ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis ⊠ Original □ Updated □Corrected	2. Date
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) REEB 16 and 25	
4. Subject Obsolete cross references in real estate broker education and update real estate terminology.	
5. Fund Sources Affected □ GPR □ FED ⊠ PRO □ PRS □ SEG □ SEG-S	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected $20.165~(1)~(g)$
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule ☑ No Fiscal Effect □ Increase Existing Revenues □ Indeterminate □ Decrease Existing Revenues	□ Increase Costs □ Decrease Costs □ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
Local Government Units Publi	ific Businesses/Sectors c Utility Rate Payers I 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, pers. 227.137(3)(b)(2)? Yes X No 	
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule This rule removes obsolete references created by repeal of REEB 17.08 and updates terminology to be consistent with 2015 Act 258.	
 Summaryof 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	
 Summaryof Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economyas a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred) This rule will not have an economic or fiscal impact. 	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit is removing confusion related to obsolete cross references and creates terminology consistency throughout the rulex and statutes.	
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule	
The long range implication is consistent rules which conform with statutes.	
17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government None	
18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) Our surrounding states do not have administrative rules regarding approved forms and do not use terinology relating to firm.	
• · · · · · ·	

19. Contact Name

20. Contact Phone Number

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

Sharon Henes

(608) 261-2377

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. Summaryof Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separatelyfor 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