STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
DOA-2049 (R09/2016)

DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE
101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 7864
MADISON, WI 53707-7864
FAX: (608) 267-0372

# ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
## Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis
☒ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected

2. Date
14 March 2019

3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)
Phar 7.01 (3)

4. Subject
Pharmacist to delegate ratio

5. Fund Sources Affected
☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S

6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule
☒ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues ☐ Increase Costs ☐ Decrease Costs
☐ Indeterminate ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues ☐ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget

8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)
☐ State's Economy
☐ Local Government Units
☐ Specific Businesses/Sectors
☐ Public Utility Rate Payers
☐ 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).
$0.00

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)?
☐ Yes ☒ No

11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule
The staffing levels of delegates in a pharmacy.

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.

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)
This rule will not have an economic or fiscal impact on specific businesses, business sectors, public utility rate payers, local governmental units or the State's Economy as a Whole.

15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule
The pilot program revealed that a ratio is not necessary to ensure safety, quality and efficiency of the pharmacy. The benefit to removing the ratio is to allow pharmacies to determine the best staffing level for their pharmacy and allow pharmacists to involved in other patient care activities.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule
The long range implication to removing the ratio requirement is it allows pharmacies to determine staffing levels which meet the needs of their individual pharmacies.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government
None

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

DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE
101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 7864
MADISON, WI 53707-7864
FAX: (608) 267-0372

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

Minnesota has a ratio of one pharmacist to two technicians except the ratio is one pharmacist to three technicians when the technicians are doing the following: intravenous admixture preparation; setting up or preparing patient specific in unit dose or modified unit dose packaging; prepacking; or compounding.

| 19. Contact Name | 20. Contact Phone Number |
|---|---|
| Sharon Henes | (608) 261-2377 |

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
DOA-2049 (R09/2016)

DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE
101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 7864
MADISON, WI 53707-7864
FAX: (608) 267-0372

# 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