

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

SPS 305

3. Subject

Liquefied gas suppliers

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

20.165(2)(j)

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

Current rules authorize a person applying for or holding a liquefied gas supplier or liquefied gas supplier – restricted license to have either 1) a surety bond, 2) an irrevocable letter of credit, or 3) commercial general liability insurance as the proof of financial responsibility required under s. 101.16, Stats. The proposed rule amends s. SPS 305.73 to reflect the provisions of 2015 Wisconsin Act 327, which, effective October 1, 2016, eliminates the first 2 options listed above. Under the Act, a person applying for or holding a liquefied gas supplier or liquefied gas supplier – restricted license is required to have commercial general liability insurance.

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.

The proposed rule was posted on the Department of Safety and Professional Services' website for 14 days in order to solicit comments from businesses, representative associations, local governmental units, and individuals that may be affected by the rule. No comments were received.

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

No local governmental units participated in the development of this EIA.

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)

This proposed rule will not have a significant impact on specific businesses, business sectors, public utility rate payers, local governmental units or the state's economy as a whole.

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

The benefit to implementing the rule is providing clarity and updated licensing provisions. If the rule is not implemented, it will continue to reference outdated licensing provisions.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The long range implication of implementing the rule is clarity and updated licensing provisions.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

None

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)
An Internet-based search found the states of Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Minnesota do not have rules relating to the licensing of retail liquefied gas suppliers.

17. Contact Name

Dale Kleven

18. Contact Phone Number

(608) 261-4472

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