

**BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT
BILL NO. 2024-32**

(Amends various provisions of LVMC Title 7 to limit to four the number of guinea pigs that may be kept at one location; limit the number of animals that can be sold by a pet shop or breeder to one person or household during a calendar year; establish corresponding documentation and compliance requirements; and establish and update penalty provisions pertaining to the keeping and sale of animals)

This business impact statement was prepared pursuant to NRS 237.090 to address the impact of the contents of a proposed ordinance, Bill No. 2024-32, that will amend various provisions of LVMC Title 7 to limit to four the number of guinea pigs that may be kept at one location; limit the number of animals that can be sold by a pet shop or breeder to one person or household during a calendar year; establish corresponding documentation and compliance requirements; and establish and update penalty provisions pertaining to the keeping and sale of animals.

1. The following constitutes a description of the manner in which comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of their responses and an explanation of the manner in which other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

Notification of the proposal was provided by US mail to approximately 73 animal-related businesses, as well as approximately 13 other individuals or organizations representative of business or identified as community partners. Included in that list were the following chambers of commerce and trade associations:

Asian Chamber of Commerce
Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce
Henderson Chamber of Commerce
Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce
Latin Chamber of Commerce
Urban Chamber of Commerce
Women's Chamber of Commerce-Nevada

A list of the proposed changes contained in the proposal was included in the mailing and also made available on the City's website. Recipients of the notification were invited to respond in writing and to submit comments, data or arguments regarding whether the proposal would impose a direct and significant economic burden upon a business or directly restrict the formation, operation, or expansion of a business.

The City received one written response. The response was from the Pet Advocacy Network, a national advocacy organization said to represent the interests of pets, pet owners, pet-related businesses and the pet care community. The response included comments about how the proposal may not be the best approach to certain perceived problems, and that improvements could be made to the proposal by possibly broadening its scope. To the extent that the organization represents the interests of businesses affected by the proposal, the response did not provide comments, data or arguments to indicate that the proposal would impose economic burdens on businesses or restrict the formation, operation or expansion of businesses. The preceding sentences of this paragraph are the means by which the summary of the response received is made available to interested persons.

No local chambers of commerce or trade associations requested a workshop regarding the proposal.

2. The estimated economic effect of the rule on businesses, including, without limitation, both adverse and beneficial effects, and both direct and indirect effects:

Adverse effects:

For businesses that might sell multiple animals to the same owner or household within a year's time, the proposal would limit the number of such sales each year, which might impact sales or sales patterns. Additionally, the information-taking and reporting requirements may place additional burdens on affected businesses, depending on what record-keeping and reporting they do now.

Beneficial effects:

May discourage pet hoarding and conditions related to pet welfare.

Direct effects:

See adverse and beneficial effects above.

Indirect effects:

None identified.

3. The following constitutes a description of the methods the local government considered to reduce the impact of the rule on businesses and a statement regarding whether any, and if so which, of these methods were used:

No changes to the rule have been proposed.

4. The estimate of the annual cost to the local government for enforcement of the rule is:

No additional cost. Enforcement will be managed within the existing budget, with responsibilities absorbed by the current administrative and animal protection services staff.

5. If the rule provides for a new fee or increases an existing fee, the total annual amount expected to be collected is:

Not applicable.

6. If the rule provides for a new fee or increases an existing fee, the money generated by the new fee or increase in existing fee will be used by the local government to:

Not applicable.

7. If the rule includes provisions that duplicate or are more stringent than federal, state or local standards regulating the same activity, the following explains why such duplicative or more stringent provisions are necessary:

The updated requirements are deemed to be beneficial to animals, owners and the community in general.

8. The reasons for the conclusions regarding the impact of the rule on businesses:

The impact of the proposal on affected businesses is determined to be minimal in relation to the benefits provided.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge or belief, the information contained in this business impact statement was prepared properly and is accurate.


By: _____
City Manager

Date: September 11, 2024