

**Zero-Based Regulation
Prospective Analysis**

- **Fill out entire form to the best of your ability, unless submitting a Notice to Negotiate only fill out 1, 2, 5, and 7. The rest of the form must be completed prior to the adoption of the proposed rule.**

Agency Name: Idaho Division of Occupational and Professional Licenses

Rule Docket Number: 24-0501-2501

1. What is the specific Idaho statutory legal authority for this proposed rule?

Statute Section (include direct link)	Is the authority mandatory or discretionary?

2. Define the specific problem that the proposed rule is attempting to solve? Can the problem be addressed by non-regulatory measures?

24.05.01 – RULES OF THE BOARD OF DRINKING WATER AND WASTEWATER PROFESSIONALS

Currently, Administrative Rules are unclear and overly restrictive. The proposed rules would:

- 1) Correct minor grammatical mistakes;
- 2) Reformat the existing fee table to make it easier to read;
- 3) Remove language that restricted applicants ability to test and qualify for higher license types;
- 4) Clarify existing educational requirements for applicants and practitioners;
- 5) Increase fees to make the Board more financially solvent.

3. How have other jurisdictions approached the problem this proposed rule intends to address?

a. Is this proposed rule related to any existing federal law?

Federal citation	Summary of Law (include direct link)	How is the proposed Idaho rule more stringent? (if applicable)

b. How does this proposed rule compare to other state laws?

State	Summary of Law (include direct link)	How is the proposed Idaho rule more stringent? (if applicable)
Washington		
Oregon		
Nevada		
Utah		
Wyoming		
Montana		
Alaska		
South Dakota		

c. If the Idaho proposed rule has a more stringent requirement than the federal government or the reviewed states, describe the evidence base or unique circumstances that justifies the enhanced requirement:

The Idaho program is not financially solvent without more revenue from fees without putting that financial burden on tax payers directly

4. What evidence is there that the rule, as proposed, will solve the problem?

An increase in fees will help the Board's cash balance to become financially solvent.

5. What is the anticipated impact of the proposed rule on various stakeholders? Include how you will involve stakeholders in the negotiated rulemaking process?

Category	Potential Impact
Fiscal impact to the state General Fund, any dedicated fund, or federal fund	
Impact to Idaho businesses, with special consideration for small businesses	
Impact to any local government in Idaho	

6. What cumulative regulatory volume does this proposed rule add?

Category	Impact
Net change in word count	
Net change in restrictive word count	

7. Should this rule chapter remain as a rule chapter or be moved to statute as suggested in Section 67-5292, Idaho Code?

Category	Impact
What is the cost of publishing this rule chapter annually? (Multiply the number of pages x \$56)	
How frequently has this rule chapter been substantively updated over the past 5 years? (Exclude republishing triggered solely by recent sunset dates)	
What is the benefit of having all related requirements in a single location in Idaho Code?	