

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<p>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected</p>	<p>2. Date 3/28/24</p>
<p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) CSB 4</p>	
<p>4. Subject Monitored Prescription Drug History Reports</p>	
<p>5. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S</p>	<p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected s. 20.165 (1) (hg)</p>
<p>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget</p>	
<p>8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers <input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)</p>	
<p>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0</p>	
<p>10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The objective of the proposed rule is to allow an authorized patient representative to request monitored prescription drug history reports on behalf of a patient both in person and via mail.</p>	
<p>12. Summary of the Businesses, Business Sectors, Associations Representing Business, Local Governmental Units, and Individuals that may be Affected by the Proposed Rule that were Contacted for Comments. The rule was posted on the Department of Safety and Professional Service's (DSPS) website for 14 days to solicit public comment on economic impact, including how the proposed rules may affect businesses, local government units, and individuals. No comments were received.</p>	
<p>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. None.</p>	
<p>14. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economy as a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred) DSPS estimates a total of \$3,200 in one-time costs for implementing the provisions of this rule to support the equivalent of a 0.1 limited term employee for activities including rulemaking and coordination with PDMP program staff. The one-time costs cannot be absorbed in the currently appropriated agency budget.</p>	
<p>15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit of implementing the rule is that patients authorized representatives will have the option to request monitored prescription drug history reports via mail, in addition to in-person requests.</p>	
<p>16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implications of implementing this rule is greater patient and customer satisfaction with the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP) through increased accessibility to monitored prescription drug history reports where allowed by law.</p>	
<p>17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government None.</p>	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

Illinois: The Illinois Prescription Monitoring Program allows patients access to their personal prescription history based on a validation process established by administrative rules [720 Illinois Compiled Statutes Chapter 570 Section 318 (m)]. The administrative rules governing patient access to their prescription history require that the patient, parent, or guardian complete a notarized request for a personal information report of a patient's prescription history, and submit it by mail to the Illinois Prescription Monitoring Program [Illinois Administrative Coder Title 77 Chapter X Subchapter e Part 2050 Section 2080.190 (a)].

Iowa: The Iowa Prescription Monitoring Program allows patients or a patient's agent to request that individual patient's own prescription history report by submitting a request form. Request forms may be submitted in-person with a government issued photo identification or via mail if the request form is notarized and sent with a certified copy of the patient's government issued identification. A patient's agent may sign the request form in lieu of the patient if a copy the legal document establishing the agency relationship is provided. The patient's agent must also present a government issued identification for in-person requests or a certified copy of a government issued identification for mailed requests. [657 Iowa Administrative Code Chapter 37 Section 37.16 (7)].

Michigan: The administrative rules that govern the Michigan Automated Prescription System, the states electronic system for monitoring schedule II to V controlled substances, does not specify whether a report of a patient's prescription history can be disclosed, nor how a report may be obtained by a patient. [Michigan Administrative Rules R 338.3162b].

Minnesota: The Minnesota Prescription Monitoring Program allows a patient who has been prescribed a controlled substance to access the program's database to obtain information on users who have access to that patient's data records. A patient may submit a request for this information on a notarized form from the Minnesota State Board of Pharmacy's website. [Minnesota Statutes Chapter 152 Section 152.126 Subdivision 11].

19. Contact Name

Nilajah Hardin, Administrative Rules Coordinator

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 267-7139

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

1. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separately for each Small Business Sector, Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

3. Did the agency consider the following methods to reduce the impact of the Rule on Small Businesses?

- Less Stringent Compliance or Reporting Requirements
- Less Stringent Schedules or Deadlines for Compliance or Reporting
- Consolidation or Simplification of Reporting Requirements
- Establishment of performance standards in lieu of Design or Operational Standards
- Exemption of Small Businesses from some or all requirements
- Other, describe:

4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)

- Yes No
-