



Nevada Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners Quarterly Board Meeting Minutes

4/30/2026 8:00 AM

Physical Location: Aloft Hotel
2015 Terminal Way, Reno, NV 89502
Video Conference Access: Microsoft Teams
Phone Conference: (929) 229-5741

Attendance

Board Members Present:

James O'Dea, DVM (President)
Michael Knehr, DVM (Vice-President)
John Travis (Treasurer)
Crystal Vaquera, LVT (Member)
Betsy Phillips, DVM (Member)
Susan Costa, DVM (Member)
Michael Knehr, DVM (Member)
Steve Damonte, DVM (Member)

Staff Present:

Jennifer Pedigo, EMBA (Executive Director)
Louis Ling, Esq. (Board Counsel)
Christina Johnson, LVT (Licensing Specialist
Senior Hospital Inspector)
John Crumley, DVM (Lead Investigator)
Lynsey Begbie, LVT (Inspector)

Dr. O'Dea called the meeting to order at 8:10 am.

1. Public Comment:

Jeanette Hutchings, LVT: Submitted documents that were also included in the regulations workshop. Ms. Hutchings is requesting the Board consider in-home nursing, which would be necessary for animal care and to elevate the standard of pet care. Clients would like to provide care at home. The care would be given under the direct supervision of a veterinarian. The goal would be to change some of the parameters to improve access to care. Pets that are elderly or people that are elderly could benefit. Some owners are not able to treat at home, or have pets that are hard to medicate.

Dr. Sidhu: Requested that, because she is coming off an overnight shift, the Board review her application earlier in the agenda.

2. Approval of January 29, 2026 Minutes Draft Board Minutes (For Possible Action)

Motion: Dr. White moved to accept the minutes changes.

Second: Dr. Costa

Vote: All aye.

3. Review & Determination of Complaints/Disciplinary Actions (Each Item in this Section is For Possible Action)

a. 11-2024DVM-79: Sally Lane, DVM (1592): Settlement Agreement

Mr. Ling presented the settlement agreement

Motion: Mr. Travis moved to accept the settlement agreement.

Second: Dr. Phillips

Vote: All aye. Dr. White, Dr. Damonte, Dr. O'Dea, and Ms. Vaquera abstained. Dr. Knehr recused himself.

b. 05-2025DVM-48; 05-2025FAC-49; 05-2025 DVM-54; 05-2025FAC-58: Hany Botros, DVM (1305) and AAA All American Animal Hospital (H280): Consent Order Agreement

Item was not presented.

c. 08-2025DVM-82: Naika Antoine, DVM (3070): Settlement Agreement

Mr. Ling presented the settlement agreement.

Motion: Dr. O'Dea moved to accept the settlement agreement.

Second: Dr. White

Vote: All aye. Dr. Knehr, Dr. Phillips, Mr. Travis, and Dr. Costa abstained.

d. 08-2025DVM-84: Benjamin Reynolds, DVM (LTD-152): Settlement Agreement

Mr. Ling presented the settlement agreement

Motion: Dr. White moved to accept the settlement agreement.

Second: Dr. Damonte

Vote: All aye. Dr. Knehr, Dr. Phillips, Dr. Costa, Mr. Travis abstained.

e. 09-2025DVM-94: Abigail Bake, DVM (3220): Settlement Agreement

Mr. Ling presented the settlement agreement

Motion: Dr. Knehr moved to accept the Letter of Reprimand.

Second: Mr. Travis

Vote: All aye. Dr. White, Ms. Vaquera, Dr. O'Dea, and Dr. Damonte abstained.

f. 12-2025DVM-114: Cassie Liu, DVM (3459): Settlement Agreement

Mr. Ling presented the settlement agreement

Motion: Dr. O'Dea moved to accept the Settlement agreement.

Second: Dr. Damonte

Vote: All aye. Dr. Knehr, Dr. Phillips, Dr. Costa, Mr. Travis abstained. Dr. White recused herself.

4. Requests for Review/Approval/Modification/Waiver of Licensure/Exam Requirements, Extensions, Education Approval, and Criminal Background Review. (Each Item in this Section is For Possible Action)

a. Nisha Sidhu - Application for Veterinarian

Ms. Pedigo presented Dr. Sidhu's application for licensure. Dr. Sidhu was present.

Motion: Dr. Knehr moved to approve Dr. Sidhu's application for licensure.

Second: Dr. O'Dea

Vote: All aye.

b. Alyssa Cruz - Application for VGAL Extension

Ms. Pedigo presented Dr. Cruz's application. Dr. Cruz was present

Motion: Dr. Knehr moved to extend Dr. Cruz's VGAL registration for 1 year.

Second: Dr. White

Vote: All aye.

c. Pavel Dubrovskii - Application for VGAL Extension

Item not presented. Dr. Dubrovskii obtained his veterinary license.

d. Lychrissa Harris - Application for VGAL Extension

Ms. Pedigo presented Dr. Harris' application. Dr. Harris was not present.

Motion: Dr. O'Dea moved to extend Dr. Harris's registration for 6 months.

Second: Dr. Costa

Vote: All aye.

e. John Lapira - Application for VGAL

Ms. Pedigo presented Dr. Lapira's VGAL application. Dr. Lapira was present.

Motion: Dr. White moved to approved Dr. Lapira's VGAL registration.

Seecond: O'Dea

Vote: All aye.

f. Natalia Mata - Application for VGAL Extension

Ms. Pedigo presented Dr. Mata's application. Dr. Mata was present.

Motion: Dr. Costa moved to extend Dr. Mata's registration for 6 months.

Second: Dr. White

Vote: All aye.

g. Larissa Munoz - Application for VGAL Extension

Ms. Pedigo presented Dr. Munoz's application. Dr. Munoz was present.

Motion: Mr. Travis moved to extend Dr. Munoz's VGAL registration for 1 year.

Second: Dr. Costa

Vote: All aye. Dr. White recused herself.

5. Staff Reports (Each Item in this Section is For Possible Action)

a. Inspection Report

Ms. Pedigo presented the Inspection Report.

b. Administrative Report

Ms. Pedigo presented the Administrative Report.

c. Financial Report

Ms. Pedigo presented the Financial Report.

Motion: Mr. Travis moved to accept the Financial Report.

Second: Dr. White

Vote: All aye.

d. 2025-2026 Budget Update

Ms. Pedigo presented the 2025-2026 Budget Report.

Motion: Mr. Travis moved to accept the 2025-2026 Budget Report.

Second: Dr. White

Vote: All aye.

e. Investigation Report

Dr. Crumley presented the Investigation Report.

f. Legal Report

Mr. Ling presented the Legal Report.

g. Legislative Report

Ms. Pedigo presented the Legislative Report.

6. Policy, Operations, and Governance (Each Item in this Section is For Possible Action)

A. Disciplinary Action Review and Discussion Update

The Board discussed possible policies and procedures regarding accessibility timelines for posting of disciplinary actions.

No vote taken.

B. Legislative 2027 Planning

Motion: Dr. Knehr moved to have staff draft the bill draft requests and discussed.

Second: Dr. O'Dea

Vote: All aye.

C. Review and Consideration for Board Comment on R075-25

Ms. Pedigo presented regulations R075-25 proposed for adoption by the Department of Business and Industry.

D. Administrative Review

1. Remote/Videoconference Quarterly Board Meetings

The Board determined that the July 30, 2026, would be held remotely.

2. Revised Hospital Inspection Program Update

Ms. Pedigo presented revisions to hospital inspection form.

a. Review of Tiered Violation Structure

Ms. Pedigo reviewed the hospital inspection point tiers.

3. VTNE and NAVLE Test Limits Discussion

Motion: Mr. Travis moved to draft regulatory language allowing for a maximum of 5 attempts maximum for VTNE and NAVLE.

Second: Dr. Phillips

Vote: All aye.

E. Regulation Committee Membership Changes

Ms. Pedigo asked the Board if the current members would like to sit on the Regulation Committee.

Motion: Dr. O'Dea moved to elect Dr. Knehr, Ms. Vaquera, Dr. Costa, and Dr. O'Dea to be on the Regulation Committee.

Second: Dr. White

Vote: All aye.

F. Policy Question: Distribution Lists and Board Email Requests

Ms. Pedigo requested clarification regarding providing Board collected emails for academic or research purposes. The Board discussed and did not pursue any exemption for providing emails.

G. Vendor Agreement: Database/SaaS Services Proposals

Ms. Pedigo presented various database vendors for consideration.

Motion: Dr. Knehr moved to approve the contract proposal with Thentia.

Second: Dr. O'Dea

Vote: All aye.

H. Vendor Agreement: Accounting Services for Annual Audit of Financial Statement

Ms. Pedigo presented a proposal for a vendor agreement for the annual financial audit.

Motion: Mr. Travis moved to approve the vendor proposal.

Second: Dr. O'Dea

Vote: All aye.

7. Board Presentation and Discussion: Nevada Physical Therapy Board (For Possible Action)

Ms. Pedigo introduced Ms. Gina McDade, Vice Chair of the Nevada Physical Therapy Board to petition the Board to consider adding Physical Therapy Assistant's (PTAs) to regulation.

The proposal would establish Animal Physical Therapist Assistants (APTAs) to work with Animal Physical Therapists (APTs) under the same supervision model used in human physical therapy. APTs would continue to evaluate patients and develop treatment plans, but would also be able to supervise APTAs who would carry out the treatment plan. The goal is to improve access to animal rehabilitation.

Board members asked questions about supervision, licensing, safety, education, and which board (Physical Therapy Board or Veterinary Board) would regulate APTAs working in veterinary settings. Ms. McDade explained that APTAs would need to maintain their licensure with the Physical Therapy Board, work only under an APT's supervision and a veterinarian's referral, and remain subject to oversight by both the Physical Therapy and Veterinary Boards. Some board

members expressed concerns about supervision standards, animal handling experience, and whether new regulations or additional training would be needed.

The Board stated that they would like to refer the proposal to the Regulation Committee for further discussion.

8. Regulation Workshop-Discussion and Determination of Possible Regulations (Each Item in this Section is For Possible Action)

A. Veterinary Technician Specialties License, Ethics, and Fee Changes Regulations

Ms. Pedigo presented the proposed language.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeannette Hutchings, LVT – stated that she has been a licensed veterinary technician (LVT) here Nevada for almost 9 years, and has briefly communicated with Dr. Crumley and Jen. Ms. Hutchings requested that the Board consider in-home nursing be able to be provided by technicians. She believes that it is a very necessary tool to help promote like the human-animal bond and reduce human safety issues. It would elevate the standard of pet care. She received frequent requests for these types of services.

Jonathan Esmond, LVT VTS – Asked what the impetus was to write these regulations.

Ms. Pedigo – stated that the intent is to ensure that LVT's are being used to the greatest effect.

Mr. Esmond, LVT VTS – questions the need for an additional license, fee, and additional CE when a veterinary technician specialist (VTS) is required to perform 60 hours of CE every 5 years in the area of specialty to recertify, unlike a Diplomate who renew every 10 years.

Dr. Knehr – asked Mr. Esmond if he felt the needed to be a two tier system or could the Board have the LVT's trained in theses skills or are there tasks that that should only be performed by an technician specialist?

Mr. Esmond LVT VTS – stated that there is a lot of training but that the skills aren't exclusive to to a VTS. Mr. Esmond stated that he would think that the VTS could be teaching other LVT's to perform skills within their scope.

Dr. Knehr – asked if there was extra liability insurance in practice for the VTS role?

Ms. Pedigo – stated there is no liability insurance available to LVT's or VTS's directly of which she is aware.

Dr. O'Dea – stated that he is having a very hard time with these regs. He does not wish to limit the scope of our LVT's and don't want limit the ability of the VTS to use the skills that they have been trained to perform.

Dennis Wilson, DVM – stated that Mr. Esmond, an employee of Animal Emergency and Specialty Center (AESC) has made exceptional contributions to AESC. Dr. Wilson asked if other states considered adding specific VTS language to their practice acts. Stated that he has a big concern of a midlevel practitioner and agrees that diagnosing and prescribing should be limited to veterinarian. Dr. Wilson asked about language to consider related to development of treatment plan to the unallowed tasks. IN addition, Dr. Wilson stated that in Sec 4.3 NAVTA does not license but only certifies. Dr. Wilson also asked if the Board would consider changing Sec 7.2 c which stated that 'Immediate supervision' can be given by a VTS of an LVT or VTS in training to direct or indirect supervision to the section.

Ken Yagi, VTS VECC – Mr. Yagi stated that Veterinary Emergency Group supports 3,500 LVT's and requests that the VTS should be framed as an additive and as long as an LVT is trained in the advanced skills within their scope they should be able to perform. Fees and title use for LVTS and VTS should be considered to indicate the difference in the license and training. Mr. Yagi requested that it is important to reinforce that the VTS scope of practice should clearly be framed as additive, not restrictive, meaning that there's value in explicitly stating what veterinary technicians specialists may do or can do in practice because it does shine light on the level of advanced expertise that they bring. Mr. Yagi stated that it is not always well understood in the public or people within the veterinary industry. VTS recognition can definitely help identify technicians with advanced specialty training to the level that they have it. However, that recognition shouldn't unintentionally imply that non-VTS licensed veterinary technicians are prohibited from performing tasks.

DISCUSSION

Dr. White – stated that she has concerns about encroaching towards a mid-level practitioner.

Dr. Knehr – stated he has concerns that we are limiting our LVT's and making them feel like they are required to get a VTS to move forward.

Ms. Pedigo – clarified that nothing in these regulations changes or limits the scope for LVT's. An MLVP may work independently of a DVM where a VTS cannot. This will be going back to regulation committee, so can we further review. Could the board consider moving forward with the fee changes in Section 10 that were discussed separately from any other sort of content language so that we can move forward with that since it doesn't seem like there's as much, obviously not with the VTS or any new licensure or certification levels?

Dr. White - stated there was some public comment on the fees, especially relating to the technicians. Dr. White also stated that it is important to address and be sensitive to increasing financial burden, but as this is an increase for a two year renewal. Dr. White also looked at licensing fees in other states and would be fairly comparable to what we're proposing. Dr. White asked Ms. Pedigo to comment.

Ms. Pedigo – responded that it depends on the state and their structure, but generally speaking, yes, they are comparable or less.

Dr. Knehr – proposed that we separate the language so that the VTS is tabled or how do you, what do you say for, or just goes back to committees and the fee language move forward to workshop.

Motion: Dr. O'Dea moved to proceed with the proposed fee changes and send the VTS back to committee.

Second: Dr. Costa

Vote: All aye.

9. Regulation Hearing: Notice of Intent to Adopt R026-26

Ms. Pedigo presented the regulation R026-26 for adoption.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ms. Pedigo presented written public and verbal discussions comment to the Board.

Katherine Fogelberg, DVM (Roseman University) Roseman University has received initial accreditation approval for its veterinary program and can begin enrolling students.

Representatives from the program met with the Board to discuss student externship requirements. They explained that first- and second-year students complete two credit hours of basic animal handling and veterinary technician skills early in the program. They asked the Board to consider this training when reviewing the student externship regulations.

Ms. Pedigo – stated that the regulations could be updated to allow the Board to recognize equivalent training from Board-approved programs without changing the rules each time a new program is created. Instead of naming Roseman University specifically, the regulation could include language such as ‘or an equivalent program approved by the Board.’ This would allow qualifying coursework to count toward the required 1,000 hands-on training hours while giving the Board flexibility to approve future programs as they develop.

Dr. Knehr – asked if there was a chance that they would admit students in with less than six months in the field.

Ms. Pedigo – conveyed that Dr. Fogelberg is concerned that the required 1,000 hours of hands-on experience may be difficult for some students to complete. While some students already have experience that counts toward the requirement, she believes certain hands-on courses in the veterinary program could also count. To address this, the Board could either allow approved coursework to count toward the required hours or reduce the total number of required hours.

Dr. White – stated that Plain-language summary the purpose of requiring hands-on experience is to protect the public and ensure students have the skills to safely work with animals. The concern is whether someone with little or no veterinary experience should be performing veterinary technician tasks. The Board discussed whether to lower the required hours or allow certain coursework to count, but also questioned whether students actually gain enough hands-on animal experience early in their training.

Dr. Knehr – stated that students with no veterinary experience may be better off working as veterinary assistants during their first years of school before taking on veterinary technician duties. He stressed that the experience requirement is important for both public safety and education, especially for tasks like anesthesia. He also expressed concern that creating an exception now could lead to more exceptions in the future and believes students should have meaningful hands-on experience before advancing.

Ms. Vaquera – stated that experience in the field is ideal before making a big jump. If they don't already have the hours and the experience, then somehow they need to have been in a clinic.

Ms. Pedigo – stated that given the Board’s concerns, there wouldn't need to be any changes. Ms. Pedigo also entered Dr. Niemiec’s letter in support of the anesthesia-free dentistry changes. Ms. Pedigo also clarified that she had responded to and clarified Dr. LaHue’s question, regarding wildlife and animal control exemptions.

Dr. O'Dea – requested explanation regarding Section 2(B)2.

Ms. Pedigo – explained that the student certification applies only to first- and second-year veterinary students. Once students reach their third and fourth years, their externships are overseen by their AVMA-accredited veterinary program. Previously, first- and second-year students registered as Veterinary Technician-in-Training (VTIT), but that requirement was removed because they are not training to become Licensed Veterinary Technicians (LVTs). The new certification still allows them to practice under the same supervision and requirements as VTITs.

Dr. White – asked if the Board needed to review the time frame for completion of medical records. Previously, the Board thought that the 60 days was too long to be a benefit for the animal patient in the case, furthermore, we all recognize that there are doctors quite far behind on medical records and that this would be a push. Dr. White asked if there was any appetite to increase the time.

Dr. O'Dea and Dr. Costa- both stated they believed that 45 days is adequate.

Dr. O'Dea – stated that Section 2(G) says the results of the notation from an examination of an animal, including without limitation, the temperature, pulse and respiration of the animal and laboratory data pertaining to the animal. Dr. O'Dea asked if there should be a carve out in there, 'depending on temperament' or species?

Ms. Pedigo – explained that if there was a value or data point that could not be obtained, that the person making the record would note that they were unable to obtain that information and why.

Dr. O'Dea – stated that Section 2, k(1), says the name, time, administration, and quantity of the drug and asked if the Board would like to add the route and concentration. Furthermore, Dr. O'Dea indicated in Section 2 (l) that dose and rate should be concentration and volume. Dr. O'Dea stated that concentration is one of the most important pieces of information in dosage. Dr. O'Dea proposed that concentration be included in the language.

Ms. Pedigo – summarize that for (k)1, that the time of administration, route, concentration, and quantity of drug administered would be acceptable.

Dr. Knehr – asked a clarifying question regarding taking the NAVLE at least once in a 12 month period.

Ms. Pedigo – clarified that in paragraph 5, a veterinary-graduate-awaiting-licensure must not later than 12 months after the date of issuance of his or her certificate submit proof that he or she has registered.

Mr. Travis – asked a question about the requirement to retake the test.

Ms. Pedigo – clarified that they are required to provide proof of registration, but that there may be some flexibility for staff regarding taking the test if there are mitigating circumstances for the applicant. Ms. Pedigo also clarified that if they do not take the exam, then the registration could be suspended.

Mr. Travis – asked if there was a desire to have more specific language that requires them to take the test.

Dr. White – stated that she did understand that they are often at whim of scheduling sometimes. Dr. White states that it would make sense to have some flexibility based on that.

Ms. Pedigo - explained that passing the required exam is still expected. If someone registers but does not take the exam on time, their certification or registration can be suspended until they provide proof that they are properly registered for the exam. Staff noted that most people complete the exam as required, so changing the process would have little impact while still allowing flexibility for unusual circumstances.

Dr. Knehr – asked if the language could be amended regarding dental examinations.

Motion: Dr. White moved to accept the regulation language as amended.

Second: Dr. O'Dea

Vote: All aye.

10. 2026 and 2027 Board Meeting Schedule (For Possible Action)

11. Report from the Nevada Veterinary Medical Association

Heather Nichols presented the NVMA update.

12. Business Items for Future Meetings (For Possible Action)

13. Public Comment

No public comment given.

14. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

Motion: Dr. White moved to adjourn at 4:38p

Second: Dr. Knehr

Vote: All aye.