

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

---

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original  Updated  Corrected

---

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

Ch. SPS 34, Firearms and Other Dangerous Weapons

---

3. Subject

Making this chapter consistent with the provisions in 2011 Act 35 (concealed carry), and specifically relating to firearms and other dangerous weapons for private security personnel, private detectives, and private investigators or special investigators.

---

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR  FED  PRO  PRS  SEG  SEG-S

---

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

---

6. 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 Cost

---

7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)

State's Economy  Specific Businesses/Sectors  
 Local Government Units  Public Utility Rate Payers  
 Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)

---

8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?

Yes  No

---

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

Chapter SPS 34 currently does not address provisions in 2011 Act 35 with regard to persons holding a concealed carry certification issued by the state. The proposed rules address that license under this chapter to allow carry a weapon, concealed or otherwise without first obtaining a permit from the department.

---

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.

**The department posted the rules for economic impact for 14-days and no comments were received from these sectors.**

---

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.

The department posted the proposed rules for 14-day period and will summarize any input from this group.

---

12. 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)

This proposed rules do not mandate any additional licenses, qualifications, or fees to any of these sectors.

---

13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

Chapter SPS 34 will be in conformance with the provisions of 2011 Act 35.

---

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The department rules will be consistent with Wisconsin's concealed carry law, 2011 Act 35.

---

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Chapter SPS 34 currently as promulgated is consistent with the minimum requirements of U.S. Code, 15 USC 5902 (b).

---

16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

While the requirements of concealed carry laws in these adjoining states are substantially similar to Wisconsin's in application, safety, training and reciprocity, not all recognize specific groups being allowed to carry weapons concealed or otherwise while an owner or employee of private security agencies. These specific groups, outlined in 2011 Act 35 include: qualified law enforcement officers (in-state, out-of state and former), when acting as a private detective or private security person without first obtaining a firearms permit.

---

17. Contact Name

Jean MacCubbin

---

18. Contact Phone Number

608.266.0955

---

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**  
**Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis**

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**  
**Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis**

**ATTACHMENT A**

---

1. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separately for 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
-