

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 4/18/2022
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Trans 1-515	
4. Subject Inclusive language in administrative rules	
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by the Rule Executive Order 15 (2019) directed each state agency to review its administrative rules and replace any outdated, derogatory, or offensive terminology used to refer to groups of people with current, inclusive terminology. Additionally, writing style guides prepared or adopted under statutes disfavor certain other language that may be contained in the department's existing administrative rules.	
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. N/A	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. N/A	
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) Because this is rulemaking is intended to accomplish only terminology changes in existing rules to eliminate outdated language, to replace language that discriminates on the basis of sex or gender with sex-neutral and gender-neutral terminology, and to conform with the usage and style prescribed in drafting guides prepared or adopted under statutes, there is no substantive fiscal effect on any entity.	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The updated terminology will not minimize or devalue any groups of people.	
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule N/A	
17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government The department is unaware of any existing or proposed federal language that would affect terminology used in this state's	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

administrative code.

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

Illinois:

Upon a review of Illinois' transportation rules, Illinois uses the terms, "handicap," "handicapped," and "elderly" sporadically. See 92 Ill. Adm. Code 445 App. A and App. B, 92 Ill. Adm. Code 534.210, 92 Ill. Adm. Code 651.103 and 651.301, 92 Ill. Adm. Code 1001.410 and 1001.420, and 92 Ill. Adm. Code 1040.20 and 1040.80.

Iowa:

Upon review of Iowa's transportation rules, Iowa uses the term, "elderly," on a very limited basis and does not use the terms, "handicap," "handicapped," "mentally retarded," nor "mental retardation." See Iowa Admin. Code 761-910.4(324A) App. and Iowa Admin. Code 761-411.2(321L).

Michigan:

Upon review of Michigan's transportation rules, Michigan uses the term, "elderly," on a very limited basis and does not use the terms, "handicap," "handicapped," "mentally retarded," nor "mental retardation." See Mich. Admin. Code R 247.4102, 247.4201, and 247.4202.

Minnesota:

Upon review of Minnesota's transportation rules, Minnesota uses the term, "elderly," throughout Minn. R. 8840. Minnesota's transportation rules do not appear to use the terms, "handicap," "handicapped," "mentally retarded," nor "mental retardation."

19. Contact Name

Alicia Augsburger

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 266-3353

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
-