

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<p>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected</p>	<p>2. Date 11/1/2018</p>
<p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Ch. NR 11, WM-10-18</p>	
<p>4. Subject Marten Protection Closed Areas</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected None.</p>
<p>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</p>	
<p>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)</p>	
<p>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0</p>	
<p>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</p>	
<p>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule American marten, a state endangered species, have recently been confirmed on 7 Apostle Islands (Stockton, Cat, Manitou, Rocky, Otter, Bear and Outer). This proposal would establish a third Marten Protection Area on those islands that are within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. Additionally, this rule allows flexibility to add or remove trap types allowed in MPA's. Research has shown that certain traps that are not currently allowed in the marten protection area can be successfully used for trapping other species within marten range without risk of incidental capture of marten.</p>	
<p>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 move convenient for hunters pursuing these species because they will have additional options for proof of harvest authorization.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>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 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.</p>	
<p>15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule</p>	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

These changes would provide trappers additional opportunities while not jeopardizing the welfare of the marten.

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 trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in trapping while simultaneously protecting a state endangered species.

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. In general, hunting and trapping within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore follows state regulations. However, in some instances, there are specific restrictions set in place by the federal government. 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)

The Upper Peninsula of Michigan and Minnesota both have a regulated marten trapping season. Marten are not currently found in Illinois or Iowa.

19. Contact Name

Scott Karel

20. 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
-