

<h1 style="text-align: center;">Regulatory Analysis Form</h1>		This space for use by IRRC 2005 APR 13 AM 11:50 REVIEW COMMISSION	
		IRRC Number: 2475	
(1) Agency  <b>Department of State, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, State Board of Cosmetology</b>			
(2) I.D. Number (Governor's Office Use)  16A-4512			
(3) Short Title  <b>Biennial Renewal Fee Increase</b>			
(4) PA Code Cite  <b>49 Pa. Code, § 7.2</b>		(5) Agency Contacts & Telephone Numbers Primary Contact: <b>Ruth D. Dunnewold, Senior Deputy Chief Counsel State Board of Cosmetology (717) 783-7200</b> Secondary Contact: <b>Joyce McKeever, Deputy Chief Counsel, Department of State (717) 783-7200</b>	
(6) Type of Rulemaking (check one)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Proposed Rulemaking</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Final Order Adopting Regulation</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy Statement</b>		(7) Is a 120-Day Emergency Certification Attached? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes: By the Attorney General</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes: By the Governor</b>	
(8) Briefly explain the regulation in clear and nontechnical language.  <b>The regulation increases the biennial renewal fees for all classes of Cosmetology Board licensees. The new fees are needed because the current fees, established in 1986 and 1991, no longer cover the cost of sustaining the Board's operations.</b>			
(9) State the statutory authority for the regulation and any relevant state or federal court decisions.  <b>The amendments are proposed under section 16(c) of the Cosmetology Law (act) (63 P.S. § 522(c)).</b>			

### Regulatory Analysis Form

(10) Is the regulation mandated by any federal or state law or court order, or federal regulation? If yes, cite the specific law, case or regulation, and any deadlines for action.

**Yes. The Board is required by section 16(c) of the act (63 P.S. § 522(c)) to reconcile its expenses and revenue biennially and to increase fees as needed to meet or exceed projected expenditures.**

(11) Explain the compelling public interest that justifies the regulation. What is the problem it addresses?

**The Board is required by section 16(c) of the act (63 P.S. § 522(c)) to set fees to raise sufficient revenue to meet expenditures. It is anticipated that without raising fees the Board will realize a deficit of \$286,531.06 by fiscal year 2007-2008.**

(12) State the public health, safety, environmental or general welfare risks associated with nonregulation.

**Nonregulation would adversely impact the fiscal integrity of the Board.**

(13) Describe who will benefit from the regulation. (Quantify the benefits as completely as possible and approximate the number of people who will benefit.)

**Recipients of cosmetology, cosmetician and manicurist services in the Commonwealth will benefit by having adequate funding for the Board to regulate the profession to insure that the appropriate standards of professional competence and integrity are maintained.**

(14) Describe who will be adversely affected by the regulation. (Quantify the adverse effects as completely as possible and approximate the number of people who will be adversely affected.)

**The licensee population will bear the cost of the increased fee.**

(15) List the persons, groups or entities that will be required to comply with the regulation. (Approximate the number of people who will be required to comply.)

**All Cosmetology Board licensees seeking to renew their licenses will be required to comply with this regulation. The Board estimates about 133,790 renewals.**

### Regulatory Analysis Form

(16) Describe the communications with and input from the public in the development and drafting of the regulation. List the persons and/or groups who were involved, if applicable.

**The reconciliation of its budget is an administrative function for which public input is not required. However, the Board receives its budget reports and discusses fee increases in public sessions, which are generally attended by members of the licensee population.**

(17) Provide a specific estimate of the costs and/or savings to the regulated community associated with compliance, including any legal, accounting or consulting procedures that may be required.

**The Board estimates that about 133,790 Cosmetology Board licenses will renew their licenses. Total additional cost for the entire regulated community for a biennial period is approximately \$1,890,456.00. No legal, accounting or consulting procedures will be implicated in complying with the regulatory amendments.**

(18) Provide a specific estimate of the costs and/or savings to local governments associated with compliance, including any legal, accounting or consulting procedures which may be required.

**Local governments will not be affected by the regulation.**

(19) Provide a specific estimate of the costs and/or savings to state government associated with the implementation of the regulation, including any legal, accounting, or consulting procedures that may be required.

**The Board will not incur an increase in administrative costs by implementing the regulation. Indeed, the regulatory amendments will permit the Board to recoup the costs of its operations.**

# Regulatory Analysis Form

(20) In the table below, provide an estimate of the fiscal savings and costs associated with implementation and compliance for the regulated community, local government, and state government for the current year and five subsequent years.

	Current FY Year	FY +1 Year	FY +2 Year	FY +3 Year	FY +4 Year	FY +5 Year
<b>SAVINGS:</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Regulated Community						
Local Government						
State Government						
Total Savings						
<b>COSTS:</b>	945,228.00	945,228.00	945,228.00	945,228.00	945,228.00	945,228.00
Regulated						
Local Government						
State Government						
Total Costs				1		
<b>REVENUE LOSSES:</b>						
Regulated						
Local Government						
State Government						
Total Revenue Losses						

(20a) Explain how the cost estimates listed above were derived.

The cost estimates are based upon the licensee population of 133,790 with the renewal expense spread over the 2-year biennial renewal period.

# Regulatory Analysis Form

## Biennial renewals:

License class	# of Licensees	Current biennial renewal fee	Proposed biennial renewal fee	Cost of increase to license class
Cosmetician	2,597	\$21.00	\$35.00	\$36,358.00
Cosmetician Shop	681	\$25.00	\$60.00	\$23,835.00
Manicurist Shop	2,038	\$25.00	\$60.00	\$71,330.00
Cosmetology Shop	15,818	\$41.00	\$60.00	\$300,542.00
½ of all Cosmetologist licensees (expire odd year)	44,940	\$23.00	\$35.00	\$539,274.00
Manicurist	12,612	\$21.00	\$35.00	\$176,568.00
½ of all Cosmetologist licensees (expire even year)	44,940	\$23.00	\$35.00	\$539,274.00
Cosmetology Teacher	10,009	\$36.00	\$55.00	\$190,171.00
Cosmetology School	156	\$66.00	\$150.00	\$13,104.00
Total cost to all licensees				\$1,890,456.00

The figures in (20) above represent the total increase to all licensees, across all license classes, expressed as an annual expense: \$1,890,456.00 divided by 2 = \$945,228.00

(20b) Provide the past three year expenditure history for programs affected by the regulation.

Program	FY -3 FY 01-02 Actual	FY -2 FY 02-03 Actual	FY -1 FY 03-04 Actual	Current FY FY 04-05 Budgeted
Cosmetology Board	\$1,843,533.68	\$2,278,868.79	\$2,486,972.00	\$2,569,000.00

### Regulatory Analysis Form

(21) Using the cost-benefit information provided above, explain how the benefits of the regulation outweigh the adverse effects and costs.

**The amendments to the existing regulations are mandated by section 16(c) of the act (63 P.S. § 522(c)), so that Board revenues meet Board expenses.**

(22) Describe the nonregulatory alternatives considered and the costs associated with those alternatives. Provide the reasons for their dismissal.

**No nonregulatory alternatives were considered. See Question 21.**

(23) Describe alternative regulatory schemes considered and the costs associated with those schemes. Provide the reasons for their dismissal.

**No alternative regulatory schemes were considered. See Question 21.**

(24) Are there any provisions that are more stringent than federal standards? If yes, identify the specific provisions and the compelling Pennsylvania interest that demands stronger regulation.

**There are no federal licensure standards.**

### Regulatory Analysis Form

(25) How does this regulation compare with those of other states? Will the regulation put Pennsylvania at a competitive disadvantage with other states?

**This regulation will not put Pennsylvania licensees at a competitive disadvantage with other states, as the proposed fees are comparable to analogous fees in surrounding states. See the table below.**

#### SURROUNDING STATES – BIENNIAL RENEWAL FEES

PROFESSION	PA	NJ	DE	OH	WV
COSMETOLOGIST	\$35.00	\$60.00	\$58.00	\$30.00	\$50.00
COSMETICIAN	\$35.00	\$60.00	\$58.00	\$30.00	\$50.00
MANICURIST	\$35.00	\$60.00	\$36.00	\$30.00	\$50.00
COSMETOLOGY TEACHER	\$55.00	\$60.00	\$88.00	\$30.00	\$100.00
COSMETOLOGY SHOP	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$49.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
COSMETICIAN SHOP	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$49.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
MANICURIST SHOP	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$49.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
COSMETOLOGY SCHOOL	\$150.00	\$300.00	\$59.00	\$250.00	\$500.00

(26) Will the regulation affect existing or proposed regulations of the promulgating agency or other state agencies? If yes, explain and provide specific citations.

**No.**

(27) Will any public hearings or informational meetings be scheduled? Please provide the dates, times, and locations, if available.

**The Board reviews regulatory proposals at regularly scheduled public meetings. However, in light of the statutory mandate, the Board has not scheduled public hearings or informational meetings regarding this regulation.**

### Regulatory Analysis Form

(28) Will the regulation change existing reporting, record keeping, or other paperwork requirements? Describe the changes and attach copies of forms or reports which will be required as a result of implementation, if available.

**No changes to reporting, record keeping, or other paperwork are required by this regulation.**

(29) Please list any special provisions which have been developed to meet the particular needs of affected groups or persons including, but not limited to, minorities, elderly, small businesses, and farmers.

**The Board has perceived no special needs of any subset of its applicants or licensees for whom special accommodations should be made.**

(30) What is the anticipated effective date of the regulation; the date by which compliance with the regulation will be required; and the date by which any required permits, licenses or other approvals must be obtained?

**The regulation will be effective upon publication as final rulemaking in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.**

(31) Provide the schedule for continual review of the regulation.

**The Board reviews its revenues and costs of its programs on a fiscal year and biennial basis.**



FACE SHEET  
FOR FILING DOCUMENTS  
WITH THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

(Pursuant to Commonwealth Documents Law)

RECEIVED  
2005 APR 13 AM 11:50

REVIEW COMMISSION

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

# 2475

Copy below is hereby approved as to  
form and legality. Attorney General

BY: Amy M. Elliott  
(DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL)

MAR 28 2005

DATE OF APPROVAL

Copy below is hereby certified to be a true and correct  
copy of a document issued, prescribed or promulgated by:

State Board of Cosmetology  
(AGENCY)

DOCUMENT/FISCAL NOTE NO. 16A-4512

DATE OF ADOPTION: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: Susan E. Rineer  
Susan E. Rineer

TITLE: Chairperson  
(EXECUTIVE OFFICER, CHAIRMAN OR SECRETARY)

Copy below is approved as  
to form and legality.  
Executive or Independent  
Agencies.

BY: [Signature]

3.8.05

DATE OF APPROVAL

EXECUTIVE  
(Deputy General Counsel  
(Chief Counsel,  
~~Independent Agency~~  
~~Strike inapplicable~~  
title)

- [ ] Check if applicable  
Copy not approved.  
Objections attached.
- [ ] Check if applicable. No Attorney  
General approval or  
objection within 30 day  
after submission.

PROPOSED RULEMAKING  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS  
STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY  
49 PA. CODE, CHAPTER 7  
BIENNIAL RENEWAL FEE INCREASE

The State Board of Cosmetology (Board) proposes to amend § 7.2 (relating to fees) to read as set forth in Annex A. The proposed regulation would increase the biennial license renewal fee for all classes of licenses issued by the Board.

### **Effective Date**

The amendment will be effective upon final publication in the Pennsylvania Bulletin. The new fees will take effect for the biennial period commencing February 1, 2006.

### **Statutory Authority**

The amendment is authorized under section 16 of the Beauty Culture Law (act) (63 P.S. § 522). It requires the Board to fix fees by regulation for the biennial renewal of licenses, and to increase fees by regulation to meet or exceed projected expenditures if the revenues raised by fees, fines and civil penalties are not sufficient to meet Board expenditures.

### **Background and Need for Amendment**

The Board is required by law to support its operations from the revenue it generates from fees, fines and civil penalties. In accordance with section 16 of the act (63 P.S. § 522(c)), if the revenue raised by fees, fines and civil penalties is not sufficient to meet expenditures over a 2-year period, the Board must increase fees by regulation so that its projected revenues will meet or exceed projected expenditures.

The Board raises virtually all of its operating revenue (exclusive of application and services fees) through biennial renewal fees. The biennial license renewal fee is the most substantial revenue-generating fee of all the fees charged by the Board. The Board's current biennial license renewal fees for cosmetologists, manicurists, teachers, cosmetology shops, and cosmetology schools were established by regulation in 1986, while the current biennial renewal fees for cosmeticians and cosmetician or manicurist shops were established by regulation in 1991.

At the Board's December 6, 2004 meeting, the Bureau of Finance and Operations (BFO) presented a summary of the Board's revenue and expenses for fiscal years 2001-2002, 2002-2003, and 2003-2004, and projected revenue and expenses for fiscal years 2004-2005 through 2010-2011. The summary, presented in table format below, demonstrated that the Board must raise fees to meet or exceed projected expenditures to comply with section 16 of the act. BFO projected a deficit of \$286,531.06 in fiscal year 2007-2008, a deficit of \$1,073,531.06 in fiscal year 2008-2009, a deficit of \$1,662,531.06 in fiscal year 2009-2010, and a deficit of \$2,606,531.06 in fiscal year 2010-2011. Therefore, BFO recommended that the Board raise fees to meet projected expenditures, in compliance with section 16 of the act.

2001-2002 beginning balance	1,718,075.05
FY 01-02 revenue	2,229,690.06
Prior year returned funds	146,300.49
FY 01-02 expenses	2,376,000.00
Remaining balance	1,718,065.60
2002-2003 beginning balance	1,718,065.60
FY 02-03 revenue	1,959,902.11
Prior year returned funds	0.00
FY 02-03 expenses	2,583,000.00
Remaining balance	1,094,967.71
2003-2004 beginning balance	1,094,967.71
FY 03-04 revenue	2,199,623.23
Prior year returned funds	0.00
FY 03-04 expenses	2,533,000.00
Remaining balance	761,590.94
2004-2005 beginning balance	761,590.94
FY 04-05 projected revenue	1,950,000.00
Prior year returned funds (estimated)	902,878.00
FY 04-05 projected expenses	2,569,000.00
Remaining balance	1,045,468.94
2005-2006 beginning balance	1,045,468.94
FY 05-06 projected revenue	2,230,000.00
FY 05-06 projected expenses	2,505,000.00
Remaining balance	770,468.94
2006-2007 beginning balance	770,468.94
FY 06-07 projected revenue	1,950,000.00
FY 06-07 projected expenses	2,580,000.00
Remaining balance	140,468.94
2007-2008 beginning balance	140,468.94
FY 07-08 projected revenue	2,230,000.00
FY 07-08 projected expenses	2,657,000.00
Remaining balance	(286,531.06)
2008-2009 beginning balance	(286,531.06)

FY 08-09 projected revenue	1,950,000.00
FY 08-09 projected expenses	2,737,000.00
Remaining balance	(1,073,531.06)
2009-2010 beginning balance	(1,073,531.06)
FY 09-10 projected revenue	2,230,000.00
FY 09-10 projected expenses	2,819,000.00
Remaining balance	(1,662,531.06)
2010-2011 beginning balance	(1,662,531.06)
FY 10-11 projected revenue	1,950,000.00
FY 10-11 projected expenses	2,904,000.00
Remaining balance	(2,616,531.06)

As the foregoing indicates, BFO estimates that at the close of FY 2007-2008, the Board's expenses will exceed its revenues by \$286,531.06. Concomitantly, BFO anticipates that in subsequent fiscal years, the deficit will increase proportionally. Without an increase, the projected deficit in FY 2010-2011 would be \$2,616,531.06.

The increases in the Board's biennial expenses occurred primarily in the area of investigative and inspection costs, attributable to increased numbers of complaints being filed and the accompanying increased number of investigations and enforcement actions (citations for minor violations under Act 48 of 1993) initiated by inspectors and investigators on behalf of the Board. For example, investigative expenditures increased from \$808,769.05 in FY 2002-2003 to approximately \$977,912.05 in FY 2003-2004. Because investigative and inspection costs are largely driven by the number of complaints received and the number of inspections performed (a number dependent in part on the number of new applications filed with the Board), the Board has little control over such expenses.

There were also increases in Legal Office costs, related to prosecuting and adjudicating many more cases than in prior years, which contribute to the need to raise biennial renewal fees. In FY 2003-2004, the Board imposed 632 disciplinary sanctions, which was significantly more than in any prior fiscal year. That 03-04 figure is in comparison to 386 disciplinary sanctions imposed in FY 2002-2003, 370 in FY 2001-2002, 393 in FY 2000-2001 and 310 in FY 1999-2000. Additionally, the Board imposed more serious sanctions than in any prior year, 17 in FY 2003-2004, as opposed to 9 in 2002-2003, 11 in 2001-2002, 3 in 2000-2001, and 3 in 1999-2000. Finally, the Board closed more cases in FY 2003-2004 than in any prior year, closing 962 cases as compared with 580 cases in FY 2002-2003, 675 in FY 2001-2002, 740 in FY 2000-2001, and 529 in FY 1999-2000. As of December 9, 2004, there were 395 cases currently open, as opposed to 220 cases open as of December 9, 2003.

The Board carefully reviewed several options in fee increases to ensure the most reasonable fee increase possible while keeping the Board out of a long run deficit. Additionally, in developing this proposal, the Board reviewed fees of other states. It found that the proposed fees are comparable to the renewal fees charged in surrounding states and should cause no competitive disadvantage to the Commonwealth. The Board also determined that making fees uniform across comparable license classes would be more equitable and would promote ease of administration. Consequently, the Board made the renewal fees for all individual license classes equal, with the exception of cosmetology teacher licenses, as it did with the renewal fees for the various shop licenses.

### **Description of Proposed Amendments**

Based upon the above expense and revenue estimates provided to the Board, the Board proposes to amend its fee schedule at § 7.2(c) (relating to fees) to increase the fee for biennial renewal of licenses for cosmeticians from \$21 to \$35; for cosmetologists from \$23 to \$35; for cosmetology teachers from \$36 to \$55; for manicurists from \$21 to \$35; for cosmetician shops from \$25 to \$60; for cosmetology shops from \$41 to \$60; for manicurist shops from \$25 to \$60; and for cosmetology schools from \$66 to \$150.

The proposed amendment also deletes reference in the regulation to a cosmetology manager's license, based on the amendments to the act made by the section 3 of the Act of June 29, 2002 (P.L. 645, No. 98)(63 P.S. § 510.4), which removed the requirement that a cosmetology shop owner employ a licensed manager if the owner does not manage his or her own shop.

### **Compliance with Executive Order 1996-1**

The requirements of Executive Order 1996-1 (February 6, 1996) for public input are not applicable to regulations relating solely to reconciliation of the Board's budget through increases in biennial renewal fees as they are required by law and the least restrictive means of covering the costs of services required to be performed by the Board.

### **Fiscal Impact**

The proposed amendments will increase the biennial renewal fee for all classes of Cosmetology Board licensees. The proposed regulation should have no other fiscal impact on the private sector, the general public or political subdivisions.

### **Paperwork Requirements**

The proposed regulation will require the Board to alter some of its forms to reflect the new biennial renewal fees; however, the proposed regulations should not create additional paperwork for the private sector.

### **Sunset Date**

The act requires that the Board monitor its revenue and expenses on a fiscal year and biennial basis. Therefore, no sunset date has been assigned.

### **Regulatory Review**

Under section 5(a) of the Regulatory Review Act (71 P. S. § 745.5(a)), on April 13, 2005, the Board submitted a copy of this proposed rulemaking and a copy of a Regulatory Analysis form to the Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC) and to the Chairpersons of the Senate Consumer Protection and Professional Licensure Committee and the House Professional Licensure Committee. A copy of this material is available to the public upon request.

Under section 5(g) of the Regulatory Review Act, IRRC may convey any comments, recommendations or objections to the proposed rulemaking within 30 days of the close of the public comment period. The comments, recommendations or objections shall specify the regulatory review criteria that have not been met. The Regulatory Review Act specifies detailed procedures for review, prior to final publication of the rulemaking, by the Board, the General Assembly and the Governor of comments, recommendations or objections raised.

### **Public Comment**

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments, suggestions or objections regarding this proposed rulemaking to Linda Dinger, Administrator, State Board of Cosmetology, P.O. Box 2649, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-2649, within 30 days following publication of this proposed rulemaking in the Pennsylvania Bulletin.

ANNEX A

**TITLE 49. PROFESSIONAL AND VOCATIONAL STANDARDS**

**PART I. DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**SUBPART A. PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**CHAPTER 7. STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY**

**GENERAL PROVISIONS**

\* \* \*

**§ 7.2. Fees.**

Fees charged by the Board are as follows:

\* \* \*

Biennial renewal of manicurist's license .....\$[21]35

Biennial renewal of cosmetician's license .....\$[21]35

Biennial renewal of cosmetologist's license .....\$[23]35

Biennial renewal of [cosmetology shop manager's or] cosmetology

teacher's license .....\$[36]55

Biennial renewal of cosmetology shop's license .....\$[41]60

Biennial renewal of cosmetician or manicurist shop's license .....\$[25]60

Biennial renewal of cosmetology school's license .....\$[66]150

\* \* \*



# FEE REPORT FORM

**Agency:** State - BPOA

**Date:** 12/09/2004

**Contact:** Basil Merenda

**Phone No.** 783-7192

## Fee Title, Rate and Estimated Collections:

Estimated Biennial Revenue:

Cosmetician -	\$90,895.00	(2,597 x \$35.00)
Cosmetician Shop -	\$40,860.00	(681 x \$60.00)
Manicurist Shop -	\$122,280.00	(2,038 x \$60.00)
Cosmetology Shop -	\$949,080.00	(15,818 x \$60.00)
Manicurist -	\$441,420.00	(12,612 x \$35.00)
Cosmetology Teacher -	\$550,495.00	(10,009 x \$55.00)
Cosmetology School -	\$23,400.00	(156 x \$150.00)
Cosmetologist -	\$3,145,765.00	(88,880 x \$35.00)

Total Estimated Biennial Revenue: \$5,364,195.00

## Fee Description:

The fee will be charged biennially to every applicant for license renewal.

## Fee Objective:

The fee should defray a substantial portion of the State Board of Cosmetology's administrative overhead, specifically the difference between the Board's total biennial expenditures and its total biennial revenues from non-renewal sources.

## Fee-Related Activities and Costs:

Estimated balance at end of 04/05 cycle:	1,045,468.94
<b>FOR BIENNIAL CYCLE 7/01/05-6/30/06</b>	
Estimated non-renewal revenue:	185,000.00
Estimated renewal revenue @ above rates:	2,588,197.50
Total revenue available:	3,818,666.44
Estimated expenditures:	2,505,000.00
Estimated ending balance on 6/30/06:	<b>1,313,666.44</b>
<b>FOR BIENNIAL CYCLE 7/01/06-6/30/07</b>	
Estimated non-renewal revenue:	185,000.00
Estimated renewal revenue @ above rates:	2,775,997.50
Estimated expenditures:	2,580,000.00
Estimated ending balance on 6/30/07:	<b>1,694,663.94</b>

**Analysis, Comment, and Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the above renewal fee's be established to cover projected funding shortfalls between the Board's total biennial expenditures and its total biennial revenues from non-renewal sources.



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS  
STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY  
Post Office Box 2649  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-2649  
(717) 783-7130  
April 13, 2005

The Honorable John R. McGinley, Jr., Chairman  
INDEPENDENT REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Harrisstown 2, 333 Market Street  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101


Re: Proposed Regulation  
State Board of Cosmetology  
16A-4512: Biennial Renewal Fee Increase

Dear Chairman McGinley:

Enclosed is a copy of a proposed rulemaking package of the State Board of Cosmetology pertaining to Biennial Renewal Fee Increase.

The Board will be pleased to provide whatever information the Commission may require during the course of its review of the rulemaking.

Sincerely,

  
Susan E. Rineer, Chairperson  
State Board of Cosmetology

SER/RDD:lm

Enclosure

c: Basil L. Merenda, Commissioner  
Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs  
Albert H. Masland, Chief Counsel  
Department of State  
Joyce McKeever, Deputy Chief Counsel  
Department of State  
Cynthia Montgomery, Regulatory Counsel  
Department of State  
Ruth D. Dunnewold, Senior Deputy Chief Counsel  
Department of State  
State Board of Cosmetology

**TRANSMITTAL SHEET FOR REGULATIONS SUBJECT TO THE  
REGULATORY REVIEW ACT**

I.D. NUMBER: 16A-4512  
SUBJECT: State Board of Cosmetology - Biennial Renewal Fee Increase  
AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE

# 2475

**TYPE OF REGULATION**

X Proposed Regulation

Final Regulation

Final Regulation with Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Omitted

120-day Emergency Certification of the Attorney General

120-day Emergency Certification of the Governor

Delivery of Tolled Regulation

a. With Revisions

b.

Without Revisions

RECEIVED  
2005 APR 13 AM 11:50  
INDEPENDENT REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION

**FILING OF REGULATION**

DATE

SIGNATURE

DESIGNATION

4/13/05 Sandra J. Harper

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE

4/13/05 Mary Walmer

SENATE COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION &  
PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE

4/13/05 Stacy J. Hoffman

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION

ATTORNEY GENERAL (for Final Omitted only)

4/13/05 Mary G. Barnes

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU (for Proposed only)

March 30, 2005