

STATE OF NEVADA



BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS

4600 Kietzke Lane, Building o-265

Reno, Nevada 89502

Phone 775 688-1788/fax 775 688-1808

[vetbdinfo@vetboard.nv.gov](mailto:vetbdinfo@vetboard.nv.gov)

[www.nvvetboard.us](http://www.nvvetboard.us)

The following statement is submitted for adopted amendments to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 638.

**LCB FILE RO72-09**

**1. PUBLIC COMMENT SOLICITED:**

Copies of the proposed regulations, notices of workshop, and notices of intent to act upon regulation was sent by US mail or e-mail to all persons who were on the Boards' mailing list and to the Nevada Veterinary Medical Association.

As per NRS 233B.0607 a copy of the regulation and the Notice of Hearing was posted at all Nevada County Public Libraries. As indicated in the Notice of Hearing, a copy of any of these proceedings could be obtained at the State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners office at 4600 Kietzke Lane, Bldg. O-265, Reno, Nevada 89502.

A copy of the summary of the public response to the proposed regulation may be obtained from the State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners' office at 4600 Kietzke Lane, Bldg. O-265, Reno, Nevada 89502.

**2. ATTENDANCE:**

**Workshop on October 7, 2009:**

**Attendance:** 1 Licensed Veterinarian who is currently the President of the Nevada Veterinary Medical Association and the Executive Director of the Nevada Veterinary Medical Association.

**Written/E-mail correspondence:** 1 Licensed Veterinarian and 1 Licensed Veterinary Technician.

These regulations were also presented at the Nevada Veterinary Medical Association's Board meeting on October 15, 2009. There were 12 veterinarians, 1 veterinary technician, and 1 public member present.

Questions were primarily focused on Section 2 in regard to an owner being notified of after-

hours staffing. All testimony was in support of the amendments. No derogatory comments were made regarding RO72-09.

**Hearing on October 22, 2009:**

**Attendance:** 2-veterinarians; 1 licensed veterinary technician; 1 public member.

**Written/E-mail correspondence:** 1 Licensed Veterinarian.

All testimony was in support of the amendments. No derogatory comments were made regarding RO72-09.

**February 16, 2010 meeting** with the Nevada Veterinary Medical Association:

Attendance: Dr. Dennis Wilson; Dr. Jon Pennell; Dr. David McCrystle; Dr. Woody Allen; Dr. Alex Turner; Dr. Travis McDermott; Dr. Brady VanderLind; Dr. Nichole Wagner; Dr. Ted Trimmer; Dr. Larry Corry; Dr. Betsy Phillips; Dr. David Tack; Dr. Jack Walther; Dr. Craig Schank & Debbie Machen, Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners representatives

**Concerns:**

Section 4- The defining of distant learning courses

Section 9- The retesting of new veterinarians applying to Nevada

**3. Comment from affected businesses:**

Comments were solicited from veterinary facilities in the same manner as they were solicited from the public.

A copy of the summary of the public response to the proposed regulation may be obtained from the State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners' office at 4600 Kietzke Lane, Bldg. O-265, Reno, Nevada 89502.

**4. REASONS FOR ADOPTING REGULATION WITHOUT CHANGE:**

The permanent regulation was adopted at the State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners meeting on October 22, 2009 and included all of changes suggested in the workshop held on October 7, 2009.

**5. ECONOMIC EFFECT OF THE REGULATION ON THE BUSINESS.**

There would be no economic effect of these new regulations on the business of veterinary medicine.

**6. ESTIMATED COST TO THE AGENCY FOR ENFORCEMENT:**

There is no cost to this agency for enforcement of these regulations.

**7. OVERLAP OR DUPLICATION OF PROPOSED REGULATION:**

To our knowledge, there is no other state or government agency which the proposed regulation duplicates.

**8. DOES THE REGULATION INCLUDE PROVISIONS THAT ARE MORE**

**STRINGENT THAN A FEDERAL REGULATION WITH REGULATES THE SAME ACTIVITY.**

N/A

**9. REGULATION PROVIDES A NEW FEE OR INCREASES EXISTING FEE:**

These regulations do not provide a new fee or increase existing fees.

**10. LIKELY TO IMPOSE A DIRECT AND SIGNIFICANT ECONOMIC BURDEN UPON A SMALL BUSINESS OR DIRECTLY RESTRICT THE FORMATION, OPERATION OR EXPANSION OF A SMALL BUSINESS.**

THE ADOPTED REGULATIONS WOULD HAVE NO DIRECT OR SIGNIFICANT ECONOMIC BURDEN UPON A SMALL BUSINESS.