

Significant Legislative Rule Analysis

WAC 246-933-460

**Organization, institutions or individuals approved by the veterinary board.
September 2, 2010**

Section 1. What is the scope of the rule?

The proposed rule is in response to a petition for rulemaking received from Brian Hunter, DVM, on March 14, 2010. The petition requests approval, without prior review, of any continuing education course sponsored by local chapters of the Washington State Veterinary Medical Association (WSVMA). The proposed rule approves courses when the speaker is either board certified or a member of the faculty of an accredited college of veterinary medicine. The rule currently approves any board approved college or school of veterinary medicine and veterinary specialty board recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association. The request does not change the existing requirements.

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

This rule is proposed based on the authority of RCW 18.92.030 which allows the Veterinary Board of Governors to adopt rules implementing continuing education requirements for renewal of the license and relicensing of veterinarians in Washington. The statute's objectives the rule implements are to protect the health and safety of the animals by ensuring the continuing competency of licensed veterinarians in the State of Washington.

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

This rule is proposed based on the authority of RCW 18.92.030 which allows the Veterinary Board of Governors to adopt rules implementing continuing education requirements for renewal of the license and relicensing of veterinarians in Washington. Chapter 18.130 RCW imposes a penalty for violation of the law or rule regulating the profession. Statute requires the department to adopt standards relating to continuing education in rule. A petition for rulemaking is authorized under RCW 34.05.330.

Section 4. What are the costs and benefits of each rule included in the rules package? What is the total probable cost and total probable benefit of the rule package?

The amendment does not add any cost to compliance with the existing continuing education rules for veterinarians. The rule adds two categories of specifically qualified individuals for licensed veterinarians to consider when choosing which course to take. A licensee may still choose to take a course from an organization or presented by an individual that does not appear on the approved list. If the organization is not currently approved, the licensee may request that the individual course be considered for approval. The benefit of an approved organization is that the licensee knows in advance that the course is approved and can register and take the course without first seeking approval.

Specific costs related to compliance

There are no costs to comply with this amendment.

Summary of cost:

Licensed veterinarians must complete thirty hours of continuing education every three years. The amendment does not add any additional requirement or cost.

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

The rule amendment is less burdensome than not adopting the amendment because it allows the licensees more choices of approved providers of continuing education.

Section 6. Did we determine that the rule does not 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. Did we determine that the rule does not 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. Did we determine if the rule differs from any federal regulation or statute applicable to the same activity or subject matter and, if so, did we determine that the difference is 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. Did we demonstrate that the rule has 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.