

BOARD OF PHARMACY
Professional and Vocational Licensing Division
Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs
State of Hawaii

MINUTES OF MEETING

The agenda for this meeting was filed with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, as required by § 92-7(b), Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”).

Date: November 20, 2025

Time: 9:00 a.m.

In-Person Location: King Kalakaua Conference Room
HRH King Kalakaua Building
335 Merchant Street, First Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Virtual Participation: Virtual Videoconference Meeting – Zoom Webinar

Recording Link: <https://youtu.be/PMTuKBgmzza>

Present: Alanna Isobe, Chairperson (“Chair”)
Mark Brown, Vice Chair
Sheri Tokumaru, Pharmacist
Brandon Rabang, Public Member
Allen Shih, Pharmacist
Shari Wong, Esq. Deputy Attorney General (“DAG”)
Christopher Fernandez, Executive Officer (“EO”)
Cortnie Tanaka, Secretary
Breyanah Panzardi, Secretary

Excused: Catalina Cross, Public Member

Guests: Lily Van, Hawaii Pharmacists Association
Rob Geddey, CVS Health
Michael R. Hartstock, Narcotics Enforcement Division, DLE
Christina Lee, Narcotics Enforcement Division, DLE
Stacy Pi, Kaiser Permanente
Tabitha Autele, Kaiser Permanente
Nick Ferreira, Longs Drugs
Lorri Walmsley, Walgreens
Mona Valentine
M. Matsukawa
Kimberly Svetin
Amy Este
Ryan Shiroma
Shelly Kikuchi
Corrie Sanders, HPhA
Cyrus
Freitajl
Mark
Phone Number

-
- Call to Order: **9:15 a.m.** After a providing instruction on how to participate in the meeting and after a roll call confirming that Vice Chair Brown, Dr. Tokumaru, Ms. Cross, and Dr. Shih were present and that the Board had met quorum, Chair Isobe brought the meeting to order. She also noted that Mr. Rabang would be in attendance shortly.
- Chair's Report: Chair Isobe noted that she would be taking the meeting out of order placing the applications at the end of the meeting.
- EO Report: EO Fernandez informed the Board that he was still working on the Miscellaneous Permit change request form that would allow for more standardized submissions. He noted his hope is to provide another update at the December meeting.
- Report from The Hawaii Pharmacists Association Chair Isobe invited Ms. Van from the Hawaii Pharmacists Association (HPhA) to provide their report.
- Ms. Van, representing the Hawai'i Pharmacists Association (HPhA), shared several updates on the organization's recent initiatives:
- HPA has been collaborating with the University of Hawai'i and other state entities to allocate rural health transportation funds to support pharmacy services. This initiative is ongoing.
 - The association is also working on a Substance Use Disorder (SUD) project in partnership with agencies in the state, funded by the Department of Health. The project is currently in its pilot phase and aims to improve access to care in rural communities. The pilot is launching on the neighbor islands to ensure that patients in those areas have access to necessary medications.
 - HPA's Executive Director, Corey, has begun meeting with legislators. The organization plans to reintroduce the same initiatives from the previous legislative session, including legislation related to the Center for Pharmacy, and measures related to PBM, or Pharmacy Benefit Managers reform.
 - Looking ahead, HPA will be launching its "Pharmacy on Tour" initiative. Over the next one to two months, the association will visit most independent pharmacies across the state. This initiative is funded by grant and is intended to gather feedback from neighbor island pharmacies to identify challenges and ensure they are being appropriately addressed.
 - HPA will also be releasing a newsletter next month. Ms. Van offered to assist the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs (DCCA) in disseminating any relevant information through this publication.

- Lastly, she reminded attendees that HPA's annual meeting is scheduled for April at the Oahu Country Club.

Meeting
Minutes
Review &

Chair Isobe asked if members had any corrections to the meeting minutes of August 21, 2025.

Vice Chair Brown Noted on Page 5, where it states:

“Chair Isobe recognized Ms. Brandy Abrilia from Kapiolani Community College, an educator of Pharmacy Technicians asking if their students entering externships will need registration.

EO Fernandez asked Ms. Abrilia to contact the Board to discuss further.”

Should read,

“Chair Isobe recognized Ms. Brandy Rebilla from Kapiolani Community College, an educator of Pharmacy Technicians asking if their students entering externships will need registration.

EO Fernandez asked Ms. Rebilla to contact the Board to discuss further.

Chair Isobe asked if there were any additional corrections beyond the one previously discussed. She then asked for a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Mr. Rabang arrived at 9:29 a.m.

On a motion by Vice Chair Brown, seconded by Mr. Shih, the meeting minutes were unanimously approved by members present.

EO Fernandez asked Chair Isobe if a roll call vote could be conducted noting that there were attendees participating via Zoom.

DAG Wong clarified that a roll call vote was only necessary if there were any nays, abstentions, or recusals. If the vote was unanimous, a single motion was sufficient.

TAKEN OUT OF ORDER

Pharmacy
Technician
Registration:

Chair Isobe opened the discussion by announcing that pharmacy technician registration would be addressed before applications. She noted that the public had been updated and confirmed the registration would be effective January 1st. She asked whether sample forms were available for review or if the actual forms were ready.

EO Fernandez confirmed the forms were included in the board packet and offered to explain them.

Chair Isobe described the packet contents, noting that there were separate forms for technicians who administered vaccines and those who did not.

EO Fernandez explained that Act 93 had been signed in May, prompting the development of the registration process. Although the initial launch had been planned for October, it was postponed due to delays in completing the digital infrastructure. The registration forms required basic demographic information and disclosures of disciplinary or criminal history, in accordance with HRS 436B.

He clarified that the vaccine authorization form had been included to allow technicians to receive updated certificates if they became authorized to administer vaccines. A separate Pharmacy Intern form was in development and scheduled for release in January. EO Fernandez outlined the different requirements for pharmacists, interns, and technicians regarding vaccine administration and continuing education.

The vaccine registration form required a certificate from a qualifying course and included an attestation section for other credentials. The board planned to rely on attestations rather than collecting all documentation, adding forms and instructions were kept concise.

Chair Isobe asked whether the forms could be combined and whether applicants needed to submit separate payments. EO Fernandez explained that the forms were kept separate to accommodate different timelines for vaccine authorization and pharmacy technician registration. Applicants could submit one combined payment of \$140 (\$130 for registration and \$10 for vaccine processing).

Chair Isobe clarified that the registration fee was \$130 for even years and \$80 for odd years, with renewals occurring every two years. Since January 1st would be an even year, applicants would pay \$130 plus \$10 if submitting the vaccine form.

EO Fernandez stated that the vaccine registration form was expected to be available by December 1st, though it might be delayed until January 1st due to database integration. Submissions would be accepted starting December 1st, and updates would be posted on the website. He emphasized that individual checks should be submitted for bulk applications to simplify receipt processing. Immediate receipts would not be available for bulk submissions. EO Fernandez explained that fee verification for each applicant would require a line-by-line review of checks, making the process time-consuming. To expedite it, he recommended individual submission, one check for one application. He clarified that the online submission function was not yet operational, so applications submitted on or before December 1 would need to be in hard copy. Efforts were underway to integrate the process into MyPVL, but until then, hard copy forms would be accepted via mail, at the front counter, or during the December 18 meeting.

Chair Isobe asked if applications submitted before January 1 would be processed in time.

EO Fernandez confirmed this was the goal and noted that certificates would be sent either by mail or email.

Vice Chair Brown asked about payment methods.

EO Fernandez recommended checks as the fastest option, though credit cards might be accepted in person.

Chair Isobe confirmed that online payment would not be available by December 1.

EO Fernandez said the Board's website would have downloadable documents for hard copy applications.

Mr. Rabang noted a question from an attendee.

Lily Van of HPhA sought clarification on the individual application process asking if individual checks for individual applications was being recommended.

EO Fernandez confirmed this was correct.

Mr. Rabang raised concerns about the high cost of licensing, suggesting it might deter pharmacy technicians and aides. He noted that the fees seemed higher than expected and could be burdensome for some individuals.

EO Fernandez responded that the total cost was \$65 annually, including a \$20 registration fee, a \$10 form fee, and a \$50 compliance resolution fund fee. He explained that the compliance fee supports the Regulated Industries Complaints Office's (RICO) regulatory and investigative functions.

Vice Chair Brown asked if the compliance fee varied by role.

EO Fernandez confirmed it was a flat \$50 for everyone.

Mr. Rabang contemplated whether the increased funding would lead to more RICO enforcement staff.

EO Fernandez said he could not confirm but could reach out to RICO for clarification, noting that the funding should support expanded capacity.

Chair Isobe asked about the process for re-evaluating fees, noting that pharmacists pay \$190, technicians pay \$130–\$140, and pharmacy application fees range from \$295 to \$495. She expressed concern that pharmacy fees had remained unchanged for the past 15 to 18 years, despite changes in technician fees. She stated that, while she was not advocating for higher fees in general, she believed the pharmacy application fee should be increased to \$2,000. She added that she did not mind if technician fees were reduced to \$10, noting the disparity between corporate earnings and technician wages.

DAG Wong acknowledged the concern as legitimate and explained the regulatory framework. She clarified that the Administrative Rules governed the fees elaborating that the fees for pharmacies and other entities were governed by administrative rules, which needed to be amended to change. She emphasized that boards did not directly regulate the fees and the PVL would

need to make the rule change, though the process was complex and had not been updated in 5 to 10 years. She pointed out that the addition of more boards and programs increased the number of regulated professions and locations, which in turn increased RICO's caseload. DAG Wong further explained that staffing and investigator allocation didn't directly correlate with fee changes. RICO operated as an umbrella agency, and no staff were specifically assigned to Boards or Programs in the PVL. However, staff attorneys and investigators were generally assigned to the same areas to build familiarity and specialization. DAG Wong clarified that no investigator was specifically assigned to pharmacy. Nonetheless, she acknowledged the concerns raised and assured that they would be documented in the meeting minutes.

Chair Isobe asked if changing the fees would require an administrative process and suggested that it might be in everyone's best interest to re-evaluate all fees collectively. She expressed sympathy for the pharmacy technicians pointing out that other groups, such as pharmacists and miscellaneous permit holders, paid comparatively lower fees. She noted the disproportionate nature of the fees and shared that her technicians were concerned.

Chair Isobe gave an example of a technician needing to pay \$140 around Christmas just to continue administering vaccines for the company. She believed other organizations were likely facing similar financial burdens.

DAG Wong explained that regulatory costs were determined by the industry's needs. If regulation was desired, associated costs had to be considered. She emphasized that the fees were based on the costs of regulation.

Vice Chair Brown clarified that the pharmacy technician credential was a registration, not a license, which should require less administrative oversight.

EO Fernandez responded that the process was still similar. He explained that the registration fee of \$20 reflected the limited scope of credential verification and continuing education tracking.

Chair Isobe recognized a representative from HPhA

Nick Ferreira of HPhA asked where Hawaii now compares to other states in terms of cost for pharmacy technicians.

EO Fernandez noted a wide range of rates, although admitting he had conducted the research some time ago and apologized for not having the data readily available.

Ms. Van, HPhA appreciated the effort involved and speculated that some of the research might have been lost in email. She recalled that research had been conducted gathering registration data from all 50 states and submitted to the board. She also noted that Hawaii's fees would place it among the top three most expensive states.

DAG Wong noted that it was not uncommon for Hawaii to be more expensive due to its unique circumstances.

Ms. Van, HPhA continued her explanation. She voiced concern about public perception, noting that a \$25 registration fee in another state compared to \$130 in Hawaii would likely lead to pushback. She struggled to find a justification beyond the high cost of living in Hawaii. She clarified that she was referring to community pushback.

Chair Isobe contemplated that the high fees might discourage individuals from becoming pharmacy technicians.

Mr. Rabang stated that they (the industry) were going to create a whole new position.

Chair Isobe responded that they already had something similar, called “quick clerks” or something like that. She explained that the industry members are reevaluation whether the role of a technician was truly necessary. She questioned whether someone who was not vaccinating, filling prescriptions, or performing any of those roles needed to be registered. She mentioned receiving calls from people in other places asking if certain tasks required registration. She advised them to look up the definition of a technician and the associated duties. If the individual was performing pharmacy technician roles, then registration was required. Otherwise, she questioned whether the person was truly a technician and suggested the role might fall under a different category. Chair Isobe anticipated seeing more roles emerge though she was not sure what to call them.

DAG Wong suggested “auxiliary.”

Chair Isobe agreed, noting that some roles were not even listed under pharmacy or auxiliary categories. She questioned whether those roles needed any title at all and mentioned that hospitals were particularly focused on this issue.

EO Fernandez observed that auxiliary staff had a broader list of duties, and it seemed that pharmacy technician responsibilities were simply added on as more technical tasks.

Chair Isobe advised members to review the auxiliary role and compare it to the definition and duties of a technician. She believed all inpatient pharmacy staff should be registered, especially in Hawaii, where inpatient sites typically registered their staff. She concluded that there was not much choice in the matter at the time. Perhaps within the next two years, before the next update, there would be an opportunity to reevaluate the framework.

Rob Geddeys of CVS Health asked a few more questions regarding CDS assistance. He wanted to clarify what EO Fernandez had said about the fee structure. If someone filed both the technician registration and immunization application together, would it be a single fee?

EO Fernandez confirmed it would be \$40, with \$10 added for the immunization registration.

Mr. Geddeys, CVS Health asked if someone filed the technician registration

now and got certified to immunize six months later, would the immunization fee then be just \$10?

EO Fernandez confirmed that was correct.

Chair Isobe explained that the applications were separated in case individuals submitted them at different times.

Mr. Geddeys, CVS Health raised another question about the age requirement mentioned in the instructions, which stated applicants must be 18 years old. He noted that in Hawaii, individuals could begin working at a younger age and asked whether technicians under 18 could be registered.

EO Fernandez responded that the requirement was based on HRS 436B, which stated applicants must be at least 18 years old.

Chair Isobe asked if the question was about high school programs, noting that students in those programs were typically 16 or 17 years old. She concluded that such students likely would not be registered for immunization, referring to those students as ancillary, PTCB, or possibly grandfathered in.

Mr. Geddeys, CVS Health expressed concern that younger students might not qualify if they could not be trained in all aspects required to pass the certification exam. He suggested this was something that needed further consideration noting that this situation probably hadn't been anticipated when the bill was written.

Ms. Van, HPhA asked whether the cost of late registration would be available on the website, noting she hadn't received that information.

EO Fernandez responded that there wouldn't be a late fee. He explained that individuals could register at any time. For example, if someone's registration ended on December 31, 2027, and they didn't renew until February 1, they would need to stay off the floor until the registration was complete. Once the registration was completed, the individual could resume work in the new year.

Mr. Geddeys mentioned that they were still reviewing duties to determine who needed to register. He stated that CVS Health planned to register all technicians at Longs Drugs, approximately 900 individuals. He wanted to confirm that if applications were submitted and fees paid, but registration had not been received by January 1, those individuals would need to be removed from duty.

EO Fernandez advised contacting the Board to check the status of the registration. He noted this was tied to another issue. He explained that pharmacists-in-charge needed to verify that individuals were registered. He had been advocating since August for a system that allowed PICs to check registration status online. Unfortunately, that system wouldn't be ready in time, but said he was preparing to receive calls and emails to confirm registration status manually.

Vice Chair Brown asked if EO Fernandez would be the contact person for that.

EO Fernandez confirmed he would take on that responsibility to cover the gap. He added that registration numbers should be available after January 1, allowing PICs to verify registration status in the future.

Chair Isobe asked about the application questions. If someone answered “no” to any of them, would the application be rejected? Or if someone answered “yes,” such as admitting to a conviction, what would happen?

EO Fernandez clarified that the application wouldn’t be automatically rejected. Instead, it would be referred to the Board for review. He explained that all applicants were required to submit their criminal history and disclose any disciplinary actions from other states. He noted that this was standard for all registration and licensure in the state, with no exceptions.

EO Fernandez noted that, depending on how submissions were handled, there might be an alternative. He referred to a memo, posted to the Board’s website the day of the meeting, that included instructions on how to submit questions to the board for the December 18th meeting. The goal was to determine whether the board could delegate authority to the Executive Officer or Clerk to approve certain convictions. For example, if a conviction was more than 10 years old and the applicant had demonstrated rehabilitation, the board might decide that such cases did not require review for pharmacy technician applicants. If the board deemed it unnecessary, and the matter qualified for delegation, there would be no need to be addressed at a board meeting.

Chair Isobe asked whether such delegations would need to be listed as agenda items.

EO Fernandez confirmed that they would. He explained that if someone had a specific type of criminal conviction that was no longer relevant and wanted to provide details, they could submit that information to the board. This would help compile ideas for delegations, which would be limited to specific cases and not generalized. He emphasized the need to identify what types of disciplinary actions from other states the board would be willing to delegate.

Chair Isobe asked whether such discussions would occur publicly or in executive session.

EO Fernandez suggested that the board could discuss the matter and seek consultation from the Attorney General.

DAG Wong confirmed that any delegation would need to be listed as an agenda item for the next meeting. She additionally asked whether the board wanted to use past pharmacy application decisions as a reference or expected different types of “yes” answers for pharmacy technician applications.

Chair Isobe noted that the situations were quite similar but questioned whether the board should publicly disclose what types of convictions were considered acceptable.

DAG Wong clarified that the board would vote for a delegation in open session.

Chair Isobe expressed concern about publicly stating acceptable drug-related histories, fearing inconsistent standards might be perceived—for example, approving someone with a five-year-old drug history but not someone with a four-year-old history.

DAG Wong reiterated that it would be a board action and part of a public delegation.

EO Fernandez reminded the Board that previous delegations to Executive Officers were still in effect and had been voted on in open session, such as those related to DUIs.

Chair Isobe inquired about how many individuals would be affected by the age requirement, noting that Castle High School had around 20 students annually in relevant programs. She emphasized the significance of the issue. She questioned whether the age requirement was changing or remaining the same asking if the age requirement was part of the registration law.

DAG Wong confirmed that it applied to everyone.

DAG Wong noted that the issue could have been addressed in the previous year's legislation.

EO Fernandez recalled hearing about it during hearings but mentioned that no one on the board had raised the issue.

Chair Isobe believed the matter had been overlooked and that the bill did not specify an age requirement. She doubted anyone realized that Chapter 436B would govern registration of pharmacy technicians.

DAG Wong explained that HRS 436B governed all boards and professions. Unless a specific chapter included a different age requirement—such as allowing 16- or 17-year-olds due to high school internships—the pharmacy technician statute would default to the age of majority as required by 436B.

Chair Isobe asked if the audience had any questions and noted she hadn't checked the screen.

Tabitha Autule of Kaiser Permanente (KP) asked about pharmacy technicians who worked at multiple locations and how that would be handled.

EO Fernandez explained that the law required registrations to be posted conspicuously. Therefore, a copy of the certificate would need to be displayed wherever the technician was working.

Chair Isobe asked whether technicians would need to register for each location.

EO Fernandez clarified that the registration was not site-specific.

Ms. Autele, KP asked if a technician who worked at multiple pharmacies would need to post her registration at each location.

DAG Wong confirmed that the registration must be visible to the public.

Ms. Autele, KP asked if the registration needed to be posted at every location.

EO Fernandez responded that, based on the language of the law, that appeared to be the case. However, he clarified that a separate registration was not required for each site—only a copy of the same registration needed to be posted at each location. He added the pharmacy technicians needed to be able to print copies of their certificate to be placed at each worksite. The bill's language stated that the certificate had to be visible to the public, which suggested wherever the public could see the technician, they should be able to see the certificate.

EO Fernandez had requested that those developing the registration process to make the font size on the certificate as large as possible so it could be reduced in size and still remain legible. The developers had done what they could. He believed individuals had to do whatever was necessary to make sure it fit in the available space.

EO Fernandez explained that he would need to ask developers if the address of the registrant would be on the certificate. The addresses of individual pharmacy technicians.

Chair Isobe noted that when they received their regular license, they could print a wall certificate, but it didn't include an expiration date, which made it less useful.

BOARD ENTERED RECESS DUE TO FIRE ALARM DRILL at 10:01 a.m.

BOARD RETURNED FROM RECESS at 10:27 a.m.

Chair Isobe apologized for the interruption due to a fire drill and explained that the meeting had gone into recess. She said they were still waiting for participants to return but suggested continuing the discussion on technician registration.

Vice Chair Brown asked about closed pharmacies that weren't open to the public.

EO Fernandez responded that there seemed to be room for interpretation, but the inclusion of the word "conspicuous" was important.

Chair Isobe interpreted that to mean the certificate should be visible to people.

EO Fernandez confirmed that the law said "visible in public view."

Rob Geddeys, CVS Health asked whether the certificate would be received by email or regular mail.

EO Fernandez responded that either method was possible.

Chair Isobe asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Van, HPhA explained that the health system handled it for the technicians and asked whether the release could be revoked at any point. There was no expiration listed, and they asked if they could authorize their employer now but revoke it later.

EO Fernandez explained the release was tied to the application. Once the application was approved, the release would no longer apply. He also suggested that those submitting bulk applications should include a designated person at the bottom of each application.

EO Fernandez added that bulk submissions weren't excluded, but if speed was a priority, it was better to submit individual checks for each application. A single check for all applications would require the cashiers to itemize receipts for each applicant, which would take significant amount of time. He noted that this might delay the receipt process, though not necessarily the registration itself. For companies needing receipts for their records, bulk submissions wouldn't be the simplest option.

Vice Chair Brown asked whether it would be worth calling to confirm receipt if the "yes" box had been checked.

EO Fernandez explained that any applications received by the licensing clerk with a "yes" answer are flagged. Those applications are then sent to the board, and he would begin preparing them for review at a meeting.

Chair Isobe noted that the Board may see an increase in their meeting time length.

EO Fernandez hoped that delegations and other measures would help. Ideally, there wouldn't be too many problematic applications.

Ms. Walmsley Walgreens stated that she wanted to ensure she understood the process for submitting bulk applications. Originally, it had sounded like the staff did not want a single check, but now they were saying one check could be submitted. She believed that submitting one check would help organizations with multiple pharmacies ensure timely submissions. She added that not every employee who could submit had access to checks, so a bulk submission with one check would be beneficial for organizations like hers.

Chair Isobe remarked that if receipts were needed, they should be considered. She then asked how many bulk submissions Walgreens was planning to submit.

Ms. Walmsley, Walgreens responded that Walgreens had well over 100 applications to submit.

Executive Officer Fernandez explained that the fee needed to be cleared before issuing a registration. If it had not been paid, the registration would not be issued. He noted that processing might take longer if there was a check per applicant, but the cashiers were very efficient. He added that the division would need to break down bulk payments, which adds even more time. While he could not guarantee everything, he stated that individual checks per applicant

would process normally and quickly. He also mentioned that the PVL division—the licensing branch—had offered additional staffing to help during December and January. He confirmed that although more staff were being brought in to assist, the recommendation remains: one check per application.

Chair Isobe asked what would happen if people did not have checks and whether money orders were allowed.

Ms. Walmsley, Walgreens asked what other payment options were available if someone did not have personal checks.

Chair Isobe noted that if Walgreens and CVS could submit earlier, it would help. She warned that if 900 or 1,000 applications came in on December 31st, it would be problematic.

Secretary Tanaka reiterated that cash was accepted in person. If someone submitted documents in person, payment could be processed. However, phone or mobile transactions were not accepted. Everything had to be mailed in.

EO Fernandez agreed and added that he was unsure if using a card in person would work for bulk submissions. There was no system code to process 900 applications at once; it would have to be done individually.

Secretary Tanaka confirmed that checks and money orders were acceptable.

Chair Isobe acknowledged that those payment methods were allowed.

Ms. Walmsley, Walgreens asked if the preference was still one check per application to streamline the process.

EO Fernandez confirmed that it helped the division and, more importantly, helped applicants receive their registration faster.

Chris Geddeys, CVS Health asked EO Fernandez if it was possible to get a PDF version of the packet, noting that it was great to have access to the applications and that they were planning to post them on the website.

EO Fernandez said he would check internally after the meeting and send it to interested parties if it was ready. He said he wanted to confirm that there were no more changes to the form. His admin was working on the digital version, and if adjustments were needed to fit the process, they would inform him. He mentioned that his the developers had told him the packet was ready the day before, but he would confirm before sending the actual document. He asked anyone who wanted to be on the distribution list to provide their email.

Chair Isobe asked if there were any more questions or concerns.

Ms. Van, HPhA asked whether a newly hired person needed to be registered before they could work, especially if they had never worked as a pharmacy technician.

EO Fernandez said that was a good question. At one point, they had considered including the pharmacist-in-charge's name on the certificate.

However, that would require the person to be hired first, which would prevent pre-registration. So the developers decided against it. He clarified that it was not about being hired—it was about whether the person was working on the floor. Someone could be registered even if they did not yet have a position.

Vice Chair Brown added that the person just could not perform technician duties.

Chair Isobe agreed, stating that the person could not function as a technician until they were registered.

Ms. Walmsley, Walgreens asked if there was an idea of what the license numbers would look like. She said it would be helpful for their licensing software to understand the sequence so they could build.

EO Fernandez explained that permit types and license types usually received a three-letter designation. He added that this was followed by a serial number of about four digits. However, since this was designed as a registration, it would be similar to other registrations and start with a letter designation of “R” followed by a sequence of numbers.

Ms. Walmsley, Walgreens asked if it would look just like a pharmacist license, specifically asking if it would have the same number of digits.

EO Fernandez clarified that it would actually be more than four digits—around eight or nine total. He added that he wasn’t sure if all digits would be used, giving an example of starting at 1 as 00000001. He reiterated that the range was about eight to nine digits.

Ms. Walmsley, Walgreens asked when that would be finalized.

EO Fernandez said he could get that information to her by the end of the day.

Ms. Walmsley, Walgreens thanked him and asked if someone in the room could add her name to the list or if there was an alternate method.

Chair Isobe thanked her.

EO Fernandez explained that, hypothetically, if there were no “yes” answers—no criminal convictions or disciplinary actions in other states—then it was just a matter of checking the registration form. He added that as long as all the information was entered correctly, the process should be quick. He said he couldn’t give an exact time but estimated it would be well within an hour.

Chair Isobe asked whether all the information was being typed in manually or if there was software that scanned it.

EO Fernandez confirmed that the information had to be entered manually.

Secretary Tanaka added that any hard copy was manually inputted. Staff would be processing and testing it, which was why they were doing the double-

checking.

Chair Isobe remarked that it wasn't that quick.

EO Fernandez agreed, saying it wasn't quick for the average person, but their licensing clerks had been doing it for a long time and additional staff would be available to help.

Chair Isobe advised submitting it as soon as possible.

EO Fernandez agreed that was the best advice.

Ms. Van asked if public display would also be followed up on and gave an example: if a hospital technician worked in an IV room and didn't interact with the public, would the license just be posted in the pharmacy even if the public didn't have access?

EO Fernandez suggested addressing the question at the December 18th meeting.

Chair Isobe said the language was more intended for retail settings where credentials were displayed.

EO Fernandez said the idea was just to ensure visibility.

Chair Isobe asked if there were any more questions or concerns. She added that the only other thing she wanted to mention—not related to the current topic—was that the Narcotics Enforcement Division (NED) team was present. Chair Isobe said they would add the NED team to the agenda next time so the public could ask questions and have a direct contact. Chair Isobe then addressed the audience, suggesting that if individuals had email addresses they wished to share, the Board could provide follow-up information.

Chair Isobe asked if there was anything else from members or attendees. Hearing none, she concluded the discussion.

Next Meeting:

After some discussion the Board confirmed it would have quorum for a hybrid meeting on:

December 18, 2025
9:00 a.m. HST
Queen Liliuokalani Conference Room

TAKEN OUT OF ORDER

Applications:

On a motion by Mr. Rabang, seconded by Vice Chair Brown, the Board unanimously voted to enter into Executive Session at **10:47 a.m.** pursuant to HRS sections 92-5(a)(1) and 92-5(a)(4) to consider and evaluate personal information relating to individuals applying for professional or vocational licenses cited in section 26-9 or both and to consult with the board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the board's powers, duties, privileges,

immunities, and liabilities.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At **11:39 a.m.**, it was moved by Vice Chair Brown, seconded by Mr. Shih, and unanimously carried by the Board to return to open session.

A. Board Review of Applications for:

Pharmacist

1. William Colburn

On a motion by Vice Chair Brown, seconded by Mr. Rabang, and unanimously carried by members present, the Board voted to defer to request additional information.

2. Dawn Hoang

On a motion by Vice Chair Brown, seconded by Mr. Rabang, and unanimously carried by members present, the Board voted to approve the application.

Miscellaneous Permit (PMP)

On a motion by Chair Isobe, seconded by Mr. Shih, and unanimously carried by members present, the Board voted to approve the applications of (1) through (9) below:

1. Biologics, Inc.
2. Strategic Pharmaceuticals Solutions, Inc.
3. Eagle Pharma Outsourcing, LLC
-excluding Pharmacist: Logan Reeves
4. Hartley Medical Center Pharmacy, LLC
5. HealthDyne Specialty Florida, LLC
6. MedOptions RX LLC
7. Pharmacy XD LLC
8. Randy Martins Health and Wellness, LLC
9. THE PHARMACY HUB 2 LLC

On a motion by Chair Isobe, seconded by Mr. Shih, and unanimously carried by members present, the Board voted to defer the following applications (1) and (2) for more information:

1. MedRx Infusion Clinical Pharmacy, LLC
2. Southwest Florida Infusion Care, Inc.

Adjournment: There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned by Chair Isobe at 10:35 a.m.

Taken, Recorded by:

/s/ Christopher Fernandez
Christopher Fernandez
Executive Officer

CF:ct
12.16.25

Minutes approved as is.
 Minutes approved with changes; see minutes of 12/18/2025.