ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis ☑ Original □ Updated □Corrected	2. Date 11/20/24	
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) CSB 2.007		
4. Subject Scheduling ADB-BUTINACA, α-PiHP, and 3-MMC		
5. Fund Sources Affected	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected s. 20.165 (1) (g) and (hg)	
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule Image: No Fiscal Effect Increase Existing Revenues Image: Indeterminate Image: Decrease Existing Revenues	 ☑ Increase Costs □ Decrease Costs □ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget 	
8. 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)		
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, pers. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0		
 10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, pers. 227.137(3)(b)(2)? Yes X No 		
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule This rule schedules ADB-BUTINACA, α -PiHP, and 3-MMC as schedule I controlled substances. The Controlled Substances Board will promulgate a final rule, without making the determinations or findings required by ss. 961.11(1), (1m), (1r) and (2) or s. 961.13 and omitting the notice of proposed rulemaking, listing ADB-BUTINACA, α -PiHP, and 3-MMC as schedule I controlled substances. The Affirmative Action order, dated June 4, 2024, took effect on June 16, 2024, upon publication in the Administrative Register and expires upon promulgation of a final rule.		
 12. Summaryof 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 rule was posted on the Department's website for 14 days to solicit public comment on economic impact, including how the proposed rules may affect businesses, local government units, and individuals. No comments were received. 		
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. None.		
 14. 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) DSPS estimates a total of \$3,455.00 in one-time costs for implementing this rule. The estimated funds support the equivalent of 0.1 limited term employee to undertake tasks such as rule drafting, legal research and review, preparation for prosecution/informational resolution, and investigation of CSB referrals. The one-time costs cannot be absorbed in the currently appropriated agency budget. 		
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The benefit is that the federal and state controlled substances acts will be uniform to avoid stakholder confusion.		
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule The long range implications of implementing the rule are that the following will be Schedule I controlled substances in Wisconsin:		

• • ADB-BUTINACA

• α-PiHP or alpha-PiHP

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

• 3-MMC

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government On December 13, 2023, the Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration published its final rule in the Federal Register adding the following three substances to schedule I of the federal Controlled Substances Act:

- ADB-BUTINACA
- α-PiHP or alpha-PiHP
- 3-MMC

The scheduling action is effective December 13, 2023.

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) Illinois: Illinois has not listed ADB-BUTINACA, α -PiHP, and 3-MMC as schedule I controlled substances [720 Illinois Compiled Statutes 570/204].

Iowa: Iowa has not listed ADB-BUTINACA, α -PiHP, and 3-MMC as schedule I controlled substances [Iowa Code 124.204].

Michigan: Michigan has not listed ADB-BUTINACA, α -PiHP, and 3-MMC as schedule I controlled substances [Michigan Compiled Laws s. 333.7212].

Minnesota: Minnesota has not listed ADB-BUTINACA, α -PiHP, and 3-MMC as schedule I controlled substances [Minnesota Statutes 152.02 (2)].

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Nilajah Hardin, Administrative Rules Coordinator	608-267-7139

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 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