ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis ☑ Original □ Updated □Corrected		
2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number $CSB\ 2.52$		
3. Subject Scheduling		
4. Fund Sources Affected □ GPR □ FED ⊠ PRO □ PRS □ SEG □ SEG-S	5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected s. 20.165(1)(g)	
6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule ☑ No Fiscal Effect □ Increase Existing Revenues □ Indeterminate □ Decrease Existing Revenues	 Increase Costs Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget Decrease Cost 	
7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) State's Economy Local Government Units Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)		
8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?		
 9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The United States Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration scheduled 4-MePPP and a-PBP as schedule I controlled substances effective March 1, 2017. The Wisconsin Controlled Substances Board took affirmative action on April 4, 2017 to similarly treat 4-MePPP and a-PBP as schedule I controlled substances effective April 10, 2017. The Board is currently promulgating a final rule. 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. This rule was posted for economic comments and none were received.		
11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA. None		
 Summaryof Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economyas a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred) This rule will not have a fiscal or economic impact. 		
13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit is for the federal and state controlled substances acts to be in conformity and alleviate confusion. In addition, it is in the best interest of Wisconsin citizens to schedule 4-MePPP and a-PBP as controlled substances.		
14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule 4-MePPP and a-PBP will be treated as schedule I controlled substances.		
15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government The federal government has scheduled 4-MePPP and a-PBP as schedule I controlled substance.		
16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) Illinois and Iowa have scheduled 4-MePPP and a-PBP as schedule I controlled substances. Minnesota has scheduled 4- MePPP as a schedule I controlled substance but has not scheduled a-PBP. Michigan has not scheduled these drugs.		

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number
Sharon Henes	(608) 261-2377

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. Summaryof Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impacton Small Businesses (Separatelyfor 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