

## RULE IMPACT STATEMENT

### TITLE 38:10-11

Changes in Title 38:10-11 involve the fee schedule. There is no change in the fee in (4). We are clarifying that the annual renewal fee for a CADC or LADC is \$125.00. In number (5), this is also the current fee, not an increase. The LADC/MH renewal fee is currently \$175.00, but it was listed as \$125.00 for the LADC and \$50.00 additional in (18). The fee in (18) was called a co-occurring disorder certification fee, which is now our LADC/MH and we are re-naming this in (5) and eliminating the old (18). New number (6) is amended to correct an oversight when we increased fees in 2018. We did not adjust the total amount that would be charged for renewing a credential that is four months or more delinquent. Due to certification/licensure renewal fee increases of \$25.00 in 2018, the total maximum renewal fee and late fees needed to be increased by \$25.00.

The new number (19) is a new fee for Criminal History Initial Determination Fee as created by HB 1373, Criminal History Initial Determination Fee. This rule allows a person with a criminal record to pay a fee up to \$95.00 to get an initial determination on their likelihood of being able to get a credential based on their past criminal record.

Persons most likely affected by the fee changes will be certified or licensed persons that renew late and applicants that have a past criminal history that are applying for a credential.

Consumers will have minimal impact due to these changes.

The Board will benefit by the fees being more clearly defined and by the new fee for the time consuming process of making an initial determination for persons with a criminal history.

Employing agencies will benefit by having the Board make a determination on a person's ability to seek licensure due to their past criminal history.

Implementation of these changes will have minimal financial impact on candidates or counselors. There is no economic impact on any political subdivision and does not require their cooperation in implementing or enforcing the rule.

The proposed rules do not have any adverse economic effect on small business.

There is no less costly or non-regulatory method or less intrusive method for achieving the purpose of these rule changes.