R015-14 NAC Chapter 453.510 Schedule 1

June 20, 2014

INFORMATIONAL STATEMENT

The informational statement required by NRS 233B.066 numerically conforms to the subsections of the statute as follows:

1. EXPLANATION OF THE NEED FOR THE ADOPTED REGULATION

Because of abuse of unregulated products containing synthetic cannabinoids, law enforcement has requested that the Board of Pharmacy add additional compounds to Schedule I.

2. A DESCRIPTION OF HOW PUBLIC COMMENT WAS SOLICITED, A SUMMARY OF PUBLIC RESPONSE, AND AN EXPLANATION HOW OTHER INTERESTED PERSONS MAY OBTAIN A COPY OF THE SUMMARY.

The Board solicited comment on the proposed amendment by (1) posting a summary of the proposed amendment on the Board's website (bop.nv.gov) with a link to the full text of the proposed amendment, (2) soliciting comment from Nevada dispensers who receive Board of Pharmacy notifications using a facsimile notice directed to each, and (3) contacting a representative of each relevant industry association Board Staff deemed likely to have an interest in the proposed amendment. The Board also provided time for public comment at the workshop(s) concerning the proposed amendment, and opened the floor for public comment at the public hearing on the proposed amendment.

The Board received positive public comment on R015-14 from a representative of the Las Vegas Metro Forensics Controlled Substance Unit and the Clark County Crime Lab. Per AB 39, there is no cost to pharmacies.

Parties interested in obtaining a copy of the summary of the proposed amendment, or that wish to view the text of the proposed amendment, may access that information on the Board's website at bop.nv.gov, or by contacting the Board's office at (775) 850-1440.

3. THE NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO: (A) ATTENDED EACH HEARING; (B) TESTIFIED AT EACH HEARING; AND (C) SUBMITTED TO THE AGENCY WRITTEN STATEMENTS.

The number of persons who attended the hearing was $\underline{}$ 19	
The number of persons who testified at the hearing was	<u>l</u>
The number of agency submitted statements was0	
The name of persons who testified at the hearing:	
The name of persons who testified at the nearing.	

-David Goldthorpe, Las Vegas Metro Forensics Controlled Substance Unit and the Clark County Crime Lab – 5605 W. Badura 120B, Las Vegas, NV. 702-828-3945 – d13317g@lvmpd.com.

4. A DESCRIPTION OF HOW COMMENT WAS SOLICITED FROM AFFECTED BUSINESSES, A SUMMARY OF THEIR RESPONSE, AND AN EXPLANATION HOW OTHER INTERESTED PERSONS MAY OBTAIN A COPY OF THE SUMMARY

The Board solicited comment on the proposed amendment by (1) posting a summary of the proposed amendment on the Board's website (bop.nv.gov) with a link to the full text of the proposed amendment, (2) soliciting comment from Nevada dispensers who receive Board of Pharmacy notifications using a facsimile notice directed to each, and (3) contacting a representative of each relevant industry association Board Staff deemed likely to have an interest in the proposed amendment. The Board also provided time for public comment at the workshop(s) concerning the proposed amendment, and opened the floor for public comment at the public hearing on the proposed amendment.

Board Staff received positive public comment on R015-14 from a representative of the Las Vegas Metro Forensics Controlled Substance Unit and the Clark County Crime Lab.

All interested parties may obtain a summary of public response by written or verbal request to: Nevada State Board of Pharmacy, 431 West Plumb Lane, Reno, Nevada, 89509.

5. IF THE REGULATION WAS ADOPTED WITHOUT CHANGING ANY PART OF THE PROPOSED REGULATION, A SUMMARY OF THE REASONS FOR ADOPTING THE REGULATION WITHOUT CHANGE.

The proposed regulation was adopted without changes because the regulation was drafted to comply with AB 39 and the Board received only positive comments from industry and the public.

- 6. THE ESTIMATED ECONOMIC EFFECT OF THE REGULATION ON THE BUSINESS WHICH IT IS TO REGULATE AND ON THE PUBLIC. THESE MUST BE STATED SEPARATELY, AND IN EACH CASE MUST INCLUDE:
 - A) BOTH ADVERSE AND BENEFICIAL EFFECTS.

This regulation should have no adverse or beneficial economic effect on businesses or on the public.

B) BOTH IMMEDIATE AND LONG-TERM EFFECTS.

This regulation will have no immediate or long-term economic effects on business or the public.

7. THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE AGENCY FOR ENFORCEMENT OF THE PROPOSED REGULATION.

There will be no additional or special costs incurred by the board for enforcement of this regulation.

8. A DESCRIPTION OF ANY REGULATIONS OF OTHER STATE OR GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WHICH THE PROPOSED REGULATION OVERLAPS OR DUPLICATES AND A STATEMENT EXPLAINING WHY THE DUPLICATION OR OVERLAPPING IS NECESSARY. IF THE REGULATION OVERLAPS OR DUPLICATES A FEDERAL REGULATION, THE NAME OF THE REGULATING FEDERAL AGENCY.

The Board of Pharmacy is not aware of any similar regulations of other state or government agencies that the proposed regulation overlaps or duplicates.

9. IF THE REGULATION INCLUDES PROVISIONS WHICH ARE MORE STRINGENT THAN A FEDERAL REGULATION WHICH REGULATES THE SAME ACTIVITY, A SUMMARY OF SUCH PROVISIONS.

The Board of Pharmacy is not aware of any similar regulations of the same activity in which the federal regulation is more stringent.

10. IF THE REGULATION PROVIDES A NEW FEE OR INCREASES AN EXISTING FEE, THE TOTAL ANNUAL AMOUNT THE AGENCY EXPECTS TO COLLECT AND THE MANNER IN WHICH THE MONEY WILL BE USED.

This regulation does not provide a new or increase of fees.