

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

Ch.'s NR 10 Game and Hunting, NR 12 Wildlife Damage and Nuisance Control, NR 13 Chippewa Treaty Participants, NR 15 Game Refuges, NR 16 Captive Wildlife, and NR 19 Miscellaneous Fur, Fish, Game and Outdoor Recreation.

3. Subject

Wildlife management rules relating to hunting, trapping, closed areas, nuisance wildlife management, removal of car-killed animals, and invasive species.

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

These rule changes are proposed to update administrative code language to correct inconsistencies, update outdated language, and provide clarification when appropriate. The proposed changes are primarily remedial in nature. This rule package will amend regulations for hunting, trapping, game refuges, nuisance wildlife management, removal of car-killed animals, and invasive species found in Ch.'s. NR 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19 and 40.

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.

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 50, Section II, this is a level 3 economic impact analysis. A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis was posted on the department's website for review by businesses, sectors, governmental units, and individuals beginning on June 2 and continuing through June 20. No comments were received.

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

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 50, Section II, this is a level 3 economic impact analysis. A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis was posted on the department's website for review by local governmental units, and individuals beginning on June 2 and continuing through June 20. No comments were received.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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)

These rules, and the legislation which grants the department rule making authority, do not have a fiscal effect on the private sector or small businesses. These rules are applicable to individual sportspersons and impose no compliance or reporting requirements for small business, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.

These rules primarily remedial in nature are not expected to significantly affect currently available outdoor opportunities and would have no impacts to the economic activities of hunters, trappers, or outdoor recreation enthusiasts are expected.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

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

These rule change proposals do not represent significant policy changes and do not differ significantly from surrounding states. All surrounding states have regulations and rules in place for the management and recreational use of wild game and furbearer species that are established based on needs that are unique to that state's resources and public desires.

17. Contact Name

Scott Loomans, Wildlife Regulations Policy Specialist

18. Contact Phone Number

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
-