

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 October 20, 2020</p> |
| <p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) SPS 318</p> | |
| <p>4. Subject Private residence elevators</p> | |
| <p>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</p> | <p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected 20.165 (2) (j)</p> |
| <p>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input checked="" 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 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 The proposed rule will remove the provisions of s. SPS 318.1705 (3) (c) 1. to 4., which relate to the space allowed between the hoistway door and the car door or gate of a private residence elevator. This update will reduce the likelihood of a child being seriously injured or killed as a result of fitting in the space, a significant safety issue identified by the Department, the Conveyance Safety Code Council, and nationally known conveyance safety experts. In addition, the update will make the safety standards in ch. SPS 318 more consistent with ASME A17.1-2016, the industry-wide national safety standards for conveyances adopted by reference in the Wisconsin Conveyance Safety Code.</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 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.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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) 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. The Department estimates one-time administrative costs of \$9,657.68. These costs may be absorbed in the agency budget.</p> | |
| <p>15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit to implementing the rule is increased safety requirements for private residence elevators and consistency with industry-wide national safety standards. If the rule is not implemented, a significant safety issue will remain in the requirements for private residence elevators.</p> | |

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The long range implication of implementing the rule is increased safety requirements for private residence elevators and consistency with industry-wide national safety standards.

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:

Illinois adopts nationally recognized elevator safety standards, including ASME A17.1 2013 [41 Ill. Adm. Code 1000.60]. These standards regulate the space allowed between the hoistway door and the car door or gate of a private residence elevator.

Iowa:

Iowa adopts nationally recognized elevator safety standards, including ASME A17.1 2016 [875 IAC 72.1(11)]. These standards regulate the space allowed between the hoistway door and the car door or gate of a private residence elevator.

Michigan:

Michigan adopts nationally recognized elevator safety standards, including ASME A17.1 2010 [Mich Admin Code, R 408.7003]. These standards regulate the space allowed between the hoistway door and the car door or gate of a private residence elevator.

Minnesota:

Minnesota adopts nationally recognized elevator safety standards, including ASME A17.1 2016 (Minnesota Rules, Part 1307.0020). These standards regulate the space allowed between the hoistway door and the car door or gate of a private residence elevator.

19. Contact Name

Dale Kleven

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
-