

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected	2. Date Nov 1, 2018
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Ch. NR 10, WM-04-18	
4. Subject Wildlife Harvest Management Regulations	
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	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected None
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	
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input 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)	
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 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, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule These rule changes are proposed to update administrative code language so that it is consistent with recently passed legislation. Previously, the department was required to issue carcass tags that authorized the harvest of a deer or turkey and required validation of the carcass tag upon taking possession of the animal. The department has also required hunters to report the harvest of Canada geese within 48 hours of harvest and used that reporting information to make harvest management decisions. This proposed rule brings NR 10 up to date following 2017 Wisconsin ACT 59. That act prohibited the department from requiring the possession or validation of a physical carcass tag for turkeys. Also eliminated was the requirement that deer hunters possess or validate a physical deer carcass tag. Additional legislation prohibited the department from requiring reporting or registration of Canada goose harvest.	
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. Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 50, Section II, this will be a level 3 economic impact analysis. A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website in April 2018 and various interest groups may be contacted. No fiscal effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated. This rule will be more convenient for hunters pursuing these species because they will have additional options for proof of harvest authorization.	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 50, Section II, this will have a level 3 economic impact (less than \$50,000). A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website during a 14 day period in April 2018 and various interest groups, including local governments, may be contacted. This rule is not anticipated to impact local governments.	
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)	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

These rules, and the legislation which grants the department rule-making authority, do not have fiscal effects on the private sector or small businesses. No costs to the private sector or small businesses are associated with compliance to these rules.

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

These proposals will generally contribute to providing good opportunities for hunting and trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in those activities. It will also provide consistency between administrative code and state statutes. This rule will be more convenient for hunters pursuing these species because they will have additional options for proof of harvest authorization.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The long range implications of this rule proposal will be the same as the short term impacts. These proposals will generally contribute to providing good opportunities for hunting and trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in those activities.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Federal regulations allow states to manage the wildlife resources located within their boundaries provided they do not conflict with regulations established in the Federal Register. None of these rule changes violate or conflict with the provisions established in the Federal Code of Regulations.

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

Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota all issue tags to hunters for both deer and turkey that must be attached to the animal following harvest. Iowa, Illinois and Minnesota require writing the registration confirmation number on the tags attached to the animal. These states do not require a harvest registration for Canada geese.

<h4>19. Contact Name</h4>	<h4>20. Contact Phone Number</h4>
Scott Karel	608-267-2452

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
-