks of a four-year program and therefore is completed quicker. The board agreed that if a program, regardless of length, receives accreditation, it is not the board’s purview to go against that accreditation. The board said that it may be best to change this statute now rather than later, but before they could discuss it further, Ms. Billiet let them know that their next guest had joined and that they could revisit this topic later in the meeting when they discuss updates on legislative efforts.

## **Legislative Session and Statute Changes**

### **Division Supported Bills**

Deputy Director Glenn Saviers was present to ask for board support on two bills being supported by the division.

### **House Bill 158 / Senate Bill 145: Professional Licensing; Temp Permits**

Ms. Saviers first covered House Bill 158 (HB 158)/ Senate Bill 145 (SB 145) and explained to the board that the bill creates universal temporary licensing for all licensing programs for applicants that haven’t had any disciplinary actions within the last ten years and hold a license elsewhere that has substantially equivalent requirements to Alaska. The temporary license would be like licensing under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA), only it would extend to anyone wishing to apply for licensure and would allow someone applying via credentials to obtain temporary licensure while working to obtain a full license. The aim is to get qualified professionals licensed quickly, as delays in licensure most often come from waiting for items from third parties, and this would allow those qualified to practice while awaiting full licensure. She pointed out that there is currently a temporary license available to veterinarians applying by examination, but not by credentials, and this would fill that need. She also added that should

there be any questions regarding the “substantial equivalency” of another state’s licensing requirement that the matter will be brought before the board for final determination. Another aspect of the bill is putting SCRA requirements into State Law, as Federal Law currently states that a military member or their spouse must be issued a license as soon as they meet the SCRA requirements, but there currently isn’t anything in State Law to point to, which is an issue.

She answered several questions from board members, clarifying that if passed, this temporary license would replace the current temporary military license, but that the board must maintain that licensing option until then. If this bill passes, the division will come to the board to clean up their regulations and license types to work with this new law. There was further questioning regarding determining substantial equivalency, and Ms. Saviers confirmed that at the conclusion of the temporary license (180 days), an application for a full license would go to the board to determine whether all requirements are met, and the board would have the right to deny a license at that time if they did not deem the applicant qualified. As a final note, she told the board that research in Alaska hospitals showed that 25% of those who obtain temporary licenses become full-time residents, so the goal here is to make Alaska competitive and allow people the chance to try out working here.

#### **House Bill 131 / Senate Bill 124: Nurse License Compact**

Ms. Saviers covered House Bill 131 (HB 131)/ Senate Bill 124 (SB 124), a bill that the division is carrying, and explained to the board that while the bill does not directly relate to Veterinary medicine, every Alaskan is impacted by the nursing shortage. She explained that Alaska was projected to have the worst nursing shortage in the nation by 2030, with a 22% vacancy rate, but that milestone was hit in 2024. The Board of Nursing has unanimously voted in support of this bill, and 92% of Alaskan nurses want to join the compact. The compact being proposed in the longest standing (25 years) and well-vetted compact in licensing, and no jurisdiction has ever opted to leave it. Of the roughly 24,000 nurses licenses in Alaska, it’s estimated that 8-10,000 hold a multi-state license and are opting not to become residents as they would lose that license, and the division wishes to change that. She further explained the tremendous number of staff and resources allocated to the nursing program alone and explained that this bill would allow better allocation of staff for fluctuating needs and therefore create the possibility of adjusting fees across all programs for the better.

At the conclusion of her presentation Ms. Saviers asked whether she could be of assistance with any other legislative matters, and the board asked about the likelihood of House Bill 70 passing. She stated that it seems likely

that the bill will pass in the House next week, but passing in the Senate is to be determined. She believes there is a good chance of the bill passing overall in 2026, but it is difficult to say. Dr. Gerlach asked if the board wishes to act on either bill Ms. Saviers has presented today, or if they wish to wait and discuss further at a later date. Members were largely in support of both bills, primarily HB 158/ SB 145, but they want to ensure the bill very clearly states that holding a temporary license for the full 180 days does not ensure an applicant will be granted full licensure. There was a question as to whether the board needed to support HB 131/ SB 124 in an official letter since it has no direct relation to Veterinary medicine, but they ultimately decided that the effects the compact could have on division overhead and potentially Veterinary licensing fees does garner their support.

The board asked that the letter for HB 158/ SB 145 specify that the temporary license is for a specific period while a licensee works towards full licensure, and that the letter for HB 131/ SB 124 states that the bill does not directly affect Veterinary medicine but that the board is in support of it overall.

**Motion:**

RESOLVED to APPROVE providing letters of support for both HB 158/ SB 145 and HB 131/ SB 124 with the necessary edits discussed made to the sample letters of support by Rachel Billiet and Glenn Saviers, which will then be uploaded to Onboard for voting

Motion moved by Dr. Geiger and motion seconded by Dr. Johnson.  
The motion passed unanimously.

**Update on Legislative Efforts for 2025 Session**

Dr. Gerlach and Dr. Albert will work to draft language to pursue a veterinary technician seat on the board. Dr. Gerlach added that it's been asked whether there is risk associated with adding a seat and having an even numbered board, and he does not think there is as the board is typically in agreement on most items and that the likelihood of tied votes is minimal. The board agreed. Ms. Billiet added that there is other language the board wanted to change in statute that the board had previously discussed, which she will forward to both board members, and asked if they wanted to add the change to 08.98.188 discussed earlier in the meeting regarding student permits, which they do. She explained to the board that this drafted language is the first step of the process and not meant to be perfect, and she is available to help with edits. Once final language is approved by the board they can begin seeking a sponsor.

**Select Legislative Liaison**

Prior to the meeting, Ms. Billiet was approached by board members asking whether former Chair Dr. Berngartt could be a suitable board liaison for legislative session as she is based in Juneau and has prior board experience. She explained to the board that the position of liaison is best given to a current board member to avoid any procedural issues. After some discussion, the board was having trouble deciding on a liaison due to busy schedules, so staff clarified for the board that they could pick two members, a liaison and an alternate, and added that we are nearing the end of session, and the time commitment would likely be minimal until the 2026 session begins. The board can also choose a liaison now and reassess if needed at the July 2025 meeting, or in the fall.

**Motion:**

RESOLVED to APPROVE Dr. Albert as the legislative liaison for the Board of Veterinary Examiners.

Motion moved by Dr. Vollaro and motion seconded by Dr. Johnson.  
The motion passed unanimously.

The board opted to skip to agenda item 12(D) and will discuss 12 (C) after.

**Review Letter of Opposition to House Bill 70**

At the April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, board meeting, the board voted to oppose House Bill 70 and selected a board member to draft a letter of opposition to be voted on in Onboard for approval. The letter was tabled as several members wanted to discuss the contents of the letter and whether it covered all the boards wants and concerns.

Dr. Geiger mentioned the concern shared by other board members that a medical director would be overseeing the care of animals and not a veterinarian, and that he believes the focus should be on saving an animal that has sustained life-threatening injuries, not on who is overseeing the care. He brought it to the boards attention that given the nature of this bill it will likely elicit strong emotional reactions from legislators and the public, and the board should make it abundantly clear that they are in support of providing care for these valuable animals but under a certain set of criteria not proposed in the current legislation. They should make their “wants” known. The board struggled to identify exactly what those wants were, with some members believing the letter should only be to state opposition and can be one simple paragraph as shown by an example from Ms. Billiet, and others believing the letter should detail the need to have care and treatment overseen or guided by a licensed veterinarian and why. There was also discussion from some members that the bill may not be necessary at all since they believe a means to provide this care already exists

within veterinary statutes and regulations, and identifying their wants would be a moot point since changes to the bill aren't needed, the bill itself isn't needed. The discussion continued to return to the topic of what does the board want and how they can communicate those wants in a way that conveys they are for something (changes to the bill), not against something (care for dogs).

### **Break**

Mr. Bowman asked that the board take a brief break as he required to allow that for his staff. The board went off the record at 3:01 PM and returned at 3:11 PM.

### **Attendance**

Members Present: Denise Albert, DVM; Hal Geiger, PhD; Robert Gerlach, VMD, Chair; Ciara Vollaro, DVM; Sarah Johnson, DVM.

### **Resume Agenda Item 12 (D)**

While on break, Ms. Billiet added a paragraph to the example letter shown earlier on the screen to reflect the boards discussion thus far. The board could not agree to this letter. She suggested to the chair that the board could amend their April 1<sup>st</sup> motion of opposition only to state that the board opposes the bill and not that they will provide a letter stating as such if they don't think they'll be able to come to a consensus today. Board members opposed this idea, stating it's best they submit something in writing, and Mr. Bowman further suggested that the board agrees on a very basic letter with minimal information, and then board members proceed with writing their own detailed letters to the legislature as individuals to make their specific concerns heard. It was then suggested that Ms. Billiet writes a new letter to go into Onboard for voting based on compiled comments board members will email her after the meeting, but that was voted down as that would be putting the board in the exact position they're in now if the letter is not approved unanimously. After further discussion, it was decided that the example letter would be edited to only read that the board is in opposition of House Bill 70 in its present form, and that board members would send their comments to Ms. Billiet to compile into a reference document should members be asked to or choose to testify on this bill.

### **Motion:**

RESOLVED to APPROVE the Letter of Opposition for House Bill 70 with the proposed changes.

Motion moved by Dr. Johnson and motion seconded by Dr. Vollaro.  
The motion passed via roll call vote. Dr. Vollaro, yes. Dr. Geiger, abstain. Dr. Gerlach, yes. Dr. Albert, yes. Dr. Johnson, yes

Ms. Billiet noted the time and asked the chair if it was the will of the board to discuss their final agenda item 12(C), reviewing the responses to questions for agencies providing euthanasia. Given that the board has expressed in the past that they would like to keep meetings shorter and that they were already 30 minutes over their scheduled time, she recommended the subject be tabled, but reiterated it is up to the board.

**Motion:**

RESOLVED to APPROVE tabling the euthanasia topic.

Motion moved by Dr. Vollaro and motion seconded by Dr. Albert.  
The motion passed unanimously.

**Adjourn**

**Motion:**

RESOLVED to APPROVE adjourning the April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025, meeting of the Board of Veterinary Examiners.

Motion moved by Dr. Vollaro and motion seconded by Dr. Johnson.  
The motion passed unanimously.

**The board went off the record at 3:39 PM.**