

**State of Wisconsin  
Department of Employee Trust Funds,  
Employee Trust Funds Board, Deferred Compensation Board, Group Insurance Board,  
Teachers Retirement Board  
and  
Wisconsin Retirement Board**

---

**FINAL DRAFT REPORT ON CLEARINGHOUSE RULE #07-066**

**FINAL RULE** to amend ETF 11.06 (1) and 11.12 (2) (b) regarding hearsay evidence in administrative appeal hearings.

---

Agency Person to be Contacted for Questions .....	2
Statement Explaining Need for Rule .....	2
Analysis Prepared by Department of Employee Trust Funds .....	2
Statutes interpreted.....	2
Statutory authority .....	3
Explanation of agency authority.....	3
Related statutes of rules .....	3
Plain language analysis.....	3
Summary of, and comparison with, existing or proposed federal regulations .....	3
Comparison with rules in adjacent states .....	3
Summary of factual data and analytical methodologies .....	6
Analysis and documentation concerning effect on small businesses .....	6
Anticipated costs incurred by private sector .....	7
Statement of effect on small business .....	7
Regulatory Flexibility Analysis.....	7
Fiscal Estimate.....	7
Text of Rule .....	8
Effective Date .....	8
Economic Impact Report .....	NONE

Department of Administration § 227.138 Report.....	NONE
Energy Impact Report .....	NONE
Legislative Council Staff Clearinghouse Report .....	9
Response to Legislative Council Staff Recommendation.....	11
List of Persons Who Appeared or Registered at the Public Hearing .....	11
Summary of Public Comments .....	11
Modifications to the Rule as Originally Proposed .....	11
Modifications to the Analysis Accompanying the Proposed Rule .....	11
Modifications to the Fiscal Estimate .....	11
Board Authorization for Promulgation .....	11

**Agency Person to be Contacted for Questions**

Please direct any questions about this rule-making to Robert Weber, Chief Counsel, Department of Employee Trust Funds, P.O. Box 7931, Madison WI 53707. Telephone: (608) 266-5804. E-mail address: rob.weber@etf.state.wi.us.

**Statement Explaining Need for Rule**

The rule is needed in order to allow the five Boards hearing appeals of determinations made by the Department of Employee Trust Funds (DETF) to rely upon hearsay evidence to make factual findings in administrative hearings to the same extent permitted in state court.

**Analysis Prepared by the Department of Employee Trust Funds**

1. Statute interpreted:

Sections 40.03 (1) (j), (6) (l), (7) (f), (8) (f) and 40.80 (2g), Stats., concerning the hearing authority of the Employee Trust Funds, Group Insurance, Teachers

Retirement, Wisconsin Retirement and Deferred Compensation Boards, respectively.

2. Statutory authority:

Sections 40.03 (2) (i) and 227.11 (2) (a), Stats.

3. Explanation of agency authority:

By statute, the DETF Secretary is expressly authorized, with Board approval, to promulgate rules required for the efficient administration of any benefit plan established in ch. 40, Stats. Also, each state agency may promulgate rules interpreting the provisions of any statute enforced or administered by the agency, if the agency considers it necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute.

4. Related statute or rule:

None.

5. Plain language analysis:

The present s. ETF 11.12 (2) (b), Wis. Admin. Code, prohibits a Board from basing any finding of fact on hearsay. The proposed rule eliminates that absolute prohibition. This change permits the Board hearing the appeal to base its findings of fact upon hearsay when that hearsay is corroborated by other non-hearsay evidence, or in any other circumstances in which Wisconsin courts may determine that reliance upon hearsay evidence is permissible in administrative proceedings. The proposed rule expressly allows the Boards to rely upon hearsay evidence as the basis for their factual findings to the same extent permitted in hearings in Wisconsin courts.

6. Summary of, and comparison with, existing or proposed federal regulations:

No existing or proposed federal regulations apply to the evidentiary standards that may be applied by the Boards in hearing administrative appeals of determinations made by the Department of Employee Trust Funds.

7. Comparison with rules in adjacent states:

Although there are a number of governmental retirement plans in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and Michigan, their administrative rules are not directly relevant to

interpreting the Wisconsin statutes governing the Wisconsin Retirement System. Governmental plans differ in the degree to which the terms of the plan are established by enabling legislation or left to subsequent administrative rulemaking or other means.

### Illinois

The various governmental retirement systems in Illinois have not adopted administrative rules specifically concerning hearsay evidence in their administrative proceedings. Other state administrative rules deal with hearsay in different ways. For example:

- The Department of Children and Family Services mandates that previous statements by the child relating to abuse or neglect must be admitted as hearsay exceptions. Ill. Admin. Code title 89, §§ 336.120 b) 10) and 412.60 g) 1) B).
- The Illinois Gaming Board permits hearsay to support a finding of the Administrative Law Judge if it is the best evidence available, has sufficient indicia of trustworthiness and reliability and is of the type reasonably and customarily relied on in the gaming industry. See Ill. Admin. Code title 86, § 3000.430 a).
- The Department of Central Management Services appeal rules provide that the technical rules of evidence do not apply. Any material evidence, including hearsay, may be accepted, but the finder-of-fact must weigh the hearsay nature of such evidence. See Ill. Admin. Code title 14, § 105.60 l) 6).
- In consumer protection hearings by the Attorney General any relevant evidence which is not privileged is admissible, whether or not the evidence is hearsay or would be inadmissible in a court of law. See Ill. Admin. Code title 14, § 450.20 b) 3).
- The State Board of Elections permits hearsay evidence to be admitted into evidence if the hearing examiner deems it reliable and trustworthy. See Ill. Admin. Code title 26, § 150.115 a).

On the other hand, some administrative rules appear to discourage hearsay evidence with general statements that the common rule against hearsay will be deemed substantive, not merely technical, for hearing purposes. For examples, see Ill. Admin. Code title 41, § 123.180 b) [*Office of the State Fire Marshall*], Ill.

Admin. Code title 56, § 2605.360 b) [*Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity*] and Ill. Admin. Code title 68, § 1110.180 b) [*Department of Financial and Professional Regulation*]. In many cases, however, the agency's rules then go on to recognize exceptions to this exclusion of hearsay evidence. For instance:

- The State Fire Marshal's rules for contested cases involving boiler and other pressure vessels state that hearsay is not admissible — unless the statement is subject to a hearsay exception under Illinois law or has circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness. The probative value of the hearsay statement must also outweigh any prejudice resulting from an inability to cross-examine the maker of the statement. See II. Admin. Code title 41, § 123.220 b). The rules also identify the kinds of statements which will not be viewed as hearsay, including certain kinds of prior statements made by the witness and admissions made by the other party. See III. Admin. Code title 41, § 123.220 c).
- The Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation and the Illinois Comptroller have taken similar approaches virtually identical to the State Fire Marshall's. See III. Admin. Code title 56, § 2605.340 d) and e), III. Admin. Code title 68, § 1110.220 b) and c) and III. Admin. Code title 74, § 310.220 b) and c), respectively.
- Language recognizing the hearsay exceptions in Illinois law or circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness (and of probative value outweighing the prejudice of the inability to cross-examine) is also found in the Department of Children and Family Services rules, although those rules do not contain the list of statements not considered hearsay. See III. Admin. Code title 89, § 412.60 g) 1) C).
- Under III. Admin. Code title 56 § 2830.335 c), the Department of Employment Security provides that, in actions pertaining to the re-issuance of benefit checks, hearsay which was not objected to may nevertheless not form the sole basis for a decision, if the claimant testified under oath to the contrary. The sole exception is if the Department's special agent finds that the claimant's testimony is incredible, inconsistent or inherently improbable.
- The Illinois Department of Revenue, in III. Admin. Code title 86, § 200.155 a), provides that hearsay may not be admitted, except to the extent that it is of a type commonly relied upon by reasonably prudent persons in the conduct of their affairs.

## Iowa

The only Iowa administrative rules expressly concerning hearsay evidence in administrative proceedings allow findings to be based on hearsay, regardless of whether the evidence would be admissible in a jury trial, if the evidence is of a kind that reasonably prudent persons are accustomed to rely upon for the conduct of their serious affairs. See Iowa Admin. Code r. 193-7.26(7) [*contested cases concerning professional licensing and regulation*], Iowa Admin. Code r. 263-9.10(4)(intro.) [*City Development Board involuntary development actions*], and Iowa Admin. Code r. 721-25.24(7) [*Secretary of State administrative complaints regarding elections*].

## Michigan

The State Employee Retirement System does not yet have administrative rules. The Michigan Administrative Code contains no rules relating specifically to hearsay.

## Minnesota

The Minnesota governmental retirement systems have not adopted administrative rules specifically concerning hearsay evidence. Other state administrative rules deal with hearsay in a fairly uniform way.

Under Minnesota's Office of Administrative Hearings, the rules governing a variety of different kinds of hearings, including contested cases, allow hearsay evidence with probative value to be admitted into evidence. See Minn. R. 1400.7300 subp. 1., Minn. R. 1400.8601 subp. 1., and Minn. R. 1405.1700 subp. 3. The rules on hearings by other state agencies also permit receiving any evidence, expressly including hearsay, if it is the type of evidence on which reasonable, prudent persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of their serious affairs. See Minn. R. 3310.2922 [*unemployment compensation procedure*], Minn. R. 3525.4320 [*Dept. of Education disabled children hearings*], Minn. R. 5510.1910 subp. 9 [*Public employment labor relations*], Minn. R. 7897.0170 subp. 3 [*Racing Commission*], Minn. R. 9200.4800 subp. 19 A [*Environmental quality board*].

The rules of two boards specify that hearsay evidence may be used to supplement or explain direct evidence, but is insufficient to support a finding in itself, unless the hearsay would be admissible over objection in a civil action. See Minn. R. 5601.3145 [*Board of Physical Therapy*] and Minn. R. 5615.0900 subp. 3 [*Board of Medical Practice*].

8. Summary of factual data and analytical methodologies:

The proposed rule is based on logical analysis of the evidentiary issues that can arise under the administrative appeal process as well as many years of experience with evidence offered in such hearings.

9. Analysis and supporting documents used to determine effect on small business or in preparation of economic impact report:

This rule-making affects only administrative hearings before the Employee Trust Funds Board and four other Boards attached to the DETF. The parties to such hearings are governmental employees affected by determinations made by the DETF in administering the pension, insurance and other fringe benefit plans under ch. 40, Stats. their beneficiaries and sometimes the governmental agencies that employ them. Third party administrators contracted by the DETF or Boards to assist in the administration of particular benefit plans may sometimes participate as parties, if they wish. However, such third-party administrators do not now, and have not in the past, met the definition of a "small business" in s. 227.114 (1), Stats.

10. Anticipated costs incurred by private sector:

None.

11. Effect on small business:

No effect.

**Regulatory Flexibility Analysis:**

The proposed rule has no effect on small businesses.

**Fiscal Estimate:**

The proposed rule is expected to have no fiscal effect on any county, city, village, town, school district, technical college district or sewerage district. Although such governmental entities may appear as parties in the administrative appeals affected by this rule, they remain free to present their evidence in those administrative

appeals in exactly the same manner as at present. It is possible that the rule will enable some limited savings if evidence can be presented in the form of corroborated, or otherwise reliable, hearsay rather than through, for example, expert testimony.



### **Text of Rule**

#### **SECTION 1.** ETF 11.06 (1) is amended to read:

ETF 11.06 (1) Rules of privilege recognized by law shall be given effect. However, common law or statutory rules of evidence do not apply, except as provided in s. ETF 11.12 (2) (b) concerning hearsay. The hearing examiner shall admit all testimony having a reasonable probative value. The hearing examiner shall exclude from the record irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious testimony.

#### **SECTION 2.** ETF 11.12 (2) (b) is amended to read:

ETF 11.12 (2) (b) *Factual basis.* The factual basis of the final decision shall be solely the evidence and matters officially noticed. ~~No finding of fact may be based upon hearsay.~~ Hearsay evidence may be relied upon as the basis for factual findings to the same extent permitted in a Wisconsin court of law.

(end of rule text)

### **Effective Date**

This rule shall take effect on the first day of the month following publication in the Wisconsin Administrative Register as provided in Wis. Stat. s. 227.22 (2).



**WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL  
RULES CLEARINGHOUSE**

Ronald Sklansky  
*Clearinghouse Director*

Terry C. Anderson  
*Legislative Council Director*

Richard Sweet  
*Clearinghouse Assistant Director*

Laura D. Rose  
*Legislative Council Deputy Director*

CLEARINGHOUSE REPORT TO AGENCY

**[THIS REPORT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO S. 227.15, STATS. THIS IS A REPORT ON A RULE AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED BY THE AGENCY; THE REPORT MAY NOT REFLECT THE FINAL CONTENT OF THE RULE IN FINAL DRAFT FORM AS IT WILL BE SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATURE. THIS REPORT CONSTITUTES A REVIEW OF, BUT NOT APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF, THE SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT AND TECHNICAL ACCURACY OF THE RULE.]**

CLEARINGHOUSE RULE 07-066

**AN ORDER to amend ETF 11.06 (1) and 11.12 (2) (b), relating to hearsay evidence in administrative appeal hearings.**

**Submitted by DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYE TRUST FUNDS**

**06-26-2007 RECEIVED BY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

**07-16-2007 REPORT SENT TO AGENCY.**

**RNS:WF**

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL RULES CLEARINGHOUSE REPORT

This rule has been reviewed by the Rules Clearinghouse. Based on that review, comments are reported as noted below:

1. STATUTORY AUTHORITY [s. 227.15 (2) (a)]

Comment Attached YES  NO

2. FORM, STYLE AND PLACEMENT IN ADMINISTRATIVE CODE [s. 227.15 (2) (c)]

Comment Attached YES  NO

3. CONFLICT WITH OR DUPLICATION OF EXISTING RULES [s. 227.15 (2) (d)]

Comment Attached YES  NO

4. ADEQUACY OF REFERENCES TO RELATED STATUTES, RULES AND FORMS [s. 227.15 (2) (e)]

Comment Attached YES  NO

5. CLARITY, GRAMMAR, PUNCTUATION AND USE OF PLAIN LANGUAGE [s. 227.15 (2) (f)]

Comment Attached YES  NO

6. POTENTIAL CONFLICTS WITH, AND COMPARABILITY TO, RELATED FEDERAL REGULATIONS [s. 227.15 (2) (g)]

Comment Attached YES  NO

7. COMPLIANCE WITH PERMIT ACTION DEADLINE REQUIREMENTS [s. 227.15 (2) (h)]

Comment Attached YES  NO



## **Response to Legislative Council Staff Recommendations**

The Legislative Council staff made no recommendations.

## **List of Persons Appearing or Registering For or Against the Rules.**

No persons registered either for or against the rule at the public hearing on August 1, 2007.

## **Summary of Comments Received at Public Hearing.**

No person wished to testify concerning the rule. The record was held open for written comments until 4:30 p.m. on August 10, 2007, but no comments were received.

## **Modifications to Rule as Originally Proposed as a Result of Public Comments**

No modifications to the rule were made as a result of public comments.

## **Modifications to the Analysis Accompanying the Proposed Rule.**

Minor non-substantive, editorial changes were made for clarity and the analysis was revised as necessary to fit into the slightly different format of a final draft report.

## **Modifications to the Initial Fiscal Estimate**

None.

## **Board Authorization for Promulgation**

This final draft report on Clearinghouse Rule #07-066 has been duly approved for submission to the Legislature, and for promulgation, by the Department of Employee Trust Funds and by:

The Employee Trust Funds Board at its meeting on September 14, 2007.

The Deferred Compensation Board at its meeting on November 13, 2007.

The Group Insurance Board at its meeting on August 28, 2007.

The Teachers Retirement Board at its meeting on September 13, 2007.

The Wisconsin Retirement Board at its meeting on September 13, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

**DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYEE TRUST FUNDS**

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Stella  
Secretary

Date: \_\_\_\_\_