

## 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 06/08/2021
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) RAD 1 and 4	
4. Subject Scope of practice	
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	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected 20.165(1)(g)
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input checked="" 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 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). \$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 The scope of practice standards for radiographers and limited X-ray machine operators in current rules are a reproduction of the standards for scope of practice established by the American Society of Radiologic Technologists (ASRT) in 2017. ASRT periodically updates its standards, most recently in 2019. The proposed rule updates the scope of practice standards in ss. RAD 4.01 and 4.02 to be a reproduction of the standards for scope of practice established by the ASRT in 2019.	
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 proposed rule was posted for comments for 14 days. No comments 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) No economic or fiscal impacts are anticipated for specific businesses, sectors, ratepayers, local governments, or the state's economy as a whole. A total of \$356.74 in one time costs are anticipated in the Department of Safety and Professional Services.	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit to implementing the rule is providing clarity and updated scope of practice standards. If the rule is not implemented, it will continue to reference outdated scope of practice standards.	
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implication of implementing the rule is clarity and updated scope of practice standards.	
17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government	

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

None

---

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

Illinois:

Illinois Administrative Code (32 Ill. Admin. Code 401) provides for accreditation in the practice of medical radiation technology in Illinois, but does not explicitly define scope of practice. However, scope of practice is addressed in definitions of the categories of accreditation in the practice of medical radiation technology and the techniques of applying radiation (32 Ill. Admin. Code 401.20). These definitions do not reference the standards established by the American Society of Radiologic Technologists.

Iowa:

Iowa Administrative Code (641 IAC 42) provides for permits to operate ionizing radiation producing machines or administer radioactive materials in Iowa, but does not explicitly define scope of practice. However, scope of practice is addressed in definitions of the categories of permits to practice and the techniques of using ionizing radiation producing machines and administering radioactive materials (641 IAC 42.2). In addition, the rules provide the scope within which a limited radiologic technologist with categories of chest, spine, extremities, shoulder, and pediatric shall perform radiography (641 IAC 42.9). The rules do not reference the standards established by the American Society of Radiologic Technologists.

Michigan:

The State of Michigan does not license operators of X-ray machines, nor does it have any requirements relative to the licensure or credentialing of X-ray machine operators except for radiologic technologists who perform mammographic examinations (Mich Admin Code, R 333.5630). These rules do not define or otherwise address scope of practice.

Minnesota:

Minnesota Statutes (2020 Minn. Stat. 144.121, Subds. 5a. and 5b.) provide the scope of practice of a limited X-ray machine operator (LXMO) and a means of granting a variance to a facility for the scope of practice of an LXMO. The statutes do not reference the standards established by the American Society of Radiologic Technologists.

---

19. Contact Name

Nilajah Hardin

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 267-7139

---

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
-