

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

X Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

SPS 321, Manufactured Homes

3. Subject

Manufactured Homes

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
20.165(2)(j)

6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule

No Fiscal Effect Increase Existing Revenues Increase Costs
 Indeterminate Decrease Existing Revenues Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
 Decrease Cost

7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)

State's Economy Specific Businesses/Sectors
 Local Government Units Public Utility Rate Payers
 Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)

8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?

Yes No

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

The proposed rule revisions primarily would update the installation standards for manufactured homes by incorporating the current, federal model standards in Title 24, Part 3285 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*.

10. 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.

Representatives of manufacturers of manufactured homes, installers, owners and residents of manufactured home communities, inspectors, industry suppliers, and an association of the manufactured housing industry.

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.

12. 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)

No significant negative economic or fiscal impact is expected.

13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

Installation of manufactured homes would be guided by more up-to-date standards and information.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Clarity and ease of use of the regulations would be improved.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

See comparison in the rule analysis that accompanies the proposed rule revisions.

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

See comparison in the rule analysis that accompanies the proposed rule revisions.

17. Contact Name

Dan Smith

18. Contact Phone Number

608-261-4463