

**BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY**  
**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS**

Hearing Date: August 14, 2015

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations: Filing of Addresses

Sections Affected: Title 16, California Code of Regulations Section 1380.5

Updated Information

The Initial Statement of Reasons is included in the file. The information contained therein is updated as follows:

The 45-day public comment period began on June 19, 2015, and ended on August 3, 2015. The Board of Psychology (Board) held a regulatory hearing on August 14, 2015, in Berkeley, California. The Board received no written comments during the 45-day comment period. No comments were given at the hearing.

Proposed Section 1380.5(d) of the regulation mentions a licensee who fails to comply with the regulation will be subject to enforcement action. The enforcement action the Board would utilize in this instance is a citation and/or fine. The Board's authority to impose citation and fines upon licensees can be found in Business and Professions Code 125.9 and 2930. A citation and fine leave the public record of a licensee after 5 years and is a minimal and educative form of discipline. This is in keeping with the relatively minor nature of the infraction.

Local Mandate

A mandate is not imposed on local agencies or school districts

Small Business Impact

This action will not have a significant adverse economic impact on small businesses.

The anticipated benefits of this regulatory proposal are as follows:

Permitting licensees to continue to report a mail-only address will continue to allow the licensee the option of not publically disclosing personal information that could be accessed by a client/patient or other persons, which may compromise the licensee/patient boundaries, or could result in an unsafe situation for the licensee. Requiring the licensee to provide a current physical address permits the Board to meet its mandate of consumer protection in a more cost efficient and reliable manner.

Requiring that email addresses be provided to the Board provides the Board with an additional tool to expeditiously communicate application deficiencies to applicants, eliminating the need for multiple staff members to receive, review and direct hardcopy correspondence, resulting in applications being reviewed sooner.

### Consideration of Alternatives

No reasonable alternative which was considered or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Board 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. The following alternative was considered and was rejected for the reasons set forth below:

1. Do not seek a regulatory change

No reasonable alternative to the regulatory proposal would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective or less burdensome to affected private persons and equally effective in achieving the purposes of the regulation in a manner that ensures full compliance with the law being implemented or made specific.

Set forth below are the alternatives which were considered and the reasons each alternative was rejected:

- Not adopt the amendments. This alternative was rejected because this regulatory proposal will provide the Board with an additional tool to meet its consumer protection mandate.

### Objections or Recommendations/Responses

There were no comments received during the 45-Day comment period and no public comments were received at the time of the hearing.