ADMINISTRATIVE RULES FISCAL ESTIMATE AND ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS						
Type of Estimate and Analysis						
☑ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected						
Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number						
Section Tax 2.495 – Apportionment of apportionable income of interstate brokers-dealers, investment advisers, investment companies, and underwriters						
Subject						
Apportionment of apportionable income of interstate brokers-dealers, investment advisers, investment companies, and underwriters						
Fund Sources Affected Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected						
□ GPR □ FED □ PRO □ PRS □ SEG SEG-S						
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 Costs       □ 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?  ☐ Yes ☒ No						
Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule  Based on evaluation by the department, the rule revises the method of assigning gross receipts from the sale of trading assets to Wisconsin in s. Tax 2.495 for purposes of computing the amount of income apportioned to Wisconsin for interstate brokers-dealers, investment advisers, investment companies, and underwriters.						
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 the proposed rule is indeterminate.						
Two comments concerning the economic effect of the rule were submitted in response to the department's solicitation. Robert W. Baird & Co. submitted a comment concerning the general positive economic effect of the proposed rule on interstate brokers-dealers domiciled in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Bankers Association's comment suggested there was a general negative economic effect, of unknown quantity, of the rule on unspecified financial institutions. The department consulted with both commenters on December 29, 2014. Both were in agreement that the economic impact of the rule is indeterminate and the assumptions used in arriving at the attached fiscal estimate are consistent with their comments.						
Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule						
Generally, clarifications and guidance provided by administrative rules may lower the compliance costs for businesses, local governmental units, and individuals.						
The rule is the only alternative for implementing the revision described above.						
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 (86 ILL. Adm. Code 100.3405) and Iowa (Rule 701-54.6(3)) address the method of assigning gross receipts of financial institutions in their rules. Illinois uses a method based on the commercial domicile of the financial institution.						

Illinois (86 ILL. Adm. Code 100.3405) and Iowa (Rule 701-54.6(3)) address the method of assigning gross receipts of financial institutions in their rules. Illinois uses a method based on the commercial domicile of the financial institution. Iowa uses a method based on the billing address of the customer. Michigan (sec. 206.659, Mich. Stats.) and Minnesota (sec. 290.191(3), Minn. Stats.) address the method of assigning gross receipts of financial institutions in their statutes. Both Michigan and Minnesota use a method based on the billing address of the customer.

FISCAL ESTIMATE FORM			2015 Session			
	<b>LRB#</b> 15-					
☑ ORIGINAL ☐ UPDATED	INTRODUCTIO	INTRODUCTION#				
☐ CORRECTED ☐ SUPPLEMENTAL	Admin. Rule #	Tax 2.495(4)(d)				
Subject						
Apportionment of Interstate Broker-De	alers ,Investment Comp	anies, and Underwrit	ters			
State: No State Fiscal Effect Check columns below only if bill makes a dire sum sufficient appropriation	☐ Increase Costs - May be Possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☐ Yes ☐ No					
- 11 1	Existing Revenues					
<ul> <li>□ Decrease Existing Appropriation</li> <li>□ Create New Appropriation</li> </ul>	e Existing Revenues	☐ Decrease Costs				
Local: ☑ No Local Government Costs						
<u> </u>	crease Revenues	5. Types of Local Gove	rnmental Units Affected:			
☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐	Permissive   Mandatory	☐ Towns ☐ Villages ☐ Cities				
2. ☐ Decrease Costs 4. ☐ De	ecrease Revenues	☐ Counties ☐ Others				
☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐	Permissive   Mandatory	☐ School Districts	☐ WTCS Districts			
Fund Sources Affected	Affected Ch. 2	0 Appropriations				
☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐	SEG-S					
Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate:						
assets to the financial institution's domicile. gross receipts in the receipts factor. Under the from these transactions to the billing address. The fiscal effect of the rule is indeterminate. In of trading assets to customers in other states assigned to the state where the customer reservative to current administrative rules. Convert in Wisconsin would assign the gross receipts their domicile, raising the receipts factor and which these two effects would offset is unknown.	he proposed rule, broke s of the customer.  For broker-dealers dom s that previously were a sides, lowering the rece ersely, broker-dealers of s from the sale of trading therefore raising gross	er-dealers would inste niciled in Wisconsin, g assigned to Wisconsin ipts factor and theref domiciled in other stat g assets to Wisconsin	gross receipts for sales would instead be ore lowering gross tax tes that have customers instead of the state of			
Long-Range Fiscal Implications:	(continued or	ı page two)				
Agency/Prepared by:	Authorized Signature/Tele	phone No.	Date			
Wisconsin Department of Revenue Michael Oakleaf, (608) 261-5173						

## FISCAL ESTIMATE FORM

Page 3

FISCAL ESTIMATE WORKSHEET	Γ Det	ailed Estimate of Annua	al Fiscal Effect	2015 Session	
☑ ORIGINAL ☐ UPDATED		LRB # 15 INTRODUCTION #		Admin. Rule #	
☐ CORRECTED ☐ SUPPLEMENTA	L INT			Tax 2.495(4)(d)	
Subject  Appartianment of Interestate Prok	or Doolors In	wastmant Campanias	and Indorwritors		
Apportionment of Interstate Brok		•		4).	
I. One-Time Costs or Revenue Impacts for Sta	ate and/or Local	Government (do not includ	e in annualized fis cal effec	:t): 	
II. Annualized Costs:			Annualized Fiscal impact on State funds from:		
A. State Costs by Category			Increased Costs	Decreased Costs	
State Operations - Salaries and Fringe			\$	\$ -	
(FTE Position Changes)			( FTE)	(- FTE)	
State Operations-Other Costs			,	-	
Local Assistance				-	
Aids to Individuals or Organizations				-	
TOTAL State Costs by Category			\$	\$ -	
B. State Costs by Source of Funds			Increased Costs	Decreased Costs	
GPR			\$	\$ -	
FED				-	
PRO/PRS				-	
SEG/SEG-S			\$	-	
III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)			Increased Rev.	Decreased Rev.	
GPR Taxes			\$	\$ -	
GPR Earned				-	
FED				-	
PRO/PRS				-	
SEG/SEG-S				-	
TOTAL State Revenues			\$	\$ -	
	NET ANNUA	LIZED FISCAL IMPACT		•	
		STATE		LOCAL	
NET CHANGE IN COSTS	\$		_ \$		
NET CHANGE IN REVENUES	\$		\$		
age 4 8	3/8/2020				
Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone No.)	Autho	rized Signature/Telephone	No.	Date	
Wisconsin Department of Revenue	Type i	n Team Name			

Type in Team Phone#