

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES  
FISCAL ESTIMATE  
AND ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS**

Type of Estimate and Analysis		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected		
Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number		
Amend ETF 52 regarding the administration of the Duty Disability Program under §40.65, Stats.		
Subject		
Duty Disability Program		
Fund Sources Affected	Chapter 20 , Stats. Appropriations Affected	
<input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG SEG-S		
Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs
The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers	
Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule		
<p>The proposed rule would amend definitions in ETF §50.02 to clarify how terms are used by the Disability Bureau of ETF. The department has determined that other provisions should be amended to incorporate the procedures for administering the benefit that the department has developed since the chapter was promulgated in its entirety in 1998.</p>		
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)		
<p>There is no economic and fiscal impact on small business, business sectors, public utility rate payers, local governmental units and the state's economy as a whole. The rule changes update the rules to reflect procedural adjustments in administering the Duty Disability program.</p>		
Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule		
<p>The rule language more accurately reflects the procedures used by the agency in administering the Duty Disability program. The agency does not see alternatives to achieving the policy goal of the rule amendments.</p>		
Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule		
<p>There are no long range economic or fiscal impacts of the rule.</p>		
Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government		
<p>The proposed rule amendments do not have federal corollaries although approximately 38 states do have laws regarding presumptive diseases contracted or developed by fire fighters.</p>		
Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)		
<p>Illinois – Similar provisions regarding presumptive diseases at 40 ILCS 5 et seq.</p>		

Iowa – Similar provisions regarding presumptive diseases at Iowa Code §§ 411 (1) and 411.6

Michigan – Similar provisions in Mich. Comp. Laws §§418.401 to 418.441 regarding presumptive diseases.

Minnesota – Similar provisions in chapter 176 of the Minnesota Statutes. Minn. Stat. §176.011 et seq.