

**CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS**

Hearing Date: **March 24, 2014**

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulation: **Fees**

Section Affected: **California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Division 26, Section 2649**

Updated Information

The Initial Statement of Reasons is included in the file. The information contained therein is updated to include the specific, rather than average, number of anticipated license renewals for fiscal years (FYs) 2015/16 and 2016/17 along with corresponding revenue projections found in the “Underlying Data” section.

Originally, the Landscape Architects Technical Committee (LATC) projected that an average of 1,688 licenses would be renewed each year at the current renewal fee of \$400, totaling \$675,200 in revenue for FYs 2015/16 and 2016/17. Instead of using an “average” number of licenses to be renewed, the LATC should have used the specific number of licenses set to expire in each FY, which it anticipates will be renewed.

The number of licenses scheduled to expire in FYs 2015/16 and 2016/17 is 1,751 and 1,948 respectively. Under the current fee of \$400, revenue would be \$700,400 in FY 2015/16 and \$779,200 in FY 2016/17. With the proposed temporary reduction in renewal fees (\$220), revenue in FY 2015/16 would total \$385,220 and \$428,560 in FY 2016/17.

This proposal would result in a cost savings to licensees of \$315,180 in FY 2015/16 and \$350,640 in FY 2016/17 for a total of \$665,820 over the two year period.

The table below updates the figures reported in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>* Estimated Total Annual Renewal Fee Revenue</b>	<b>* Estimated Revenue Savings</b>
2013-14	\$703,600	N/A
2014-15	\$703,600	N/A
2015-16	\$385,220	\$315,180
2016-17	\$428,560	\$350,640
2017-18	\$700,400	N/A
<b>Total Estimated Revenue Savings over Lifetime of Proposed Temporary License Renewal Fee Reduction:</b>		<b>\$665,820</b>

\* Estimate based on 3,699 licensee population

### Local Mandate

A mandate is not imposed on local agencies or school districts.

### Small Business Impact

This regulation will not have a significant adverse economic impact on small business.

### Anticipated Benefits of This Regulatory Action

The LATC is proposing to temporarily reduce license renewal fees to ensure compliance with existing law. Licensees will also benefit from the temporary license renewal fee reduction by lowering the cost to maintain their license.

This proposal will also amend subsections (b), (e), and (f), to remove outdated references to fees that were in effect before July 1, 2009. This amendment will remove unnecessary language and help avoid confusion.

### Consideration of Alternatives

No reasonable alternative which was considered or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the LATC would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which it was proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulation or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

### Objections or Recommendations/Responses

The following recommendations and/or objections were made regarding the proposed action during the 45-day public comment period:

1. Katherine Howard's Comment: On February 7, 2014, Ms. Howard emailed LATC expressing support for the proposed temporary renewal fee reduction.

Response: LATC acknowledged Ms. Howard's support of the proposed regulatory action.

2. Deborah Denne's Comments: On February 7, 2014, Ms. Denne emailed LATC asking for clarification that the proposed rulemaking action would reduce her license renewal fee when it is due for her in April 2016, and LATC responded by confirming her assessment of the proposal.

On February 13, 2014, Ms. Denne emailed LATC again suggesting that it consider reducing the license fees for landscape architects who are either having difficulty with finances or are out of work.

Response: This comment was rejected because it is outside the scope of the proposed regulation.