This document is made available electronically by the Minnesota Legislative Reference Library as part of an ongoing digital archiving project. http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/sonar/sonar.asp

STATE OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF PODIATRIC MEDICINE

STATEMENT OF NEED

In the Matter of the Proposed Adoption of Rules of the Minnesota Board of Podiatric Medicine Increasing Temporary Permit, Licensure, and License Renewal Fees, and Establishing a One-Time Fee, Minnesota Rules, Chapter 6900

AND REASONABLENESS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject		page
I. Introduction		1
II. Statement of Board's A	Authority	1
III. Small Business Conside	erations	2
IV. Affect on Local Public Agricultural Land	Bodies, Impact on	3
V. Statement of Need and	Reasonableness	3
VI. Finance Department App	proval	5

BOARD OF PODIATRIC MEDICINE

STATEMENT OF NEED AND REASONABLENESS

1. INTRODUCTION

State law requires a regulatory board to generate sufficient revenue to cover its expenditures within a fiscal biennium, that is, from July 1 in an even-numbered year to June 30 in the following odd-numbered year. Expenditures are divided into two basic categories: (1) operating costs (or budgeted items) that in total cannot exceed tha amount appropriated for that purpose by the legislature, and (2) extra-budget costs, such as Statewide Indirect costs related to services provided to the board by other state agencies, and Attorney Generals's costs related to legal services provided to the board. Extra-budget items do not have a cap as budget items do.

At the time the appropriation for the Board of Podiatric Medicine (hereinafter "Board") was passed by the 1992 legislature for the fiscal 1994-95 biennium, anticipated total expenditures for both budget and extra-budget items were under the anticipated revenues from existing fees. However, since that time, the Board received word that Statewide indirect costs would be approximately \$4,000 higher than estimated, and Attorney Genral's costs for the first quarter (July through September) execced one-half the amount extimated for the entire year. It became obvious that existing fee levels could not cover the additional extra-budget expenses.

The approximately \$6,000 shortfall must by law be reduced to zero by means of a rule that increases existing fees. Part V addresses the need and reasonableness of the proposed rule.

II. STATEMENT OF THE BOARD'S STATUTORY AUTHORITY

Minn. Stat. S 153.02 (1992) grants the Board the authority to adopt rules as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the licensing law. Minn. Stat. S 214.06, subdivision 1, requires any licensing board to adjust any fee it is empowered to assess a sufficient amount so that the total of all fees collected will as closely as possible equal anticipated expenditures during the fiscal biennium. Subdivision 2 authorizes licensing boards to promulgate rules providing for renewal of licenses, including fees for license renewal.

Because licensing boards are required to match anticipated revenue with anticipated expenditures, setting fees and increasing them as needed by rule are necessary to carry out the purposes of the podiatric medicine law.

III. SMALL BUSINESS CONSIDERATIONS

Minnesota Statutes, Section 14.115, subdivision 2, requires that when an agency proposes new or amended rules, it must consider "methods for reducing the impact of the rule on small business" and "document how it has considered these methods". Subdivision 4 requires the agency to "provide opportunity for small businesses to participate in the rulemaking process." Subdivision 7, clause 2, states that Section 14.115 does not apply to rules that do not affect small businesses directly.

It is the Board's position that the proposed rule increasing some fees does not directly affect businesses in general, whether large or small, because a licensure-related fee paid to the Board is the obligation of the individual seeking licensure or a temporary permit, or holding a license to practice in this state, irrespective of whether the individual is the owner of his or her professional practice, an employee of another entity, or not gainfully employed at all. Licensure-related fees are fees related solely to the right to practice in this state and are not at all concerned with the economic status or condition of the individuals granted the right to practice. The licensure fee or renewal fee is not an obligation of, and is not assessed against, any professional podiatric medical practice (which may be considered by some as belonging to the category designated as "small business").

Despite the fact that this proposed rule does not directly affect small business, the Board examined the methods in subdivision 2 of lessening the impact of the proposed fee increases on small business.

Clause (a) cannot be implemented because (1) a given fee must be equally applied to every person paying the fee in order to be fair, (2) attempting to prorate a fee to take into consideration the economic status of each person paying the fee would be virtually impossible to administer, and (3) no reporting requirements are imposed by the proposed rule.

Clause (b) cannot be implemented because a less stringent schedule for compliance would result in the Board being unable to meet its financial obligations, and in any case would run counter to rules requiring the payment of renewal fees by a certain date.

Clause (c) does not need to be implemented because compliance (that is, paying the fee) is already reduced to the simplest of processes - writing a check and mailing it to the Board.

Clause (d) does not need to be implemented because no performance or operational standards are imposed by the proposed rule.

Clause (e) cannot be implemented because to do so would result in

Bd of Podiatric Medicine - Statement of Need and Reasonableness

the Board being unable to meet its financial obligations.

Further, should the rule be modified as a result of any of the provisions of subdivision 2, the rule would then be contrary to the statutory objectives that are the basis of the proposed rulemaking, in that the Board is required by law to generate sufficient revenues to cover expenses.

Therefore, it remains the Board's position that Section 14.115 does not apply to this proposed rule, but if it does apply, the small business considerations have been examined and determined to be not applicable in this rulemaking process.

IV. EFFECT ON LOCAL PUBLIC BODIES, IMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL LAND

Minnesota Statutes S 14.11 imposes certain duties upon agencies if proposed rules would require the expenditure of public money by local public bodies or would have a direct and substantial adverse impact on agricultural land.

It is the position of the Board that Minnesota Statutes S 14.11, subdivision 1, does not apply in the case of this proposed rule, inasmuch as the proposed increase in fees affect individuals licensed or seeking licensure in Minnesota, and as such, does not require the expenditure of money by local public bodies. While some licensees may provide services to residents of a city or county, for example, the services are provided on a fee-forservice basis. The licensure or renewal fee is the obligation of the podiatrist providing the services, not the local public body contracting for them. Therefore, no fiscal note regarding the proposed cost to local public bodies is required.

It is the position of the Board that subdivision 2 does not apply to the proposed rule, because the rule does not relate at all to agricultural land, and, therefore, cannot have a direct and substantial adverse impact on agricultural land. Therefore, the provisions of Sections 17.81 to 17.84 need not be followed.

V. STATEMENT OF NEED AND REASONABLENESS

6900.0200 LICENSE RENEWAL.

Subpart 1 is amended to change "\$450" to "the renewal fee" in the text that prorates the renewal fee for the first renewal period for licensees licensed less than two full years. The amendment is necessary because part 6900.0250 increases the \$450 renewal fee to \$500, rendering "\$450" inaccurate. It is reasonable to change the reference to "the renewal fee" rather than "\$500" so that any increases necessitated in the future by additional Board obligations will not require an amendment to this part.

Bd of Podiatric Medicine - Statement of Need and Reasonableness

6900.0250 FEES.

Subpart 1 increases the licensure fee from \$450 to \$500, the renewal fee from \$450 to \$500, and the temporary permit fee from \$200 to \$250. The licensure and renewal fees are for a two-year period, the temporary permit for one year.

The Introduction justified the need for fee increases generally. Stated briefly, the increases are necessary because anticipated revenues from existing fees are insufficient to cover the anticipated expenditures in the categories of Statewide Indirect costs and Attorney General's services, and state law requires regulatory boards' revenues to match their obligations.

It is reasonable to raise the license and license renewal fee the same amount because they both have essentially the same purpose and are for the same time period. It is reasonable that the temporary permit fee also be raised by the same amount, although for one year, as the licensure fee because it covers the cost of local administration of the PMLexis (national licensure examination), checking and maintaining lists of authorized postgraduate training sites and trainers, and a greater degree of correspondence and other administrative details not found in connection with licensure applications.

Subdivision 3 imposes a one-time fee of \$15 to be paid by every person who is licensed on the effective date of the rule. It is reasonable to provide a one-time assessment to partially cover a one-time "balloon" expenditure because the fee generation is not perpetuated beyond the biennium in which it is assessed. (It should be noted that if fees generate too much revenue and a large positive balance (compared to total expenditures) results, fees must be decreased accordingly.)

It is reasonable to provide that failure to pay the one-time fee is failure to submit a complete renewal application because an enforcement procedure ensures that the fee will be paid, and the fee must be paid by everyone if the Board's obligations are to be met. Failure to submit a complete renewal application can result in loss of the right to practice if, after proper notice and time to respond, the renewal application remains incomplete.

Part VI reproduces the request to the Finance Department for approval of the proposed fee increases, together with accompanying documents, and the Finance Department's approval of the fee increases. The request includes tables that indicate the changes in anticipated expenditures and revenue, and the balance between expenditures and revenue anticipated because of the increase in fees.

4

Bd of Podiatric Medicine - Statement of Need and Reasonableness

VI. FINANCE DEPARTMENT APPROVAL

Minnesota Statutes, Section 214.06, subdivision 1, requires that fee increases be approved by the Commissioner of Finance before being promulgated by rule. The request for approval, with documents, and the approval are reproduced on the following pages.

Low & Muneno

Lois E. Mizuno UExecutive Director

March 7, 1994

Date



Board of Podiatric Medicine

2700 University Avenue West #101 40 St. Paul, MN 55114 (612) 642-0588 0401

TO: Bruce J. Reddemann, Director Budget Operations Department of Finance 4th Floor Centennial Bldg.

FROM: Lois E. Mizuno Executive Director

DATE: January 24, 1994

RE :

Request for Approval of Fee Increases

This memo serves as a request for approval of the intention of the Board of Podiatric Medicine to increase fees in F.Y. 1994 for the purpose of covering costs unanticipated at the time the budget for this biennium was adopted.

There are two reasons for the unanticipated extra expenses: (1) the statewide indirect costs to be covered in this fiscal year are about \$4,000 higher than estimated, primarily due to the legislative audit of the Board's finances conducted in the spring of 1992; and (2) Attorney General's fees, which in the first quarter of F.Y. 1994 exceeded half of the amount allocated for the entire year, primarily due to three complaint case that required investigation and conferencing. That degree of activity is unusual; the Board had had no need to take disciplinary action since June, 1991.

The following tables indicate the expenditure amounts estimated for the budget and revised to include the unanticipated amounts (Table I), and the revenues originally estimated, subsequently revised, and anticipated based upon proposed fee increases (Table II).

T	ab	1	e	Ι	

Fiscal Year 1994 Expenditures

Category	<u>As Adopted</u>	<u>As Amended</u>
Budget (Operating Expenses) Statewide Indirect Attorney General MDH - HIV/HBV Monitoring	#30,000 2,000 7,000 2,000	\$30,000 6,000 10,000 1,000 *
TOTAL	41,000	47,000

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

B. Reddemann - 01/24/94

* The revised figure is based upon actual costs to this Board for F.Y. 1993.

Table II

Fiscal Year 1994	Anticipated	Revenues
------------------	-------------	----------

Category Original				С	orrected	i ·	Prop	osed	
	<u>Fee</u>	#	Amount	Fee	<u>#</u> .	<u>Amount</u>	<u> </u>	#	Amount
Temp Permit Licensure Renewal Late Renewal Corp Regist Corp Re-regist	200 450 450 100 25	15 20 67 5 0 12	\$3,000 9,000 30,150 500 0 300	200 450 450 100 25	15 20 64 2 1	\$3,000 9,000 28,800 200 100 350	250 500 500 100 100 25	15 20 64 2 1 14	\$3,750 9,750 31,900 200 100 350
TOTAL			42,950			41,450			46,050
Plus a one-time	e acr	oss-	the-board	fee	of \$	15 for	135 pa	yers	2,025
GRAND TOTAL	ĩ								48,075

Note: The figures for renewal and late renewal in the Corrected column include actual revenue from late pay F.Y. 1993 renewals, for two late renewals instead of anticipated five. The correction for corporation registration represents actual revenue from one registration. The two late renewals @ \$450 are included in the renewal total in the Proposed column. The Licensure total in the Proposed column includes 5 applications @ \$450.

It should be noted that because the number of licensees has gradually increased since F.Y. 1989, the Board has been able to meet its expenses without increasing fees since F.Y. 1989. (In F.Y. 1991 the renewal period was changed from one year to two years, and the renewal fee was doubled to match. The per year fee, of course, remained the same.)

Because it is anticipated that the cost of legislative audits in future will be spread over two or three years (rather than the one year balloon assessment in F.Y. 1994) the statewide indirect costs are not expected to be as high from now on. Therefore, the Board proposes that a portion of needed revenue this year come from a one-time only fee paid by all licensees (rather than coming from renewal fees paid by half the licensees each year).

The Board is anticipating passing a formal resolution initiating the rule-making process at its meeting on March 4, 1994. I would appreciate a response before that date. Thank you. Department: of Finance

state of minnesota Office Memorandum

Date: February 14, 1994

- To: Lois E. Mizuno, Executive Director Board of Podiatric Medicine
- From: Michelle Harper Budget Operations

Phone: 296-7838

Subject: Departmental Earnings Rate Change Response- Temp. Permits, Initial Licenses, Renewal, etc.

Pursuant to provisions of Laws 1993, sec. 56, subd. 5 (M.S. 16A.1285), the Department of Finance has reviewed and approved the attached departmental earnings proposal submitted by the Board of Podiatric Medicine on 2/14/94. If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at the above number.

cc Bruce Reddemann Josie Ashton

Johulle

Department of Finance Departmental Earnings: Reporting/Approval

Part A: Explanation

	le: Fee Revenue o	f Bd of Podi	iatric Me	dicine	Statutor	ry Authority:	MS 153.02,	214.06	Date: 02,	/10/94
rf Descrij	i o	pprovals of p nitial licen n record as xpenses (ind	nses, and of effec	l license r tive date	enewal, an of increas	d a special es, for the	fee for ea purpose of	ch licens covering	ee	
Se	pe (check one): rvice/User 2 ecial Tax/Assessment		-		3. <u>×</u> Occ	upational Licer	nsure			
X Ch Re	<i>Purpose (check one):</i> ap. 14 Review and C porting of Agency Ini her (specify):	omment				lationary Adjus	tment			
• –	an agency initiated ac pertinent statutes:	ction (option 3	above), do	es agency ha	eve explicit au	nthority to retain	in and spond r	eceipts? _	Yes	_ No
es, cite j			-	of payees imp		nthority to retain	in and spend r	eceipts? _		No
es, cite j	pertinent statutes:	nge in unit rate	-	of payees imp F.	acted, etc.):	Increase	<i>in and spond r</i> ∦ Paying	F.Y.		
es, cite point of Part	portinent statutes: proposed Change (cha	nge in unit rate # it ears)	Paying 15 15	of payees imp F. Current	acted, etc.): Y. 1994 Proposed			F.Y. Current	1995 Proposed	No Increase 50 50 50 0

FI-00399-01

Department of Finance

Departmental Earnings: Reporting/Approval (Cont.)

(\$1,000,000 = 1,000)

Part B: Fiscal Detail

APID:	21505-00-17		AID: 941-674	Rev. Code(s): S	ee "Item" column	Dedicated	Dedicated Non-Dedicated		
		F.Y. 1991	F.Y. 1992	F.Y. 1993	F.Y. 1994	F.Y. 1995	F.Y. 1994	F.Y. 1995	
	ltem	Revenues:			As Shown in Biennial Budget	As Shown in Biennial Budget	As Currently Proposed	As Currently Proposed	
101	Temporary Permit	3	3	3	3	3	3.7	3.7	
102	Licensure	2	9	8.3	9	9	9.8	10.0	
200	License Renewal	29	29	26.1	30	31	31.9	31.	
202	Late Renewal	1	2	0.5	1	1	0.2	0.2	
500	Corp Regist.	0	0	0.1	· 0	0	0.1	0	
505	Corp Re-regist	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	
600	Civil Penalty	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
400	Special Fee	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	0	
	TOTAL	36.3	44.3	38.4	43.4	44.4	48.1	45.3	
		Expenditures:							
Direct		26	26	29.7	30	<u>3</u> 0	30	30	
Indirect	t	13	8	9.8	11	11	17	13	
Total		39	34	39.5	41	41	47	43	
Current Deficit/	t Excess	(3)	10	(1)	. 2	3	1	2	
Accum Excess	ulated /Deficit*		7	6	8	11	7	9	
As nec	essary, attach detaile	d schedule/listi	ng of proposed ch	anges in departr	nental earnings	Agency Signat	ure:		

rates. Please see memo dated 01/24/94 for revenue/expenditure details

S Agency Signature: Laus & Minjuno

* F.Y. 1991 beginning accumulated balance to include amount of accumulated excess/deficit (if any) carried forward from F.Y. 1990.

1 Board of Podiatric Medicine

2 3 Proposed Permanent Rules Relating to Fee Increases 4

5 Rules as Proposed

6 6900.0200 LICENSE RENEWAL.

7 Subpart 1. Active status. The license renewal term is 24 months beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30. Applications 8 received and postmarked after June 30 in the year due will be 9 10 returned for addition of the late renewal fee. The term of 11 renewal begins on July 1 in odd-numbered years for a licensee 12 whose license number is an odd number and in even-numbered years 13 for a licensee whose license number is an even number. The July 14 1, 1991, renewal term for a licensee who renews in even-numbered years shall end June 30, 1992, and the renewal fee and 15 continuing education hours shall be half the amount required for 16 a 24-month renewal period. For the first renewal period 17 following the initial licensure period, the fee for renewal of 18 license is that fraction of \$450 the renewal fee, to the nearest 19 dollar, that is represented by the ratio of the number of days 20 the license is held in the initial licensure period to 730 days. 21 22 An applicant for license renewal must submit to the board: 23 [For text of items A to C, see M.R.] [For text of subps 2 to 7, see M.R.] 24 6900.0250 FEES. 25 26 Subpart 1. Amounts. Fees are as follows: A. licensure, \$450 \$500; 27 B. renewal of a license, \$450 \$500; 28 29 C. late renewal of a license, an additional \$100; D. temporary permit, \$200 \$250; 30 31 E. replacement of an original license document or 32 renewal certificate, \$10; and 33 F. relicensure following expiration of license, \$550. 34 [For text of subp 2, see M.R.] Subp. 3. Special fee. A one-time fee of \$15 is assessed 35 against the license of each person holding a license to practice 1 2 on the effective date of this part, to be paid on or before June 30, 1994. Failure to pay the fee by the licensee's renewal date 3

4 is failure to submit a completed license renewal application as

5 provided in part 6900.0200.



3/21



2700 University Avenue West #104-40 St. Paul, MN 55114 (612) 642-0588-0401

March 14, 1994

Maryanne Hruby, Executive Director LCRAR Room 55 State Office Building

Dear Ms. Hruby:

Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 14.131, I am hereby forwarding to you a copy of the Statement of Need and Reasonableness that justifies the proposed rule increasing fees. The Notice was submitted to the State Register on March 7, 1994, for publication on March 21, 1994. The Notice will be mailed to all persons who indicated they wish to be notified on or before March 16, 1994.

Also enclosed is a copy of the proposed rule.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Jaco & Minjino

Lois E. Mizuno Executive Director

enclosures

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER