

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<p>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original   <input type="checkbox"/> Updated   <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected</p>	<p>2. Date 14 December 2018</p>
<p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) MPSW 1.09</p>	
<p>4. Subject Substance Use Disorder Specialty Authorization</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected 20.165(1)(g)</p>
<p>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget</p>	
<p>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></p>	
<p>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0.00</p>	
<p>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 type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule 2017 Act 262, section 34 repealed MPSW 1.09 of the administrative code. Assembly Bill 907, as introduced, initially included a repeal of s. 457.02 (5) and (5m) and the repeal of MPSW 1.09, as MPSW 1.09 was promulgated under the authority of s. 457.02 (5m). However, a subsequent amendment to the bill reinserted and amended s. 457.02 (5) and (5m) but did not reinsert MPSW 1.09. Assembly Bill 907 passed with these amendments to become 2017 Act 262. 2017 Act 262 authorizes individuals certified under chapter 457 to treat substance use disorder as a specialty if the individual satisfies the educational and supervised training requirements established in rules promulgated by the examining board. Therefore, the examining board needs to establish the educational and supervised training requirements for those who specialize in treating substance use disorder in order to fully implement 2017 Act 262.</p>	
<p>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. This rule was posted for economic comments and none were received.</p>	
<p>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. None</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit of implementing the rule is allowing individuals certified under chapter 457 to treat substance use disorder as a specialty. The statutes require the educational and supervised training requirements to allow this specialty authorization to be established by rule.</p>	
<p>16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implication of implementing the rule is creating greater access to treatment for people with substance use disorder.</p>	

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

---

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government  
None

---

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)  
Our surrounding states do not have educational or training requirements for social workers to specialize in substance use disorder treatment.

---

19. Contact Name  
Sharon Henes

---

20. Contact Phone Number  
(608) 261-2377

---

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
-