

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Type of Estimate and Analysis<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected  | 2. Date<br>6 July 2021                        |
| 3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)<br>ATCP 149.10  |   |
| 4. Subject<br>Potato Industry   |   |
| 5. Fund Sources Affected<br><input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S   | 6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected |
| 7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs<br><input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget  |   |
| 8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)<br><input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors<br><input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers<br><input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses <b>(if checked, complete Attachment A)</b>  |   |
| 9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1).<br>\$0.00  |   |
| 10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)?<br><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  |   |
| 11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule<br>Section ATCP 149.10 specifies the process for suspending operations under the potato industry act. 1991 Wisconsin Act 39 repealed the potato industry act, therefore, this section is obsolete. This rule repeals the obsolete section.   |   |
| 12. 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.<br>This rule was posted on the Department website for 14 days to obtain economic impact comments and none were received.   |   |
| 13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.<br>None.  |   |
| 14. 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)<br>This rule does not have an economic or fiscal impact on specific businesses, business sectors, public utility rate payers, local governmental units or the State's Economy as a Whole.  |   |
| 15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule<br>The benefit to implementing the rule is to remove an obsolete provision. The alternative is to retain the rule which creates confusion when there are references to a repealed statutory provision.  |   |
| 16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule<br>The long range implication of implementing the rule is statutory compliance.  |   |
| 17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government<br>There are federal statutes and regulations relating to potato research and marketing. There is a provision for the Secretary to terminate or suspend the operation of a marketing plan when the Secretary finds that the plan or provision obstructs or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Potato Research and Promotion chapter. There are no provisions relating to suspension due to a national emergency or other reason deemed meritorious by the Secretary. |   |

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**  
**Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis**

---

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)  
Minnesota has rules related to potato industry promotion, however, Minnesota does not have a provision for suspension based upon a national emergency or other reason deemed meritorious by the Commissioner other than the promotional order being contrary to or does not effectuate the provisions of Minnesota Statutes. Illinois, Iowa and Michigan do not have rules related to potato marketing.

---

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 19. Contact Name<br>Sharon Henes | 20. Contact Phone Number<br>(608) 381-2808 |
|----------------------------------|--|

---

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
-