OVMEB BOARD MEETING PUBLIC SESSION	**March 11-12, 2026, 8:30 AM**
	Zoom Conference: **https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85648730252?pwd=MbsJgrDvBSGVXYCBIGEAMLoGZw3Vbf.1**
	Meeting ID: 856 4873 0252 **Passcode: Az3NMP**
	Phone 971-673-0224 Fax 971-673-0226
Board President: Max Rinaldi, DVM	

March 11-12, 2026, 8:30 AM

Convene Public Session

1. CALL TO ORDER

Public Session is scheduled to start at 8:30AM and will continue until the end of business. Executive Session (closed to the public) will follow, continuing until the end of business. The Board expects to come out of Executive Session and into Public Session for the purpose of voting on the cases discussed during Executive Session and other applicable Board business.

2. Roll Call

3. OVMEB BOARD CHAIR'S COMMENTS

a. Welcome comments from Max Rinaldi, OVMEB Board Chair

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS – For Items Not on the Agenda (Comments must be limited to 3-5 minutes, limited to 1 hour for the full comment period. For planning and scheduling purposes, the Board requests public participants to notify the office in advance if you wish to address the Board.)

5. CONSENT AGENDA

a. Today's Agenda

b. January 21-22, 2026- Public Board Meeting Minutes

6. UPDATE FROM STATE VETERINARIAN – Dr. Ryan Scholz

7. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT – OVMEB Peter Burns

8. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

i. CVT Workgroup Update - OVMEB Director Pete Burns and Dr. Emilio Debess

ii. Rulemaking Update – OVMEB Director, Pete Burns

9. Next Board Meeting- May 7-8, 2026

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION: The Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board will now go into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(L), ORS 192.660(2)(f), ORS 192.660(2)(h), and 676.175(1) concerning discipline, litigation, and exempt public records. Representatives of the news media and designated staff will be allowed to attend the Executive Session. All other members of the audience are asked to leave the room. Representatives of the news media are specifically directed not to report on any of the deliberations during the Executive Session except to state the general subject of the session as previously announced. No decision will be made in Executive Session. At the end of the Executive Session, we will return to open session and welcome the audience back into the room.

11. IN THE MATTERS OF (following Executive Session)

4. Public Comment

From:	BURNS Peter J * OVMEB
To:	WALKER Brooke * OVMEB
Subject:	Fw: Subject: Written Continuation of Public Comment – [January 21, 2026] – Request for Entry Into Official Record
Date:	Wednesday, February 11, 2026 3:08:35 PM

Please add to Jeffries Public Comments for March meeting

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Erissa Jeffries <erissaruby78@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2026 3:06:14 PM
To: BURNS Peter J * OVMEB <Peter.J.BURNS@ovmeb.oregon.gov>
Subject: Re: Subject: Written Continuation of Public Comment – [January 21, 2026] – Request for Entry Into Official Record

Good afternoon Mr. Burns,

Yes, that is correct.

Please include this communication as additional public comment associated with my January 21, 2026 public comment, for inclusion in the March Board meeting public comment record.

Thank you for confirming and for ensuring the record is complete and accurate.

Respectfully,
Erissa Jeffries

On Wed, Feb 11, 2026, 2:10 PM BURNS Peter J * OVMEB <Peter.J.BURNS@ovmeb.oregon.gov> wrote:

> Ms. Jeffries,
>
> I understand you would like this communication included with your previous January 28 email to the Board. This all should be included as additional public comment to the Board at the March Board Meeting, correct?
>
> Thank you,
>
> Pete
>
> ---
>
> **Peter J. Burns**
>
> *Executive Director*

Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board

800 NE Oregon Street Suite 407, Portland, OR 97232

971.673.0223 | FAX 971.673.0226

OMVEB.Exec@oregon.gov | http://www.oregon.gov/OVMEB

From: Erissa Jeffries <erissaruby78@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 6:39 PM
To: BURNS Peter J * OVMEB <Peter.J.BURNS@ovmeb.oregon.gov>
Subject: Re: Subject: Written Continuation of Public Comment – [January 21, 2026] – Request for Entry Into Official Record

Good Evening Mr. Burns,

Thank you for your continued communication regarding my January 21, 2026 public comment. I respect the Board's meeting structure and public comment time limits and will continue participating within those parameters.

This correspondence is intended to serve as formal record preservation notice that I will be continuing public engagement related to regulatory policy, public safety interface responsibilities, reporting pathway clarity, and public-facing communication systems during the March meeting cycle and future public comment opportunities.

For transparency and documentation purposes, I am also maintaining parallel engagement with appropriate state oversight and audit review processes concerning systems-level policy structure, complaint intake and classification processes, reporting-referral evaluation controls, regulatory advisory interface awareness, and public-facing communication effectiveness. This is not intended as an adversarial action. It reflects standard civic participation and documentation practices when systemic policy questions affecting public safety and consumer protection are identified.

Over the past six years, my work has primarily involved assisting members of the public, veterinary professionals, and whistleblowers in navigating complaint intake systems, jurisdictional limitations, reporting pathway barriers, and evidence preservation considerations. Through this work, I have observed recurring structural barriers that appear to impact public access to regulatory protection systems and coordinated public safety reporting pathways.

My January written submission reflected multi-year aggregated observations intended to support systems-level policy evaluation. My objective remains focused on forward-looking regulatory improvement, public safety risk reduction, and restoration of public confidence in oversight systems.

My January submission was intended as Part One of a policy-focused series examining reporting pathway evaluation, jurisdiction clarity, and public safety system coordination. A continuation submission was anticipated for the March meeting cycle addressing regulatory advisory interface awareness and professional reporting framework integration considerations. I remain willing to coordinate the continuation structure consistent with Board process expectations.

From a regulatory governance perspective, mandatory reporting frameworks operate as cross-jurisdictional public safety infrastructure designed to protect vulnerable populations. Where regulatory intake systems, advisory structures, or public-facing communication do not consistently reinforce reporting pathway awareness, the result can include delayed reporting, fragmented jurisdiction routing, and erosion of public confidence in regulatory protection systems.

Separately, I have submitted a systems-level audit and oversight review request evaluating complaint intake clarity, reporting-referral evaluation processes, regulatory IT transparency, and public-facing communication effectiveness. That request is structured as a policy and systems review request.

One recurring barrier identified through direct public interaction is the knowledge and language gap between administrative regulatory systems and working-class consumers. Many individuals interacting with regulatory systems lack specialized medical or legal training but are expected to translate complex or traumatic events into regulatory terminology. Where public-facing education tools or jurisdiction guidance are limited, this can unintentionally create adversarial system dynamics and reduce effective reporting outcomes.

For record clarity, I respectfully request continued policy consideration in the following areas:

• Public-facing jurisdiction navigation clarity and integrated consumer education tools

• Trauma-informed intake and public interaction awareness

• Clear distinction between administrative complaint processes and criminal reporting pathways

• Complaint portal submission confirmation and jurisdiction guidance disclaimers / public navigation tools

• Evaluation of whether public-facing language may unintentionally discourage reporting of harmful or potentially criminal conduct

• Evaluation of whether public-facing systems fully support statutory public safety and consumer protection mandates

It is also important to document that long-term public trust erosion is typically not caused by single events, but by sustained patterns of perceived imbalance between regulatory authority, public communication transparency, and enforcement consistency. Where public trust erosion reaches multi-decade duration, restoration efforts generally require visible systems-level modernization and communication recalibration.

I recognize current Board leadership is not responsible for historical system design decisions. However, current leadership does have the authority and opportunity to evaluate whether legacy communication practices, intake structures, or public interface tools warrant modernization, clarification, or reinforcement aligned with current statutory public protection mandates and mission scales balanced in the public's safety and animal welfare interests.

My intent in continuing this discussion is to support forward-looking regulatory alignment with statutory public protection responsibilities, transparency commitments, and long-term public trust stabilization. I remain committed to maintaining a professional, policy-focused, and solutions-oriented posture in all continued engagement with the Board and associated oversight entities.

Please advise how you would prefer continuation of this discussion to be structured for the March meeting or future public engagement opportunities.

Respectfully,

Erissa Jeffries

companionsforjustice00@gmail.com

(503) 660-6911

On Wed, Jan 28, 2026, 2:35 PM BURNS Peter J * OVMEB <Peter.J.BURNS@ovmeb.oregon.gov> wrote:

> Good afternoon, Ms. Jeffries
>
> I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your email and the attached written continuation of your public comment from the January 21, 2026 Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board meeting.
>
> We appreciate your continued engagement and communication with the Board. As noted during the meeting, public comment time is limited to ensure that all individuals have an opportunity to speak and that the Board can complete its scheduled agenda. We recognize that this sometimes requires speakers to conclude before finishing their remarks.
>
> Your written continuation will be included in the materials for the March Board meeting so that Board Members may receive and fully review your additional comments. It will also be retained as part of the official record associated with the January 21, 2026 meeting.
>
> Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments and valuable perspective.
>
> Respectfully,
> Pete
>
> ---
>
> **Peter J. Burns**
>
> *Executive Director*
>
> **Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board**
>
> 800 NE Oregon Street Suite 407, Portland, OR 97232
>
> 971.673.0223 | FAX 971.673.0226
>
> OMVEB.Exec@oregon.gov | http://www.oregon.gov/OVMEB

From: Erissa Jeffries <erissaruby78@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 12:48 AM
To: INFO OVMEB * OVMEB <ovmeb.info@ovmeb.oregon.gov>
Cc: BURNS Peter J * OVMEB <Peter.J.BURNS@ovmeb.oregon.gov>
Subject: Subject: Written Continuation of Public Comment – [January 21, 2026] – Request for Entry Into Official Record

Good morning,

I am submitting the attached written continuation of my public comment from the Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board public meeting held on January 21, 2026.

During the meeting, my oral public comment was limited by the five-minute public comment cap and was cut off before I could complete the solutions-focused portion of my statement. As noted during the meeting, by Mr. Burns Executive Director. Written comment submissions from individuals who did not have sufficient time to complete their comment were invited for continued Board review.

Please include my written continuation in the official public meeting record and meeting minutes associated with the above-referenced meeting.

Thank you for your time and for accepting this submission into the public record.

Respectfully,

Erissa Jeffries

Attachment: Erissa_Jeffries_Written_Public_Meeting_Comment_Continuation_[2026-01-21]

Written Continuation of Oral Public Commentary

Public Meeting Attendee: Erissa Jeffries

Submitted for Inclusion in the Official Public Meeting Record & Minutes

Agenda Item: Public Comment – Board Oversight, Enforcement, and Public Safety

Meeting Date: January 21, 2026

My oral testimony concluded at the following point due to the five-minute time limit:

“Veterinarians — including Board members — have a duty to report suspected criminal animal abuse to law enforcement. Yet confirmed by state officials, those reports are not being made. Instead, families are redirected solely into administrative complaints, where criminal conduct is filtered out and buried quietly in administrative files.”

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional written comment for the record and board review.. My oral testimony during the public meeting was limited by the 5-minute time cap; this submission contains the solutions-focused, public trust restoration portion I skipped to conclude, in compliance with time limits.

— ORAL TESTIMONY CONCLUDED DUE TO TIME LIMIT —

Good afternoon. My name is Erissa Jeffries.

I’m here today because my dog, Ace, was injured in 2017 during what was supposed to be a routine neuter procedure at the Companion Pet Clinic of Beaverton, performed by Daniel God Koller.

Ace went into that clinic a happy-go-lucky dog — tail wagging, trusting. After more than five hours in Daniel Koller’s custody, he did not come out of Koller's custody, the same dog. He suffered physical injuries and ocular hemorrhaging that clinic staff later misrepresented as “medication side effects.”

That misleading and misrepresentation is not unique. It is the same conduct documented in California disciplinary records, where staff were coerced into concealing injuries caused by Daniel God Koller’s inhumane handling. What has not changed over decades is the pattern of abuse behind Daniel God Koller's closed clinic doors.

What has changed is regulatory tolerance for intimidation, hostility, and silence that has created conditions where abuse to animals and humans can repeat for decades. While the board renews and reinstates a licensee with a long, documented history of violent recidivism.

Oregon has had notice, knowledge, and foreseeability of Daniel Koller’s dangerous handling and restraint practices since at least 1980, when California probationary findings were known to this Board. Yet despite that notice, Oregon communities have continued to bear the risk.

Protesting Clackamas 2002; Protesting Beaverton 2019; Protesting Gresham 2026. The community is the only one fighting against this violence towards our animals and for public safety.

Over the past several years, I’ve listened closely to families whose pets were injured, traumatized, or killed while in Daniel Koller’s clinic custody. What initially appeared to be isolated tragedies revealed a consistent, repeatable pattern.

Families describe the same sequence again and again:

Their pet goes into clinic custody, at a Koller-affiliated clinic. Something goes wrong. A crisis unfolds. They rush their animal to the nearest emergency hospital. Emergency teams focus on stabilization and survival.

Families leave traumatized, confused, and financially devastated.

Emergency hospitals are not the problem — they are the safety net. The failure occurs before and after that emergency handoff, where accountability disappears.

Companion Pet Clinics are often described as “affordable.” But affordability cannot be measured by the initial invoice alone. True affordability must account for the total cost of the crisis.

Documented outcomes associated with these clinics include:

- Severe restraint injuries during routine procedures
- Immediate emergency transfers
- Euthanasia because the damage could not be reversed
- Botched or incompetent surgeries requiring correction,
- Long-term physical disability
- Neurological and behavioral damage requiring months or years of rehabilitation

Lori Makinen said it best: “He is butchering animals, and will not stop on his own.”

These outcomes cost families thousands of dollars. When an animal is rushed from Daniel God Koller’s clinic to an emergency hospital, or euthanized because the abuse cannot be undone, this veterinary service is neither affordable nor humane.

It is a transfer of risk onto the most vulnerable families and animals.

Now I want to address a critical legal failure.

In 2003, the Oregon Legislature enacted mandatory reporting laws after finding a direct link between animal abuse and human abuse. Veterinarians were given a duty to report aggravated animal abuse — and immunity when reporting in good faith.

Aggravated animal abuse includes reckless conduct causing serious injury or death, especially where there is a prior conviction. Daniel God Koller was convicted of aggravated animal abuse in 1979.

During that criminal trial, SPCA witnesses testified that he followed, harassed, and intimidated them — conduct that constitutes witness tampering. This is exactly why the Legislature recognized animal abuse as a public-safety issue, not a “bedside manner” issue.

Yet for decades, the public and veterinary professionals have reported coercive intimidation, menacing behavior, and violent abuse in Daniel Koller’s clinics. These complaints have routinely been dismissed as “outside the Board’s jurisdiction,” despite mandatory reporting laws being in effect for over 20 years.

Veterinarians — including Board members — have a duty to report suspected criminal animal abuse to law enforcement. Yet confirmed by state officials, those reports are not being made. Instead, families are redirected solely into administrative complaints, where criminal conduct is filtered out and buried quietly in administrative files.

— WRITTEN CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC COMMENT BEGINS HERE —

That creates a structural gap where abuse disappears on paper, patterns remain unacknowledged, and public trust collapses.

This failure has downstream and upstream consequences.

Downstream:

- Emergency hospitals absorb crisis care.
- Shelters absorb surrendered animals.

- Veterinary professionals experience morale injury, while their professional integrity is at risk and the board refuses to defend their own professional standards.
- Families face catastrophic emotional and financial loss.

Upstream:

- Taxpayers fund IT systems that provide no confirmation of complaint submission.
- Licensee lookup databases are inaccurate,
- Families report filing complaints in the OVMEB portal and never hearing back from the board.
- Without confirmation, there is no proof a complaint was received.
- Trust erodes, and the public's reporting declines.

Downstream harm is socialized; upstream risk is protected. The system is inverted.

Victims pay emotionally, financially and psychologically. Taxpayers fund the legal defense and administrative operations. Meanwhile the licensee continues practicing. The board avoids decisive intervention.

Communities have invested countless hours of unpaid, voluntary time and personal resources—organizing protests, boycotts, and public-safety awareness efforts, and working to shut down or prevent access to unsafe clinics from Clackamas to Gresham, Beaverton, and St. Johns—in order to protect animal welfare and their own public safety.

This community-driven protection has occurred with little to no meaningful support from the tax-funded state regulatory board that is statutorily mandated to protect animal welfare and public safety, despite the Board having salaried staff, formal authority, and significantly greater institutional resources than the disadvantaged communities forced to fill this gap themselves.

Declining complaint numbers does not mean abuse has stopped. They mean people have lost faith that reporting matters. People who trusted the system. People who felt trapped, dismissed, or afraid to speak while their animals were in veterinary custody and they were witnessing real time animal cruelty and if they attempted to intervene, they too were subjected to abuse and threats from Daniel God Koller.

While the board dismissed the public's complaints that were acknowledged, statements of criminal animal abuse and human abuse alike. The board Minimized down to: "bedside manners". And buried the criminal animal and human abuse allegations made in complaints received failure to report criminal conduct to law enforcement authority, within the board's jurisdictional duty to report.

The Legislature has repeatedly stepped in:

- In 2003 with mandatory reporting.
- In 2005 with "Unfit to Practice."
- In 2019 by raising minimum standards.

Yet those tools have not been enforced.

Once again, another legislative 'rescue' effort is underway to grant the Board additional authority through criminal-conviction legislation. Yet the Board has never codified or enforced the mandatory reporting requirements for criminal animal abuse enacted in 2003. That failure renders each new legislative fix ineffective.

When licensed veterinarians encounter injured animals following veterinary custody and do not report suspected criminal animal abuse to law enforcement—and when the Board, itself composed of licensed veterinarians, reviews complaints containing allegations of criminal animal abuse but declines to report them—the duty to report is effectively nullified.

After 23 years of non-enforcement, the question becomes unavoidable: what meaningful impact will new criminal-conviction legislation have if the veterinary system continues to fail its existing, mandated obligation to report suspected criminal animal abuse to the proper jurisdictional authorities?

In 2005—twenty years ago—Lori Makinen stated, in DVM360: 'There is currently a situation where a veterinarian's surgical capabilities are compromised because of nerve disease; the doctor is basically butchering animals in surgery and is not stopping on his own.' That raises an unavoidable question: if a practitioner is 'not stopping on his own,' is it not the OVMEB's responsibility to intervene and stop a dangerous practitioner from continuing to harm animals and endanger public safety?

In Koller v. OVMEB, the Court of Appeals found that the Board failed to justify a $42,000 cost assessment. That cost was absorbed by the public. Four years later, Daniel Koller's license was reinstated — wasting resources exhausted and the public has continued to pay ever since.

This is not a lack of authority. It is a failure of duty.

When a single licensee generates decades of complaints, investigations, appeals, and litigation, the public pays at every step — while the practitioner continues practicing.

- Victims pay.
- Emergency hospitals absorb costs when families can't absorb the unexpected emergency triage
- Shelters absorb surrender.

Taxpayers fund defense and administration that insulates the board postured against public safety, even when the board veterinarians are immune from liability when they report animal abuse to criminal law enforcement agencies.

Meanwhile, oversight aligns with industry rather than public protection. That is regulatory capture — sustained by silence and procedural insulation.

What does not exist in this system is just as important as what does. Licensees such as Koller are not billed per complaint. There are no escalating disciplinary consequences for repeat offenders, and no automatic cost-shifting for serial violations. Most critically, the mandatory handoff of suspected criminal animal abuse, in clinic custody, to the proper law-enforcement authorities has failed for twenty-three years, despite mandatory reporting laws being in effect for veterinary professionals.

I want to be very clear about something. What I have described today is not the result of missing laws. It is the result of laws that exist but are not being enforced. The Oregon Legislature has stepped in repeatedly because this Board has failed to act.

Restoring public trust requires enforcement of the laws and authorities already granted to the Board.

In 2003, the Legislature enacted mandatory reporting laws after finding a direct link between animal abuse and human abuse. Veterinarians were given a clear duty to report suspected aggravated animal abuse, along with immunity for good-faith reporting. Yet this statutory mandate was never codified into Board policy or operational practice. That omission alone has cost the Board, affected communities, and emergency systems years of time and resources—and most importantly, it has allowed animals to continue suffering inhumanely in Oregon for decades.

Other jurisdictions have acted on the authority already available to them. California enforced its regulatory tools, and Daniel God Koller's license has not been reinstated there since 2008. Washington State has declined to issue him a veterinary license. The USDA federal accreditation program has not reinstated his federal accreditation since 2011. The continued failure to enforce existing authority with respect to this single, high-risk licensee is therefore not a national or systemic inevitability—it is an Oregon-specific failure to protect animal welfare and public safety despite decades of legislative action designed to address precisely this risk.

For criminal animal abuse to reach the conviction stage, it must first be reported to criminal law-enforcement authorities. That is the core issue I am trying to understand. Over all these years and across so many victims, only one family in Oregon reported criminal animal abuse to the proper authorities. What happened to the rest of the reports?

There should be criminal animal abuse reports—submitted by families, by emergency and referral veterinarians who treated animals injured after leaving veterinary custody, and by the Board itself. Board members are licensed veterinarians with a legal duty to report suspected animal abuse allegations encountered during complaint review and investigation. The law also provides immunity for good-faith reporting. There is no liability barrier preventing these reports from being made to criminal law enforcement authorities' jurisdictional investigations.

So the question remains: where did the criminal animal abuse reports go over decades of incidents and victims complaints to the board?

One of the most egregious and serial criminal animal abusers in Oregon's history is not an outsider—it is a licensed veterinarian regulated by this Board. Why has the Board not fulfilled its duty to report suspected criminal animal abuse allegations to criminal law enforcement in this case, as the law requires?

In 2005, the Legislature enacted "Unfit to Practice" because dangerous practitioners were not stopping on their own.

In 2019, the Legislature raised minimum standards because the Board said it lacked authority.

Those tools already exist. They are already law. What is missing is enforcement.

So I want to be explicit about what enforcement looks like.

First: Mandatory reporting must be operational, not theoretical.

When a veterinarian, a credentialed technician, an emergency intake hospital, or this Board itself receives credible allegations of criminal animal abuse, sustained in veterinary custody settings, that information must be referred to law enforcement jurisdiction.

- Not filtered.
- Not minimized as "bedside manners."
- Not buried in administrative files.

Administrative review does not supplant criminal investigation. The Department of Justice has clearly defined this jurisdictional distinction, and it has never been otherwise.

Reporting suspected abuse is not a finding of guilt. It is a jurisdictional handoff — one the Legislature required more than twenty years ago.

Second: This Board must stop allowing administrative processes to be used as a shield against accountability.

Board investigators are trained in administrative law. They are not trained to determine criminal culpability, and they should not be placed in that position.

When allegations rise to the level of suspected criminal conduct, the Board's role is not to decide whether there is "enough evidence," for criminal abuse statutes. That decision belongs to criminal law enforcement jurisdiction.

If the Board maintains that criminal animal abuse allegations are beyond its administrative jurisdiction, the duty to report those allegations does not disappear. Rather, OVMEB investigators and licensed veterinarians serving on the Board are obligated to refer such allegations to the appropriate criminal law-enforcement authorities.

The law requires:

686.455: A veterinarian who has reasonable cause to believe that an animal with which the veterinarian has come in contact has suffered aggravated animal abuse, or that ANY person with whom the veterinarian has come in contact has committed aggravated animal abuse, shall immediately report the suspected aggravated animal abuse in the manner prescribed shall be made to a law enforcement agency, either orally or in writing.

- The name and description of each animal involved;
- The address and telephone number of the owner or other person responsible for the care of the animal;
- The nature and extent of the suspected aggravated animal abuse;
- Any evidence of previous aggravated animal abuse;
- Any explanation given for the suspected aggravated animal abuse; and
- Any other information that the person making the report believes may be helpful in establishing the cause of the suspected animal abuse or the identity of the person causing the aggravated animal abuse. [2003 c.275 S3]

686.460 Duty of law enforcement agency after receiving report of aggravated animal abuse:

- A law enforcement agency receiving a report of suspected aggravated animal abuse pursuant to ORS 609.654 or 686.455 shall investigate the nature and cause of the suspected aggravated animal abuse.
- If the law enforcement agency finds reasonable cause to believe that aggravated animal abuse has occurred, the law enforcement agency shall process the case in the same manner as any other criminal investigation. [2003 c.275 S4; 2007 c.731 S5]

Taken together, ORS 686.455 and 686.460 establish a mandatory, non-discretionary reporting and referral framework. When a licensed veterinarian comes into contact with an animal or a person under circumstances giving reasonable cause to believe aggravated animal abuse has occurred, the veterinarian must immediately report the suspected abuse to a law-enforcement agency.

“In contact” necessarily includes emergency intake and secondary veterinarians receiving animals following prior clinic custody, as well as Board investigators and licensed veterinarians reviewing complaints that contain evidence of injury or death sustained during veterinary custody.

Complaints submitted to the Board routinely contain all of the information the law requires for reporting suspected aggravated animal abuse. They identify the animal involved, the responsible parties during clinic custody, the nature and extent of the injuries or death, evidence of prior abuse including aggravated animal abuse convictions or charges, and the explanations offered for the harm—often including misrepresentation or failure to disclose adverse events.

Those complaints also frequently document abuse directed at clients who raise concerns about inhumane handling of their animals during exams. That matters, because the Legislature did not limit mandatory reporting to harm against animals alone. In 2003, the duty to report was enacted in recognition of the direct link between animal abuse and human abuse.

Over decades, families have reported being screamed at, threatened, coerced into silence, and told their pets would be euthanized if they did not comply. They describe being forced to restrain their own animals during abusive handling, pressured to consent to chemical restraint they were not informed would be used, and retaliated against when they sought help or attempted to report what occurred.

Some were stalked, harassed and retaliated against after speaking out. These behaviors are not isolated. They appear repeatedly in complaints, witness statements, and even in clinic medical records, the clinic admits to stalking and retaliating against victims who are seeking assistance and guidance reporting the incidents. Those remarks in clients medical records and letters sent to clients, that is criminally coded as: Witness Tampering - within Oregon criminal law jurisdiction.

Once a report of suspected aggravated animal abuse is made, ORS 686.460 assigns exclusive investigative authority to criminal law enforcement. That authority—and responsibility—belongs to law enforcement alone. Administrative review does not replace or satisfy this statutory obligation.

What has happened instead is that conduct routinely minimized as “bedside manner” issues under administrative law has never been evaluated through the lens of Oregon’s criminal code. When mapped correctly, the behaviors described in complaints align with criminal statutes, not professional disagreements.

- When clients are told to comply or face harm to their pet, that is coercion.
- When threats are made against a client or their animal, that is menacing.
- When clients are screamed at or verbally attacked in a way that causes fear or distress, that is harassment.
- When clients or staff are punished for speaking up, that is retaliation against a witness or victim.
- When people are pressured not to report, encouraged to lie, or discouraged from contacting authorities, that is witness tampering.
- When animals are forcefully handled, squeezed, struck, suspended, or injured in front of their owners, that is animal abuse—and when accompanied by threats or intimidation, those offenses compound to aggravated animal abuse statutory criminal codified laws.

Criminal law enforcement—not victims, not administrative investigators—determines criminal charges. Veterinarians and Board investigators are not tasked with weighing criminal evidence; they are tasked with reporting suspected abuse so that trained criminal authorities can investigate.

These behaviors are not “bad bedside manners.” They are criminal acts under Oregon law.

Failing to report them to the proper law-enforcement authorities is a failure to carry out the mandatory duty imposed by statute.

Not to mention, failure to report suspected aggravated animal abuse and failure to disclose injuries or adverse events in complaints,constitute violations of the Veterinary Practice Act and Minimum Standards, including unprofessional conduct, misrepresentation, failure to maintain accurate records, and failure to protect animal welfare and public safety.

- OAR 875-015-0020(4) - Failure to inform clients of material facts necessary for informed decision-making
- OAR 875-015-0020(1) - Failure to prevent or disclose injury to an animal

The Board has lost credibility in enforcing the Veterinary Practice Act and Minimum Standards because it has not consistently complied with or enforced its own reporting and disclosure standards. When the Board fails to apply mandatory reporting duties and disclosure obligations within its own complaint review and investigative processes, it undermines its ability to credibly require compliance from the veterinary professionals it regulates.

The Board should set the standard by modeling compliance with the Veterinary Practice Act and Minimum Standards, demonstrating how these obligations are to be applied in practice.

What has occurred in practice since 2003:

In practice, allegations of suspected criminal animal abuse disclosed during emergency intake, secondary veterinary care, or within complaints submitted to the Board have routinely been retained within administrative files and treated as “outside jurisdiction,” rather than referred to law enforcement. Families have been redirected solely into administrative complaint processes, while criminal referral pathways were not triggered.

Board investigators and licensed veterinarians reviewing complaints have not consistently initiated reports to law enforcement, despite complaints containing the information required by statute. As a result,

allegations meeting the statutory reporting threshold have not generated corresponding criminal investigations, patterns of harm have remained unacknowledged on the criminal record, and public trust in veterinary oversight has eroded.

The duty to report arises at the point of reasonable cause and applies regardless of whether the abuse is disclosed during clinical care, emergency triage, or the Board's complaint review process.

Third: Mandatory reporting must be taught, reinforced, and required.

This Board already controls continuing education requirements.

There is no reason — none — that every licensed veterinarian and credentialed technician in Oregon has not been trained on:

- What constitutes suspected aggravated animal abuse, including within clinic custody.
- When reporting is required,
- Where reports must go, jurisdictionally
- And the immunity protections that exist when reporting is done in good faith, all veterinarian Professionals are immune from liabilities, even when the abuse allegations are sustained during clinic custody, elsewhere.

The absence of this training has real consequences. It leaves professionals unsure. It leaves abuse unreported. And it leaves dangerous patterns invisible in medical records and administrative files, as gatekeeper silence.

A mandatory continuing education module on duty to report would immediately change behavior across the system.

Fourth: Misrepresentation, failure to disclose and concealment of injuries must be enforced as serious violations.

When injuries sustained during veterinary custody are minimized, mischaracterized, or concealed, that is not a communication issue. It is a gross negligent professional standards violation.

- It undermines informed consent.
- It transfers risk to families.
- And it erodes trust in the entire profession.

Those violations must be treated as aggravating conduct — especially when they repeat.

Fifth: Repeat allegations must trigger escalated discipline.

Right now, nothing in Oregon's system meaningfully escalates when the same licensee generates complaint after complaint, investigation after investigation, appeal after appeal.

That is not neutrality. That is tolerance. It is reflected in respondent apathy in adjudicated disciplinary records, accessible to the public.

- There is no cost-shifting.
- No escalating financial consequence.
- No automatic scrutiny triggered by volume or pattern.

As a result, the public pays — every time. In order to restore public trust, that inversion must stop.

Sixth: The complaint system must be transparent enough to be trusted.

When families submit complaints and receive no confirmation, no receipt, and no follow-up, they reasonably conclude that reporting does not matter. That is why complaint numbers decline. Not because

abuse stopped — but because trust collapsed. A basic confirmation of receipt is not a courtesy. It is a public-safety function. Which protects both the board integrity, as well as complainants.

Finally, I want to say this plainly: Everything I have described today is preventable. The laws already exist. The authority already exists.

What is required now is the will to enforce it.

We ask the Board, in good faith, to realign the board's position and posture with its statutory mandate to protect animal welfare and public safety, and to prioritize the interests of our affected communities—especially when known high-risk licensees pose a foreseeable danger to our animals and public safety.

Repeat allegations should trigger escalated discipline. The decades-long pattern of dismissed complaints and continued licensure has produced a measurable erosion of public trust in veterinary oversight. Because the public no longer believe oversight systems will protect them or their animals.

I am here today because silence has caused decades of preventable suffering for animals and our communities. Mandatory reporting exists to prevent this. Lack of enforcement has not. The erosion of public trust you are seeing today is not accidental. It is the predictable result of decades of dismissed and buried abuse. Public safety is not only about what happens to animals behind closed doors - it is also about how witnesses, clients and community members are treated when they raise concerns.

This Board was created to protect animal welfare and public safety. That mandate only functions if it is enforced. The board has been drifting from the mission to protect animal welfare and public safety, for decades.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

— WRITTEN CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC COMMENT ENDS HERE —

Re: Policy Consideration Regarding Access to Spay and Neuter Services

NB

Nevin Beckes <beckesng@gmail.com>
To INFO OVMEB * OVMEB

Reply | Reply All | Forward

Wed 2/4/2026 10:30 PM

image001.jpg
615 KB

Oregon_Limited_Veterinary_Practitioner_Proposal.pdf
3 KB

Good Evening,

Thank you for allowing me to submit a proposal for your consideration. Attached is the base outline of a policy concept I hope the board will review at the next meeting. Please also consider my original email as part of this submission, as it provides additional context for where this request is coming from.

I recently fostered two young dogs and helped provide care, including transportation to and from their spay and neuter services. The cost of these procedures is becoming an increasing burden for rescues and shelters that are constantly working to stay funded. While this proposal will not solve the problem entirely, I can envision a future where more services are available and costs may be reduced by expanding the number of qualified individuals able to perform these critical, preventative procedures.

I believe this board is uniquely positioned to determine what is in the best interest of the people and animals it serves. Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Nevin Beckes

Policy Consideration Regarding Access to Spay and Neuter Services

NB

Nevin Beckes <beckesng@gmail.com>
To INFO OVMEB * OVMEB

Reply | Reply All | Forward

Tue 1/20/2026 9:35 PM

Follow up. Completed on Wednesday, January 28, 2026.
You replied to this message on 1/23/2026 3:52 PM.

Members of the Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board,

I am an Oregon resident writing out of concern for the growing strain on shelters, rescues, veterinarians, and volunteers addressing companion-animal overpopulation. Through recent foster and rescue experience, it has become clear how exhausted everyone involved has become, and how preventable many outcomes are with better access to spay and neuter services.

I would like to share, for consideration, a narrowly scoped policy idea exploring a Limited Veterinary Practitioner role focused exclusively on spay and neuter procedures. The intent is to increase access to essential preventative care while preserving veterinary oversight, professional standards, and animal welfare.

I have prepared a short PDF outline of this concept, available upon request. For transparency, I want to note that the document was developed with assistance from AI (ChatGPT), used as a drafting and structuring tool. The ideas, framing, and intent are my own, informed by lived experience and concern for the public good.

I am offering this idea solely as a potential approach worth study or discussion, particularly in light of ongoing access, capacity, and workforce challenges across Oregon. My goal in reaching out is to better understand whether similar concepts have been evaluated in the past, whether any related discussions are underway, and where appropriate conversations typically begin.

Thank you for your time and for the work you do to protect animal welfare and uphold professional standards in Oregon.

Respectfully,

Nevin Beckes
Cottage Grove, Oregon

Proposal for an Oregon Limited Veterinary Practitioner (LVP) License

Purpose
To expand access to affordable spay and neuter services, reduce shelter overpopulation, and prevent the euthanasia of healthy animals through the creation of a limited-scope veterinary license.

Problem
Oregon shelters and rescues are overwhelmed. Rising veterinary costs and limited access to spay/neuter services result in preventable litters and unnecessary euthanasia. These procedures are standardized, repetitive, and preventative, yet current law treats them the same as complex veterinary surgery.

Proposed Solution
Create a Limited Veterinary Practitioner (LVP) license authorizing qualified individuals to perform only spay and neuter procedures under strict training, oversight, and scope limitations.

Scope of Practice
• Canine and feline spay and neuter only
• Optional: microchipping and non-rabies vaccines by protocol
• No diagnostics, emergency care, dentistry, or independent practice

Training & Oversight
• Formal didactic education (anatomy, anesthesia, aseptic technique)
• Supervised completion of a minimum number of procedures
• Practice limited to shelters, nonprofits, or approved clinics
• Oversight by a licensed veterinarian or board-approved protocols

Public Benefit
• Reduced shelter intake and euthanasia
• Lower costs for families and municipalities
• Workforce expansion without lowering standards
• Allows veterinarians to focus on complex care

Conclusion
This proposal modernizes access to preventative veterinary care while protecting animal welfare and professional standards. Oregon has an opportunity to lead with a compassionate, practical solution.

5. Consent Agenda

OVMEB BOARD MEETING PUBLIC SESSION	**March 11-12, 2026, 8:30 AM**
	Zoom Conference: **https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85648730252?pwd=MbsJgrDvBSGVXYCBIGEAMLoGZw3Vbf.1**
	Meeting ID: 856 4873 0252 **Passcode: Az3NMP**
	Phone 971-673-0224 Fax 971-673-0226
Board President: Max Rinaldi, DVM	

March 11-12, 2026, 8:30 AM

Convene Public Session

1. CALL TO ORDER

Public Session is scheduled to start at 8:30AM and will continue until the end of business. Executive Session (closed to the public) will follow, continuing until the end of business. The Board expects to come out of Executive Session and into Public Session for the purpose of voting on the cases discussed during Executive Session and other applicable Board business.

2. Roll Call

3. OVMEB BOARD CHAIR'S COMMENTS

a. Welcome comments from Max Rinaldi, OVMEB Board Chair

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS – For Items Not on the Agenda (Comments must be limited to 3-5 minutes, limited to 1 hour for the full comment period. For planning and scheduling purposes, the Board requests public participants to notify the office in advance if you wish to address the Board.)

5. CONSENT AGENDA

a. Today's Agenda

b. January 21-22, 2026- Public Board Meeting Minutes

6. UPDATE FROM STATE VETERINARIAN – Dr. Ryan Scholz

7. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT – OVMEB Peter Burns

8. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

i. CVT Workgroup Update - OVMEB Director Pete Burns and Dr. Emilio Debess

ii. Rulemaking Update – OVMEB Director, Pete Burns

9. Next Board Meeting- May 7-8, 2026

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION: The Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board will now go into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(L), ORS 192.660(2)(f), ORS 192.660(2)(h), and 676.175(1) concerning discipline, litigation, and exempt public records. Representatives of the news media and designated staff will be allowed to attend the Executive Session. All other members of the audience are asked to leave the room. Representatives of the news media are specifically directed not to report on any of the deliberations during the Executive Session except to state the general subject of the session as previously announced. No decision will be made in Executive Session. At the end of the Executive Session, we will return to open session and welcome the audience back into the room.

11. IN THE MATTERS OF (following Executive Session)

PLEASE NOTE: The BOARD MEETING SUMMARY IS CONSIDERED DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY THE BOARD AT THE NEXT SCHEDULED BOARD MEETING.

MEETING SUMMARY	**2025 Month Board Meeting** **January 21-22, 2026, 2:30AM** **Virtual Meeting** **Please see the Teams video on the Board Meeting Agendas/Minutes webpage and the correlating timestamps below.**

Board Members

- Max Rinaldi, DVM, President
- Brett Hamilton, DVM
- Brian Wadyka, Public Member
- Katy Wallace, DVM
- Karen Pate, Public Member
- Ragan Borzcik, DVM
- Natalie Mair-Williamson, CVT

Agency Staff

- Peter Burns, Executive Director
- Bertina Grajo, Investigator
- Janine Holland, Investigator
- Brooke Walker, Licensing Administrator
- Ingrid Nye, Inspector

Timestamps for Teams Video	
Teams Video Part #1	**January 21-22, 2026,** **OPEN SESSION – PUBLIC MAY ATTEND**
0:2:28	i. President Rinaldi called the meeting to order at 2:38 PM. ii. Roll Call

Board Members	Here	Absent
Board President Max Rinaldi	x	
Board Member Brett Hamilton		**x**
Board Member Brian Wadyka	x	
Board Member Katy Wallace	x	
Board Member Karen Pate	x	
Board Member Ragan Borzcik	x	
Board Member Natalie Mair-Williamson	x	
Agency Staff Members	**Here**	**Absent**

Executive Director Peter Burns	x	
Investigator Bertina Grajo	x	
Licensing Administrator Brooke Walker	x	
Investigator Janine Holland	x	
Inspector Charlie Esparza	x	
AAG Joanna Tucker-Davis Day 1	x	

Public Member
Dr. Ryan Shultz
Christina Keef
Taryn Pestalozzi
KOIN
Whitney Holliday
Dr. Emilio Debess
Glenn Kolb
Jill Domine Krystin Noffsinger Melody Pugh Tammie Houston Tiffani Daffern Brad David Carpenter Bradley Larios Mel Rockman Alicia Bice TU Mae Erissa Jeffries
Chris Holenstein
Debra Warner

0:2:59

iii. Public Comment

- Crystal Bloodworth (Letter)
- Merle Weiner (Letter)
- Melissa Kosta
- Helen Holliday

	• Erissa Jeffries • Jill Domine • Bradley Larios • Glenn Kolb
0:3:42	iv. Agenda review and approval
0:3:44	v. Update from State Veterinarian- Dr. Ryan Shultz
0:3:50	vi. Executive Director Report
0:4:26	vii. Discussion and Action Items i. CVT Workgroup Update - OVMEB Director Peter Burns ii. Applicants- OVMEB Licensing Administrator Brooke Walker (Reviewed January 22) iii. Rule Review- OVMEB Director Peter Burns and Joanna Tucker-Davis AAG (Reviewed January 22)
0:4:53	**Dr. Max Rinaldi announced ending of public session. We reconvene January 22, 2026, at 8:30AM.**
Teams Video Part #2	**January 21-22, 2026,** **OPEN SESSION – PUBLIC MAY ATTEND**
0:08:31	i. President Rinaldi called the meeting to order at 8:31 AM. ii. Roll Call

Board Members	Here	Absent
Board President Max Rinaldi	x	

Board Member Brett Hamilton		**x**
Board Member Brian Wadyka	x	
Board Member Katy Wallace	x	
Board Member Karen Pate	x	
Board Member Ragan Borzcik	x	
Board Member Natalie Mair-Williamson	x	
Agency Staff Members	**Here**	**Absent**
Executive Director Peter Burns	x	
Investigator Bertina Grajo	x	
Licensing Administrator Brooke Walker	x	
Investigator Janine Holland	x	
Inspector Charlie Esparza	x	
AAG Joanna Tucker-Davis	x	

viii. Discussion and Action Items

iv. CVT Workgroup Update - OVMEB Director Peter Burns (reviewed January 21)

v. Applicants- OVMEB Licensing Administrator Brooke Walker

0:8:45

vi. Rule Review- OVMEB Director Peter Burns and Joanna Tucker-Davis AAG

0:9:17 **Dr. Rinaldi announced to move into Executive Session for the purpose of legal advice, review and discussion of investigations and disciplinary cases at 9:17 AM.**

EXECUTIVE SESSION – NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(L), ORS 192.600(2)(f), ORS 192.660 (2)(h), ORS 676.175(1)

- Legal Advice pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(f)
- Deliberation on Disciplinary Cases and Investigations
- Contested Case Deliberation ORS 192.690(1)

MOTIONS RELATED TO DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

0:3:20	**Close the following cases:** 2025-0141, 2025-0152, 2025-0171, 2025-0176, 2025-0189- Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-0067, 2025-0074- Mair-Williamson moved; Borzcik seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. Rinaldi recused. 2025-0006- Offer a settlement agreement with a $1000 civil penalty and 2 violations of OAR 875-015-0030(2)(f)(Q). Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-0006- Issue amended notice. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2024-0069- Issue notice of revocation costs under ORS 686.130(10) and (11). Rinaldi moved; Wallace seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2026-0005- Close case and issue license. Rinaldi moved; Wadyka seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2026-0016- Deny approval for VTNE. Rinaldi moved; Wallace seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-0183- Close case and approve license. Rinaldi moved; Pate seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-0009AB- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-0013- Issue a proposed $250 civil penalty and costs for violation of OAR 875-015-0030(2)(f)(S). Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-0017- Issue a proposed $500 civil penalty and costs for under OAR 875-010-0031(7)(c) and OAR 875-015-0030(3)(d). Rinaldi moved; Borzcik seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-0023AB- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Wallace seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-0025- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Borzcik seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. 2025-00029AB- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0035- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Pate seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0037- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0041- Close case. Rinaldi moved; second. All in favor. Motion passes.

2025-0049- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0055- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Borzcik seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0059- Issue Letter of Education. Rinaldi moved; Borzcik seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0061- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Borzcik seconded. All in favor. Motion passes.

2025-0063AB- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passes.

2025-0064- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Pate seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0069- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Pate seconded. All in favor. Motion passes.

2025-0072- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0073AB- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Pate second. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0080A- Issue Letter of Education. Rinaldi moved; Borzcik second. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0080B- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Pate second. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0081A- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0081B- Issue Letter of Education. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0084- Issue a proposed $500 civil penalty and costs for violations of 875-015-0030(2)(b) and 875-015-0050(2)(b). Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0088- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0090- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Pate second. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0091- Rinaldi moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0096- Issue Letter of Education. Natalie second. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0104- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Pate second. All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0112- Close case. Rinaldi moved; Pate second All in favor. Motion passed.

2025-0094, 2025-0109- Close cases. Pate moved; Mair-Williamson seconded. All in favor. Motion passed. Rinaldi abstained.

❖ ADJOURN

Adjourn at 3:49 PM.

PLEASE NOTE: The BOARD MEETING SUMMARY IS CONSIDERED DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY THE BOARD AT THE NEXT SCHEDULED BOARD MEETING.

7. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Executive Director
Report March 2026

To: Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board

From: Peter J. Burns, Executive Director

Board Meeting Details:	**March 11-12, 2026**

Executive Director's Introduction

Dear Board Members, Licensees, and Members of the Public,

Thank you for your continued engagement with the Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board. As we move further into the 2025–2027 biennium, I want to take a moment to reflect on the work we are doing together to support veterinary professionals, protect Oregon's animals, and serve communities across the state.

OVMEB remains committed to transparency, accountability, and open communication. We continue to meet statewide expectations by posting our full Board meeting calendar, agendas, minutes, disciplinary actions, and all rulemaking updates on our website. Our goal is to ensure that licensees, stakeholders, and the public have clear access to the information they need and a meaningful opportunity to participate in our regulatory processes.

This month, we reintroduced our quarterly newsletter to provide practical compliance guidance, highlight national regulatory trends, and share updates from our licensing, investigations, and inspection programs. These communications are part of our broader effort to support veterinary teams—particularly those in rural Oregon, where access to veterinary care is essential for livestock health, public safety, and the strength of local economies.

We also continue to collaborate closely with our national and regional partners, including the American Association of Veterinary State Boards, as well as Oregon Veterinary Medical Association and Portland Veterinary Medical Association. These partnerships help us stay aligned with national standards, share best practices, and ensure that Oregon's regulatory framework remains modern, consistent, and responsive to the needs of the profession.

As you review the budget and program updates that follow, I hope you will see the same themes reflected throughout: fiscal responsibility, steady progress in licensing and investigations, strong inspection activity, and a commitment to clear communication and public service. I am grateful for the dedication of our Board members, staff, licensees, and partners who make this work possible.

Thank you for your continued support and for the important role you play in protecting animal health and public safety in Oregon.

Warm regards,
Peter J. Burns
Executive Director
Oregon Veterinary Medical Examining Board

2025-2027 Budget

25-27 BIENNIUM BUDGET VS. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE
Actuals to Budget through most current closed period (January 2026)

	Actuals (to date)	Budget (to date)	$ Variance	% of Budget (to date)
Revenue	$934,459	$2,879,879	-$1,945,420	32.5%
Expenditure	$582,335	$1,948,744	-$1,366,409	29.9%

Revenue and Expenditure Variance Summary

Overall Financial Position

OVMEB remains in a strong fiscal position early in the 2025–2027 biennium. Revenue and expenditures are tracking below budget due to timing, vacancies, and phased spending. Cash reserves remain healthy, and DAS Shared Financial Services (SFS) continues to describe the agency's financial posture as stable.

Revenue collections to date total **$934,459**, representing approximately **32.5% of projected revenue**. These numbers reflect the recent license renewal period which commenced in earnest at the beginning of 2026.

Expenditures to date total **$934,459**, or approximately **29.9% of the budgeted expenditures**, reflecting a favorable variance of **$1.3 million below budget**. This favorable expenditure variance is primarily due to phased spending, vacancies, and timing of contractual and operational costs, and demonstrates continued fiscal restraint and effective budget management early in the biennium.

We have an ending cash balance of $445,832, which equates to or 5 months of available cash. Our biennial Legislatively Adopted Budget for 25-27 is available on our website.

Fiscal Oversight
• The Executive Director meets monthly—and as needed—with DAS Shared Financial Services (SFS) to monitor revenue, expenditures, and cash flow.
• DAS-SFS reports that OVMEB's financial position is healthy as we continue into the new fiscal year.
• The full legislatively adopted 2025–2027 budget is available on the OVMEB website.

Board Access to Financial Materials

Board Members have access to detailed fiscal documents on their meeting iPads, including:

- Monthly expenditure reports
- Revenue tracking summaries
- Cash flow statements
- Budget-to-actuals detail

Please contact the Executive Director with any questions or requests for additional information.

2026 Board Meeting Calendar
January: 21-22 | March 11-12 | May 7-8 | July 16-17 | Sept 1-2 | Nov 16-17

Agency Administration

Board Officer Update:

We are still looking for nominations for a current Board Member to serve as Vice Chair. This is a supportive role primarily to learn the role of the Board Chair and potentially lead meetings, in the absence of the Board Chair. If any Board Member would like to know more, please feel free to contact the agency director.

Recruitment Update:

We have received a significant increase in interest from people to serve on the Board. There are several people who have applied for our open DVM and Public Member seats. Candidates will be reviewed and selected in coordination with the Board Appointments Office. Selected candidates will be eligible for Legislative Appointment at in June.

Agency Program Areas

1. **Licensing Administration:** Issuance of Licenses | Conducting Background Checks | Reviewing Continuing Education Requirements

2. **Compliance:** Handling Complaints and Investigations | Taking Board Action | Providing Educational Resources

3. **Facility Inspections:** On-Site Inspections | Self-Inspections |Investigation Support

Licensing Administration

Licensing activity remains steady, including intern-to-veterinarian transitions and out-of-state applicants. Completed applications are processed in an average of **three business days**, with approximately **10–15 applications processed per week**. Staff continue to support the 2026 renewal cycle, including CVT continuing education verification.

OVMEB Licenses by the Numbers (January 2026)	
Total Individual Licenses	**4,331**
DVM Licenses	**2,669**
Intern licenses	**74**
CVT Licenses	**1,523**
CET Licenses	**65**
New Individual Licenses	
Licenses added in October - December	**62**
DVM Licenses	**27**
DVM Interns	**4**
CVT Licenses	**28**
CET Licenses	**5**
Total facilities statewide (Oct. 2025)	**717**

Investigations

Open Cases Report	August	November	January
OVMEB Open Cases	**81**	**174**	**141**
Presenting to the Board at Board Meeting	**35**	**42**	**50**
Post Board Meeting (Notice/Hearing Process)	**28**	**26**	**37**

Complaint volume increased significantly beginning in August and continues. Every complaint received by OVMEB is statutorily required to be investigated and presented to the Board.

Investigators continue to reduce a long-standing backlog that exceeded 200 cases in 2024, while managing increased intake. The Board, Director, staff, and Assistant Attorneys General continue to review and close cases efficiently.

Inspections

There are currently 717 registered Oregon Facilities. A Board Inspection Report detailing inspections since the last Board meeting has been provided for Board review in Executive Session.

OVMEB Inspector has been active in veterinary facilities since completion of his onboarding and commending inspections since October. From July 2025 to mid-January, we had inspected 97 facilities as part of our regular inspection mandate. OVMEB Inspector has added approximately 20 more facility inspections in the last month, continuing to make steady progress on inspections, which will be detailed in the Board Inspection Report.

Pharmacy Self-inspections:

Each year, OVMEB collects information on veterinary facilities that have pharmacy operations. 2026 pharmacy self-inspections requests were sent out in early January. We have been working to update all facility contact information to help ensure smooth completion of this project. Updates will be reported as this project progresses. We are coordinating with Oregon Board of Pharmacy Compliance Team to review this process once completed for 2026 and explore efficiencies.

Looking Ahead

OVMEB remains focused on:

- Maintaining fiscal responsibility and transparency
- Delivering timely licensing and renewals
- Managing increased complaint volume
- Conducting effective inspections statewide
- Clear communication with licensees, stakeholders, and the public

The Executive Director welcomes feedback on additional information or data that would be helpful to the Board, licensees, or interested parties.

---

8. Discussion and Action Items

Enrolled
Senate Bill 1539

Printed pursuant to Senate Interim Rule 213.28 by order of the President of the Senate in conformance with presession filing rules, indicating neither advocacy nor opposition on the part of the President (at the request of Senate Interim Committee on Natural Resources and Wildfire)

CHAPTER .....

AN ACT

Relating to providing animal health care; creating new provisions; and amending ORS 686.040.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. ORS 686.040 is amended to read:

686.040. (1) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to **the following:**

(a) Commissioned veterinary officers of the United States Army, or those in the employ of other United States Government agencies while engaged in their official capacity, unless they enter into a private practice.

(b) An individual who has received training to verify whether cattle are pregnant and is performing pregnancy verification services on cattle within the scope of the individual's training.

(2) Nothing in ORS 167.322 or 686.020 (1)(a) shall be so construed as to prevent any person or the agent or employee of the person from practicing veterinary medicine and surgery or dentistry in a humane manner on any animal belonging to the person, agent or employee or for gratuitous services or from dehorning and vaccinating cattle for the person, agent or employee.

(3) Nothing in ORS 686.020 (1)(a) shall be so construed as to prevent the selling of veterinary remedies and instruments by a licensed pharmacist at the regular place of business of the licensed pharmacist.

(4) A practitioner of allied health methods may practice that method on animals without violating ORS 686.020 (1)(a), as long as the practice is in conformance with laws and rules governing the practitioner's practice and the practice is upon referral from a licensed veterinarian for treatment or therapy specified by the veterinarian.

(5) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to the lay testing of poultry by the whole blood agglutination test.

(6) A certified euthanasia technician holding an active, current certificate may inject sodium pentobarbital, sedative and analgesic medications and any other euthanasia substance approved by the Oregon State Veterinary Medical Examining Board without violating ORS 686.020 (1)(a).

(7) The board by rule may specify circumstances under which unlicensed persons may give vaccinations, administer an anesthetic or otherwise assist in the practice of veterinary medicine.

(8) Any individual licensed as a veterinarian in another state may be used in consultation in this state with a person licensed to practice veterinary medicine in this state provided the consultation does not exceed 30 days in any 365 consecutive days.

(9) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to authorized representatives of the State Department of Agriculture in the discharge of any duty authorized by the department.

(10) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to an unlicensed representative of a livestock association, cow-testing association, or poultry association who, for the benefit of the association, takes blood samples for laboratory tests for the diagnosis of livestock or poultry diseases, but only if this person has received authorization from the State Department of Agriculture following a written request to the department.

(11) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to persons permitted by the State Department of Fish and Wildlife to rehabilitate orphaned, sick or injured wildlife, as defined in ORS 496.004, for the purpose of restoring the animals to the wild.

(12) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to students, agents or employees of public or private educational or medical research institutions involved in educational or research activities under the auspices of those institutions.

(13) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to:

(a) Veterinarians employed by Oregon State University;

(b) Instructors of veterinary courses; or

(c) Students of veterinary science who participate in the diagnosis and treatment of animals if the students:

(A) Are participating in the diagnosis and treatment of animals while engaged in an educational program approved by the board or a college of veterinary medicine accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association; and

(B) Are under the direct supervision of an Oregon licensed veterinarian or a veterinarian approved by the board or Oregon State University to supervise students in the educational program.

(14) The Oregon State Veterinary Medical Examining Board may by rule specify circumstances under which unlicensed persons may engage in activities described in subsection (1)(b) of this section.

SECTION 2. ORS 686.040, as amended by section 1 of this 2026 Act, is amended to read:

686.040. (1) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to [*the following:*]

[*(a)*] commissioned veterinary officers of the United States Army, or those in the employ of other United States Government agencies while engaged in their official capacity, unless they enter into a private practice.

[*(b) An individual who has received training to verify whether cattle are pregnant and is performing pregnancy verification services on cattle within the scope of the individual's training.*]

(2) Nothing in ORS 167.322 or 686.020 (1)(a) shall be so construed as to prevent any person or the agent or employee of the person from practicing veterinary medicine and surgery or dentistry in a humane manner on any animal belonging to the person, agent or employee or for gratuitous services or from dehorning and vaccinating cattle for the person, agent or employee.

(3) Nothing in ORS 686.020 (1)(a) shall be so construed as to prevent the selling of veterinary remedies and instruments by a licensed pharmacist at the regular place of business of the licensed pharmacist.

(4) A practitioner of allied health methods may practice that method on animals without violating ORS 686.020 (1)(a), as long as the practice is in conformance with laws and rules governing the practitioner's practice and the practice is upon referral from a licensed veterinarian for treatment or therapy specified by the veterinarian.

(5) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to the lay testing of poultry by the whole blood agglutination test.

(6) A certified euthanasia technician holding an active, current certificate may inject sodium pentobarbital, sedative and analgesic medications and any other euthanasia substance approved by the Oregon State Veterinary Medical Examining Board without violating ORS 686.020 (1)(a).

(7) The board by rule may specify circumstances under which unlicensed persons may give vaccinations, administer an anesthetic or otherwise assist in the practice of veterinary medicine.

(8) Any individual licensed as a veterinarian in another state may be used in consultation in this state with a person licensed to practice veterinary medicine in this state provided the consultation does not exceed 30 days in any 365 consecutive days.

(9) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to authorized representatives of the State Department of Agriculture in the discharge of any duty authorized by the department.

(10) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to an unlicensed representative of a livestock association, cow-testing association, or poultry association who, for the benefit of the association, takes blood samples for laboratory tests for the diagnosis of livestock or poultry diseases, but only if this person has received authorization from the State Department of Agriculture following a written request to the department.

(11) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to persons permitted by the State Department of Fish and Wildlife to rehabilitate orphaned, sick or injured wildlife, as defined in ORS 496.004, for the purpose of restoring the animals to the wild.

(12) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to students, agents or employees of public or private educational or medical research institutions involved in educational or research activities under the auspices of those institutions.

(13) ORS 686.020 (1)(a) does not apply to:

(a) Veterinarians employed by Oregon State University;

(b) Instructors of veterinary courses; or

(c) Students of veterinary science who participate in the diagnosis and treatment of animals if the students:

(A) Are participating in the diagnosis and treatment of animals while engaged in an educational program approved by the board or a college of veterinary medicine accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association; and

(B) Are under the direct supervision of an Oregon licensed veterinarian or a veterinarian approved by the board or Oregon State University to supervise students in the educational program.

[*(14) The Oregon State Veterinary Medical Examining Board may by rule specify circumstances under which unlicensed persons may engage in activities described in subsection (1)(b) of this section.*]

SECTION 3. The amendments to ORS 686.040 by section 2 of this 2026 Act become operative on January 1, 2031.

Passed by Senate February 19, 2026

.....
Obadiah Rutledge, Secretary of Senate

.....
Rob Wagner, President of Senate

Passed by House February 27, 2026

.....
Julie Fahey, Speaker of House

Received by Governor:

.....M.,....., 2026

Approved:

.....M.,....., 2026

.....
Tina Kotek, Governor

Filed in Office of Secretary of State:

.....M.,....., 2026

.....
Tobias Read, Secretary of State

Proposed Administrative Rulemaking

Proposed rulemaking and public comment will be posted here when active.
Visitors may also access administrative rulemaking information for the OVMEB and all Oregon State agencies as well as related information on the Oregon Transparency Website.

The Board has convened a workgroup to review and make recommendations for appropriate amendments to rules regulating Certified Veterinary Technicians. Any questions or to provide input, please reach out to OVMEB Director Pete Burns at 971-673-0223 | peter.j.burns@ovemb.oregon.gov .

Anticipated Administrative Rulemaking for 2026

The Board updates this projected schedule of anticipated rulemaking activity at each board meeting.

The schedule is subject to change.

Updated 02/20/2026

March- April

- Rule amendments to modify aspects of VCPR, related to establishing VCPR and physical examinations.
- Rule amendment to clarify language regarding requirements for licensee to provide written prescriptions.

Recent Administrative Rulemaking

Effective 02/17/2026 - OAR 875-010-0010 – Adopting Rule establishing Criminal Conviction Determination Process, in accordance with SB1552.
Senate Bill 1552 requires specified boards to make a determination as to whether a criminal conviction will prevent the petitioner from receiving a license.
Filing can be reviewed here: 875-010-0100 - Determination Rule Feb 2026.pdf
Public comment: No comments received.

Effective 12/31/2026 - OAR 875-010-0092(2)(c) – Continuing Education Credit for Board Meeting Attendance.
Provides opportunity for CE for licensees to attend OVMEB Board Meetings; increases Board Meeting participation and licensee engagement.
Filing can be reviewed here: 875-010-0092(2)(c) - CE Rule Dec 2025.PDF
Public comment: No comments received.

Effective 12/31/2026 - OAR 875-005-0005 - Amend OAR 875-005-0005 to include “allied health practitioner".
Adding definition for ""Practitioner of allied health methods".
Filing can be reviewed here: 875-005-0005 – Allied Health Def.PDF
Public comment: No comments received.

OVMEB Rulemaking Status Sheet – February 2026

	Rule Number Referenced	**New or Amend**	**Description of New Rule or Change**	**Status**	**Notes/To Do**
	ADOPT: 875-010-0100	New	PREDETERMINATION Senate Bill 1552 requires specified boards to make a determination as to whether a criminal conviction will prevent the petitioner from receiving a license.	Voted Pass and **Permanent**	
	875-005-0005 Definitions	New	Defines "Allied Health Practitioner"	Voted Pass and **Permanent**	
	875-010-0090(2)(c)	New	Amends 875-010-0090(2)(c) to include 1 hour of CE for licensees to attend Public Board Meetings	Voted Pass and **Permanent**	
	875-005-0005 Definitions	Amend	Establishing VCPR	In process. Notice Drafted.	Discussed in January. Board needs to decide: The alternative to a physical examination in the definition of a VCPR to only apply to herds and flocks, or more generally apply to any situation where there are medically appropriate and timely visits to where the animal is kept? To do: Research other jurisdictions and precedent (in process). Bring back to Board in March

	OAR 875-015-0020 – Minimum Requirements for Veterinary Medical Facilities and Veterinary Licensees	Amend	Clarifying language regarding requirement for licensee to provide written prescription to client upon request. No timeline for providing a written prescription is included in the rule; Board Staff have received inquiries regarding how quickly after request a licensee must provide written prescription.	In Process	Public Rulemaking Hearing conducted February 21, 2025; no comments received. Board motion needed to make rule change permanent.
	SB- 1539 Legislation regarding rulemaking related to pregnancy Checking.	New	Would allow an individual to verify whether cattle are pregnant without holding a valid license issued by the Oregon State Veterinary Medical Examining Board under certain circumstances.	In February Legislative Session.	OVMEB would be required to draft rules on this. Potential need for Rules Advisory Committee or Workgroup.