ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis	2. Date	
☐ Original ☐ Updated ☐Corrected		
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Ch NR 12, WM-09-23		
4. Subject		
Wildlife damage and abatement.		
5. Fund Sources Affected	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected	
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		
	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		
 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)? 		
\Box Yes \boxtimes No		
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule		
Current rules implement statutory requirements for wildlife damage and nuisance conflict management. These rules		
have been in place for decades. Recently the department along with impacted stakeholders undertook a comprehensive		
review of all of the rules related to wildlife damage and nuisance conflict management. The proposed rules are		
consistent with longstanding practices while making updates to provide better clarity for stakeholders and partners.		
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 May 2024 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 10 day period		
in May 2024 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 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 proposals will 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 contribute to		
providing good opportunities for hunting and trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate		

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

in those activities.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government		
These rules are consistent with any federal regulations that guide wildlife damage management. Federal agencies also		
partner with the state in implementing wildlife damage and abatement programs.		
18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)		
The US department of agriculture's Wildlife Services and US fish and wildlife service partner with the state in		
implementing wildlife damage and abatement programs in Minnesota and Illinois and these rules are generally similar		
with nuisance wildlife management in those states. USDA Wildlife Services does not partner with Michigan but their		
rules on wildlife conflict management are similar to that of Wisconsin.		
19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number	
Scott Karel	608-206-0222	

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