## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES FISCAL ESTIMATE AND ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS Type of Estimate and Analysis ☑ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number Section Tax 7.23 – Activities of brewers, bottlers, out-of-state shippers, and wholesalers Subject The production, distribution, and sale of fermented malt beverages Fund Sources Affected Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected $\square$ GPR $\square$ FED $\square$ PRO $\square$ PRS $\square$ SEG SEG-S Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule ☑ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues ☐ Increase Costs ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues ☐ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☐ Indeterminate ☐ Decrease Costs The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) ☐ State's Economy ☐ Specific Businesses/Sectors ☐ Local Government Units ☐ Public Utility Rate Payers Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million? ⊠ No ☐ Yes Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The rule does not create or revise policy, other than to reflect a statutory change. 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) As indicated in the attached fiscal estimate, the fiscal effect of modifying the regulation of fermented malt beverages was included in the fiscal effect of 2011 Wisconsin Act 32. The rule itself does not create any further economic or fiscal impact or implementation and compliance costs beyond the statutes it interprets. No comments concerning the economic effect of the rule were submitted in response to the department's solicitation. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule Clarifications and guidance provided by administrative rules may lower the compliance costs for businesses, local governmental units, and individuals. If the rule is not implemented, section Tax 7.23 will be incomplete in that it will not reflect current law. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule No long-range implications are anticipated. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government N/A Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Minnesota have their own unique provisions concerning the regulation of fermented malt beverages, which differ from Wisconsin's provisions substantively enough to prohibit consideration of these approaches.