

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. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number Ch. DE 11 Anesthesia											
3. Subject Sedation Permits											
4. 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		5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected 20.165(1)(g)									
6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <table style="width: 100%;"><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"></td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Cost</td></tr></table>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs	<input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate	<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues	<input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget			<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Cost
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs									
<input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate	<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues	<input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget									
		<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Cost									
7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <table style="width: 100%;"><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)</td></tr></table>			<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)				
<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)											
8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No											
9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The objective of the proposed rule is to allow the Board to use discretion in granting sedation permits to a dentist who is currently being investigated or has had disciplinary action relating to general anesthesia or conscious sedation.											
10. 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. Licensees											
11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA. None											
12. 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) None.											
13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule Providing the Board to use discretion in granting sedation permits based on investigation or disciplinary actions of licensees.											
14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule None known.											
15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government None found.											
16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) Illinois and Iowa request information pertaining to arrests, convictions, etc. Neither Minnesota or Michigan appears to request such information at time of permit application.											
17. Contact Name Jean MacCubbin		18. Contact Phone Number 608.266.0955									

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
