Dr. Taylor called the meeting to order and called roll at 8:52 a.m. and recognized that the Community College of Southern Nevada students were in the audience.
2. Approval of Board Minutes for Possible Action
   A. January 29, 2015 Board Meeting
      Motion: Ms. Schalles moved to accept the minutes with changes to 3D.
      Second: Dr. Sandoval
      Passed: Unanimous

3. Review & Determination of Complaints/Disciplinary Action & Disciplinary Hearings for Possible Action:
   A. 2014DVM-037; George Anast, DVM, License #0260: Letter of Reprimand
      Discussion: Ms. Machen provided the Board with an overview of the proposed stipulated agreement.
      Motion: Dr. Sandoval moved to accept the Letter of Reprimand as written.
      Second: Ms. Rogers
      Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Pelsue abstained

   B. 2014DVM-038; Betsy Murdock, DVM, License #2272: Letter of Reprimand
      Discussion: Ms. Machen provided the Board with an overview of the proposed stipulated agreement.
      Motion: Dr. Bradley moved to accept the Letter of Reprimand as written.
      Second: Dr. Damonte
      Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Collins abstained

   C. 2014DVM-036 & 2014DVM-040; Dudley Pflaum, License #0728: Consent Decree
      Discussion: Ms. Machen provided the Board with an overview of the proposed stipulated agreement.
      Motion: Dr. Sandoval moved to accept the Consent Decree as written.
      Second: Ms. Schalles
      Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Pelsue abstained

   D. 1-2015DVM-001
      Discussion: After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action.
      Motion: Dr. Bradley moved to dismiss.
      Second: Dr. Pelsue
      Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Damonte abstained

   E. 1-2015LVT-002
      Discussion: After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board recommended that disciplinary action be initiated against the licensee.
      Motion: Ms. Rogers moved to have staff and Mr. Ling initiate action against the licensee due to there being sufficient evidence to proceed with disciplinary action.
      Second: Dr. Damonte
      Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Collins abstained. Ms. Schalles recused herself.
F. **1-2015DVM-003**

*Discussion:* After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action. Staff was directed to send a Letter of Concern to the licensee regarding speaking directly to a client rather than conveying a message through a staff member when there is a possibility of a drug reaction. The complainants were present and addressed the Board with their concerns.

*Motion:* Dr. Bradley moved to dismiss the complaint with a Letter of Concern.
*Second:* Dr. Pelsue
*Passed:* Unanimous; Dr. Taylor abstained

G. **1-2015DVM-004**

*Discussion:* After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action. Staff was directed to send a Letter of Concern to the licensee regarding communication with the client in regard to diagnosis of a disease process, available options for treatment, prognosis for outcome, possible side effects, and an estimate for cost. Specifically in this case when an emotional client is having a difficult time grasping and understanding what is being conveyed it is important to follow-up to clarify any misconceptions.

*Motion:* Dr. Bradley moved to dismiss the complaint with a Letter of Concern.
*Second:* Ms. Schalles
*Passed:* Unanimous; Dr. Damonte abstained


*Discussion:* After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaints due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee’s had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action.

*Motion:* Dr. Sandoval moved to dismiss.
*Second:* Dr. Collins
*Passed:* Unanimous; Dr. Pelsue abstained

I. **1-2015DVM-008**

*Discussion:* After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action.

*Motion:* Dr. Bradley moved to dismiss.
*Second:* Dr. Pelsue
*Passed:* Unanimous; Dr. Collins abstained


*Discussion:* After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaints due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee’s had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action. Staff was directed to send a Letter of Concern to the licensee’s regarding when an NSAID is prescribed for a patient, it is recommended that you include a label with warnings and discuss the potential
side effects of the medication with the owner. This should include indications for stopping the medication and to call the hospital for further instructions.

Motion: Dr. Sandoval moved to dismiss the complaint with a Letter of Concern.
Second: Dr. Collins
Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Pelsue abstained

K. 1-2015DVM-012
Discussion: After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action. The complainant was present during the review and discussion of the complaint.

Motion: Dr. Sandoval moved to dismiss
Second: Dr. Collins
Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Pelsue abstained

L. 1-2015DVM-013 & 1-2015DVM-014
Discussion: After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaints due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee’s had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action.

Motion: Dr. Pelsue moved to dismiss.
Second: Dr. Collins
Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Taylor abstained

After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaints due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee’s had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action. Staff was directed to send a Letter of Concern to the licensee’s regarding: 1) transfer and communication protocols for when multiple doctors are seeing the same patient to ensure the best continuum of care, and 2) when dispensing medications to a small patient that requires splitting of a pill beyond a scored demarcation such as \( \frac{1}{6} \), consider using a compounded formulation to ensure adequate dosing.

Motion: Dr. Pelsue moved to dismiss with a Letter of Concern.
Second: Dr. Collins
Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Bradley abstained

N. 2-2015DVM-018
Discussion: After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action. The complainants were present and addressed the Board with their concerns.

Motion: Dr. Pelsue moved to dismiss.
Second: Dr. Damonte
Passed: Unanimous; Dr. Sandoval abstained
Discussion: After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaints due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee’s had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action. The complainants were present and addressed the Board with their concerns.

**Motion:** Dr. Sandoval moved to dismiss.
**Second:** Dr. Bradley
**Passed:** Unanimous. Dr. Pelsue abstained

3-2015DVM-022
After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action. Staff was directed to send a Letter of Concern to the licensee regarding, regardless of the species, a complete physical exam including a TPR and weight (or estimate) must be recorded in the animal's medical record in addition to the differential diagnosis, treatment plan, treatment rendered, and client communication.

**Motion:** Dr. Sandoval moved to dismiss the complaint with a Letter of Concern.
**Second:** Dr. Bradley
**Passed:** Unanimous. Dr. Damonte abstained

3-2015DVM-023
**Discussion:** After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board recommended that disciplinary action be initiated against the licensee. The complainant was present during the review and discussion of the complaint.

**Motion:** Dr. Sandoval moved to have staff and Mr. Ling initiate action against the licensee due to there being sufficient evidence to proceed with disciplinary action.
**Second:** Dr. Bradley
**Passed:** Unanimous. Dr. Taylor abstained

3-2015DVM-024
**Discussion:** After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action.

**Motion:** Dr. Collins moved to dismiss.
**Second:** Dr. Damonte
**Passed:** Unanimous. Ms. Schalles abstained.

3-2015DVM-025 & 3-2015DVM-026
**Discussion:** After discussion of the complaint assessments with the review panel the Board asked that the complaint be tabled for further investigation.

**Motion:** Dr. Pelsue moved to table the complaints for further investigation.
**Second:** Dr. Bradley
**Passed:** Unanimous. Dr. Sandoval abstained
T. 3-2015DVM-027

Discussion: After discussion of the complaint assessment with the review panel the Board dismissed the complaint due to the fact that there was not sufficient evidence to believe that the licensee had committed an act which constitutes a cause for disciplinary action.

Motion: Dr. Bradley moved to dismiss.
Second: Dr. Pelsue
Passed: Unanimous. Dr. Sandoval abstained.

4. Requests for Licensure/Reinstatement/Old Business for Possible Action

A. Honesty Hoopai, application for VTIT/LVT

Discussion: Ms. Hoopai submitted an application for licensed veterinary technician based on her education, practical experience, and references. The Board reviewed and discussed her application and all supplemental documentation.

Motion: Dr. Taylor moved to deny Ms. Hoopai’s application based on the applicant not meeting the educational equivalent standard.
Second: Ms. Schalles
Passed: Unanimous

B. Stacy Safholm, application for LVT

Discussion: Ms. Safholm submitted an application for licensed veterinary technician based on her education, practical experience, and references. The Board reviewed her application and all supplemental documentation.

Motion: Ms. Schalles moved to accept Ms. Safholm’s application.
Second: Ms. Rogers
Passed: Unanimous

5. Discussion and Determination for Possible Action

A. 2015 AVMA updated Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics

Discussion: Ms. Machen presented the Board with the current laws regarding the AVMA’s Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics, the 2003 AVMA’s version of the ethics, and the new 2015 version. The Board discussed the new provision that requires veterinarians to report illegal practices, unethical behavior, and competency issues to the local licensing authority. The consensus of the Board is that since only thirteen states recognize the AVMA principles and the other states have their own unprofessional conduct standards that the Board should form a review panel to discuss options in drafting new regulations to address the concerns. The review panel will consist of Dr. Bradley, Dr. Pelsue, and Ms. Rogers. The Board will ask for a representative from the Nevada Veterinary Medical Association to join the review panel.

B. Fees for State Veterinary Boards (renewals, applications)

Discussion: Ms. Machen presented the Board with an overview of the renewal and license fees for all States for comparison to this Boards current fee schedule. The consensus of the Board is that the licensing fees are comparable to other states and there is not any reason to adjust the current fees for the individual licensee.

C. Cost of hospital inspections vs. fees collected

Discussion: Ms. Machen presented an overview of 2013-2015 revenue vs. expenses for hospital inspections. The consensus of the Board was that instead of raising yearly renewal and application fees for veterinary facilities it might be a better approach to charge the facilities an
inspection fee. Facilities that have minimum violations for non-compliance would only be inspected every two years and those facilities with repeat violations would be inspected bi-annually or annually which would direct the cost to repeat offenders.

D. Legislative Update
Discussion: Ms. Machen provided the Board with Ms. Laxalt’s legislative update.

E. On-line veterinary pharmacy incentives
Discussion: Ms. Machen presented the Board with a letter that the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy drafted for the purpose of informing the veterinarians that, “The Nevada State Board of Pharmacy recently became aware of certain pharmacies that sell veterinary medications. These pharmacies are giving incentives to veterinarians and veterinary hospitals who direct their patients to those pharmacies. Nevada law (NRS 639.264) does not allow a Nevada-licensed pharmacy to give any form of financial or non-monetary benefit to any prescriber—including veterinarians and veterinary facilities—for referring or otherwise steering patients to the pharmacy to fill the prescriber’s prescriptions.” The Pharmacy Board is currently notifying these pharmacies of Nevada law. The consensus of the Board is that the Pharmacy Board should complete the notification of Nevada licensed veterinary pharmacies that are providing such services prior to distributing the letter to Nevada veterinary facilities.

F. Increase of the percentage of yearly continuing education audits
Discussion: Currently the Board is auditing 10% of the licensee base and considered increasing the percentage of licensed veterinary technician audits due to the number of licensees misrepresenting their annual CE on their renewals. The consensus of the Board was to increase Licensed Veterinary Technician auditing to 15% in 2015.

6. Staff Reports for Possible Action
A. Financial Report -Debbie Machen
B. Administrative Report-Tracie Estep
C. Hospital Inspection Report-Christina Johnson, LVT
   Discussion: The above noted quarterly reports were presented to the Board’s satisfaction.

D. Legal Report, Louis Ling, Esq
      Discussion: Mr. Ling presented the Board with an overview of the Supreme Court decision and discussed the impact it might possibly have on the Veterinary Board.
   b. Board meeting licensee complaint notice letter
      Discussion: Mr. Ling presented the Board with the letter that the Board currently uses to notice a licensee that is the subject of a current complaint. The letter allows the licensee to waive their confidentiality and address the Board in person or proceed with anonymity while the Board discusses and votes on their complaint.
   c. Use of personal email and phones for Board use
      Discussion: Mr. Ling discussed the use of personal email and cell phones by Board members and staff, specifically, emails and text messages which are used to communicate board business. These forms of communication are considered public records and are subject to an open meeting records request. Since the Board members do not communicate among themselves only with staff there is no reason to set up individual board member email
accounts when all correspondence that comes through the vetboard.nv.gov domain is already being archived.

7. Public Comment
   None

8. Agenda items for next meeting.
   72 hour compounding laws

9. Adjournment for Possible Action
   Motion: Dr. Pelsue moved to adjourn at 4:03 p.m.
   Second: Ms. Schalles
   Passed: Unanimously