



MEMORANDUM

DATE	August 9, 2016
TO	Dental Board Members
FROM	Lusine M Sarkisyan, Legislative and Regulatory Analyst
SUBJECT	Agenda Item 20(A): Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Comments Received During the 45-Day Public Comment Period and During the Regulatory Hearing for the Board's Proposed Rulemaking to Amend California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Sections 1021 and 1022 Relevant to Dentistry and Dental Assisting Fee Increase

Background:

At its May 2016 meeting, the Dental Board of California (Board) approved proposed regulatory language relative to fee increases for dentistry and dental assisting licensing and permitting and directed staff to initiate the rulemaking. Board staff filed the initial rulemaking documents with the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on June 14, 2016 and the proposal was published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on Friday, June 24, 2016.

The 45-day public comment period began on Friday, June 24, 2016 and end on Monday, August 8, 2016. A regulatory hearing was held in Sacramento on August 8, 2016 to receive verbal and written testimony. The Board received written comments from the California Dental Association (CDA), the Foundation for Allied Dental Education, Inc. (FADE), the California Association of Dental Assisting teachers, Inc. (CADAT), the California Dental Assistants Association, Inc. (CDAA), and the Extended Functions Dental Assistants Association, Inc. (EFDAA). No comments were received at the regulatory hearing.

Pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, the Board is required to respond to any adverse comments received during the 45-day public comment period or during the regulatory hearing.

Comments Received from the CDA:

The CDA submitted the attached letter in response to the Board's proposed rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Section 1021(n) relative to the fictitious name permit renewal.

Summary of Comments from CDA:

The CDA commented that its membership makes up of approximately 26, 000 licensed dentists in California, and that the Board's oversight of the profession is important to its organization. The CDA recognizes and supports the Board's role in the licensure and enforcement of the practice of dentistry that set the standard of professionalism in California. The CDA agrees that it is necessary for the Board to have resources available to carry out its responsibilities, and that those resources must come from the dentists who benefit from the Board's oversight.

The CDA commented that though the statute requires that the initial fictitious name permit fee be equal to the initial licensure fee, it does not apply to the fictitious permit renewal fee. The CDA expresses concern that a fee increase of the fictitious name permit renewal to \$650 will result in more than 6,500 dentists experiencing a very dramatic rise in the fees they must pay, on an ongoing basis, for the privilege of providing dental care under a consumer-friendly business name. The CDA encourages the Board to reconsider the proposal and the Board's subcommittee's recommendation of \$325.

Staff Recommended Response to Comment(s):

Staff recommends the Board accept the CDA's comment to establish the fee for a fictitious name permit at \$325. The fictitious name permit renewal should be half the initial licensing fee, thus staff recommends modifying to the proposed language.

Board Action Requested:

The Board may take action to accept, reject, or modify staff's recommended response to the comments. If staff recommendations are rejected or modified, staff requests that the Board provide a rationale for inclusion in the rulemaking's final statement of reasons.

Comments Received from the (FADE), the (CADAT), (CDAA), and the (EFDA):

The FADE, CADAT, CDAA, and EFDA submitted the attached joint letter in response to the Board's proposed rulemaking to amend California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 16, Sections 1021 and 1022 relative to the dentistry and dental assisting fee increase.

In the letter they commented collectively to the proposed language regarding the fee increase rulemaking. They commented that the increases to the program and course application fees could potentially support the registered dental assistant (RDA) and registered dental assistant in extended functions (RDAEF) examinations more effectively rather than asking the candidates for dental assisting examinations for more financial support. Also, these professional associations commented that regulatory language be consistent between CCR Sections 1021 and 1022 relating to terms such as "fees", "dental assisting" instead of "dental auxiliary", and "initial approval" for course and program applications. Additionally, they commented that recent statutory changes provide the Board the authority to revisit programs and courses, or ask such programs and courses to reapply for continued approval. They are proposing that a structure be placed into the regulations that would allow the Board to charge site visit fees for programs every (7) years.

FADE, CADAT, CDAA, and EFDAA Comment #1-Section 1021

FADE, CADAT, CDAA, and EFDAA recommended the addition of the word “fee” and made other various technical grammatical amendments throughout Section 1021, Subsections (a) through (ac).

Additionally, they recommended adopting Subsection (ad) which is a law and ethics re-examination fee of \$100 and Subsection (ae) which is a fee of \$125 for the issuance of a replacement pocket license, replacement wall certificate and the like.

Staff Recommended Response:

Staff recommends that the recommendations to Section 1021 be rejected, because rationale and justification are necessary for each proposed amendment in order to comply with the legal review standards in proposing regulations. Neither justification nor rationale was provided in the attached letter as relating to the proposed amendments. The recommended amendments to the language of the text are unnecessary as the heading of Section 1021 references that the subsections refer to fees as relating to dentists.

Additionally, no rationale is provided as to why there should be a “Law and Ethics Re-examination fee” as well as why the fee should be \$100. There is no demonstrated evidence that there is a necessity for the re-examination application fee. An applicant applying to take the law and ethics exam as a result of this proposed rulemaking will pay an application fee of \$125 for eligibility determination and once the Board deems the candidate eligible then that candidate will proceed to make an examination payment to PSI. Should a candidate fail the law and ethics exam, then that candidate would resubmit the examination fee to PSI. It would be duplicative to have the candidate reapply for eligibility through the Board, since the Board has determined that the applicant is already eligible to sit for the law and ethics exam.

Furthermore, there is no rationale or justification provided as to why the replacement pocket license, replacement wall certificate and the like should be \$125.

Board Action Requested:

The Board may take action to accept, reject, or modify staff’s recommended response to the comments. If staff recommendations are rejected or modified, staff requests that the Board provide a rationale for inclusion in the rulemaking’s final statement of reasons.

FADE, CADAT, CDAA, and EFDAA Comment #2-Section 1022

FADE, CADAT, CDAA, and EFDAA recommended technical grammatical changes to the heading of this section, the language proposed in the body of the rulemaking, and the adoption of footnotes for consistency with Section 1021, amendments to proposed fees, and adoption of various fees.

They are recommending that the application fee for the registered dental assistant (RDA) and registered dental assistant in extended functions (RDAEF) be \$50 instead of \$120; the application fee for dental sedation assistant permit to be \$50 instead of

\$120; the application fee for the orthodontic assistant permit to be \$50 instead of \$120; the RDA practical examination fee to be \$50 instead of \$100; the RDAEF examination fee to be \$300 instead of \$500; the RDA program application fee to be \$5,500 instead of the existing \$1,400; the RDAEF program application fee to be \$3,500 instead of the existing \$1,400; the orthodontic assistant permit course application fee to be \$1,500 instead of the existing \$300; the dental sedation assistant permit course application fee to be \$1,000 instead of the existing \$300; the infection control course application fee to be \$1,000 instead of the existing \$300; the coronal polish course application fee to be \$1,000 instead of the existing \$300; the pit & fissure sealant course application fee to be \$1,000 instead of the existing \$300; the radiation safety course application fee to be \$1,000 instead of the existing \$300; and the ultrasonic scaling course application to be \$1,000 instead of the existing \$300.

Furthermore, they are recommending the adoption of the following fees: application fee for RDA practical re-examination fee to be \$75; the application fee for RDAEF simulated or clinical re-examination fee to be \$250; the fee for issuance of a duplicate registration, license, permit, or certificate to replace one that is lost or destroyed, or in the event of a name change to be \$75; the RDA program re-evaluation fee to be \$2,000; and the RDAEF program re-evaluation fee to be \$2,000.

Staff's Response to Comments Received from FADE, CADAT, CDAA, and EFDA

Staff recommends that all recommendations to Section 1022 be rejected, because if the Board averts or delays an immediate fee increase, the Board's State Dental Assisting Fund will become insolvent and the structural imbalance between its revenue and expenditures will continue to grow. Also, rationale and justification are necessary for each proposed amendment in order to comply with the legal review standards in proposing regulations. Neither justification nor rationale was provided in the attached letter as relating to the proposed amendments. Since no justification is provided for Section 1021 regarding the language amendments, it cannot be consistent with the language amendments recommended in Section 1022. Additionally, the language proposed to Section 1022 requires justification for each written comment provided.

Staff acknowledges the concern relating to the program and course application fees; however the application fees for the RDA and RDAEF programs and courses are part of the Comprehensive Dental Assisting Regulatory workshop. The fees for programs and courses will be discussed during an upcoming workshop in order to determine the appropriate fees as well as conduct further research in the proposed fees in order to demonstrate evidence that the Board has authority to charge a fee, that there is a need for the proposal, as well as a justification for each of the fees proposed.

The Board's highest priority is the protection of the public when exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. The primary methods by which the Board achieves this goal are: issuing licenses to eligible applicants; investigating complaints against licensees and disciplining licensees for violations of the Dental Practice Act (Act); monitoring licensees whose licenses have been placed on probation; and managing the Diversion Program for

licensees whose practice may be impaired due to abuse of dangerous drugs or alcohol. The Board must assess fees to licensees to sustain the financial resources necessary to carry out the methods of meeting its highest priority of consumer protection. Since 1998, the Board's enforcement program has grown exponentially in (1) response to consumer protection issues that have surfaced, and (2) response to new statutory and regulatory requirements. Over time, the Board has been able increase staffing resources to meet consumer protection needs in California, but has not raised its licensing fees to offset such expenses.

If the Board does not correct the structural imbalance between its revenue and expenditures through this proposed fee increase, the Board will be forced to: (1) reduce staffing in licensing and enforcement, and (2) reduce operating resources and equipment to offset expenditures. The Board's licensing and enforcement programs would suffer from reductions in staffing and would result in delayed response times to licensing inquiries, application approvals, processing of consumer complaints, conducting investigations, and referring egregious cases to the Attorney General's Office for prosecution. Such staffing reductions would make continued demonstrable and sustained improvements in customer service improbable and the Board would be unable to provide efficient and effective consumer protection.

Board Action Requested:

The Board may take action to accept, reject, or modify staff's recommended response to the comments. If staff recommendations are rejected or modified, staff requests that the Board provide a rationale for inclusion in the rulemaking's final statement of reasons.

Staff Recommendation to Modify Section 1021(c)

Staff recommends that the fee associated with the portfolio examination be modified from \$800 to \$400. During the May 2016 Board meeting, members of the Board expressed concern relating to the \$800 cost of this examination pathway. While conducting research regarding the pathway and considering the number of applicants, the cost associated with implementation, and cost associated with implementing similar pathways, staff recommends that the fee be modified to \$400. The Board has authority to decide the fee for this pathway and therefore it would be necessary to establish the fee for now at \$400, so as to maintain consistency with other similar examination pathways.

Board Action Requested:

The Board may take action to accept, reject, or modify staff's recommended response to the comments. If staff recommendations are rejected or modified, staff requests that the Board provide a rationale for inclusion in the rulemaking's final statement of reasons.

Staff Recommendation to Modify Section 1022(g) and (r)

Staff recommends that the fee associated with the oral conscious sedation (OCS) application fee be modified to \$368 and renewal fee be modified to \$168. Board members expressed concern regarding the fees proposed for the OCS permit and

suggested that further research be conducted to determine whether the proposed fee could be modified. Staff reconsidered the complexity of all permits, the current cost, the recommendations from the Board's Subcommittee, and the recommendations from Capitol Accounting Partners; Staff determined that the oral conscious sedation permit be modified to \$368 for initial application for the permit and \$168 for renewal of the permit.

Board Action Requested:

The Board may take action to accept, reject, or modify staff's recommended response to the comments. If staff recommendations are rejected or modified, staff requests that the Board provide a rationale for inclusion in the rulemaking's final statement of reasons.

**TITLE 16. DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

MODIFIED TEXT

Changes made to the originally proposed text are indicated with double-strikethrough for deletions and double-underline for additions.

Amend Sections 1021 and 1022 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read:

§ 1021. Examination, Permit and License Fees for Dentists.

The following fees are set for dentist examination and licensure by the board**:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (a) Initial application for those applicants qualifying pursuant to Section 1632(c)(2) and those applicants qualifying pursuant to Section 1634.1 | \$ 100 <u>400</u> |
| (b) Initial application for restorative technique examination
<u>Initial application for those applicants qualifying pursuant to Section 1634.1</u> | \$ 250 <u>800</u> |
| (c) Applications for reexamination <u>Initial application for those applicants qualifying pursuant to Section 1632(c)(1)</u> | \$ 750 <u>900</u> <u>400</u> |
| (d) Restorative technique examination or reexamination | \$250 |
| (e) Fee for application for licensure by credential <u>Initial application fee for those applicants applying pursuant to Section 1635.5</u> | \$ 283 <u>525</u> |
| (f) Initial license | \$ 450 <u>650</u> * |
| (g) Biennial license renewal fee | \$ 450 <u>650</u> |
| (h) Biennial license renewal fee for those qualifying pursuant to Section 1716.1 of the code shall be one half of the renewal fee prescribed by subsection (g). | |
| (i) Delinquency fee-license renewal - The delinquency fee for license renewal shall be the amount prescribed by section 163.5 <u>1724</u> (f) of the code. | |
| (j) Substitute certificate | \$ 50 |
| (k) Application for an additional office permit | \$ 100 <u>350</u> |

(lk) Biennial renewal of additional office permit	\$ 100 <u>250</u>
(ml) Late change of practice registration	\$ 50
(nm) Fictitious name permit The fee prescribed by Section 1724.5 of the Code	
(on) Fictitious name renewal	\$ 150 50 <u>\$325</u>
(po) Delinquency fee-fictitious name renewal The delinquency fee for fictitious name permits shall be one-half of the fictitious name permit renewal fee.	
(qp) Continuing education registered provider fee	\$ 250 <u>410</u>
(rq) General anesthesia or conscious sedation permit or adult or minor oral conscious sedation certificate	\$ 200 <u>500</u>
(sr) Oral Conscious Sedation Certificate Renewal	\$ 75 00 <u>\$136</u>
(ts) General anesthesia or conscious sedation permit renewal fee	\$ 200 <u>325</u>
(ut) General anesthesia or conscious sedation on-site inspection and evaluation fee	\$ 250 <u>2,000</u>
<u>(u) Application for a Special Permit</u>	<u>\$1,000</u>
<u>(v) Special Permit Renewal</u>	<u>\$125</u>
<u>(w) Initial Application for an Elective Facial Cosmetic Surgery Permit</u>	<u>\$850</u>
<u>(x) Elective Facial Cosmetic Surgery Permit Renewal</u>	<u>\$800</u>
<u>(y) Application for an Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Permit</u>	<u>\$500</u>
<u>(z) Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Permit Renewal</u>	<u>\$650</u>
<u>(aa) Continuing Education Registered Provider Renewal</u>	<u>\$325</u>
<u>(ac) Application for Law and Ethics Examination</u>	<u>\$125</u>
<u>(ad) Adult or minor oral conscious sedation certificate</u>	<u>\$368</u>

* Fee pro-rated based on applicant's birth date.

** Examination, licensure, and permit fees for dentistry may not all be included in this section, and may appear in the Business and Professions Code.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 1614, 1635.5, 1634.2(c), 1724 and 1724.5, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 1632, 1634.1, 1646.6, 1647.8, 1647.12, 1647.15, 1715, 1716.1, 1718.3, 1724 and 1724.5, Business and Professions Code.

§ 1022. Dental Auxiliaries.

The following fees are fixed for dental auxiliaries licensed by the board:

(a) <u>Registered Dental Assistant (RDA)/Registered Dental Assistant in Extended Functions (RDAEF) Application</u>	\$20 <u>\$120</u>
(b) <u>Dental Sedation Assistant Permit Application</u>	<u>\$120</u>
(c) <u>Orthodontic Assistant Permit Application</u>	<u>\$120</u>
(b) (d) <u>Nonclinical RDA Practical Examination or Reexamination</u>	\$30 <u>\$100</u>
(c) (e) <u>Clinical examination or reexamination Registered Dental Assistant in Extended Functions Examination</u>	\$50 <u>\$500</u>
(d) (f) <u>RDA Biennial License Renewal</u> The biennial renewal fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$30.	\$12 <u>\$100</u>
(e) (g) <u>RDAEF Biennial License Renewal</u> The biennial renewal fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$30.	\$10 <u>\$100</u>
(f) RDH license renewal (h) <u>Dental Sedation Assistant Permit Biennial Renewal</u> The biennial renewal fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$30.	\$24 <u>\$100</u>
(g) RDHEF license renewal (i) <u>Orthodontic Assistant Permit Biennial Renewal</u> The biennial renewal fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$30.	\$10 <u>\$100</u>

(h) <u>(j) RDA Delinquency Renewal fee</u>	\$6 <u>\$50</u>
The delinquency fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$15.	
(i) <u>(k) RDAEF Delinquency Renewal fee</u>	\$5 <u>\$50</u>
The delinquency fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$15.	
(j) <u>RDH delinquency fee</u> (l) <u>Dental Sedation Assistant Permit Delinquency Renewal</u>	\$12 <u>\$50</u>
The delinquency fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$15.	
(k) <u>RDHEF delinquency fee</u> (m) <u>Orthodontic Assistant Permit Delinquency Renewal</u>	\$5 <u>\$50</u>
The delinquency fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$15.	
<u>(n) RDA Program Application</u>	<u>\$1400</u>
<u>(o) RDAEF Program Application</u>	<u>\$1400</u>
<u>(p) Orthodontic Assistant Permit Course Application</u>	<u>\$300</u>
<u>(q) Dental Sedation Assistant Permit Course Application</u>	<u>\$300</u>
<u>(r) Infection Control Course Application</u>	<u>\$300</u>
<u>(s) Coronal Polish Course Application</u>	<u>\$300</u>
<u>(t) Pit & Fissure Sealant Course Application</u>	<u>\$300</u>
<u>(u) Radiation Safety Course Application</u>	<u>\$300</u>
<u>(v) Ultrasonic Scaling Course Application</u>	<u>\$300</u>
(w) <u>Substitute Certificate Duplicate License/Certification Fee</u>	\$25 <u>\$50</u>

Note: Authority cited: Section 1614, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 1656 and 1725, Business and Professions Code.



Submitted via email

August 8, 2016

Lusine Sarkisyan, Legislative & Regulatory Analyst
Department of Consumer Affairs
2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 1550
Sacramento, CA 95815

Re: Amendments to Sections 1021 and 1022 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

Dear Ms. Sarkisyan:

California Dental Association (CDA) would like to thank the Dental Board of California (Board) for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed changes to the Board fee structure established within 16 CCR 10 §§1021, 1022. We understand that the increases in fees across the board are necessary to correct structural imbalances between revenue and expenditures while also supporting the Board's licensing and enforcement programs. CDA, an organization comprised of over 26,000 dentists, strives to ensure that the practice of dentistry consists of qualified individuals to provide the highest level of patient care. CDA hopes to continue to work closely with the Board to ensure patient protection while also ensuring that qualified dentists can establish and continue their practices.

With these goals in mind, CDA offers the following comment regarding the proposed fee increases to support the Board:

Section 1021 (n) Fictitious name permit renewal: The current renewal fee is \$150, the subcommittee recommended \$325 and the independent fee audit recommended \$136, yet the proposal recommends \$650, equal to the amount a dentist will pay for his or her dental license. While statute requires that the initial fictitious name permit fee be equal to initial licensure, this is not the case for the permit renewal fee. CDA is concerned that a fee increase of this magnitude will result in more than 6,500 dentists experiencing a very dramatic rise in the fees they must pay, on an ongoing basis, for the privilege of providing dental care under a consumer-friendly business name. CDA certainly understands the need for the fee and the need to increase it, but encourages the Board to reconsider this proposal and accept the Board subcommittee's recommendation of \$325.

CDA appreciates the Board's focus on its fiscal health and the opportunity to contribute to the discussion and deliberation on this important matter. We recognize that developing a budget where the Board is fiscally sound and dentists are paying their fair share – not more and not less – is not an easy task and we appreciate working with you to achieve that goal. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 916.554.4995 or gayle.mathe@cda.org with questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gayle Mathe". The signature is written in a dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Gayle Mathe
CDA Board Liaison

The Foundation for Allied Dental Education, Inc. (FADE)
The California Association of Dental Assisting Teachers, Inc. (CADAT)
The California Dental Assistants Association, Inc. (CDAA)
The Extended Functions Dental Assistants Association, Inc. (EFDA)

August 8, 2016

The Dental Board of California
Ms. Sarah Wallace – Asst. Executive Officer
Dr. John Morrow – President
2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 1550
Sacramento, California 95815

Dear President Morrow and Ms. Wallace:

RE: Proposed Amendment to CCR 1021 and 1022 – Fee Structure

On behalf of the professional dental assisting organizations identified herein, we would like to submit to the Dental Board of California our collective response to proposed language regarding California Code of Regulations 1021 and 1022. We look forward to the opportunity to provide further comment during the regulatory hearing.

The attached document reflects the Board's proposed language and our proposed amendments to each Section, with highlighting to reflect the areas we are suggesting be amended. Of specific concern to us are the following:

- Significant increases to dental assisting examination fees without any increase to program and course application fees: we believe that the Board's ability to properly enforce programs and courses rests solely on budgetary constraints; in addition, such fees could potentially support the RDA and RDAEF examinations more effectively rather than ask the candidates for more financial support.
- The use of terms in a more consistent manner: in accordance with the Board's responsibility to present regulatory language that is consistent, we propose amendments that are consistent between 1021 and 1022 such as the terms "fees", "dental assisting" instead of "dental auxiliary" and "initial approval" for course and program applications.
- The ability of the Board to revisit programs and courses: recent statutory changes allow the Board the ability to revisit programs and courses, or ask such programs and courses to reapply for continued approval. The Board's proposed language does not specifically delineate such fees; we are suggesting such a structure be placed into regulation to allow the Board the most flexibility possible to charge site visit fees for programs at each seven (7) year interval.

We ask the Board to consider the proposed language as presented with further discussion during the regulatory hearing. Representatives from each of the dental assisting organizations will be present during the hearing for further interaction based on our recommendations.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our comments and for your consideration of our recommendations.

Respectfully submitted:



Claudia Pohl, CDA, RDA, BVE, FADAA
CDAA



Lorraine Gagliardi, CDA, RDA, RDH, Ed.D
CADAT



LaDonna Drury-Klein, RDA, BS
FADE



Joan Greenfield, RDAEF, OAP, MS
EFDAA

TITLE 16. DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

PROPOSED LANGUAGE

Amend Sections 1021 and 1022 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to read:

§ 1021. Examination, Permit and License Fees for Dentists.

The following fees are set for dentist examinations and licensure by the Board**

(a) Initial application fee for those applicants qualifying pursuant to Section 1632(c)(2) and those applicants qualifying pursuant to Section 1634.1	\$100 \$400
(b) Initial application for restorative technique examination Initial application fee for those applicants qualifying pursuant to Section 1634.1	\$250 \$800
(c) Applications for reexamination Initial application fee for those applicants qualifying pursuant to Section 1632(c)(1)	\$85 \$800
(d) Restorative technique examination or reexamination	\$250
(e) Fee for application for licensure by credential Initial application fee for those applicants applying pursuant to Section 1635.5	\$283 \$525
(f) e) Initial license fee	\$450 \$650*
(g) f) Biennial license renewal fee	\$450 \$650
(h) g) Biennial license renewal fee for those qualifying pursuant to Section 1716.1 of the code shall be one half of the renewal fee prescribed by subsection (g).	
(i) h) Delinquency fee: license licensure renewal - The delinquency fee for license renewal shall be the amount prescribed by section 163.5 1724(f) of the code.	
(j) i) Substitute certificate Fee for issuance of a replacement license or permit	\$50
(k) j) Application for an additional office permit fee	\$100 \$350
(l) k) Biennial renewal of additional office permit fee	\$100 \$250
(m) l) Late change of practice registration fee	\$50
(n) m) Fictitious name permit fee – The fee prescribed by Section 1724.5 of the Code	
(o) n) Fictitious name renewal fee	\$150 \$650
(p) o) Delinquency fee: fictitious name renewal – The delinquency fee for fictitious name permits shall be one-half of the fictitious name permit fee	
(q) p) Continuing education registered provider fee	\$250 \$410
(r) q) Initial application fee for General Anesthesia or Conscious Sedation permit or Adult or Minor Oral Conscious Sedation certificate permit	\$200 \$500

(s r) Oral conscious sedation certificate permit renewal fee	\$75- \$500
(t s) General anesthesia or conscious sedation permit renewal fee	\$200- \$325
(u t) General anesthesia or conscious sedation Fee for on-site inspection and evaluation: General Anesthesia or Conscious Sedation Permit	\$250 \$2,000
(u) Application fee for a Special Permit	\$1,000
(v) Special Permit renewal fee	\$125
(w) Initial application fee for an Elective Facial Cosmetic Surgery Permit	\$850
(x) Elective Facial Cosmetic Surgery Permit renewal fee	\$800
(y) Application fee for an Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Permit	\$500
(z) Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Permit renewal fee	\$650
(aa) Continuing education – registered provider renewal fee	\$325
(ab) License certification Fee for a certification of licensure	\$50
(ac) Application fee for Law and Ethics Examination	\$125
(ad) Application fee for Law and Ethics Re-examination	\$100
(ae) The fee for issuance of a replacement pocket license, replacement wall certificate, or replacement engraved certificate	\$125

* Fee pro-rated based on applicant's birth date.

** Examination, licensure, and permit fees for ~~dentistry~~ dentists may not all be included in this Section, and may appear in the Business and Professions Code.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 1614, 1635.5, 1634.2(c), 1724 and 1724.5, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 1632 1634.1, 1646.6, 1647.8, 1647.12, 1647.15, 1715, 1716.1, 1718.3, 1724 and 1724.5, Business and Professions Code.

§ 1022. ~~Dental Auxiliaries.~~ Examination, Permit and License Fees for Allied Dental Healthcare Professionals.

The following fees are ~~fixed set~~ for ~~allied healthcare~~ examinations and licensure by the Board**

(a) Application fee for Registered Dental Assistant (RDA) and Registered Dental Assistant in Extended Functions (RDAEF) application written examination or re-examination *	\$20 \$120 \$50
(b) Application fee for Dental Sedation Assistant Permit application written examination or re-examination *	\$120 \$50

(c) Application fee for Orthodontic Assistant Permit application written examination or re-examination *	\$120- \$50
(b d) Nonclinical Application fee for RDA Practical Examination or Re-examination	\$30- \$100 \$50
(e) Application fee for RDA Practical Re-examination	\$75
(c) (e) (f) Clinical examination or reexamination Application fee for Registered Dental Assistant in Extended Functions RDAEF Examination	\$50- \$500 \$300
(g) Application fee for RDAEF Simulated or Clinical Re-examination	\$250
(d) (f) (h) RDA Biennial license renewal fee for RDA and RDAEF The biennial renewal fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$30.	\$12- \$100
(e) (g) RDAEF Biennial License Renewal The biennial renewal fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$30.	\$10- \$100
(f) RDH license renewal (h) (i) Dental Sedation Assistant Permit Biennial Renewal	\$10- \$100
(g) RDHEF license renewal (i) Orthodontic Assistant Permit Biennial Renewal The biennial renewal fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$30.	\$10- \$100
(i) Biennial permit renewal fee for Orthodontic Assistant and Dental Sedation Assistant	\$10- \$100
(h) (j) Delinquent licensure renewal fee for RDA and RDAEF The delinquency fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$15.	\$6- \$50
(k) Delinquent permit renewal fee for Orthodontic Assistant and Dental Sedation Assistant	\$50
(l) Fee for issuance of a duplicate registration, license, permit, or certificate to replace one that is lost or destroyed, or in the event of a name change	\$75
(i) (k) RDAEF Delinquency Renewal fee The delinquency fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$15.	\$5- \$50
(j) RDH delinquency fee (l) Dental Sedation Assistant Permit Delinquency Renewal The delinquency fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$15.	\$12- \$50
(k) RDHEF delinquency fee (m) Orthodontic Assistant Permit Delinquency Renewal The delinquency fee for licensing periods beginning on or after January 1, 1988 shall be \$15.	\$5- \$50
(n) RDA Program Application	\$1,400
(o) RDAEF Program Application	\$1,400

(p) Orthodontic Assistant Permit Course Application	\$300
(q) Dental Sedation Assistant Permit Course Application	\$300
(r) Infection Control Course Application	\$300
(s) Coronal Polish Course Application	\$300
(t) Pit & Fissure Sealant Course Application	\$300
(u) Radiation Safety Course Application	\$300
(v) Ultrasonic Scaling Course Application	\$300
(w) Duplicate License/Certification fee	\$25-\$50
(n)-(m) RDA program: Fee for initial approval application and site evaluation	\$5,500
(n) RDA program: Fee for re-evaluation and site visit for continued approval	\$2,000
(o) RDAEF program: Fee for initial approval application and site evaluation	\$3,500
(p) RDAEF program: Fee for re-evaluation and site visit for continued approval	\$2,000
(q) Orthodontic Assistant Permit Course: Fee for initial approval application	\$1,500
(r) Dental Sedation Assistant Permit Course: Fee for initial approval application	\$1,500
(s) 8-hour Infection Control Course: Fee for initial application for approval	\$1,000
(t) Coronal Polish Course: Fee for initial application for approval	\$1,000
(u) Pit & Fissure Sealant Course: Fee for initial application for approval	\$1,000
(v) Radiation Safety Course: Fee for initial application for approval	\$1,000
(w) Ultrasonic Scaling For Orthodontic Cement Removal Course: Fee for initial application for approval	\$1,000

* Subject to additional fees assessed by contracted examination provider.

** Examination, licensure, permit, course provider and educational program fees for allied dental professionals may not all be included in this Section, and may appear in the Business and Professions Code.

Note: Authority cited: Section 1614, Business and Professions Code, Reference: Sections 1656 and 1725, Business and Professions Code.