

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected | 2. Date January 6, 2025 |
| 3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Chapter NR 10 Game and Hunting, WM-12-24 | |
| 4. Subject Relating to revising white-tailed deer management unit boundaries. | |
| 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 |
| 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)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |
| 11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule Deer unit boundaries and population objectives are reviewed every 3 years according to s. NR 10.104 (3), Wis. Adm. Code. County Deer Advisory Councils are charged with gathering public input and developing deer harvest quotas and antlerless tag recommendations under s. NR 10.104(5)(c). CDACs review deer herd metrics to develop recommendations for three-year deer population objectives of either increasing, maintaining or decreasing the herd in each county's DMU(s). These population objectives and DMUs serve as the foundation for managing the deer herd and determining annual antlerless deer harvest quotas, antlerless tag levels and deer season structures. These rules will allow CDACs to provide recommendations to the department pertaining to revising DMU boundaries and three-year population objectives. | |
| 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. No fiscal effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated. The outcomes of this rule will mainly affect stakeholders in deer management, including conservation organizations, the Ojibwe tribes, the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, the Wisconsin Conservation Congress, deer hunters, agricultural producers, private landowners, foresters and timber producers, transportation commissions, tourism and retail industries, and recreational wildlife viewers. However, no fiscal impacts for these groups are anticipated. A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis was posted on the department's website in November 2024. No comments were received during the open comment period. 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. None at this time. Local Government units are not anticipated to be impacted by this rule. | |
| 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) | |

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

These rules, and the legislation which grants the department rule making authority, do not have an economic and 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.

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

This rule will propose revised DMU boundaries, which will allow CDACs to refine deer management recommendations provided to the department in order to best manage the deer resource of each DMU. Not implementing these rules would result in the department failing to properly manage the deer herd and meet the requirements outlined in Ch. NR 10.104(3), Wis. Admin. Code.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Long-range implications include allowing County Deer Advisory Councils and the public to continue to play an active role in deer management and sustainable management of the deer population. These rules will result in quality deer hunting opportunities and several related benefits. Participation by deer hunters will continue to be good or may improve. Deer hunters generate economic activity through significant retail spending and travel related expense. This continued or even improved activity will be beneficial to Wisconsin's overall economy.

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 Code of Federal Regulations.

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

All of Wisconsin's neighboring states have established management units for the purpose of managing deer populations. By using units with identifiable boundaries, deer populations can be monitored and kept at various population levels to more effectively control the deer herd, to address regional differences in habitat and population (human and deer) and to reduce conflict with other land uses such as residential, agricultural or forested. In addition, neighboring states utilize population goals, informed by hunter and public input, to keep deer populations at levels that are biologically and socially acceptable.

| | |
|--|---|
| <h3>19. Contact Name</h3> <p>Scott Karel</p> | <h3>20. Contact Phone Number</h3> <p>608-206-0222</p> |
|--|---|

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.