

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 December 21, 2021
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Adm 1 - Parking Adm 2 - Use of State Buildings and Facilities Adm 21 - Advertising, Bidding, and Award of Construction Contracts Adm 30 - Payroll Deductions for Charitable Purposes Adm 50 - Contract Compliance Adm 89 - Housing Cost Grants and Loans Adm 92 - Relocation Assistance Game 4 - Duties and Responsibilities of Associations and Racetrack Operators ER 44 - Employment Development and Training	
4. Subject Updating Terminology 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 N/A
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 2019 Executive Order #15 requires each state agency to review its administrative rules and replace any derogatory or offensive terms with current, inclusive terminology. This includes replacing the phrase "mentally retarded" with "intellectually disabled," "mental retardation" with "intellectual disability," and "handicapped" with "disabled."	
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. None.	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. None.	
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) No economic or fiscal impact is anticipated from the proposed rule.	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit of promulgating the proposed rule is compliance with EO #15. The alternative to promulgating the rule would be to leave the code language unchanged, which would be contrary to the purpose of EO #15.	
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

The updated terminology will make the Department's rules consistent with modern usage and improve inclusivity, but no long-range fiscal or economic implications are anticipated.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

The drafting approach taken in the proposed rule is consistent with language and definitions used in the federal Americans with Disabilities Act.

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

A review of administrative rules in Illinois, Iowa, and Michigan shows that most current provisions of these states' rules use updated terminology, though some instances of the term "handicap" can still be found in certain rules in these states which have not been updated. An online search of Minnesota administrative rules was not able to identify any current provisions where the term "handicap" is used in reference to individuals with disabilities; it appears that all previous usage of such terminology has been repealed in Minnesota.

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Alexandra Arkin, Legal Counsel, Division of Legal Services	(608) 267-7877

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)

N/A

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

N/A

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

N/A

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

N/A

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)

☐ Yes ☒ No
