

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

X Original    Updated    Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

SPS 360

3. Subject

Erosion Control

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR    FED    PRO    PRS    SEG    SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

20.165(2)(j)

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

This rule removes ambiguities and obsolete provisions within SPS 360 relating to erosion control and storm water management at construction sites over one acre in size.

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.

Construction industry

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

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)

This rule will eliminate the current conflict between SPS 360 and NR 216.42.

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

The benefit to this rule is to create clarity in the erosion control and storm water management process at construction sites over one acre in size.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

This rule eliminates conflict between SPS 360 and NR 216.42.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

None

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

Surrounding states generally split responsibility for erosion control at the one acre size.

17. Contact Name

Greg DiMiceli

18. Contact Phone Number

(608) 266-0955

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
-