ADMINISTRATIVE RULES FISCAL ESTIMATE AND ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS					
Type of Estimate and Analysis					
☐ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected					
Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number					
Section Tax 2.495 – Apportionment of apportionable income of interstate brokers-dealers, investment advisers, investment companies, and underwriters					
Subject					
Apportionment of apportionable income of interstate brokers-dealers, investment advisers, investment companies, and underwriters					
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					
Based on evaluation by the department, the rule revises the method of assigning gross receipts from the sale of trading assets to Wisconsin in s. Tax 2.495 for purposes of computing the amount of income apportioned to Wisconsin for interstate brokers-dealers, investment advisers, investment companies, and underwriters.					
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 the proposed rule is indeterminate.  Two comments concerning the economic effect of the rule were submitted in response to the department's solicitation. Robert W. Baird & Co. submitted a comment concerning the general positive economic effect of the proposed rule on interstate brokers-dealers domiciled in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Bankers Association's comment suggested there was a general negative economic effect, of unknown quantity, of the rule on unspecified financial institutions. The department consulted with both commenters on December 29, 2014. Both were in agreement that the economic impact of the rule is indeterminate and the assumptions used in arrival at the attached fiscal estimate are consistent with their comments.					
Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule					
Generally, clarifications and guidance provided by administrative rules may lower the compliance costs for businesses, local governmental units, and individuals.					
The rule is the only alternative for implementing the revision described above.					
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 (86 ILL. Adm. Code 100.3405) and Iowa (Rule 701-54.6(3)) address the method of assigning gross receipts of financial institutions in their rules. Illinois uses a method based on the commercial domicile of the financial institution.  Jowa uses a method based on the billing address of the customer. Michigan (sec. 206.659. Mich. Stats.) and Minnesota					

Iowa uses a method based on the billing address of the customer. Michigan (sec. 206.659, Mich. Stats.) and Minnesota (sec. 290.191(3), Minn. Stats.) address the method of assigning gross receipts of financial institutions in their statutes. Both Michigan and Minnesota use a method based on the billing address of the customer.

FISCAL ESTIMATE FORM	_			2015 Session	
		LRB # 15-			
☐ ORIGINAL ☐ UPDATED		INTRODUCTION #			
☐ CORRECTED ☐ SUPPLEM	ENTAL	Admin. Rule #	Tax 2.495(4)(d)		
Subject					
Apportionment of Interstate Fiscal Effect	Broker-Dealers	Investment Comp.	anies, and Underwri	ters	
State: No State Fiscal Effect			İ		
Check columns below only if b sum sufficient appropriation	ill makes a direct app	ropriation or affects a		May be Possible to Absorb Budget □ Yes □ No	
☐ Increase Existing Appropriation	☐ Increase Existin	ng Revenues		•	
☐ Decrease Existing Appropriation	☐ Decrease Existi	ing Revenues			
☐ Create New Appropriation			☐ Decrease Costs		
Local: No Local Government Costs		_			
1. Increase Costs	3. Increase I			nmental Units Affected:	
☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory	<u></u>	sive   Mandatory	_	illages   Cities	
2. Decrease Costs	4. Decrease			thers	
☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory	☐ Permis	sive  Mandatory	☐ School Districts	☐ WTCS Districts	
Fund Sources Affected			Appropriations		
☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS	☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S	S			
Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal E	stimate:				
gross receipts in the receipts factor from these transactions to the billing. The fiscal effect of the rule is indeed of trading assets to customers in assigned to the state where the correlative to current administrative rule in Wisconsin would assign the grotheir domicile, raising the receipts which these two effects would offs	terminate. For be other states that ustomer resides, ules. Conversely oss receipts from factor and there	roker-dealers dom t previously were a , lowering the recei y, broker-dealers do the sale of trading	iciled in Wisconsin, g ssigned to Wisconsi pts factor and theref omiciled in other stat assets to Wisconsi	gross receipts for sales n would instead be fore lowering gross tax tes that have customers n instead of the state of	
Long-Range Fiscal Implications:		(continued on	page two)		
Agency/Prepared by:	Autho	orized Signature/Telep	hone No.	Date	
Wisconsin Department of Revenue Michael Oakleaf, (608) 261-5173		•			

## FISCAL ESTIMATE FORM

Page 3

FISCAL ESTIMATE WORKS	SHEET	Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect		2015 Session	
☐ ORIGINAL ☐ UPDA	TED	LRB # 15		Admin. Rule #	
	LEMENTAL	INTRODUCTION #		Tax 2.495(4)(d)	
Subject Apportionment of Interests	ta Broker-Dea	lers, Investment Companies	and Underwriters		
I. One-Time Costs or Revenue Impac		•		<b>)</b> :	
II. Annualized Costs:			Annualized Fiscal impact on State funds from:		
A. State Costs by Category			Increased Costs	Decreased Costs	
State Operations - Salaries and Fring	je		\$	\$ -	
(FTE Position Changes)			( FTE)	(- FTE)	
State Operations-Other Costs				-	
Local Assistance				-	
Aids to Individuals or Organizations				-	
TOTAL State Costs by Catego	ry		\$	\$ -	
B. State Costs by Source of Funds			Increased Costs	Decreased Costs	
GPR			\$	\$ -	
FED				-	
PRO/PRS				-	
SEG/SEG-S			\$	-	
III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)			Increased Rev.	Decreased Rev.	
GPR Taxes			\$	\$ -	
GPR Earned			<u> </u>	-	
FED				-	
PRO/PRS				-	
SEG/SEG-S				-	
TOTAL State Revenues			\$	\$ -	
	NET	ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT	1	1	
		<u>STATE</u>		LOCAL	
NET CHANGE IN COSTS		\$			
NET CHANGE IN REVENUES		\$	\$		
age 4	1/14/2020		_		
Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone	e No.)	Authorized Signature/Telephone	No.	Date	
Wisconsin Department of Revenue		Type in Team Name			

Michael	Oakleaf,	(608)	261-5173
---------	----------	-------	----------

Type in Team Phone #