STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION DOA-2049 (R03/2012) DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE 101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR P.O. BOX 7864 MADISON, WI 53707-7864 FAX: (608) 267-0372

Type of Estimate and Analysis Original □ Updated □ Corrected	
2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number NR 50 – Law Enforcement Aids to Counties and Municipaliti	es
3. Subject The Bureau of Law Enforcement recommends promulgating 50.12, NR 50.13 and NR 64.15 relating to law enforcement a	¥ .
4. Fund Sources Affected ☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S	5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule ☑ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues ☐ Indeterminate ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues	☐ Increase Costs ☐ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☐ Decrease Cost
	cific Businesses/Sectors ic Utility Rate Payers Il Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)
8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$ ☐ Yes ☐ No	
9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The proposed revisions are intended to provide consister recreational vehicle patrol units. Inconsistencies include limits to the percentage of reimburseable administrative officers spend teaching safety education classes, and definite increase the allowable fringe rate percentage and change capital equipment from \$1,000 to \$2,500 to reflect current.	the definition of allowable hours for patrol units, hours, eligibility to include time law enforcement preciation methods. The proposed revisions would also the dollar amount of capital equipment and repairs to
The proposed revisions would increase the number of particles from 20 to 40 hours, snowm from 40 to 80 hours providing an increased law enforcer positive effect on health and safety	obile from 20 to 40 hours and waters safety patrol
The proposed revisions will provide consistency and standard administration of the law enforcement aids program.	dization for the state, counties, and municipalities in the
10. Summaryof the businesses, business sectors, associations re may be affected by the proposed rule that were contacted for content of Revisions will affect county sheriff, city, village, township and water safety patrol activities.	omments.
11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the deverse list at end of this document.	elopment of this EIA.

DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE 101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR P.O. BOX 7864 MADISON, WI 53707-7864 FAX: (608) 267-0372

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

12. 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)

Proposed changes will have an overall positive economic impact on the county sheriff's departments and local municipalities identified in the list at the end of this document.

A review of the reimbursement payments for the past three years indicates that increasing the minimum patrol hour requirement could affect 5 ATV patrol units, 12 water safety patrol units and 5 snowmobile patrol units that would have to increase their patrol efforts in order to meet the minimum standards. However, the revision will provide for an increased law enforcement presence thereby providing a positive impact for health and safety.

The revisions propose capping the reimbursable administrative time to 30%, which is close to the amount used for federal grants and other aids program within the State of Wisconsin. While reducing the maximum administrative time allowed will impact patrol unit reimbursement claims, the intent of the law enforcement aids program is to provide reimbursement for law enforcement activities.

An analysis of the 174 patrol claims received for the 2013 boating season and the 2013-2014 ATV and Snowmobile seasons indicates that 78% of the patrols would receive an increase in their reimbursement payment, 10% would see a decrease in their reimbursement payment, and 12% of the patrols would need to increase their patrol numbers in order to meet the minimum standards proposed in this rule.

A final analysis will be completed after public comments are received.

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

The proposed revisions will provide consistency of eligibility and reimbursement standards for recreational vehicle patrol units. The revision will also provide for an increased law enforcement presence thereby providing a positive impact for health and safety.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule
None

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government Not applicable

16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota) N/A

17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number
Roy Zellmer	608-212-5385

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

ATV	BOAT	SNOWMOBILE	MUNICIPALITY
1	1	1	ADAMS COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	ASHLAND COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		BALSAM LAKE, VILLAGE OF
1	1	1	BARRON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	BAYFIELD COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		BIG CEDAR LAKE P&R DISTRICT
1	1	1	BROWN COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT

ATV	BOAT	SNOWMOBILE	MUNICIPALITY
	1		BURLINGTON, TOWN OF
1	1	1	BURNETT COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1	1	CALUMET COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		CHENEQUA, VILLAGE OF
1	1	1	CHIPPEWA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		CHURCH PINE, ROUND & BIG LAKE
1	1	1	CLARK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		COLOMA, TOWN OF
1	1	1	COLUMBIA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	DANE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		DEERFIELD, TOWN OF
	1		DELAFIELD, CITY OF
	1		DELAVAN, TOWN OF
1	1	1	DODGE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
-	1	1	DOOR COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	DOUGLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		DOVER, TOWN OF
		1	DUNN COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1	-	EAGLE, TOWN OF
	1		EAST TROY, TOWN OF
1	1	1	EAU CLAIRE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		ELKHART LAKE, VILLAGE OF
	1		FARMINGTON, TOWN OF
1	1	1	FLORENCE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1	1	FOND DU LAC COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		FONTANA, VILLAGE OF
1	1	1	FOREST COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		FOX LAKE, TOWN OF
	1		GENEVA LAKE LAW ENFORCEMENT
	1		GENEVA, TOWN OF
1		1	GREEN COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		GREEN BAY, CITY OF
1	1	1	GREEN LAKE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		HANCOCK, VILLAGE OF
	1		HARTFORD, TOWN OF
1	1	1	IRON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	JACKSON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	JEFFERSON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	JUNEAU COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	KENOSHA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
		1	KEWAUNEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		LA GRANGE, TOWN OF
	1		LAC LA BELLE, VILLAGE OF
	1		LACROSSE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT

ATV	BOAT	SNOWMOBILE	MUNICIPALITY
1			LAFAYETTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		LAKE DELTON, VILLAGE OF
	1		LAKE GENEVA, CITY OF
	1		LAKE MILLS, TOWN OF
1		1	LANGLADE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		LAUDERDALE LAKE MGMT
	1		LAVALLE, TOWN OF
	1		LEGEND LAKE PRD
1	1	1	LINCOLN COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		LINCOLN, TOWN OF (LAKE WAPAGASSET/BEAR TRAP)
	1		LINN, TOWN OF
	1		LITTLE CEDAR LAKE P&R DISTRICT
	1		MANITOWISH WATERS, TOWN OF
1	1	1	MANITOWOC COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	MARAHON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	MARINETTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		MARION, TOWN OF
	1	1	MARQUETTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	MENOMINEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		MEQUON, CITY OF
	1		MERTON, TOWN OF
1	1	1	MILWAUKEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		MILWAUKEE, CITY OF
	1		MINOCQUA/WOODRUFF BOAT PATROL
	1		MUKWONAGO, TOWN OF
	1		MUSKEGO, CITY OF
	1		NORWAY, TOWN OF
	1		OAKLAND, TOWN OF
	1		OCONOMOWOC LAKE, VILLAGE OF
	1		OCONOMOWOC, CITY OF
	1		OCONOMOWOC, TOWN OF
1	1	1	OCONTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	ONEIDA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		OSCEOLA, TOWN OF
	1	1	OUTAGAMIE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
		1	OZAUKEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		PADDOCK LAKE, VILLAGE OF
	1		PARK LAKE MGMT DISTRICT
	1		PEWAUKEE, CITY OF
1	1	1	PIERCE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	POLK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		PORT WASHINGTON, CITY OF
1	1	1	PORTAGE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	PRICE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT

ATV	BOAT	SNOWMOBILE	MUNICIPALITY
1	1	1	RACINE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		RANDALL, TOWN OF
	1		RICHFIELD, TOWN OF
		1	RICHLAND COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1	1	ROCK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		ROCK RIVER SAFETY PATROL
	1		ROME, TOWN OF
1	1	1	RUSK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1	1	ST CROIX COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		SALEM, TOWN OF
1	1	1	SAUK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	SAWYER COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	SHAWANO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	SHEBOYGAN COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		SILVER LAKE P&R DISTRICT
	1		SILVER LAKE, VILLAGE OF
	1		SPRINGWATER, TOWN OF
	1		STEPHENSON, TOWN OF
	1		STURGEON BAY, CITY OF
	1		SUMMIT, TOWN OF
		1	TAYLOR COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		THREE LAKES, TOWN OF
	1		TROY TOWN OF
	1		TWIN LAKES, VILLAGE OF
	1	1	VILAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1	1	1	WALWORTH COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
1		1	WASHBURN COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
		1	WASHINGTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		WATERFORD, TOWN OF
1	1	1	WAUKESHA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1	1	WAUPACA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1	1	WAUSHARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1		WEBB LAKE, TOWN OF
	1		WHEATLAND, TOWN OF
	1		WHITEWATER, TOWN OF
	1		WILLIAMS BAY, VILLAGE OF
1	1	1	WINNEBAGO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
	1	1	WOOD COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT
46	123	62	

STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION DOA-2049 (R03/2012) DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE 101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR P.O. BOX 7864 MADISON, WI 53707-7864 FAX: (608) 267-0372

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

 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