

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

---

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis  
 Original    Updated    Corrected

---

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number  
Phar 8

---

3. Subject  
Relating to identification card required for certain controlled substances

---

4. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
---	---

---

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  
2013 Act 199 requires the pharmacist to record the name of the person, obtained from the identification card or known to the pharmacist, to whom the drug is dispensed or delivered to and requires the board to promulgate rules to designate the time period for which the record is to be maintained. The Board designates a time period of 5 years to be consistent with the other pharmacy record retention requirements.  
In addition, 2013 Act 199 allows the pharmacy board to add facilities to the definition of a health care facility. This rule recognizes that inpatient hospice facilities are similar in nature to the other facilities designated in the definition.

---

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.  
This rule was posted for economic impact comments for 14 days and none were received.

---

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.  
This rule does not impact local governmental units and none 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)  
This rule does not have an economic or fiscal impact on specific businesses, business sectors, public utility rate payers, local governmental units or the State's economy as a whole.

---

13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule  
The benefit to implementing the rule is to create consistency and clarity.

---

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule  
The long range implication is a rule which is consistent with other pharmacy rules.

---

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government  
None.

---

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**  
**Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis**

Michigan and Iowa do not require identification for a prescription to be dispensed. Illinois requires identification and requires the name and address be maintained for not less than 2 years. Minnesota requires identification for a controlled substance being dispensed if the purchase is not covered in whole or in part by a health plan company or other third party payor and requires the record to be maintained for a minimum of 2 years.

---

17. Contact Name Sharon Henes	18. Contact Phone Number (608) 261-2377
----------------------------------	--

---

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
-