



Wisconsin Legislative Council

RULES CLEARINGHOUSE

Scott Grosz
Clearinghouse Director

Anne Sappenfield
Legislative Council Director

Margit Kelley
Clearinghouse Assistant Director

CLEARINGHOUSE RULE 22-017

Comments

[NOTE: All citations to “Manual” in the comments below are to the Administrative Rules Procedures Manual, prepared by the Legislative Council Staff and the Legislative Reference Bureau, dated November 2020.]

2. Form, Style and Placement in Administrative Code

a. In the enumeration of provisions treated by the proposed rule, when identifying renumbered provisions, it is unnecessary to include the citation to which a provision is renumbered.

b. What is the department’s intent regarding the notes following ss. Tax 11.55 and 11.88 (6), as repealed and recreated? Generally, notes do not have the force of law; however, the added references to 2019 Wisconsin Act 10 in these particular Notes could be construed as a retroactive effective date or initial applicability provision, in conflict with SECTION 6 of the proposed rule. If the department intends those retroactive effects, the rule should be revised, considering s. 1.03 (3) and (4) of the Manual, and a detailed explanation of the department’s authority to apply the provisions in a retroactive manner should be provided.

c. In s. Tax 11.55 (1) (b) 1., it appears the reference to “subd. 4.” should instead be to “sub. (4)”. Similarly, in s. Tax 11.55 (1) (e), it appears the reference to “subd. (d) (1) and (2)” should be to “par. (d) 1. and 2.”.

d. Based on these changes proposed in SECTIONS 1 to 3, it is not clear to the reader via the plain language analysis or renumbered provisions themselves why the *Enforcement of Liens* provision, s. Tax 11.55 (3), should be placed under the *Credit Sales* provision, s. Tax 11.30 (1). Please review this placement to make sure it fits the department’s intent and revise the plain language analysis to provide detail as to why this renumbering is appropriate. Similar explanation should be considered regarding the proposed renumbering of s. Tax 11.55 (4). Relatedly, for clarity, the department may wish to review the numbering conventions used by the proposed rule. Why is it preferable to repeal and recreate s. Tax 11.55 to implement the marketplace provider provisions rather than repealing s. Tax 11.55 (1) and (2), renumbering or otherwise retaining s. Tax 11.55 (3) and (4), and creating a new provision, s. Tax 11.555 or 11.58, for example, to implement the marketplace provider provisions?

e. Related to comment d. above, use of titles throughout s. Tax 11.30 (1) (c), as renumbered, should be reviewed for clarity and consistency. Currently, as renumbered, it appears s. Tax 11.30 (1) (c) 1. and 2. will share the same title. The department may also consider revising the title of s. Tax 11.30 (1), in order to encompass all of the content that follows in this subsection. [See s. 1.10 (2) (a), Manual.]