

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 11/9/20
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) PSC 160 Universal Service Support Funding and Programs	
4. Subject Updating the Universal Service Fund rules	
5. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected 20.155(1)(q)
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	
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input checked="" 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 Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule Current Lifeline rules are outdated and need to be aligned with federal law. Changes in technology also shift the way that TEPP is administered to authorize equipment used to access the internet for the Deaf. Language describing people with disabilities is revised to reflect inclusive language.	
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. Commission sought input from the USF Council, comprised of members of the telecommunication industry, and agencies serving the stakeholders (people who are low-income, people with disabilities). The Commission solicited public comments from telecommunications carriers authorized to provide service in Wisconsin who provide funding to the USF through annual assessments, and to all community-based and public agencies working with the stakeholder groups including W-2 agencies, Aging and Disability Resource Centers, and county and Tribal health agencies.	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. Public comment was sought from W-2 agencies, county Aging and Disability Resource Centers, and county and Tribal health agencies.	
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) The changes made in this rulemaking have minimal, if any, economic impacts.	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule
Updating and revising outdated rules to align with federal rules. Implementing changes in TEPP that provide access to telecommunications, and are responsive to changes in technology.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule
Added efficiency and compliance with federal rules. Additional access for people with disabilities to access telecommunications.
Revision of disability language to reflect inclusive language.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government
The Lifeline program is a federal USF program, and in Wisconsin a complementary state program. Per the federal Lifeline Modernization Act, all Lifeline subscribers must have an eligibility determination from the National Verifier to enroll in Lifeline. Eligibility determinations in the National Verifier are aligned with federal rules; this rule changes will clearly align the Wisconsin rules with the federal rules.

Wisconsin's equipment distribution program (TEPP) does not have corollary with federal USF programs.

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)
This rulemaking specifically addresses the alignment of Wisconsin's rules with the federal rules for Lifeline eligibility, and revises and clarifies the rule for TEPP.

Citizens of Illinois, Minnesota and Michigan are able to access the federal Lifeline program using the federal eligibility rules in their program. Illinois does not operate a state program. Minnesota and Michigan administer limited state programs that provide an additional discount based on age and technology, where all technologies and applicants eligible under the federal program are allowed.

Iowa and Illinois administer equipment distribution programs, similar to TEPP, where customers are the ultimate equipment owners. Minnesota uses an equipment loan model. Wisconsin's program eligibility is the broadest, including people who are low vision and hard of hearing. Like Wisconsin, Minnesota covers equipment for people with physical disabilities, while Illinois and Iowa provide coverage only to people with hearing and speech disabilities.

19. Contact Name

Jenna Schmidt

20. Contact Phone Number

608 267 7709

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

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
-