

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<p>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected</p>	<p>2. Date October 9, 2019</p>
<p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Wis. Admin. Code ch. ATCP 83, Dairy Product Advertising and Labeling</p>	
<p>4. Subject Removing the annual renewal and notarization requirement for a milk producer rBST-free affidavit.</p>	
<p>5. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S</p>	<p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected</p>
<p>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget</p>	
<p>8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers <input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)</p>	
<p>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0</p>	
<p>10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The policy problem addressed by the proposed rule revision is the redundant effort and cost incurred by dairy plants and milk producers to renew milk producer affidavits for not administering recombinant bovine somatotropin (rBST) to milking cattle.</p>	
<p>12. 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. Various industry groups and dairy plants were surveyed asking for their opinion on the desirability of the proposed removal of the annual milk producer affidavit renewal requirement. The survey results indicated strong industry support for the proposed rule change.</p>	
<p>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. The proposed rule does not affect local governmental units; no local governmental units were asked to participate.</p>	
<p>14. 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) The rule will have a direct positive impact on all Wisconsin dairy plants making rBST-free claims and the Wisconsin milk producers supplying milk to these dairy plants. Dairy plant field representatives report spending a significant amount of time collecting affidavit renewals. In some cases, milk producers must take time away from their work to update the affidavit and have it notarized. These time costs will be dramatically reduced by the proposed rule change.</p>	
<p>15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule The Department expects the proposed rule revision to have a positive impact on businesses because it will reduce the annual regulatory burden while maintaining the same level of protection against mislabeled dairy products. The alternative to implementing the proposed rule is to maintain the requirement.</p>	
<p>16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule Eliminating the annual renewal requirement removes an unnecessary regulatory burden on Wisconsin dairy plants and milk producers, thereby allowing them to focus on other issues.</p>	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued a guidance document on rBST-free label claim wording, and initially approved administration of rBST to cows producing milk for human consumption. Otherwise, FDA has not promulgated any regulation specific to rBST-free label claims.

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

The states of Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, and Illinois do not mandate milk producers in rule to comply with rBST-free labeling and affidavit requirements.

19. Contact Name

Caitlin Jeidy, Program & Policy Analyst - Advanced, Division of Food and Recreational Safety

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 224-4696

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 (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
-