

WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL RULES CLEARINGHOUSE

Ronald Sklansky Clearinghouse Director

Richard Sweet *Clearing house Assistant Director* **Terry C. Anderson** Legislative Council Director

Laura D. Rose Legislative Council Deputy Director

CLEARINGHOUSE RULE 05-050

Comments

[<u>NOTE</u>: All citations to "Manual" in the comments below are to the <u>Administrative Rules Procedures Manual</u>, prepared by the Revisor of Statutes Bureau and the Legislative Council Staff, dated January 2005.]

2. Form, Style and Placement in Administrative Code

a. The analysis does not contain information on "Analysis and supporting documents used to determine effect on small business or in preparation of economic impact report." [See s. 1.02(2) (a) 9., Manual.]

b. In s. RL 1.04 (3), the introductory subsection does not introduce the subsequent paragraphs. It appears that s. RL 1.04 (3) (intro.) should be renumbered as s. RL 1.04 (3) (a) and the remaining paragraphs should be renumbered accordingly.

5. Clarity, Grammar, Punctuation and Use of Plain Language

a. In the plain language analysis of SECTION 2, it would be helpful to briefly explain what a class 1 proceeding is.

b. In the plain language analysis of SECTION 5, why is facilitation by a barber or cosmetology school instructor in cheating or breach of examination security referenced?

c. In s. RL 1.03 (1r) (intro.), "but is not limited to" is not necessary and should be deleted.

d. In s. RL 1.03 (1r) (c), "for the applicant who writes" should be replaced with "to write."

e. In s. RL 1.03 (1r) (d), "crib notes" may be better replaced with "notes."

f. In s. RL 1.04 (3), "but not limited to" is not necessary and should be deleted. Also, the semicolon following that phrase should be replaced with a colon. Finally, "is" following "more than one applicant" should be replaced with "are."

g. In s. RL 1.04 (3) (a), the comma after "period of time" should be deleted.

h. In s. RL 1.05 (3) (b), what is the significance of providing that the notice is effective upon mailing? It appears that this sentence could be deleted. If not, it should be clarified and perhaps placed in a separate provision.