

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected	2. Date October 28, 2019
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) A-E 9	
4. Subject Landscape architect registration	
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	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
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	
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)	
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0	
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	
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The Section has reviewed the chapter and made revisions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Insert cross-references into s. A-E 9.06 (6) for relevant statutes to implement 2017 Act 278, which made various changes to the circumstances under which a licensing agency may base its decisions on an individual's criminal history; and• Revise the chapter for clarity, consistency, and to meet drafting standards.	
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 proposed rule was posted on the Department of Safety and Professional Services' website for 14 days in order to solicit comments from businesses, representative associations, local governmental units, and individuals that may be affected by the rule. No comments were received.	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. No local governmental units participated in the development of this EIA.	
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) The proposed rule will not have a significant impact on specific businesses, business sectors, public utility rate payers, local governmental units, or the state's economy as a whole.	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit to implementing the rule is providing consistency with current practices and drafting standards, and applicable Wisconsin statutes. If the rule is not implemented, it will continue to not reflect current Wisconsin statutes.	
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implication of implementing the rule is consistency with current practices and drafting standards, and applicable Wisconsin statutes.	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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

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

Illinois:

Landscape architects are licensed by the Illinois Landscape Architect Registration Board under the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. The Board does not have a process for preliminary determinations concerning whether any court judgments against the applicant would result in a denial of a license. If an applicant has a criminal history, the board must consider mitigating factors and evidence of rehabilitation. The board may not consider sealed or expunged records.

Iowa:

Landscape architects are licensed by the Landscape Architectural Examining Board, attached to the Iowa Professional Licensing Bureau. The Board does not have a process for preliminary determinations concerning whether any court judgments against the applicant would result in a denial of a license. The application requirements are substantially similar to Wisconsin's requirements.

Michigan:

Landscape architects are directly licensed by the Bureau of Professional Licensing of the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs. Under s. 339.202a, MCL, the department shall provide preliminary determinations concerning whether any court judgments against an applicant would result in a denial of a license.

Minnesota:

Landscape architects are licensed by the Minnesota Board of Architecture, Engineering, Land Surveying, Landscape Architecture, Geoscience, and Interior Design. The Board does not have a process for preliminary determinations concerning whether any court judgments against the applicant would result in a denial of a license. If an applicant has a criminal history, the board must consider mitigating factors and evidence of rehabilitation.

19. Contact Name

Dale Kleven, Administrative Rules Coordinator

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 261-4472

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
-