

Significant Rule Analysis  
Chapter WAC 246-933-275  
Reactivation of an expired veterinary license.  
Veterinary Board of Governors  
July 15, 2013

**Section 1. What is the scope of the rule?**

The Washington State Veterinary Board of Governors (board) is proposing a rule that amends the requirements to reinstate a veterinarian license that has been expired for more than three years. The amendment requires veterinarian who have been actively practicing in another state to submit verification of their active practice. The rule also requires veterinarians who have not practiced in another state to successfully complete the current North American Veterinary Licensing Examination (NAVLE) to reactivate the license. The practitioner must also meet the requirements of Chapter 246-12 WAC, Part 2.

Currently, a Washington State veterinarian whose license is expired beyond three years only needs to pay a fee and attest that they have completed continuing education to reactivate their license. The board is proposing this rule because it is concerned about patient safety due to the potential lack of current skills and knowledge when a veterinarian has not been actively practicing for an extended period of time. The board determined that requiring veterinarians to demonstrate that they are competent to safely practice veterinary medicine, surgery and dentistry is prudent.

**Section 2. What are the general goals and specific objectives of the proposed rule's authorizing statute?**

RCW 18.92.030 directs the board to adopt rules necessary to carry out the purposes of the chapter. The proposed rule requiring documented practice and completion of required continuing education or successful completion of the current NAVLE examination helps to ensure that a veterinarian is competent to safely practice veterinary medicine, surgery and dentistry.

**Section 3. What is the justification for the proposed rule package?**

The board determined that requiring a veterinarian with a license that has been expired for more than three years to either demonstrate that they have been actively practicing in another state or successfully complete the current NAVLE examination establishes a mechanism for veterinarians to demonstrate that they are competent to safely practice veterinary medicine, surgery and dentistry.

#### **Section 4. What are the costs and benefits of the rule? What is the total probable cost and total probable benefit of the rule?**

- Chapter WAC 246-933-275 – Expired license.

##### **Rule Overview:**

The proposed rule will require a veterinarian with a license that has expired for more than three years, and who has been actively engaged in the practice of veterinary medicine in another state or jurisdiction, to submit verification of 200 hours of active practice in each of the previous three years. A veterinarian whose Washington State license has been expired for more than three years and who has not been actively engaged in the practice of veterinary medicine must successfully complete the current NAVLE to reactivate the license. The rule also incorporates by reference, the requirement for a practitioner to comply with Chapter 246-12 WAC, Part 2, which is an existing requirement.

##### **Rule Cost/Benefit Analysis:**

Veterinarians that have been actively engaged in the practice of veterinary medicine in another state must submit verification of active practice in the other state directly from the other state's licensing authority. Some states charge a fee for the verification.

Veterinarians that have not been actively practicing must provide documentation directly from the National Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners that they have successfully completed the NAVLE to reactivate the license. The fee to sit for the NAVLE fee is \$560. The NAVLE is administered in Prometric Test Centers (PTCs). There are three PTCs in Washington State including both King County and Spokane. There are two PTC's in the Portland Oregon vicinity. The exam is administered twice each year in "test windows". The testing windows are November to December and in the month of April. The total exam time is six hours and thirty minutes. There are break times which bring the total testing time to just over seven hours. Candidates for the NAVLE will incur additional costs for meals, travel and possible overnight accommodations associated with travel to the PTC.

##### **Rule Package Cost-Benefit Conclusion:**

Although there are costs for veterinarians to renew an expired license, as described in the preceding analysis, the benefits of requiring veterinarians to demonstrate that they can safely treat animal practices (either by demonstrating that they have been actively practicing in another state or that they have successfully passed an examination) outweigh these costs. Therefore, the total probable benefits of the proposed rule exceed the total probable costs.

**Section 5. What alternative versions of the rule did we consider? Is the proposed rule the least burdensome approach?**

The board considered a required period of supervised practice by a licensed veterinarian to measure competence to return to practice. They determined that this option was more burdensome because it would require assessing the adequate period of time of supervised practice, selection of an approved supervising veterinarian, development of a means to measure competency and a reporting system. Additionally, it would be more costly to the practitioner to compensate the supervising veterinarian.

**Section 6. Does the rule require anyone to take an action that violates another federal or state law?**

The rule does not require those to whom it applies to take an action that violates requirements of federal or state law.

**Section 7. Does the rule impose more stringent performance requirements on private entities than on public entities, unless the difference is required in federal or state law?**

The Department of Health determined that the rule does not impose more stringent performance requirements on private entities than on public entities.

**Section 8. Does the rule differ from any federal regulation or statute applicable to the same activity or subject matter and, if so, how is the difference justified by an explicit state statute or by substantial evidence that the difference is necessary?**

The rule does not differ from any applicable federal regulation or statute.

**Section 9. Has the rule been coordinated, to the maximum extent possible, with other federal, state, and local laws applicable to the same activity or subject matter?**

There are no other applicable laws.