

2003 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: 12/26/2003

Received By: chanaman

Wanted: Soon

Identical to LRB:

For: John Gard (608) 266-3387

By/Representing: Brian Wornson

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: btradewe

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Environment - mining

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: YES

Requester's email: Rep.Gard@legis.state.wi.us

Carbon copy (CC:) to: laura.rose@legis.state.wi.us
daryl.hinz@legis.state.wi.us

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Nonmetallic mining financial assurances

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	btradewe 12/26/2003	kgilfoy 12/26/2003		_____			Local
/1			rschluet 12/29/2003	_____	sbasford 12/29/2003	lemery 01/05/2004	

FE Sent For:

<END>

At
intro

2003 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **12/26/2003**

Received By: **chanaman**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **John Gard (608) 266-3387**

By/Representing: **Brian Wornson**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **btradewe**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Environment - mining**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Rep.Gard@legis.state.wi.us**

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Nonmetallic mining financial assurances

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	btradewe 12/26/2003	kgilfoy 12/26/2003		_____			Local
/1			rschluet 12/29/2003	_____	sbasford 12/29/2003		

12/29/2003 10:05:32 AM

Page 2

FE Sent For:

<END>

2003 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **12/26/2003**

Received By: **chanaman**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **John Gard (608) 266-3387**

By/Representing: **Brian Wornson**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **btradewe**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Environment - mining**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Rep.Gard@legis.state.wi.us**

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given



Topic:

Nonmetallic mining financial assurances

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	btradewe	1-12/26 krug					
							<END>

FE Sent For:

Tradewell, Becky

From: Malaise, Gordon
Sent: Monday, December 22, 2003 2:11 PM
To: Hanaman, Cathlene; Tradewell, Becky; Kunkel, Mark; Shovers, Marc; Kennedy, Debora; Marchant, Robert
Subject: RE: Gard request

Cathlene:

The apprenticeship language was my only contribution to -3380. Accordingly, one of the drafters captioned above will have to take the lead in drafting -3380 as a separate bill. Also, Rob and Debora were in on -3380 as well. Indeed, because -3380 is such a miscellaneous mishmash, I wonder whether Gard might want the draft broken down further.

Gordon

-----Original Message-----

From: Hanaman, Cathlene
Sent: Monday, December 22, 2003 1:45 PM
To: Nelson, Robert P.; Tradewell, Becky; Gibson-Glass, Mary; Kite, Robin; Malaise, Gordon; Kunkel, Mark; Shovers, Marc; Kennedy, Debora
Subject: Gard request

Steve tells me that Gard wants all of the miscellaneous items included in AB-655, with the exception of the apprenticeship bill, to be drafted as separate bills. The contact person is Brian Wornson.

-3426/1 (RPN), -3455/p2 (RCT), -3599/p3 (MGG), and -3380/p5 (GMM, MDK, MES, and RCT).

Do you need more information?

-3940

SCON (n 12/26)

- 3940/1
[unclear]
[unclear]

~~PRELIMINARY DRAFT - NOT RE~~

I left the other pages of
the underlying draft out
because it is so long.
Hope that doesn't cause
problems.
Ret

regenerate

1 AN ACT *to repeal* 137.04, 137.06, 196.491 (3) (g) 1m. and 224.30 (2); *to renumber*
2 196.491 (3) (g) 1.; *to renumber and amend* 137.05 (title) and 137.05; *to*
3 *amend* 16.957 (2) (b) 1. (intro.), 16.957 (2) (c) 2., 16.957 (3) (b), 25.96, 66.1001
4 (2) (e), 66.1001 (4) (a), 106.01 (9), 106.025 (4), chapter 137 (title), subchapter I
5 (title) of chapter 137 [precedes 137.01], 137.01 (3) (a), 137.01 (4) (a), 137.01 (4)
6 (b), subchapter II (title) of chapter 137 [precedes 137.04], 146.82 (2) (a) (intro.),
7 196.195 (10), 196.374 (3), 196.491 (1) (d), 196.491 (2) (a) 3., 196.491 (2) (a) 3m.,
8 196.491 (2) (g), 196.491 (3) (a) 3. a., 196.491 (3) (e), 221.0901 (3) (a) 1., 221.0901
9 (8) (a) and (b), 452.09 (2) (a), 452.09 (2) (c) (intro.), 452.09 (3) (d), 889.29 (1),
10 910.01 (1), 910.02 and 910.03; and *to create* 16.957 (2m), 66.0628, 66.1001 (4)
11 (e), 77.52 (2r), 106.04, 137.11 to 137.24, 137.25 (2), 146.82 (2) (a) 22., 196.03 (7),
12 196.195 (5m), 196.374 (3m), 241.02 (3), 295.13 (4) and 452.05 (3) of the statutes;
13 *relating to:* ~~administrative rule-making procedures, the control of air~~
14 ~~pollution, the protection of navigable waters,~~ nonmetallic mining reclamation
15 financial assurances, ~~the regulation of electric generating facilities and~~

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

high-voltage transmission lines, partial deregulation of telecommunications services, contributions by electric and gas utilities to the utility public benefits fund, grants for energy conservation and other programs, electric and gas utility service and rates, reciprocal agreements for real estate licenses, comprehensive planning by local governmental units, fees imposed by political subdivisions, the confidentiality of patient health care records, apprentice-to-journeyman job-site ratios, the acquisition of in-state banks and in-state bank holding companies, credits agreements, electronic notarization and acknowledgement, electronic transactions and records, a sales tax exemption for temporary help services, extending the time limit for emergency rule procedures, and granting rule-making authority.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

INTRODUCTION

This bill makes various changes relating to administrative rule-making procedures, the control of air pollution, the protection of navigable waters, nonmetallic mining reclamation financial assurances, the regulation of electric generating facilities and transmission lines, the deregulation of telecommunications services, contributions to and grants from the utility public benefits fund, economic development costs of electric and gas utilities, reciprocal agreements for real estate licenses, comprehensive planning by local governmental units, fees imposed by political subdivisions, the confidentiality of patient health care records, apprentice-to-journeyman job-site ratios, the acquisition of in-state banks and in-state bank holding companies, electronic notarizations and acknowledgements, electronic transactions and records, a sales tax exemption for temporary help services, and credit agreements and related documents.

LARGE ELECTRIC GENERATING FACILITIES AND HIGH-VOLTAGE TRANSMISSION LINES

Under current law, a person may not begin to construct certain large electric generating facilities or high-voltage transmission lines unless the Public Service Commission (PSC) has issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity (CPCN) for the facility or line. The process for the PSC to consider an application for a CPCN is subject to various deadlines. One deadline requires the PSC to take final action on an application within 180 days after the application is completed. Under certain circumstances, a court may extend the deadline by an additional 180 days. If the PSC fails to take final action within the deadline, current law provides that the

PSC is considered to have issued the CPCN, unless another state is also taking action on the same or a related application. Under this bill, the PSC is considered to have issued the CPCN even if another state is also taking action on the same or a related application.

Also under current law, at least 60 days before a person applies for a CPCN for a large electric transmission facility or high-voltage transmission line, the person must provide an engineering plan regarding the facility or line to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Under the bill, this requirement applies only to applications for large electric generating facilities, and not to applications for high-voltage transmission lines.

In addition, current law requires the PSC to prepare a strategic energy assessment every two years that evaluates the adequacy and reliability of the state's electricity supplies. An assessment must describe, among other things, large electric generating facilities and high-voltage transmission lines on which utilities plan to begin construction within three years. The bill requires an assessment to describe large electric generating facilities and high-voltage transmission lines on which utilities plan to begin construction within seven years, rather than three years.

PARTIAL DEREGULATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

Under current law, a person may petition the PSC to begin proceedings for determining whether to partially deregulate certain telecommunications services. The PSC may also begin such proceedings on its own motion. If the PSC makes certain findings regarding competition for such telecommunications services, the PSC may issue an order suspending specified provisions of law. Current law does not impose any deadlines on such proceedings.

The bill requires the PSC to complete the proceedings no later than 120 days after a person files a petition. In addition, if the PSC begins proceedings based on its own motion, the proceedings must be completed no later than 120 days after the PSC provides notice of its motion. If the PSC fails to complete the proceedings and, if appropriate, issue an order within the deadline, the bill provides for the suspension of any provisions of law that are specified in the petition or in the PSC's motion.

UTILITY PUBLIC BENEFITS FUND

Under current law, certain electric and gas utilities are required to make contributions to the PSC in each fiscal year. The PSC deposits the contributions in the utility public benefits fund (fund), which also consists of monthly fees paid by utility customers. The fund is used by the Department of Administration (DOA) to make grants for low-income assistance, energy conservation and efficiency, environmental research and development, and renewable resource programs. The amount that each utility must contribute to the PSC is the amount that the PSC determines that the utility spent in 1998 on its own programs that are similar to the programs awarded grants by DOA.

Under this bill, the PSC may allow a utility to retain a portion of the amount that it is required to contribute in each fiscal year under current law. However, the PSC may allow a utility to do so only if the PSC determines that the portion is used by the utility for energy conservation programs for industrial, commercial, and agricultural customers in the utility's service area. Also, the programs must comply

with rules promulgated by the PSC. The rules must specify annual energy savings targets that the programs must be designed to achieve. The rules must also require a utility to demonstrate that, within a reasonable period of time determined by the PSC, the economic benefits of such a program will be equal to the portion of the contribution that the PSC allows the utility to retain. If the PSC allows a utility to retain such a portion, the utility must contribute 1.75 percent of the portion to the PSC, which the PSC must deposit in the fund for DOA to use for programs for research and development for energy conservation and efficiency. In addition, the utility must contribute 4.5 percent of the portion to the PSC for deposit in the fund for DOA to use for renewable resource programs. The bill also requires the PSC to allow a utility to recover in rates any expenses related to administration, marketing, or delivery of services for the utility's energy conservation programs, and prohibits a utility from paying for such expenses from the portion of a contribution the utility is allowed to retain.

The bill also requires the PSC to promulgate rules for the grants made by DOA from the fund for energy conservation and other programs. Under the bill, an applicant is not eligible for such a grant unless the applicant's proposal for the grant complies with rules promulgated by the PSC. The rules must require an applicant to demonstrate that, within a reasonable period of time determined by the PSC, the economic benefits resulting from the proposal will be equal to the amount of the grant. The rules must also specify annual energy savings targets that a such proposal must be designed to achieve.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COSTS OF ELECTRIC AND GAS UTILITIES

Under current law, the PSC regulates rates charged to consumers by gas and electric utilities. Current law requires gas and electric utilities, like other public utilities, such as telecommunications utilities, to provide reasonably adequate service and to charge rates for service that are reasonable and just. In determining a reasonably adequate telecommunications service or a reasonable and just charge for telecommunications service, current law requires the PSC to consider certain costs incurred by a telecommunications utility, including costs promoting economic development, including telecommunications infrastructure deployment.

This bill requires the PSC to consider similar costs in determining whether the service of a gas or electric utility is reasonably adequate, or whether charges for such service are reasonable and just. Specifically, the bill requires the PSC to consider costs incurred by a gas or electric utility for economic development activities that support and promote customer service load retention and load growth.

RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS FOR REAL ESTATE LICENSES

Under current law, the Department of Regulation and Licensing (DRL) grants licenses that allow persons to practice as real estate brokers or salespersons. Current law specifies the requirements a person must satisfy to obtain such a license. The Real Estate Board (board) advises DRL on rules regarding licensing and other matters.

This bill allows DRL to grant licenses to persons licensed as real estate brokers or salespersons in other states and territories, in addition to persons who satisfy the requirements specified under current law. Under the bill, DRL may, after consulting

with the board, enter into reciprocal agreements with officials of other states or territories for granting licenses to persons licensed in those states or territories.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

Under the current law popularly known as the “Smart Growth” statute, if a local governmental unit (city, village, town, county, or regional planning commission) creates a comprehensive plan (a zoning development plan or a zoning master plan) or amends an existing comprehensive plan, the plan must contain certain planning elements. The required planning elements include the following: housing; transportation; utilities and community facilities; agricultural, natural, and cultural resources; economic development; and land use.

Beginning on January 1, 2010, under Smart Growth, any program or action of a local governmental unit that affects land use must be consistent with that local governmental unit’s comprehensive plan. The actions to which this requirement applies include zoning ordinances, municipal incorporation procedures, annexation procedures, agricultural preservation plans, and impact fee ordinances. Also beginning on January 1, 2010, under Smart Growth, if a local governmental unit engages in any program or action that affects land use, the comprehensive plan must contain at least all of the required planning elements.

Before the plan may take effect, however, a local governmental unit must comply with a number of requirements, such as adopting written procedures that are designed to foster public participation in the preparation of the plan.

Under this bill, before the plan may take effect, a local governmental unit must provide written notice to all owners of property, and leaseholders who have an interest in property pursuant to which the persons may extract nonmetallic mineral resources, in which the allowable use or intensity of use, of the property, is changed by the comprehensive plan, and must create written procedures that describe the methods the local governmental unit will use to distribute elements of a comprehensive plan to owners of, and other persons who have such interests in, such property.

FEES IMPOSED BY POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

Under current law, cities, villages, towns, and counties (political subdivisions) provide various services for which those political subdivisions may impose a fee. This bill requires that any fee imposed by a political subdivision bear a reasonable relationship to the service for which the fee is imposed and that, when a political subdivision first imposes or raises a fee, the political subdivision issue written findings that demonstrate that the fee bears a reasonable relationship to the service for which the fee is imposed.

PATIENT HEALTH CARE RECORDS

Under current state law, patient health care records must remain confidential and may be released by a health care provider only with the informed consent of the patient or of a person authorized by the patient. However, patient health care records are required to be released without informed consent by the health care provider in specified circumstances, including for patient treatment, health care provider payment and medical records management, and certain audits, program

monitoring, accreditation, and health care services review activities by health care facility staff committees or accreditation or review organizations.

Under current federal law, patient health care information may be released without patient authorization by health care providers for, among other purposes, treatment, payment, and health care operations. "Health care operations" is defined in federal law to include quality assessment and improvement activities; credentialing or evaluating of health care practitioners and training; underwriting; medical review, legal services, and auditing; business planning and development; and business management and general administrative activities.

This bill modifies the requirement for release of patient health care records without patient consent to authorize, rather than require, release under specified circumstances, and to eliminate the requirement that a request for the records be received before release. The bill also increases the circumstances under which patient health care records are authorized to be released without patient informed consent, to include purposes of health care operations, as defined and authorized in federal law.

APPRENTICESHIP-TO-JOURNEYMAN JOB-SITE RATIOS

Under current law, the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) may determine reasonable classifications, promulgate rules, issue general or special orders, hold hearing, make findings, and render orders as necessary to oversee the apprenticeship programs provided in this state.

This bill prohibits DWD from prescribing, whether by promulgating a rule, issuing a general or special order, or otherwise, the ratio of apprentices to journeymen that an employer may have at a job site.

ACQUISITIONS OF IN-STATE BANKS AND BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Current law specifies certain requirements applicable to the acquisition of an in-state bank or in-state bank holding company by an out-of-state bank holding company. This bill applies those requirements to similar acquisitions by out-of-state banks.

LAWSUITS CONCERNING FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

With certain exceptions, this bill prohibits any person from bringing a lawsuit against a bank, savings bank, savings and loan association, or any affiliate of such an institution (financial institution) based upon any of the following promises or commitments of the financial institution, unless the promise or commitment is in writing, sets forth relevant terms and conditions, and is signed by the financial institution: 1) a promise or commitment to lend money, grant or extend credit, or make any other financial accommodation; or 2) a promise or commitment to renew, extend, modify, or permit a delay in repayment or performance of a loan, extension of credit, or other financial accommodation. This prohibition does not apply to transactions that are subject to the Wisconsin Consumer Act (which generally regulates credit transactions of \$25,000 or less that are entered into for personal, family, or household purposes).

Currently, under the doctrine of promissory estoppel, the existence of an enforceable contract may be implied if a person makes a promise, the promise is one which the person should reasonably expect to induce action or forbearance of a

definite and substantial character, the promise induces such action or forbearance, and injustice can be avoided only by enforcement of the promise. This bill provides that any promise or commitment described above may not be enforced under the doctrine of promissory estoppel. This prohibition does not apply to transactions that are subject to the Wisconsin Consumer Act.

FINANCIAL ASSURANCE FOR NONMETALLIC MINING RECLAMATION

Current law requires counties to administer ordinances to ensure that nonmetallic mining sites are reclaimed. "Nonmetallic" mining means extracting substances like gravel and stone. Among other things, nonmetallic mining reclamation ordinances must require operators to provide financial assurance to ensure that the nonmetallic mine will be reclaimed. This bill provides that if a city, village, or town requires an operator to provide financial assurance for nonmetallic mining reclamation, the county must credit the value of that financial assurance toward the amount that the operator is required to provide under the county ordinance.

ELECTRONIC NOTARIZATIONS, ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, TRANSACTIONS, AND RECORDS

In 1999, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws approved the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act (UETA) and recommended it for enactment in all of the states. Generally, UETA establishes a legal framework that facilitates and validates certain electronic transactions. This bill enacts a version of UETA in Wisconsin, with certain changes.

Current law regarding electronic documents, transactions, and signatures

Currently, a combination of state and federal laws govern the use of electronic records, transactions, and signatures in this state. The most significant federal law in this regard is the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, commonly known as "E-sign," which was enacted after UETA was recommended for enactment in all of the states. With certain exceptions relating to existing or pending document retention requirements, E-sign took effect on October 1, 2000. Although much of E-sign represents new law in this state, some of the issues addressed in E-sign were addressed under state law previous to E-sign. With certain exceptions, E-sign preempts the state law to the extent that the treatment is inconsistent with the treatment under E-sign.

1. PUBLIC RECORDS

Under E-sign, any law that requires retention of a contract or document relating to a transaction in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce may be satisfied by retaining an electronic document, as long as the retained information satisfies certain requirements relating to accuracy and accessibility. Thus, under E-sign, a custodian of a public record relating to a covered transaction is likely permitted to destroy the original record if a proper electronic copy is retained. This authority is consistent with current provisions in state law that, in most cases, permit electronic retention of public records; however, the state law in certain cases imposes additional quality control and evidentiary preservation requirements that must be followed if a public record is to be retained electronically. It is unclear

whether these additional requirements continue to apply or would be preempted as inconsistent with these provisions of E-sign.

2. ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS BY GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

Current law relating to the acceptance of electronic documents by governmental units in this state is ambiguous. Under current state law, any document that is required by law to be submitted in writing to a governmental unit and that requires a written signature may be submitted in an electronic format, as long as the governmental unit consents. Current state law does not require any governmental unit to accept documents in an electronic format, but provides that an electronic signature may be substituted for a manual signature if certain requirements are met.

E-sign, however, may require any governmental unit that is a "governmental agency" under E-sign (an undefined term) to accept certain electronic documents that relate to transactions in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce. E-sign states that it does not require any person to agree to use or accept electronic documents or electronic signatures, other than a governmental agency with respect to any document that is not a contract to which it is a party. Although no provision of E-sign specifically requires a governmental agency to use or accept electronic documents or signatures, under E-sign, a document relating to a covered transaction may not be denied legal effect solely because it is in electronic form. Thus, E-sign implies that a governmental agency may be required under E-sign to accept an electronic document relating to a covered transaction, as long as the document is not a contract to which the governmental agency is a party. This implication conflicts with another provision of E-sign, which states that E-sign generally does not limit or supersede any requirement imposed by a state regulatory agency (an undefined term) that documents be filed in accordance with specified standards or formats.

3. ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND SIGNATURES IN COMMERCE

Promissory notes

Currently, this state's version of the Uniform Commercial Code contains the primary legal framework allowing for transactions in this state involving promissory notes (commonly, loan documents). Title II of E-sign contains the primary legal framework relating to a new type of promissory note, termed a "transferrable record," which allows for the marketing of electronic versions of promissory notes in transactions secured by real property.

Other documents and records

The primary electronic commerce provisions of E-sign are contained in Title I, which establishes a legal framework relating to electronic transactions in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce. Generally, Title I contains provisions that relate to the use of "electronic records" and signatures in covered transactions, the retention of "electronic records" of covered transactions, and the notarization and acknowledgement of covered electronic transactions. Title I broadly defines the term "electronic record" to include, among other things, any information that is stored by means of electrical or digital technology and that is retrievable in perceivable form. This definition likely covers such things as information stored on a computer disk or

a voice mail recording. Because of this broad definition, in this analysis of E-sign, the term “document” is generally used in place of the term record. Title I also defines “transaction” broadly to mean any action or set of actions relating to the conduct of business, consumer, or commercial affairs between two or more persons, including governmental agencies.

Currently, under Title I, a signature, contract, or other document relating to a covered transaction may not be denied legal effect, validity, or enforceability solely because it is in an electronic form, as long as the electronic contract or record, if it is otherwise required to be in writing, is capable of being retained and accurately reproduced by the relevant parties. Similarly, a contract relating to a covered transaction may not be denied legal effect solely because an electronic signature or electronic document was used in its formation.

Title I also permits electronic notarization, acknowledgement, or verification of a signature or document relating to a covered transaction, as long as the electronic signature of the person performing the notarization, acknowledgement, or verification is accompanied by all other information required by law. In addition, Title I provides that no person is required under Title I to agree to use or accept electronic records or signatures.

However, under Title I, any law that requires retention of a contract or document relating to a covered transaction may be satisfied by retaining an electronic document, as long as the retained information satisfies certain requirements relating to accuracy and accessibility. Title I contains similar provisions with regard to laws requiring retention of a check. An electronic contract or document retained in compliance with these provisions generally has the same legal status as an original document. As discussed above with regard to public records custodians, this provision of Title I also likely permits any *private* custodian of records relating to covered transactions to destroy original records if a proper electronic copy is retained.

Consumer protections

Under Title I, with regard to consumer transactions in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, existing laws requiring written disclosure currently may be satisfied electronically only if the consumer consents after being informed of certain rights and of the technical requirements necessary to access and retain the electronic document. In addition, the consumer must consent or confirm his or her consent electronically in a manner that reasonably demonstrates that the consumer can access the information that is required to be provided to the consumer. The legal effect of a contract, though, may not be denied solely because of a failure to obtain the consumer’s electronic consent consistent with this requirement. Title I also specifies that the use of electronic documents permitted under these consumer provisions does not include the use of an oral communication, such as a voice mail recording, unless that use is permitted under other applicable law.

Any federal regulatory agency, with respect to a matter within the agency’s jurisdiction, may exempt a specified category or type of document from the general consumer consent requirement, if the exemption is necessary to eliminate a

substantial burden on electronic commerce and will not increase the material risk of harm to consumers.

Exemptions

All of the following are exempt from coverage under the primary electronic commerce provisions of E-sign and, as a result, currently may not be provided in electronic format unless otherwise authorized by law:

1. A document to the extent that it is governed by a law covering the creation and execution of wills, codicils, or testamentary trusts.
2. A document to the extent that it is governed by a law covering adoption, divorce, or other matters of family law.
3. A document to the extent that it is governed by certain sections of the Uniform Commercial code.
4. Court orders or notices and official court documents, including briefs, pleadings, and other writings.
5. Notices of cancellation or termination of utility services, including water, heat, and power.
6. Notices of default, acceleration, repossession, foreclosure, or eviction or the right to cure under a credit agreement secured by, or a rental agreement for, a primary residence of an individual.
7. Notices of the cancellation or termination of health insurance or life insurance, other than annuities.
8. Product recall notices.
9. Documents required to accompany the transportation of hazardous materials.

A federal regulatory agency may remove any of these exemptions, as the particular exemption applies to a matter within the agency's jurisdiction, if the agency finds that the exemption is no longer necessary for the protection of consumers and that the elimination of the exemption will not increase the material risk of harm to consumers.

Limits on the scope of Title I

In addition to these specific exemptions, Title I has a limited effect upon certain specified laws. For example, Title I states that it does not affect any requirement imposed by state law relating to a person's rights or obligations other than the requirement that contracts or other documents be in nonelectronic form. However, this provision may conflict with other provisions of Title I which appear to specifically affect obligations other than writing or signature requirements. Title I also has a limited effect on any state law enacted before E-sign that expressly requires verification or acknowledgement of receipt of a document. Under Title I, this type of document may be provided electronically only if the method used also provides verification or acknowledgement of receipt. In addition, Title I does not affect any law that requires a warning, notice, disclosure, or other document to be posted, displayed, or publicly affixed within a specified proximity.

State authority under Title I

Title I provides that a state regulatory agency that is responsible for rule making under any statute may interpret the primary electronic commerce provisions

of Title I with respect to that statute, if the agency is authorized by law to do so. Rules, orders, or guidance produced by an agency under this authority must meet specific requirements relating to consistency with existing provisions of Title I; to regulatory burden; to justification for the rule, order, or guidance; and to neutrality with regard to the type of technology needed to satisfy the rule, order, or guidance. A state agency may also mandate specific performance standards with regard to document retention, in order to assure accuracy, integrity, and accessibility of retained electronic documents. However, under state law, the rule-making authority of a state agency is limited to interpretation and application of state law and no state agency may promulgate a rule that conflicts with state law.

Relationship between E-sign and UETA

E-sign generally preempts state law unless the state law qualifies for one of two exceptions to preemption. The first exception to preemption permits a state to supersede the effect of the primary electronic commerce provisions of Title I by enacting a law that constitutes an enactment of UETA as approved and recommended for enactment in all of the states. The second exception to preemption permits a state to supersede the effect of the primary electronic commerce provisions of Title I by enacting a law that specifies alternative procedures or requirements for the use or acceptance of electronic records or signatures to establish the legal effect of contracts or other records. Among other things, the alternative procedures or requirements generally must be consistent with E-sign. It is difficult to predict how a court would apply this second exception to preemption. As a result, it is difficult to predict whether and to what extent any state law that does not constitute an enactment of UETA would qualify for this second exception from preemption.

Because this bill makes certain substantive changes to UETA and in some cases it is not clear whether the text is consistent with the intent of the version of UETA recommended for enactment in all of the states, it is difficult to determine whether the bill qualifies for an exception from preemption and, if enacted, the extent to which the bill would likely supplant the primary electronic commerce provisions of E-sign in this state.

UETA

The following analysis of the version of UETA contained in this bill generally reflects an interpretation that is consistent with the prefatory note and official comments accompanying UETA, which generally discuss the intent of each recommended provision of UETA. For the provisions that are subject to varying interpretations, this analysis discusses each primary interpretation and indicates which interpretation, if any, is supported by the prefatory note or comments. Although the prefatory note and comments have no legal effect, in the past courts have often relied on the prefatory notes and comments to other uniform laws when interpreting ambiguous provisions of those laws. In some instances, the interpretation supported by the prefatory note or comments is difficult to derive from the text of the bill.

1. PUBLIC RECORDS

Although the version of UETA recommended for enactment in all of the states contains a provision potentially affecting the maintenance of public records that is

similar to the provision currently in effect under E-sign, this bill provides that public records retention requirements currently in effect in this state continue to apply. The bill also permits the public records board to promulgate rules prescribing additional records retention standards consistent with the bill's provisions. Thus, under this bill, the maintenance of public records is likely governed by current law, as affected by E-sign.

2. ACCEPTANCE OF ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS BY GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

The same ambiguities regarding the acceptance of electronic documents by governmental units exist under this bill as exist currently under E-sign, although under this bill it is more likely that a governmental unit is not required to accept electronic documents. This bill attempts, in a manner consistent with UETA, to restore the law as it existed in this state before E-sign regarding the acceptance of electronic documents by governmental units. Thus, under this bill, any document that is required by law to be submitted in writing to a governmental unit and that requires a written signature may be submitted in an electronic format if the governmental unit consents. Although this bill, like current law under E-sign, also states that a document relating to a transaction may not be denied legal effect solely because it is in electronic form, it is more likely under this bill that this provision has no effect on the authority of a governmental unit to refuse to accept an electronic document. Unlike current law under E-sign, this bill does not contain any statement that a governmental unit is required to accept an electronic document.

With certain exceptions, this bill grants the Department of Electronic Government (DEG) primary rule-making authority with regard to the use of electronic documents and signatures by governmental units and grants DEG and the secretary of state joint rule-making authority with regard to electronic notarizations. In addition, this bill requires DEG's rules to include standards regarding the receipt of electronic documents and the acceptance or electronic signatures by governmental units, in order to promote consistency and interoperability with similar standards adopted by other governmental units, the federal government, and other persons interacting with governmental units of this state.

3. ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND SIGNATURES IN COMMERCE

Rule of construction

This bill specifies that it must be construed and applied to facilitate electronic transactions consistent with other applicable law, to be consistent with reasonable practices concerning electronic transactions and with the continued expansion of those practices, and to bring about uniformity in the law of electronic transactions.

Applicability and definitions

Generally, the bill applies to the use of electronic records and electronic signatures relating to transactions. Like current law under E-sign, this bill broadly defines the term "electronic record" to include, among other things, any information that is stored by means of electrical or digital technology and that is retrievable in a perceivable form. This definition would likely cover such things as information stored on a computer disk or a voice mail recording. Because of this broad definition,

in this analysis of the version of UETA contained in this bill, the term “document” is generally used in place of the term “record.” Under the bill, an “electronic signature” includes, among other things, a sound, symbol, or process that relates to electrical technology, that is attached to or logically associated with a document, and that is executed or adopted by a person with intent to sign the document.

The bill defines “transaction” to mean an action or set of actions between two or more persons relating to the conduct of business, commercial, or governmental affairs. Although this definition may be interpreted broadly to include a typical interaction with the government like the filing of a document, the prefatory note and comments to UETA imply that a narrower interpretation is intended which covers the actions of the government as a market participant. In addition, although the definition does not expressly cover consumer-to-consumer or consumer-to-business transactions, it is possible to interpret this definition, consistent with the official comments, to cover these transactions.

This bill contains all of the exemptions currently in effect under E-sign, with certain modifications. Thus, among other things, this bill does not apply to a transaction governed by a law relating to the execution of wills or the creation of testamentary trusts, to a transaction governed by any chapter of this state’s version of the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) other than the chapter dealing with sales of goods, to a certain utility cancellation notices, to certain court documents, or to product recall notices. Unlike current law under E-sign, the bill also specifically exempts cancellation notices for local telecommunications services. With the exception of the provisions relating to wills, trusts, and the UCC, these exceptions are not included in the version of UETA recommended for enactment in all of the states.

Agreements to use electronic documents and electronic signatures

This bill does not require the use of electronic documents or electronic signatures. Rather, the bill applies only to transactions between parties each of which has agreed to conduct transactions by electronic means. Under the bill, this agreement is determined from the context, the surrounding circumstances, and the parties’ conduct. A party that agrees to conduct one transaction by electronic means may refuse to conduct other transactions by electronic means. Although the bill also states that a document relating to a transaction may not be denied legal effect solely because it is in electronic form, it is likely that, consistent with the comments, these provisions permit a person to deny the legal effect of an electronic document relating to a transaction if a party to the transaction never agreed to conduct the transaction electronically. With certain exceptions, the parties to any transaction may agree to vary the effect of this bill as it relates to that transaction.

Consumer protections

Unlike current law under E-sign, this bill does not contain any protections that specifically apply only to consumers. The consumer protections currently in effect under E-sign would arguably have no effect in this state upon the enactment of this bill.

Legal effect of electronic documents and electronic signatures

As noted earlier, this bill specifies that a document or signature may not be denied legal effect or enforceability solely because it is in electronic form. The bill also specifies that a contract may not be denied legal effect or enforceability solely because an electronic document was used in its formation. These provisions are similar to provisions in current law under E-sign. Unlike E-sign, this bill further states that an electronic document satisfies any law requiring a record to be in writing and that an electronic signature satisfies any law requiring a signature.

Effect of laws relating to the provision of information

Under this bill, if the parties to a transaction have agreed to conduct the transaction electronically and if a law requires a person to provide, send, or deliver information in writing to another person, a party may, with certain exceptions, satisfy the requirement with respect to that transaction by providing, sending, or delivering the information in an electronic document that is capable of retention by the recipient at the time of receipt. Although the bill also states that a document relating to a transaction may not be denied legal effect solely because it is in electronic form, it is likely that, consistent with the comments, the bill permits a person to deny the legal effect of an electronic document relating to a transaction if the electronic document is provided, sent, or delivered in violation of this provision. The bill further provides that an electronic document is not enforceable against the recipient of the document if the sender inhibits the ability of the recipient to store or print the document.

The bill also specifies that, with certain exceptions, a document must satisfy any law requiring the document to be posted or displayed in a certain manner; to be sent, communicated, or transmitted by a specified method; or to contain information that is formatted in a certain manner. There are three possible interpretations of this provision. First, the provision may prohibit the use of an electronic document if a law requires the document to be posted, displayed, sent, communicated, transmitted, or formatted on paper. Second, the provision may instead require a paper document to be used in addition to an electronic document in these circumstances. Third, consistent with the comments, the provision may require the parties to a transaction to comply with any legal requirement relating to the provision of information *other than a requirement that the information be provided on paper.*

Attribution of electronic documents

Under this bill, an electronic document or electronic signature is attributable to a person whose act created the document or signature. The act of a person may be shown in any manner, including through the use of a security procedure that determines the person to whom an electronic document or electronic signature is attributable.

Effect of change or error

This bill contains three provisions that determine the effect of a change or error in an electronic document that occurs in a transmission between the parties to a transaction. First, if the parties have agreed to use a security procedure to detect changes or errors and if one of the parties fails to use a security procedure and an

error or change occurs that the nonconforming party would have detected had the party used the security procedure, the other party may avoid the effect of the changed or erroneous electronic document. Second, in an automated transaction involving an individual, the individual may avoid the effect of an electronic document that results from an error made by the individual in dealing with the automated agent of another person, if the automated agent did not provide an opportunity for prevention or correction of the error. However, an individual may avoid the effect of the electronic document only if the individual, at the time he or she learns of the error, has received no benefit from the thing of value received from the other party under the transaction and only if the individual satisfies certain requirements relating to notification of the other party and return or destruction of the thing of value received. Third, if neither of these provisions applies to the transaction, the change or error has the effect provided by other law, including the law of mistake, and by any applicable contract between the parties.

Electronic notarization and acknowledgement

Like current law under E-sign, this bill permits electronic notarization, acknowledgement, or verification of a signature or document relating to a transaction, as long as the electronic signature of the person performing the notarization, acknowledgement, or verification is accompanied by all other information required by law. Unlike current law under E-sign and the version of UETA recommended for enactment in all of the states, an electronic notarization under this bill must also comply with rules promulgated by DEG and the secretary of state.

Retention of electronic documents

Under this bill, any law that requires retention of a document may, with certain exceptions, be satisfied by retaining an electronic document, as long as the retained information satisfies certain requirements relating to accuracy and accessibility. The bill contains similar provisions with regard to laws requiring retention of a check, although the term "check" is not defined under the bill and, as a result, may not include a share draft or money order. These provisions are similar to current law under E-sign. However, unlike E-sign and the version of UETA recommended for enactment in all of the states, this bill preserves the treatment of public records under current law, as affected by E-sign (see page 2. of this analysis for a discussion of E-sign's effect upon public records). In addition, unlike E-sign, this bill specifies that an electronic document that is required to be retained must accurately reflect the information set forth in the document *after it was first generated in its final form as an electronic document or otherwise*. The comments indicate that this provision is intended to ensure that the content of a document is retained when documents are converted or reformatted to allow for ongoing electronic retention.

The bill provides that an electronic document retained in compliance with these provisions need not contain any information the sole purpose of which is to enable the document to be sent, communicated, or received. Under current law, this ancillary information is normally required to be retained along with the document to which it is attached. In addition, as under E-sign, an electronic contract or document retained in compliance with these provisions generally has the same legal

status as an original document. Like E-sign, this bill also provides that a person may comply with these electronic document retention provisions using the services of another person.

The bill provides that it does not apply to any new laws enacted by this state, after enactment of this bill, that prohibit a person from using an electronic document to satisfy any requirement that the person retain a document for evidentiary, audit, or like purposes. It is unclear, though, what types of retention requirements are enacted for “evidentiary, audit, or like purposes.” It is also unclear how this provision relates to other provisions of the bill which provide that an electronic document satisfies any retention requirement as long as specified requirements relating to accuracy and accessibility are also satisfied.

In addition, the bill specifies that it does not preclude a governmental unit of this state from specifying additional requirements for the retention of any document of another governmental unit subject to its jurisdiction. It is unclear how this provision relates to other provisions of the bill which provide that an electronic document satisfies any retention requirement as long as specified requirements relating to accuracy and accessibility are also satisfied. It is also unclear whether this provision grants rule-making authority or merely references any authority that may exist currently. This provision is narrower than a corresponding provision included in the version of UETA recommended for enactment in all of the states in that the corresponding provision is not specifically limited in its application to documents of governmental units.

Evidence

Under this bill, a document or signature may not be excluded as evidence solely because it is in electronic form. This provision confirms the treatment of electronic documents and signatures under current law.

Automated transactions

This bill validates contracts formed in automated transactions by the interaction of automated agents of the parties or by the interaction of one party's automated agent and an individual. Under current law, it is possible to argue that an automated transaction may not result in an enforceable contract because, at the time of the transaction, either or both of the parties lack an expression of human intent to form the contract.

Time and location of electronic sending and receipt

Under this bill, an electronic document is sent when the electronic document a) is addressed or otherwise properly directed to an information processing system that the intended recipient has designated or uses for the purpose of receiving electronic documents or information of the type sent and from which the recipient is able to retrieve the electronic document; b) is in a form capable of being processed by that information processing system; and c) enters an information processing system outside of the control of the sender or enters a region of the information processing system used or designated by the recipient that is under the recipient's control. An electronic document is received when the electronic document enters and is in a form capable of being processed by an information processing system that the recipient has designated or uses for the purpose of receiving electronic documents or

information of the type sent and from which the recipient is able to retrieve the electronic document. The bill permits the parties to a transaction to agree to alter the effect of these provisions with respect to the transaction. Under the bill, an electronic document may be received even if no individual is aware of its receipt. Furthermore, under the bill, an electronic acknowledgment of receipt from the information processing system used or designated by the recipient establishes that the electronic document was received but does not establish that the information sent is the same as the information received.

These provisions may be interpreted to alter laws under which the date of receipt of a public record submitted for filing is the date on which a paper copy is received or postmarked, so that the date of electronic filing constitutes the date of receipt instead. However, as noted earlier, this bill specifically states that it applies only to transactions between parties each of which has agreed to conduct transactions by electronic means. Although the definition of "transaction" may be interpreted broadly to include a typical governmental action like the filing of a document, the prefatory note and comments to UETA imply that a narrower interpretation is intended which covers only the actions of the government as a market participant. If the narrower interpretation applies, then these provisions will likely have no effect upon the filing of most public records.

Under this bill, an electronic document is deemed to be sent from the sender's place of business that has the closest relationship to the underlying transaction and to be received at the recipient's place of business that has the closest relationship to the underlying transaction. If the sender or recipient does not have a place of business, the electronic document is deemed to be sent or received from the sender's or recipient's residence. The bill also permits a sender to expressly provide in an electronic document that the document is deemed to be sent from a different location. The bill also permits the parties to a transaction to agree to alter the effect of these provisions on the transaction. To the extent that an electronic document may constitute a sale, with the seller receiving payment electronically, these provisions may be interpreted to permit a seller to argue that a sale occurred in a jurisdiction where the seller is not subject to a tax that would otherwise be imposed under Wisconsin law. However, the official comments imply that this interpretation is not intended.

In addition, under the bill, if a person is aware that an electronic document purportedly sent or purportedly received in compliance with these provisions was not actually sent or received, the legal effect of the sending or receipt is determined by other applicable law. Although the official comments are silent on the meaning of this provision, it is likely intended to give a court direction as to what law to apply to determine the legal effect when there is a *failure* to send or receive an electronic document in the manner provided under the bill.

Transferable records

This bill expands current law with regard to transactions involving the use of transferable records (electronic versions of certain documents under the Uniform Commercial Code). Although current law under E-sign only permits the use of transferrable records in transactions secured by real property, this bill permits the

use of transferable records in any transaction in which a promissory note or document of title under the Uniform Commercial Code may be used. Under this bill, an electronic document qualifies as a transferable record only if the issuer of the electronic document expressly agrees that the electronic document is a transferable record.

SALES TAX EXEMPTION FOR TEMPORARY HELP SERVICES

Under this bill, no part of the charge for services provided by a temporary help company is subject to the sales tax, if the client for whom the services are provided controls the means of performing the services and is responsible for the satisfactory completion of the services. Under current law, a temporary help company is generally, any entity that contracts with a client to supply individuals to perform services for the client on a temporary basis.

This bill will be referred to the Joint Survey Committee on Tax Exemptions for a detailed analysis, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

For further information see the ~~state and local~~ fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

fix component

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. 16.957 (2) (b) 1. (intro.) of the statutes is amended to read:

16.957 (2) (b) 1. (intro.) Subject to subd. 2. and the rules promulgated under sub. (2m), after holding a hearing, establish programs for awarding grants from the appropriation under s. 20.505 (3) (s) for each of the following:

SECTION 2. 16.957 (2) (c) 2. of the statutes is amended to read:

16.957 (2) (c) 2. Requirements and procedures for applications for grants awarded under programs established under par. (a) or (b) 1. The rules for grants awarded under programs established under par. (b) 1. may not be inconsistent with the rules promulgated by the commission under sub. (2m).

SECTION 3. 16.957 (2m) of the statutes is created to read:

16.957 (2m) ENERGY CONSERVATION AND EFFICIENCY GRANTS. The commission shall promulgate rules that provide that a proposal for providing energy conservation or efficiency services is not eligible for a grant under sub. (2) (b) unless

1 1. A promise or commitment to lend money, grant or extend credit, or make any
2 other financial accommodation.

3 2. A promise or commitment to renew, extend, modify, or permit a delay in
4 repayment or performance of a loan, extension of credit, or other financial
5 accommodation.

6 (c) Except as provided in par. (d), a promise or commitment by a financial
7 institution described in par. (b) may not be enforced under the doctrine of promissory
8 estoppel.

9 (d) Paragraphs (b) and (c) do not apply to credit transactions that are subject
10 to chs. 421 to 427.

11 ~~SECTION 45.~~ 295.13 (4) of the statutes is created to read:

12 295.13 (4) CREDITING OF FINANCIAL ASSURANCE. If a nonmetallic mining site is
13 subject to a county ordinance under sub. (1) or (2) and the city, village, or town in
14 which a nonmetallic mining site is located required the operator of the mining site
15 to provide financial assurance for nonmetallic mining reclamation of the nonmetallic
16 mining site, the county shall credit the value of the financial assurance provided to
17 the city, village, or town against the amount of financial assurance that the operator
18 is required to provide under the county ordinance.

19 **SECTION 46.** 452.05 (3) of the statutes is created to read:

20 452.05 (3) The department may, after consultation with the board, enter into
21 reciprocal agreements with officials of other states or territories of the United States
22 for licensing brokers and salespersons and grant licenses to applicants who are
23 licensed as brokers or salespersons in those states or territories according to the
24 terms of the reciprocal agreements.

25 **SECTION 47.** 452.09 (2) (a) of the statutes is amended to read:

(End)

Emery, Lynn

From: Nowak, Ellen
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2004 1:39 PM
To: LRB.Legal
Subject: Draft review: LRB 03-3940/1 Topic: Nonmetallic mining financial assurances

It has been requested by <Nowak, Ellen> that the following draft be jacketed for the ASSEMBLY:

Draft review: LRB 03-3940/1 Topic: Nonmetallic mining financial assurances