



Emergency Medical Services Authority

Meeting Materials

Paramedic Disciplinary Review Board

11120 International Drive, Suite 200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 322-4336 | Fax: (916) 322-1441
www.emsa.ca.gov

Meeting Date: Thursday, December 4, 2025

Meeting Time: 10:00 a.m.

Materials:

1. PDRB Quarterly Meeting Minutes from September 11, 2025



PDRB Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: Thursday, September 11, 2025

Meeting Time: 1:00 p.m.

Meeting Location(s): Virtual (Microsoft Teams)
11120 International Drive, Ste 200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
1571 Beverly Boulevard, Ste 201, Los Angeles, CA 90026
475 Foothill Boulevard, La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011

PDRB Members Present:

David Konieczny, Paramedic (Chair)

Jesse Conner, Paramedic

James De La Torre, MD, Physician

Jane Kang, Paramedic

Kelli Moore, Public Member

Richard Ramirez, Paramedic

PDRB Staff Present:

Kailey Jackson, Attorney

Katherine Rice, Analyst

Diane Sabonis, Special Advisor

1. Call to Order

Chair called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. on Thursday, September 11, 2025. Chair served as the meeting facilitator and conducted roll call. Quorum was established to conduct business.

2. Approval of Minutes from the PDRB Quarterly Meeting on June 20, 2025

Member Discussion

None

Public Comment

None

PDRB Action

Kelli Moore moved to approve the June 20, 2025 Paramedic Disciplinary Review Board Meeting Minutes as presented. Jesse Conner seconded the motion. A roll call was held and the motion carried (unanimous approval).

3. Conflict of Interest Training

Presenter: Kailey Jackson, J.D., PDRB Attorney

Ms. Jackson provided an overview of conflict of interest (COI) requirements applicable to members of PDRB. The presentation focused on legal and ethical standards under the Political Reform Act and the Administrative Adjudication Code of Ethics.

Key points of the presentation included a definition of a disqualifying COI, which occurs when a government decision could foreseeably and materially impact a PDRB member's financial interests. If a potential COI arises, PDRB members are required to take specific actions: they must contact the PDRB attorney immediately, disclose the conflict, recuse themselves from any discussion, voting, or attempts to influence the matter, and leave the room during deliberation on the item. Additionally, PDRB members are expected to uphold ethical standards by maintaining the integrity of the agency, avoiding impropriety or the appearance of it, and refraining from political activity that could compromise the agency's impartiality.

Member Discussion

None

Public Comment

None

PDRB Action

None required

4. Recommended Guidelines for Disciplinary Orders and Conditions of Probation: Optional Conditions 8 and 9

Presenter: Diane Sabonis, J.D., PDRB Special Advisor

Ms. Sabonis presented an overview of Optional Conditions of Probation 8 and 9 from EMSA's Recommended Guidelines for Disciplinary Orders and Conditions of Probation, dated July 2008 (Guidelines). These conditions pertain to Practical Skills Examination and Oral Skills Examination.

The presentation highlighted EMSA's challenges with implementation of Optional Conditions 8 and 9. Optional Condition 8 requires respondents to pass a skills examination based on U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) or National Registry of Emergency Medical Technicians (NREMT) standards; however, DOT exams are no longer in use and NREMT has discontinued its psychomotor exams. Additionally, identifying and applying consistent local standards has proven difficult. Optional Condition 9 requires an oral examination, but EMSA lacks a standardized exam bank, and developing exams that align with national or local training standards would be resource intensive. Administratively, EMSA would need to establish a three-member internal exam board, comprising an EMS physician, an EMS educator, and a paramedic, which has not yet been formed. The cost and ongoing effort to develop and maintain relevant exams pose a further barrier to implementation.

Historically, Optional Conditions 8 and 9 have only been ordered 4 times across approximately 156 disciplinary decisions, and in each case, EMSA substituted Optional Condition 5: Educational Course Work due to these barriers. Optional Condition 5, which allows for flexible, EMSA-approved educational coursework, has proven to be a feasible and effective alternative. In conclusion, the remaining optional conditions offer sufficient flexibility to address probation requirements without relying on Optional Conditions 8 and 9.

Member Discussion

PDRB members held an in-depth discussion regarding the proposed removal of Optional Conditions 8 (Practical Skills Examination) and 9 (Oral Examination) from the Guidelines.

PDRB member Jesse Conner questioned who has made the decision to remove Optional Conditions 8 and 9 from the Guidelines. Ms. Sabonis explained that EMSA Enforcement has communicated these barriers to implementation of prerequisites for compliance with these optional conditions of probation. Ms. Sabonis explained that in the past, EMSA Enforcement has substituted those optional conditions with Optional Condition 5. Ms. Jackson further explained that updating the Guidelines and removing these optional conditions is something that requires compliance with the rulemaking process under California's Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. Conner questioned where the requirements for the review board required in Optional Conditions 8 and 9 came from. Ms. Jackson explained that the Guidelines are incorporated by reference within EMSA's regulations and therefore are regulations. There was discussion regarding the Office of Administrative Law rulemaking process. Mr. Conner emphasized his concern that PDRB avoid violation of any law, or any conflict with legislative intent in removing these optional conditions.

Mr. Conner suggested engaging LEMSAs or other stakeholders, such as paramedic schools, as options to facilitate testing that might avoid EMSA absorbing the cost and workload. He also emphasized maintaining the integrity of any testing process employed.

PDRB chair David Konieczny questioned how "the satisfaction of EMSA" as mentioned in Optional Condition 5 is defined. Ms. Sabonis explained that EMSA works with a probationer to find courses related to the violations to satisfy the conditions of their probation.

Mr. Konieczny discussed that education provided by approved paramedic schools includes skills training and asked whether EMSA could approve a skills test from a paramedic school. Ms. Sabonis explained that they could hypothetically do so, if appropriately approved by EMSA for that probationer. Mr. Konieczny expressed concerns about wiping out the skills testing, which he perceives to be a critical piece of probation. Ms. Sabonis explained that the skills testing would be subsumed into Optional Condition 5.

Mr. Conner discussed that a challenge for continuing education classes is that there is not always a capstone event, such as a skills-based scenario where psychomotor skills are performed. For example, an EKG rhythm course does not mean that a paramedic can run a

real-life CPR with the correct algorithm and treat with the correct drugs. Ms. Jackson mentioned that the language in Optional Condition 5 states that all courses must be approved by EMSA, and then says the respondent shall submit evidence of competency.

Mr. Conner asked why eliminate Optional Conditions 8 and 9 if it is just going to be added back into Optional Condition 5. Ms. Jackson explained that if it gets placed into Optional Condition 5, then it becomes outsourced training which is different than EMSA having to stand up a board specific to this purpose. Mr. Conner suggested delegating to the LEMSA to test for local protocols or standing up an ad hoc board of people that are already at EMSA. Ms. Jackson explained that imposing mandates on local jurisdictions comes with many requirements and becomes expensive quickly.

Mr. Konieczny questioned the requirement in Optional Condition 5 to provide a letter from an instructor, stating that EMSA licenses the LEMSAs to provide continuing education and that EMSA does not define 'instructor.' His concern is that Optional Condition 5 will become unenforceable. Ms. Jackson explained that it is different than continuing education, and that one does not need to be a continuing education provider in order to be an instructor of relevant education for remediation.

Mr. Konieczny shared his disappointment in the options for paramedic disciplinary actions becoming smaller.

Public Comment

Kevin Green, EMS Health and Safety Director, California Professional Firefighters, addressed PDRB, echoing concerns raised by PDRB member Jesse Conner regarding the transparency and process surrounding the discussion of Optional Conditions 8 and 9. Mr. Green asked for clarification on the action being requested of PDRB during the meeting, noting that the agenda was vague and lacked supporting materials. He expressed concern that stakeholders were not adequately informed or prepared for the discussion and suggested the item be tabled until further clarity is provided. Ms. Sabonis clarified that no action is being requested at this time and the item is for informational purposes only. Ms. Jackson added that supporting materials would be provided once a draft of the proposed guideline revisions is available. The intent of the discussion was to provide early notice and gather feedback before formal regulatory language is developed.

Benjamin Keifer also provided public comment, thanking EMSA staff and PDRB for reviewing the Guidelines and acknowledging the need for updates. He requested that PDRB consider existing regulations in Title 22, Division 9, specifically sections 100094.02(c), 100096.01(b)(6), and 100100.02(d) regarding LEMSA remediation authority. Mr. Keifer emphasized the importance of aligning any changes to Optional Conditions 8 and 9 with existing regulatory frameworks and training standards, including those that govern paramedic skills testing and licensure eligibility. He further recommended that PDRB consider consolidating skills and oral examination requirements into Optional Condition 5 to provide flexibility while maintaining clarity and accountability. Mr. Keifer supported the idea of allowing PDRB to identify specific courses or training requirements to ensure probationary conditions are meaningful and enforceable.

PDRB Action
None required

5. PDRB Quarterly Meeting Dates for 2026

Meeting dates for 2026 were announced: March 12, June 11, September 10, December 3.

Member Discussion
None

Public Comment
None

PDRB Action
None required

6. Public Comments on Items not on the Agenda

Public Comment
PDRB member Jesse Conner asked about PDRB member vacancy. Ms. Sabonis clarified that it is up to the appointing authority to fill the vacancy and PDRB is currently waiting for that appointment to take place.

7. Closed Session

PDRB convened in closed session as authorized by Government Code section 11126(c)(3) to deliberate on proposed disciplinary decisions.

8. Adjournment

Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:42 p.m. on Thursday, September 11, 2025.