## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis	2. Date	
Original Updated Corrected	May 29, 2019	
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) NR 11 & 15, WM-24-18		
4. Subject		
Closed areas and refuges		
5. Fund Sources Affected	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected None	
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule		
☑ No Fiscal Effect	□ Increase Costs □ Decrease Costs	
□ Indeterminate □ Decrease Existing Revenues	Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)		
□ State's Economy □ Specific Businesses/Sectors		
Local Government Units Public Utility Rate Payers		
Sma	Ill 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 (No implementation and compliance cost anticipated)		
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)?		
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule Current rules establish properties as closed areas and wildlife refuges. These designations restrict the public's ability to		
access these properties for activities during specific dates. Many of the current closed area and refuge definitions are		
decades old. During that time wildlife use of the property has changed. This proposal will update the closed area and		
refuges designations of all currently designated properties so that the designations reflect the current property use.		
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.		
A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website in June 2019 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.		
A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website during a 14 day period		
in June 2019 and various interest groups, including local governments, may be contacted. This rule is not aniticpated to		
impact local governments.		
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.		
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule		
These rules will offer additional hunting and trapping opportunities, particularly waterfowl hunting, by opening		
department lands that were previouly closed to hunting and trapping during the migratory hunting seasons.		
16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule		

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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

States possess inherent authority to manage the wildlife resources located within their boundaries, except insofar as preempted by federal treaties and laws, including 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 furbearer species that are established based on needs that are unique to that state's resources and public desires.

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
.Scott Karel	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