

## 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 11/21/18
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) DCF 150	
4. Subject A correction affecting the determination of child support when the parents have shared placement and the payer receives the child's SSDI benefits	
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 ( <b>if checked, complete Attachment A</b> )	
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$NA	
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 Correction of a drafting error.	
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 Wisconsin Child Support Enforcement Association and the State Bar of Wisconsin	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. No comments were received.	
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) None	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule Correction of a drafting error	
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule None	
17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government  Wisconsin's Percentage of Income Standard was created to comply with federal requirements in 45 CFR 302.56 (a) that require that as a condition of approval of its State plan, all states must establish one set of guidelines by law or by judicial or administrative action for setting and modifying child support award amounts within the State. The methodology to be used in calculating support orders is at state discretion.	
18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)	

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**  
**Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis**

Iowa, Minnesota, and Michigan use an Income Shares Model to establish child support. Illinois uses a Percentage of Income Standard. The amount of support calculated under Wisconsin's Percentage of Income Standard is consistent with that of neighboring states.

---

19. Contact Name Connie Chesnik, Attorney	20. Contact Phone Number (608) 422-7040
--	--

---

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)

NA

---

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

NA

---

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

NA

---

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

NA

---

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

- Yes     No
-