

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 09/13/2018</p>
<p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Chapter DHS 1, Uniform Fee System</p>	
<p>4. Subject Chapter DHS 1 is authorized by s. 227.11 (2) and interprets ss. 46.03 (18) and 46.10, Stats., to establish a system for determining fees, liability, billing, and collection practices for services.</p>	
<p>5. 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</p>	<p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected N/A</p>
<p>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input 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 checked="" 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 Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule Chapter DHS 1 is outdated. The rule has not been substantively revised since 1978. The department proposes to repeal and recreate the chapter in order to restate its provisions more clearly and to minimize confusion and inconsistency of interpretation.</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 Department collected public comments in regards to economic impact from August 6, 2018 to August 20, 2018. The Department also established an advisory committee comprised of representatives from Jackson, Portage, Marathon, Walworth, Green and Outagamie counties, as well as a representative from the Department of Children and Families. The advisory committee held nine open meetings in 2016 and 2017. The Department also reviewed policies and procedure materials from the Western Region of Integrated Care Consortia (Jackson, Monroe and La Crosse counties), Portage, Walworth, Green, Lafayette, Outagamie, and Marathon County.</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) There are no implementation or fiscal impacts on specific businesses, business sectors, public utility rate payers, local governmental units and the state's economy as a whole. There are no implementation or compliance costs expected to be incurred from this rule change.</p>	
<p>15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The rule implementation benefits include a standardized system for determining fees, liability, billing, and collection practices for services.</p>	
<p>16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule</p>	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

The long range implications of rule implementation are to provide consistency in regards to determining fees, liability, billing, and collection practices for services.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

The Department was unable to locate federal regulations that were sufficiently analogous to the proposed rules. However, 42 CFR 51c.303 and 42 CFR 56.303, for example, discuss similar fee, billing, ability to pay and collection requirements to be used by certain federal health centers. Specific program requirements are further contained in compliance manuals (see, for example, Chapter 16, <https://bphc.hrsa.gov/programrequirements/compliancemanual/chapter-16.html>).

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

Provisions relating to similar subjects of the proposed rule are contained in various sections of code from adjacent states. See, for example, Illinois Admin. Code. tit. 59 § 106 (Services Charges), tit. 89 § 103 (Support Responsibility of Relatives), tit. § 545 (Ratemaking), tit. § 560 (Customer Financial Participation), IAC Rules 441.11 (Collection of Public Assistance Debts), IAC Rules 441.36 (Facility Assessments), IAC Rules 445.95 (Collections), Michigan Admin. Code r. 330.8005-330.8284 (Financial Liability for Mental Health Services), Minnesota Rules ch. 9550 Part 9550.6240 (Collections), ch. 9515 Part 9515.2200 (Sources of Income Considered), ch. 9515 Part 9515.2600 (Responsible Relative's Ability to Pay).

19. Contact Name

Mary P. Jablonski

20. Contact Phone Number

608-261-5984

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)

N/A

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
-