State Board of Veterinary Medicine September 17, 2021

BOARD MEMBERS:

Thomas Garg, V.M.D., Chairman
K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of
Professional and Occupational Affairs
Joseph S. Bender D.V.M.
Anjilla Cooley, D.V.M. - Absent
Apryle Horbal, V.M.D.
Valerie Kehoe, C.V.T.
Andrew Nebzydoski, V.M.D., Secretary

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel Paul J. Jarabeck, Esquire, Board Prosecutor Michelle Roberts, Board Administrator

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc. (814) 536-8908

1 ***

2 State Board of Veterinary Medicine 3 September 17, 2021

* * *

5 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, at 9:00 a.m. the Board entered into Executive Session 7 with Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel, for the 8 purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations and 9 to receive advice from counsel on the matters upon which the Board will later vote. The Board returned 11 to open session at 10:30 a.m.]

12

The regularly scheduled meeting of the State
Board of Veterinary Medicine was held on Friday,
September 17, 2021. Thomas Garg, V.M.D., Chairman,
called the meeting to order at 10:31 a.m.

17

18

19 Roll Call

20 [A roll call of Board members was taken by Chair

21 | Garq.]

4

13

14

15

16

22 ***

23 [Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted the 24 meeting was being recorded, and those who continued to

25 participate were giving their consent to be recorded.

```
Mr. Davis also informed everyone that the Board
1
2
   met in Executive Session prior to this meeting for the
3
   purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations and
   to receive advice of counsel.
                              * * *
5
   Approval of minutes of the July 23, 2021 meeting
6
   CHAIR GARG:
                  The first item on our agenda for today
9
                  is review of the minutes from the last
10
                  meeting.
11
                       Did anybody have any concerns
12
                  regarding those minutes?
                       Would somebody like to make a
13
14
                  motion to accept the minutes?
15
   DR. NEBZYDOSKI:
                  I'll make that motion.
16
17
   MS. KEHOE:
                  I second it.
18
19
   CHAIR GARG:
2.0
                  Any further discussion? All in favor of
2.1
                  accepting the minutes? I will read
2.2
                  roll.
2.3
2.4
                  Commissioner Johnson, aye; Dr. Bender,
25
                  aye; Dr. Horbal, aye; Ms. Kehoe, aye;
```

```
Dr. Nebzydoski, aye; Dr. Garg, aye.
1
2
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
3
4
   Report of Prosecutorial Division
5
   [Paul J. Jarabeck, Esquire, Board Prosecutor, on
6
   behalf of Julia A. Feld-Caralle, Esquire, Board
   Prosecution Liaison, presented the Consent Agreement
   for Case No. 20-57-006395.1
   [Paul J. Jarabeck, Esquire, Board Prosecutor,
10
11
   presented the Consent Agreement for Case No. 21-57-
   008273.1
12
                              * * *
13
14
   [Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel, asked Board
15
   members whether anyone wished to reenter Executive
16
   Session to further discuss any of the consent
17
   agreements that were presented.]
   MR. DAVIS:
18
19
                  For number 2 on the agenda, based on the
2.0
                  Board's discussions in Executive
2.1
                  Session, I believe the Chair would
2.2
                  accept a motion to approve the Consent
2.3
                  Agreement in the following matter: Case
2.4
                  No. 20-57-006395.
25
                       For the record, Dr. Nebzydoski is
```

6 recused from this. 1 2 CHAIR GARG: 3 Would somebody like to make the motion? DR. BENDER: 4 5 I can make the motion. 6 MS. KEHOE: 7 I'll second the motion. 8 CHAIR GARG: 9 Any further discussion? I will call 10 roll. 11 12 Commissioner Johnson, aye; Dr. Bender, 13 aye; Dr. Horbal, aye; Ms. Kehoe, aye; 14 Dr. Nebzydoski, recuse; Dr. Garg, aye. 15 [The motion carried. Dr. Nebzydoski recused himself 16 from deliberations and voting on the motion. For the 17 record, Case No. 20-57-006395 is Commonwealth BPOA v. 18 Henry Joseph Nebzydoski, D.V.M.] * * * 19 2.0 MR. DAVIS: 2.1 Number 3 on the agenda. Based on the Board's discussions in Executive 2.2 2.3 Session, I believe the chair would 2.4 accept a motion to approve the Consent 25 Agreement in the following matter: Case

```
No. 21-57-008273.
1
2
   DR. HORBAL:
3
                  I'll make a motion.
4
   DR. BENDER:
5
                  I'll second it.
   CHAIR GARG:
6
                  Any further discussion? I will call
                  roll.
9
10
                  Commissioner Johnson, aye; Dr. Bender,
11
                  aye; Dr. Horbal, aye; Ms. Kehoe, aye;
                  Dr. Nebzydoski, aye; Dr. Garg, aye.
12
13
   [The motion carried unanimously. For the record, the
   individual's name has been withheld because he is
14
15
   entering into the Voluntary Recovery Program.
16
   participation in that program will remain confidential
17
   provided that he abides by the terms and conditions of
18
   the program.]
                              * * *
19
20
   Report of Board Chair - No Report
21
                              * * *
22
   Report of Commissioner
23
   [K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of
24
   Professional and Occupational Affairs, noted the
25
   Governor's emergency declaration will end September
```

30, along with many regulatory suspensions. He informed the Board of the return to in-person meetings beginning October 1, 2021, at Penn Center. He stated that all Commonwealth of Pennsylvania employees are required to wear masks and observe the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines.

2.2

2.4

Commissioner Johnson announced the ban on physical travel has been lifted and requests for regional or national conferences are being accepted. He encouraged Board members to submit paperwork early due to staffing shortages. He mentioned the allowance of two members for physical travel but encouraged virtual attendance. He reminded the Board that a formal motion and vote for travel requests must be on the record as part of the Sunshine Act requirements.

Commissioner Johnson announced a new online cost of travel system, noting Ms. Roberts will help shepherd everyone through that system.

Chair Garg requested more information regarding in-person rules that apply to the public during the meetings.

Commissioner Johnson stated the members of the public will be asked to wear masks and required to observe CDC recommended guidelines with respect to social distancing. He mentioned that some individuals

may be relegated to a breakout room depending on the number of public participants, where there would be another board room in the building just watching closed caption television.

Dr. Garg asked Commissioner Johnson whether masks would be requested or required for the public.

Commissioner Johnson noted ongoing discussion but will advise all Board members when he receives clear guidance.]

10 **

2.2

Report of Board Counsel - Regulations
[Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel, addressed ongoing regulations regarding euthanasia, Act 41 endorsement, CE requirements, and fees. He noted movement with three of the four regulations and working on Act 41. He reported the euthanasia regulation has progressed and should be published as proposed in late September or early October 2021. He mentioned there will be a 30-day comment period once that is posted to the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*, noting there will be directions available on the Bulletin

Mr. Davis addressed proposed regulation 16A-5731 regarding veterinarian continuing education, noting the Board voted to release an exposure draft at its

website for those who wish to comment.

July meeting and the exposure draft was sent out on August 9, 2021. One comment was received; it was from the Pennsylvania Veterinary Medical Association (PVMA).

2.2

Chair Garg referred to a letter received from PVMA, dated September 8, expressing support for the continuing education changes. He stated PVMA also made several suggestions, including increasing the amount of required CE for both veterinarians and veterinary technicians and considering allocation of those increased hours toward specific topics that are different from those currently accepted.

Chair Garg commented that, to his understanding, the Board does not have the authority to change the number of biennial hours of CE required for renewal because the act specifically lists the number of continuing education hours required for renewal. He explained that the act does not say, "at minimum," or at least." Instead, the act specifically says, veterinarians are required to complete 30 hours of continuing education for biennial renewal.

Mr. Davis commented that the Board was created via the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act, on top of which that same act specifically says veterinarians must complete 30 clock hours biennially, and certified

veterinary technician (CVTs) must complete 16 clock 1 2 hours biennially. He also noted the act does not say 3 "at least 30 hours" or "at least 16 hours" or anything of that nature and suggested the Board keep those 5 hours at 30 and 16 based upon the plain language of 6 the statute.

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

Chair Garg noted two other matters incorporated into the PVMA letter, one related to the Veterinary Nurse Initiative and the other related to telehealth.

Chair Garg stated telehealth was a very relevant issue at the moment and is something that is likely to be placed on the Board's agenda in the near future.

Chair Garq commented that in order to comply with the Sunshine Act, the Veterinary Nurse Initiative and telehealth, to his understanding, would need to be on the agenda to give people who are interested in these matters the opportunity to know they are going to be discussed.

Mr. Davis explained that the Sunshine Act has been amended to suggest that the Board should not be conducting any kind of Board business unless that specific topic was listed on the Board's agenda giving the public notice that the Board would be discussing or acting upon that particular topic.

Mr. Davis noted receiving PVMA's comment on

September 8 via email, and suggested he was able to add the letter to the agenda because the Board's agenda already listed the the CE and fee regulations as topics of discussion. He suggested not broadening the topics of discussion beyond CE and fees in light of the amendment to the Sunshine Act.

Mr. Davis explained that he received a chat notification asking that the Board discuss broadening the approved continuing education topics, which was something also mentioned in the PVMA's letter. He mentioned that the statute itself says no credit shall be given for any course in office management or practice building and he believes there is language in the act which says continuing education programs must be specifically related to the practice of veterinary medicine, so the Board does not have a lot of leeway to broaden the scope of continuing education programs.

2.4

Chair Garg commented that it was also his understanding that the act defines the allowable content. He noted the PVMA or any other organization may submit an application to the Board requesting its approval of continuing education programs. He noted that individual programs will be approved as long as they meet the requirements of the act and regulations.

2.3

Mr. Davis informed the Board that he would continue working on the CE regulation as currently drafted and create a Regulatory Analysis Form (RAF) and preamble to be brought before the Board for additional review and a vote.

Mr. Davis addressed 16A-573, the Board's proposed fee regulation, noting prior tabling because of a new template requirement. He informed the Board that the new Annex was uploaded to the Board's agenda. He explained that application fees are based entirely on what it currently costs to process an application, and a renewal fee is where the Board obtains the money it needs to run day-to-day activities.

Mr. Davis commented that the Board utilizes the Bureau of Finance and Operations (BFO) reports in order to determine the appropriate fees. He noted the report from BFO showed what the financial future looks like in three separate possible scenarios: if no change is made to any fees; if the Board increased only application fees; or if the Board increased application fees and it simultaneously increased biennial renewal fees by 8.5 percent.

Mr. Davis noted he drafted the proposed Annex in accordance with the third option, which is essentially

1 the most drastic but would quickly and easily get the 2 Board to where it needs to be.

2.4

Dr. Nebzydoski commented that he would like to be provided with more information with regard to the number of complaints because he would like to know why Board expenditures are increasing.

Dr. Nebzydoski referred to the fee report form related to the Application for Continuing Education Program, where a Board member review is \$26 for a quarter of an hour, questioning where BFO came up with that figure and noting the importance of being honest about the fees.

Dr. Horbal supported Dr. Nebzydoski's comments and is also stated she was concerned of the lack of reporting or transparency that is being given to the Board members themselves regarding these fees and where they are spent. She requested more detailed information from the prosecution section and the Bureau of Enforcement and Investigation (BEI) and to understand where the money is being spent.

Dr. Nebzydoski stated he would like to know how the amount was calculated by the number of cases and he explained that investigative fees are never itemized on the individual cases. He also noted the Board does not know how many complaints are received a

year, and none of it is on the paperwork to justify the dollar amount.

Dr. Horbal requested more information regarding how many cases are opened and investigated and she noted concern with the cost of investigation with regard to some of the quality of the work being produced. She reported the Board has noticed some trends that are making them concerned about where Board and taxpayer dollars are being spent and want to make sure they are truly going to protecting the public and protecting the veterinarians and everyone else involved appropriately.

Commissioner Johnson commented that the Board receive an annual report from prosecution that explains the number of cases with a high-level breakdown of the dispositions and is given the chance to ask questions at those particular presentations.

Dr. Horbal stated the prosecution representative is often unsure of how to answer the Board's questions.

Commissioner Johnson commented that the Board has an obligation to remain dispassionate and objective.

He suggested that how professional Board members perceive the quantification of cost involved in discipline of other professional Board members creates

the appearance of a conflict of interest or bias.

2.2

Dr. Nebzydoski stated there was no bias in knowing how the numbers were produced. He mentioned that it is hard for the Board in good conscience to vote to raise fees unless the need to do so can be proven. He noted seeing Consent Agreements presented to the Board that were rejected as too lenient or too harsh, and in some cases when the proposed Consent agreement was presented once again the investigative fee was changed to a lower fee, which does not make sense.

Mr. Davis commented that the annual BFO report discusses the overall cost of prosecution. He echoed Commissioner Johnson's statement, noting the presentation from prosecution a little while ago, where the Prosecution Division Chief told the Board how many cases were brought in and how many were processed. He suggested having prosecution come back to discuss that at greater length before revisiting the proposed fee increase and suggested that the fee increase regulation be tabled.

Dr. Horbal noted that providing more detail would be much appreciated in moving forward.

Mr. Jarabeck stated there will still be investigative costs and expert costs related to

complaints that never make it to the Board, where an 1 2 expert may find that there is no violation of a 3 standard of care or a process where no formal prosecution is conducted.

5

6

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

- Mr. Jarabeck mentioned that if the Board is making a statement saying they want absolute investigative costs and that is what the Board moves forward asking for so be it, but whenever there is a hearing, an itemized grouping of cost is available 10 because it is presented as a petition.
 - Dr. Nebzydoski referred to the line-item entitled "enforcement and investigation" at \$300,000 in the 2013-2014 and \$318,000 anticipated for 2021, which is not changing a great deal. He noted the "Legal Prosecution" line item increase from \$27,000 in 2013-2014 which increases to more than \$500,000 in anticipated expenses for FY 2020-2021, questioning how they justify that change. He requested more information as to why the prosecution fee is changing that much and the investigative fees are virtually static.
 - Mr. Jarabeck stated the prosecution has to engage experts in order to have a fair and accurate review of the case, which greatly increases cost.
- 25 Dr. Horbal asked Mr. Jarabeck whether the Board

1 could see a breakdown of the cost of expert testimony,
2 expert witnesses, and court fees.

Dr. Nebzydoski referred to a line itemized for hearing expenses, where he assumed that expert witnesses go under hearing expenses and not legal prosecution but stating he is not sure because the paperwork does not note which fits under which category.

2.0

2.3

2.4

Mr. Davis suggested having BFO return to the Board to further explain the report. He commented that he does not know if prosecution can actually provide more information because there are issues related to confidentiality and keeping the wall of separation between the prosecution division and the Board.

Dr. Nebzydoski recommended BFO provide bullet points under each cost item with what is included in each one of those items to make the report more tenable.

Dr. Horbal commented that the Board does not oppose increasing fees, noting they are responsible for protecting the public and want to make sure the cost and fees are completely transparent but do not feel that it is right now.

Mr. Davis tabled the fee regulation and will

```
19
   discuss this issue with a couple of different
1
2
   departments between now and the next Board meeting to
3
   see if the Board's concerns can be addressed.]
                              * * *
 4
5
   Report of Board Counsel - Adjudication and Order
6
   MR. DAVIS:
                  Number 7 on the Board's agenda.
                                                     Based
                  on the Board's discussions in Executive
9
                  Session, I believe the Chair would
10
                  accept a motion to approve as final the
11
                  Draft Adjudication and Order in the
12
                  following matter: In the Matter of the
1.3
                  Petition for Reinstatement of the
14
                  License to Practice Veterinary Medicine
15
                  of Leonard Daryl Kreger, D.V.M., Case
16
                  No. 20-57-014137.
   CHAIR GARG:
17
18
                  Would somebody like to make that motion?
19
   DR. NEBZYDOSKI:
2.0
                  I'll make the motion.
21
   MS. KEHOE:
                  I'll second it.
22
2.3
   CHAIR GARG:
2.4
                  Any further discussion? I'll call roll.
25
```

```
20
                  Commissioner Johnson, aye; Dr. Bender,
1
2
                  aye; Dr. Horbal, aye; Ms. Kehoe, aye;
3
                  Dr. Nebzydoski, aye; Dr. Garg, aye.
4
    [The motion carried unanimously.]
                               * * *
5
6
   MR. DAVIS:
                  Number 8 on the Board's agenda. Based
                  on the Board's discussions in Executive
8
9
                  Session, I believe the Chair would
10
                  accept a motion authorizing counsel to
11
                  draft an Adjudication and Order
                  consistent with the Board's discussions
12
13
                  in the following matter: Commonwealth
14
                  BPOA v. Christopher Glenn Korte, D.V.M.,
15
                  Case No. 17-57-05852.
   CHAIR GARG:
16
17
                  Would somebody like to make that motion?
   DR. BENDER:
18
                  I'll make the motion.
19
2.0
   DR. NEBZYDOSKI:
21
                  I'll second.
2.2
   CHAIR GARG:
2.3
                  Any further discussion? I'll call roll.
2.4
25
                  Commissioner Johnson, aye; Dr. Bender,
```

```
1
                  aye; Dr. Horbal, aye; Ms. Kehoe, aye;
2
                  Dr. Nebzydoski, aye; Dr. Garg, aye.
3
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
4
5
   Miscellaneous
6
   [Thomas Garg, V.M.D., Chair, noted the proposed 2022
   meeting dates for the Board's review.]
8
   Adjournment
10
   CHAIR GARG:
11
                  Would anyone like to make a motion to
12
                  adjourn?
13
   DR. NEBZYDOSKI:
14
                  I would like to make that motion to
15
                  adjourn.
16
   CHAIR GARG:
17
                  It has been good seeing everybody as
18
                  usual. Stay safe. I will see you all
19
                  in person two months from now.
                               * * *
20
21
   [There being no further business, the State Board of
22
   Veterinary Medicine Meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.]
2.3
                               * * *
2.4
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing summary minutes of the State Board of Veterinary Medicine meeting, was reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately summarize the substance of the State Board of Veterinary Medicine Meeting.

Samantha Sabatini,

Minute Clerk

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc.