DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE

Page 1 of 2

| Clearinghous | e Rule Number: 07-063 | on: Madison | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Rule Number: Chapter Comm 133 Hearing Date: | | | | Tuly 17, 2007 | | | |
| Relating to: Film Production Accreditation Program | | | | | | | |
| Comments: Oral or Exhibit No. | Presenter, Group Represented, City and State | Comments/Recommendations | | Agency Response | | | |
| Oral and Exhibit 1 | Scott Robbe Film Wisconsin, Inc. Milwaukee, Wisconsin | Thinks the Hearing draft is a very good first set of rules and definitions to help grow the film- and television-production business in Wisconsin. Appreciates the Department's review of incentive processes in other States. | | Support is noted. | | | |
| | | Recommends not tying the goals of the State's branding campaign to the film production accreditation process. Believes that when domestic and international producers and directors look at the 42 States that offer incentive packages, most of those packages will be seen as not tying any type of restrictions of content to the incentives. The producers and directors may view a tie to Wisconsin's branding campaign as being an infringement on their free speech rights, and believe that Wisconsin will try to influence the content. Wants to be able to sell Wisconsin as being a State which is dedicated to free speech and which in no way ties the accreditation process to content. | | The proposed rules have been changed, in section Comm 133.30 (4), to refer to not hurting the reputation of the State, instead of referring to consistency with a positive brand image of the State. | | | |
| | | Recommends making the tax credits transferable. Recommends treating wages for out-of-state workers as being production expenditures, if those workers are either paid through a Wisconsin-based | | The enabling legislation – 2005 Wisconsin Act 483 – does not allow transferring the taxcredits. Agree. The proposed rules allow treating these wages in this manner, as indicated by the third Note under | | | |
| 2 | Barbara Lawton Lieutenant Governor Madison, Wisconsin | Appreciates the Department's effort in developing the proposed is concerned that the proposed requirement for film product conflict with a desired brand image of Wisconsin would keefilmmakers from deciding to do films in Wisconsin. States the would brand Wisconsin as having an anachronistic, proving Believes the brand should instead be one of a forward-thing understands how bringing a very visible sector of the creat life in Wisconsin would draw attention to the strengths in more traditional sectors and infuse them with greater poten innovation, because the visibility would be a magnet for the that is needed. Other States that have attempted to ensure flattering images be recorded ("flattering" or "desired branchighly subjective and slippery notions) have had to change law and eliminate the provision in order to draw business the Wisconsin can learn a vicarious lesson and not create an understands. | posed rules. etions to not ep some his requirement ncial mentality. king State that ive economy to Wisconsin's tial for e kind of talent that only d image" being e their rules or here. Believes | section Comm 133.20 (1). Support is noted. The proposed rules have been changed, in section Comm 133.30 (4), to refer to not hurting the reputation of the State, instead of referring to consistency with a positive brand image of the State. | | | |

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE

Page 2 of 2

| Clearinghouse | e Rule Number: 07-063 | | Hearing Location: Madison | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Rule Number: | Chapter Comm 133 | | Hearing Date: July 17, 2007 | | | | |
| Relating to: Film Production Accreditation Program | | | | | | | |
| Comments: | Presenter, | | | | | | |
| Oral or | Group Represented, | Comments/Recommendations | | Agency Response | | | |
| Exhibit No. | City and State | | | | | | |
| | | delay in implementing its law. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

File Reference: Comm 133/Hearing Summary