## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis ☑ Original  ☐ Updated  ☐ Corrected		
2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number ETH 1 – Campaign Financing		
3. Subject Repeal of portions of Chapter ETH 1 that have been ruled unconstitutional or have been deemed inconsistent with the new campaign finance law created by 2015 Act 117.		
4. Fund Sources Affected □ GPR □ FED □ PRO □ PRS □ SEG □ SEG-S	5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected $N\!/\!A$	
6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule ⊠ No Fiscal Effect □ Increase Existing Revenues □ Indeterminate □ Decrease Existing Revenues	<ul> <li>Increase Costs</li> <li>Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget</li> <li>Decrease Cost</li> </ul>	
Local Government Units     Publ	cific Businesses/Sectors ic Utility Rate Payers Il Businesses <b>(if checked, complete Attachment A)</b>	
8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?		
9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule Significant portions of Chapter ETH 1 have been found unconstitutional or are no longer consistent with state law subsequent to the passage of 2015 Act 117. The changes proposed in the rule are simply to repeal these provisions. There is no new policy being proposed.		
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. N/A		
11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA. $N\!/\!A$		
<ol> <li>Summary of 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)</li> <li>The Commission finds that the proposed rule will have no economic impact on small businesses.</li> </ol>		
13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule Promulgating the rule would remove outdated portions of Chapter ETH 1 and reduce confusion of the regulated community. The alternative would be to not create such a rule, but instead continue to not enforce the outdated provisions. Such inaction could continue to promote confusion among the regulated community.		
14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule Promulgating the rule would remove those portions of the law that have been ruled unconstitutional or have been deemed inconsistent with the new campaign finance law created by 2015 Act 117.		
15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government $N/A$		
16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) $N\!/\!A$		

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number
David P. Buerger	(608) 267-0951

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. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on 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