STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION DOA-2049 (R03/2012) DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE 101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR P.O. BOX 7864 MADISON, WI 53707-7864 FAX: (608) 267-0372

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

Type of Estimate and Analysis ☐ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected		
2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number ETH 1 – Campaign Financing		
3. Subject Repeal WIS. ADMIN. CODE ETH 1.855 (3), and to amend WIS. ADMIN. CODE ETH 1.20 (3), 1.20 (4), 1.25, 1.39 (1) (b), 1.56 (2), 1.60 (1) (a), 1.60 (1) (c), 1.60 (2), 1.70 (2), 1.70 (3), and 1.85 (3), to reflect the changes of 2015 Wisconsin Act 117; related to campaign finance.		
4. Fund Sources Affected GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S	5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected $\ensuremath{N/A}$	
6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule ☑ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues ☐ Indeterminate ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues	☐ Increase Costs ☐ 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 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 The rule repeals or amends several provisions of ETH 1 to eliminate or modify references to statutory provisions or terms that were repealed or replaced under the new campaign finance law created by 2015 Act 117.		
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 Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule Promulgating the rule would remove outdated portions of the administrative code and adopt consistent language between Wis. Admin. Code Chapter ETH 1 and Chapter 11, Stats. The alternative to implementing the rule would be to continue leave the code and statute mismatched and requiring the regulated community and the Commission to attempt to translate between the two sets of terminology. This could continue to promote confusion among the regulated community and may lead to non-compliance with Chapter 11, Stats.		
14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule Promulgating the rule would bring WIS. ADMIN. CODE ETH 1 fully up to date with the changes made by 2015 Act 117.		
15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government N/A .	t	

STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION DOA-2049 (R03/2012)

DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE 101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR P.O. BOX 7864 MADISON, WI 53707-7864 FAX: (608) 267-0372

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) $N\!/\!A.$		
17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number	
David P. Buerger	(608) 267-0951	

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION DOA-2049 (R03/2012) DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE 101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR P.O. BOX 7864 MADISON, WI 53707-7864 FAX: (608) 267-0372

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

 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