## ADOPTED REGULATION OF THE

# STATE CONTRACTORS' BOARD

#### **LCB File No. R117-03**

Effective December 4, 2003

EXPLANATION – Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [omitted material] is material to be omitted.

AUTHORITY: §1, NRS 624.100 and 624.240; §2, NRS 624.100 and 624.265.

**Section 1.** NAC 624.600 is hereby amended to read as follows:

624.600 1. If the Board requires an applicant or his qualified employee to take an examination, he must take and pass an examination administered by an independent testing service.

- 2. The Board will waive the examination if it is satisfied that the experience and qualifications of the applicant or qualified employee justify granting the license without examination.
- 3. Following any waiting period established by the independent testing service, an applicant or the qualified employee may retake the examination. If he fails a second examination, he may take it a third time. The person qualifying for the applicant must take and pass the examination within 6 months after the filing of the application. If he fails the third examination, the application becomes void. The applicant may apply again with a new application and fee [3] months] 30 days or more after the date of the last examination.
  - **Sec. 2.** NAC 624.681 is hereby amended to read as follows:
- 624.681 Any fingerprint cards required pursuant to subsection 2 of NRS 624.265 must be accompanied by a cashier's check made payable to the "Nevada Highway Patrol" for [\$15.] an

amount equal to the sum of the amounts charged by the Central Repository for Nevada

Records of Criminal History and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for processing the fingerprint cards.

# NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF PROPOSED REGULATION LCB File No. R117-03

The State Contractors' Board adopted regulations assigned LCB File No. R177-03 which pertain to chapter 624 of the Nevada Administrative Code on October 28, 2003.

Notice date: 8/26/2003 Date of adoption by agency: 10/28/2003

**Hearing date:** 10/6/2003 **Filing date:** 12/4/2003

## INFORMATIONAL STATEMENT

1. A description of how public comment was solicited, a summary of public response, and explanation how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

A workshop and hearing were noticed on August 26, 2003 by posting at the Washoe County Court House; Washoe County Library; Reno City Hall; Las Vegas City Hall; Sawyer State Building; Clark County Library and Offices of the Contractors' Board in Reno and Las Vegas. The notice was posted on the agency's website and mailed to approximately 135 interested individuals.

- 2. The number of persons who:
  - (a) Attended each hearing:
    (b) Testified at each hearing:
    (c) Submitted to the agency written comments:
    0
- 3. A description of how comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of their response and an explanation how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

Comments were solicited from affected businesses by the notice posting, website and direct mail.

4. If the regulation was adopted without changing any part of the proposed regulation, a summary of the reasons for adopting the regulation without change.

The regulation was adopted by the Nevada State Contractors Board at its October 27, 2003 meeting without change since no comments were received.

- 5. The estimated economic effect of the adopted regulation on the businesses which it is to regulate and on the public. These must be stated separately, and each case must include:
  - (a) Both adverse and beneficial effects; and
  - (b) Both immediate and long-term effects.

- (a) The regulation is expected to have little economic impact on the regulated industry since the regulation provides a shorter period of time that an applicant for a license may reapply after failing the exam and changes the fee required for fingerprints to comport with Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History and the Federal Bureau of Investigation fee requirements.
- (b) Immediate and long-term effects should be minimal.
- 6. The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the adopted regulation.

The cost of enforcement of the proposed regulation will be minimal.

7. A description of any regulations of other state or governmental agencies which the proposed regulation overlaps or duplicates and a statement explaining why the duplication or overlapping is necessary. If the regulation overlaps or duplicates a federal regulation, the name of the regulating federal agency.

There are no other state or government agency regulations which the proposed regulations duplicate.