

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 May 16, 2024 |
| 3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) A-E 8 | |
| 4. Subject Supervision | |
| 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 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 (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 The Board reviewed chapter A-E 8 to ensure that rules are consistent with standards of current professional practice. The rule updates the definition of supervision to clarify that remote supervision is allowed. And, the rule specifies that the same standards of practice and professional conduct apply when working remotely and in person. | |
| 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. N/A | |
| 13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. N/A | |
| 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) DSPS estimates a total of \$3,400 in one-time costs to implement this rule. The estimated one-time costs include \$3,400 for the equivalent of a 0.1 limited term employee and associated overhead for rulemaking activities. The one-time costs cannot be absorbed in the currently appropriated agency budget. | |
| 15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit of the rule is to clarify within A-E code the ability to work remotely and to supervise remotely. If not implemented, the legality of this ability will remain unclear. | |
| 16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implication of implementing the rule is clarity within the A-E professions of the ability to work and supervise remotely. | |
| 17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government None. | |
| 18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) | |

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

Illinois:

Rules of the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation provide standards of professional conduct for architects [68 Ill. Adm. Code 1150.90], professional engineers [68 Ill. Adm. Code 1380.300], and professional land surveyors [68 Ill. Adm. Code 1270.57]. None of these rules address direct supervision of subordinate employees.

Iowa:

Rules of professional conduct for architects, engineers, professional land surveyors, and landscape architects are specified by the Iowa Architectural Examining Board [193B IAC 4.1], the Iowa Engineering and Land Surveying Examining Board [193C IAC 8.1 to 8.5], the Iowa Landscape Architectural Examining Board [193D IAC 4.1 to 4.5] and the Iowa Interior Design Board [193G IAC 4.1]. None of these rules address direct supervision of subordinate employees.

Michigan:

Rules of the Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs provide standards of professional conduct for architects [Mich Admin Code, R 339.15401], professional engineers [Mich Admin Code, R 339.16031 to R 339.16034], professional land surveyors [Mich Admin Code, R 339.17401 to R 339.17404], and landscape architects [Mich Admin Code, R 339.19001 to R 339.19049]. None of these rules address direct supervision of subordinate employees.

Minnesota:

The Minnesota Board of Architecture, Engineering, Land Surveying, Landscape Architecture, Geoscience, and Interior Design provide rules of professional conduct for architects, engineers, land surveyors, and landscape architects [Minnesota Rules, parts 1805.0100 to 1805.1600]. The Minnesota rules define a direct supervisor as an individual who “directs the work of other licensees, unlicensed professionals, technicians, and clerical persons assigned to that work and is in responsible charge of the project comprising the work being supervised.”

19. Contact Name

Jake Pelegrin, Administrative Rules Coordinator

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 267-0989

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
