

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
FISCAL ESTIMATE
AND ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS**

Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

Section Tax 7.23 – Activities of brewers, bottlers, out-of-state shippers, and wholesalers

Subject

The production, distribution, and sale of fermented malt beverages

Fund Sources Affected

Chapter 20 , Stats. Appropriations Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule

No Fiscal Effect

Increase Existing Revenues

Increase Costs

Indeterminate

Decrease Existing Revenues

Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget

Decrease Costs

The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)

State's Economy

Specific Businesses/Sectors

Local Government Units

Public Utility Rate Payers

Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?

Yes No

Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

The rule does not create or revise policy, other than to reflect a statutory change.

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)

As indicated in the attached fiscal estimate, the fiscal effect of modifying the regulation of fermented malt beverages was included in the fiscal effect of 2011 Wisconsin Act 32. The rule itself does not create any further economic or fiscal impact or implementation and compliance costs beyond the statutes it interprets.

No comments concerning the economic effect of the rule were submitted in response to the department's solicitation.

Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

Clarifications and guidance provided by administrative rules may lower the compliance costs for businesses, local governmental units, and individuals.

If the rule is not implemented, section Tax 7.23 will be incomplete in that it will not reflect current law.

Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

No long-range implications are anticipated.

Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

N/A

Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Minnesota have their own unique provisions concerning the regulation of fermented malt beverages, which differ from Wisconsin's provisions substantively enough to prohibit consideration of these approaches.