

# ADMINISTRATIVE RULES FISCAL ESTIMATE AND ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Type of Estimate and Analysis  |   |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected   |   |   |
| Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number  |   |   |
| Ch. ATPC 30, Pesticide Product Restrictions Appendix A ("Atrazine Prohibition Areas")  |   |   |
| Subject  |   |   |
| Updating the Maps in Ch. ATPC 30 Appendix A Using Computerized Mapping Technology  |   |   |
| Fund Sources Affected  |   | Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEG SEG-S  |   | 20.115 (7)(r), Stats.   |
| Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule   |   |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect<br><input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate   | <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues<br><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues  | <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget<br><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs |
| The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)  |   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy<br><input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units  | <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors<br><input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers |   |
| Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?  |   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  |   |   |
| Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule   |   |   |
| <p>Chapter ATPC 30 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code describes prohibitions on pesticide use. Appendix A to ch. ATPC 30 consists of maps that show Atrazine Prohibition Areas where atrazine currently may not be applied as a pesticide, primarily due to the fact that groundwater samples tested in those areas have attained or exceeded a regulatory standard under ch. NR 140, Wis. Adm. Code.</p> <p>DATPC is <u>not adding to or changing</u> any of the current Atrazine Prohibition Areas on any of the maps in Appendix A. This rule merely replaces existing (in many cases outdated) maps with updated maps that have been created in the past year using computerized mapping technology. Because the maps in this proposed rule are current and more accurate (containing changes such as roadways that have been added since the existing maps were made, modified street names, and adjustments to other surface features shown on maps), the possibility of inadvertently using atrazine within an Atrazine Prohibition Area is less likely to occur.</p> |   |   |
| 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)   |   |   |
| There will be no economic or fiscal impact.  |   |   |
| Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule  |   |   |
| An alternative to the rule is to do nothing. Implementing the rule will decrease the possibility of atrazine users inadvertently using atrazine within an Atrazine Prohibition Area.   |   |   |
| Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule   |   |   |
| None.  |   |   |
| Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government   |   |   |
| Atrazine product labels approved by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (and implementing regulations) identify the legal application rate of product use ("label rate"), depending  |   |   |

on factors such as crop type, timing of crop emergence, and erodibility of soils. EPA does not require the establishment of prohibition areas for atrazine in its regulations.

Wisconsin's maximum atrazine application rates are set by administrative rule at about half the rates normally allowed under the federal label. Wisconsin restricts atrazine use based on the actual testing and finding of groundwater contamination in an area and then maps the areas where atrazine is prohibited. Maps are shown in Appendix A of ch. ATCP 30 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

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

None of the surrounding states generates maps relating to atrazine prohibitions in its administrative rules. Relating to atrazine prohibitions: Iowa restricts atrazine application rates to half the federal label rate in 23 counties; Illinois and Michigan do not have state regulations concerning atrazine; and Minnesota has a voluntary use limitation program when surface water or groundwater contamination exceeds a level of concern.