

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

ETH 1 – Campaign Financing

3. Subject

Repeal of portions of Chapter ETH 1 that have been ruled unconstitutional or have been deemed inconsistent with the new campaign finance law created by 2015 Act 117.

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

N/A

6. 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 Cost

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

State's Economy Specific Businesses/Sectors
 Local Government Units Public Utility Rate Payers
 Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)

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

Yes No

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

Significant portions of Chapter ETH 1 have been found unconstitutional or are no longer consistent with state law subsequent to the passage of 2015 Act 117. The changes proposed in the rule are simply to repeal these provisions. There is no new policy being proposed.

10. Summary of 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.

N/A

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.

N/A

12. 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)

The Commission finds that the proposed rule will have no economic impact on small businesses.

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

Promulgating the rule would remove outdated portions of Chapter ETH 1 and reduce confusion of the regulated community. The alternative would be to not create such a rule, but instead continue to not enforce the outdated provisions. Such inaction could continue to promote confusion among the regulated community.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Promulgating the rule would remove those portions of the law that have been ruled unconstitutional or have been deemed inconsistent with the new campaign finance law created by 2015 Act 117.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

N/A

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

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

17. Contact Name

David P. Buerger

18. Contact Phone Number

(608) 267-0951

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. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separately for 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
-