

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 December 14, 2017
--	------------------------------

3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)

Ch.'s NR 10 Game and Hunting and NR 45 Use of Department Properties

4. Subject

Wildlife mangement rules relating to hunting and use of department properties.

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)?

Yes No

11. 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These rule changes are proposed to update administrative code language to correct inconsistencies, update outdated language, and provide clarification when appropriate.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 and use of department properties found in Ch's. NR 10 and 45.

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 January 2018 and various interest groups may be contacted. No fiscal effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated.

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 is a level 3 economic impact analysis, this will be 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 January 2018 and various interest groups, including local governments, may be contacted..

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)

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.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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 or outdoor recreation enthusiasts are expected.

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.

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)

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 use of department properties that are established based on needs that are unique to that state's resources and public desires.

19. Contact Name

Scott Karel

20. Contact Phone Number

608-2687-2452

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
-