

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 8/25/20
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) HAS 3, 7, 8	
4. Subject Delete obsolete rule provisions.	
5. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected s. 20.165 (1)(g), Wis. Stats.
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 administrative rule revisions under HAS 3, 7 and 8 removed the use of a master hearing instrument from the list of equipment on the potential list for the practical examination because it is no longer used in practice. The proposed rules also correct administrative code cross-references as needed.	
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. This rule was posted for economic impact comments and none were received.	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. None. This rule does not impact local governmental units.	
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) This rule will not have an economic or fiscal impact on specific businesses, business sectors, public utility rate payers, local governmental units and the State's Economy as a whole.	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit of implementing this rule is 1) to update the rule to meet current practice and 2) to comply with state statutes in updating the rules. The alternative is to leave the current rules in place, which will then remain outdated with current practices.	
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implication of implementing the rule is clarity and complying with state statutes.	
17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government None	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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

Illinois: The Illinois Board of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, under the authority of Illinois Statutes 225 ILCS 110, regulates speech-language pathologists and audiologists under the authority of the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation (IDFPR). The Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) regulates the licensing of hearing instrument dispensers and trainees under Rule (68 Ill. Adm. Code 1465). Illinois requires a practical examination with similar topics as Wisconsin, as prescribed in 225 ILCS 50/9, for licensure requirements for a hearing instrument dispenser. However, it does not identify testing for specific equipment.

Iowa: The Iowa Board of Speech Pathology and Audiology regulates the professions of speech pathology and audiology under Iowa Administrative Code 645, Chapter 300. The Bureau of Professional Licensure in the Iowa Department of Public Health (IDPH) regulates the licensure of these professions. The Board of Hearing Aid Specialists regulates hearing aid specialists and temporary permits. Iowa does not require a practical examination for a license for a hearing instrument specialist. Iowa does not have specific equipment listed in its regulations.

Michigan: Michigan's Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA) includes the Board of Audiology, Board of Speech-Language Pathology, and direct licenses hearing aid dealers, salespersons, and trainees. Requirements for Michigan licensure are found in Article 15 of the Public Health Code, 1978 PA 368, MCL 333.16801 to 333.16811 and further outlined in administrative rule R 338.1 to 338.12 and R 338.601 through R 338.649. Specific equipment is not included within the examination for a hearing aid dealer license.

Minnesota: Minnesota's laws for Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists are found under Minnesota Statutes s. 148.511 through s. 148.5198. The Minnesota Department of Health includes the Speech-Language Pathologist and Audiologist Advisory Council which advises the department Commissioner and makes recommendations for speech-language pathologists, audiologists, and hearing aid dispensers. Hearing instrument dispensers must pass a practical examination which does not include a master hearing instrument. [Minnesota Statutes s. 153A.14]

19. Contact Name

Kassandra Walbrun

20. Contact Phone Number

608-261-4463

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
-