

## **INFORMATIONAL STATEMENT**

### **BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS**

4600 Kietzke Lane, Building o-265  
Reno, Nevada 89502  
Phone 775 688-1788/fax 775 688-1808  
[vetbinfo@vetboard.nv.gov](mailto:vetbinfo@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 R116-10**

#### **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:**

##### **A) Workshop on October 14, 2010 in Reno:**

Attendance: These regulations were presented at the Nevada Veterinary Medical Association's (NVMA) Board meeting. There were 13 veterinarians, 1 veterinary technician, and 1 public member present. Dr. David Tack; Dr. Dennis Wilson; Dr. John Crumley; Dr. Woody Allen; Dr. Alex Turner; Dr. Travis McDermott; Dr. Brady VanderLind; Dr. Joe Coli; Dr. Ted Trimmer; Dr. Richard Pratt; Dr. Betsy Phillips; Dr. Cynthia Schneider; Dr. Gary Ailes; Michelle Wagner, Executive Director of the NVMA; Dr. Craig Schank Louis Ling, and Debbie Machen, Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (NSBVME) representatives.

Questions were primarily focused on the handling of the drugs by licensed employees and staff. All testimony was in support of the amendments. No derogatory comments were made regarding RO116-109. Concerns and changes were forwarded to the NSBVME.

##### **B) Workshop on October 21, 2010 in Las Vegas:**

**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 RO116-10.

**C) Hearing on January 27, 2011 in Reno:**

Attendance: Michelle Wagner, Executive Director of the NVMA; Dennis Lopez, Director of the PIMA Veterinary Technician Program.

Written/E-mail correspondence: 5 Licensed Veterinarian; 7 licensed veterinary technicians.

**D) Workshop on July 14, 2011 in Reno:**

Written/E-mail correspondence: 1 licensed veterinary technician.

**E) Hearing on October 19, 2011 in Las Vegas:**

Attendance: Michelle Wagner, Executive Director of the NVMA; Dennis Lopez, Director of the PIMA Veterinary Technician Program; Melissa Schalles, LVT, SNCC instructor; 16 SNCC veterinary technician students; 4 veterinarians; 1 veterinary technician; 1 office manager.

Written/E-mail correspondence: A letter from the NVMA that was read into the record.

**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 19, 2011.

**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.