

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 10/04/2019 |
| 3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) VA 6 - Wisconsin Veterans Homes | |
| 4. Subject Rate Setting for Wisconsin Veterans Homes | |
| 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 20.485 (1) (gk) |
| 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). \$0.00 | |
| 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 Current rules lack a codified formula for calculating private pay rates or corresponding definitions of rate setting terms. The proposed rule will include the methodology for setting rates for the veterans homes. | |
| 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 is not expected to impact businesses, local governmental units, or individuals. The rule will be posted for 14 days on the Department of Veterans Affairs' website for economic impact comments. | |
| 13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. No local government units participated in the development of the 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) This rule will not have an economic or fiscal 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 benefits of implementing the proposed rules is to define the rate setting terms and codify the methodology and procedures to calculate the private pay rate for members of Wisconsin Veterans Homes. If the agency does not implement the rule, current administrative rules would not include the recommendations included in LAB Report, which is to clarify and codify the department's methodology for setting private pay rates for veterans homes. | |
| 16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implications will bring the agency's rules into conformity with the LAB report by codifying the Department's methodology for setting private pay rates at Wisconsin's Veterans Homes. | |
| 17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government The federal government does not have a similar approach as rates are set by the state for state-operated veterans homes. | |

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

-
18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)
- Illinois charges a monthly fee set by the state and does not establish the methodology in rule.
 - Iowa bases its rates on direct costs only and does not establish the methodology in rule.
 - Michigan's board of managers determines the per diem expenses for services and does not establish the methodology in rule.
 - Minnesota calculates the cost of care using direct and indirect costs in which the methodology is established in rule.

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 19. Contact Name | 20. Contact Phone Number |
| Mindy Allen, Administrative Rules Coordinator | (608) 264-6085 |

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
-