

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA – DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS**

HEARING DATE: November 16, 2006

SUBJECT MATTER OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS: Delinquent Fees, Board Approved Providers, Renewal of Expired Approval, and Time Limit for Renewal of Approval After Expiration; New Approval

SECTIONS AFFECTED: Sections 1816.7, 1887.7, 1887.75, and 1887.77 of Division 18 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF EACH ADOPTION, AMENDMENT, OR REPEAL:

The specific purpose of this proposal is to: 1) add a delinquency fee for continuing education provider approval in order to reduce the processing of new provider applications; 2) prevent a provider from applying for a new provider approval number within one year of an existing approval's expiration unless the provider has undergone a change of ownership; 3) prevent courses from being presented for continuing education credit when a provider's approval is expired; 4) set forth requirements for renewal of an expired approval; and 5) set forth a one-year time limit for renewal of an expired approval.

FACTUAL BASIS/RATIONALE

Staff research indicated that nearly one-third of the new provider applications that it receives are from providers whose approvals have been cancelled by failing to renew on time. Therefore, this proposal is reasonably necessary, as it would: reduce the number of new provider applications received each year; set forth a reasonable time period for renewal of an expired approval, establish a delinquency fee which would encourage providers to not let their approval expire, and explicitly state that the Board is not able to grant continuing education credit to a licensee when a provider's approval is expired.

UNDERLYING DATA

None

BUSINESS IMPACT

The proposed regulations will not have a significant adverse economic impact on businesses.

SPECIFIC TECHNOLOGIES OR EQUIPMENT

The proposed regulations do not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

No reasonable alternative to the regulation would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.