STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
DOA-2049 (R09/2016)

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

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis
☒ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected

2. Date
1/17/17

3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)
Ch. ATCP 10

4. Subject
Swine Animal Disease Control

5. Fund Sources Affected
☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S

6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule
☐ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues ☐ Increase Costs
☐ Indeterminate ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues ☒ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
☐ Decrease Cost

8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)
☒ State's Economy ☒ Specific Businesses/Sectors
☐ Local Government Units ☐ Public Utility Rate Payers
☐ Small Businesses **(if checked, complete Attachment A)**

9. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than $20 million?
☐ Yes ☒ No

10. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule
None

11. 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.
Wisconsin Show Pig Association and the Wisconsin Pork Association

12. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.
None.

13. 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)
There is no fiscal impact on public utility rate payers and costs to local governmental units will be minimal. See the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for more information on the fiscal effect on specific businesses, business sectors, and the state's economy.

14. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule
Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS) has been designated the most economically significant disease for swine, costing livestock producers in North America $600 million annually from deaths and medical treatments. Similar to PRRS, the Porcine Epidemic Diarrhea Virus (PEDv) has a substantial economic burden given that it is highly infectious, resulting in significant morbidity and mortality in piglets.

This rule will have a generally positive impact on business and will save Wisconsin swine producers from the devastating effects of PRRS and PEDv.

There will be some costs to producers to test their herds for these diseases, but such costs will be minimal compared to the substantial economic burden of these highly infectious diseases to Wisconsin's $136 million swine industry.

Alternatives are to do nothing in rule and hope that Wisconsin swine producers do not unknowingly import or move

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

swine infected with these diseases as disease symptoms are not always present.

15. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule
The goal of the rule is to control the spread of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin.

16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government
Current federal regulations require reporting of swine enteric corona diseases, including PED. When a positive herd is reported, the herd is also required to work with a veterinarian to develop a herd plan to control the disease.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)
Similar to other Midwestern states, Wisconsin has established programs for historically important diseases, such as tuberculosis, brucellosis and chronic wasting disease. Wisconsin would be the first to establish testing requirements for PRRS and PEDv when moving swine in order to prevent and control these diseases. Surrounding states have no PRRS or PEDv testing requirements in place for moving swine.

PRRS and PEDv have proven to be costly, highly contagious diseases among pigs and can result in tremendous production losses for swine producers.

18. Contact Name	19. Contact Phone Number
Darlene Konkle, DVM, Assistant State Veterinarian	608-224-4902

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

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

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)

The majority of the costs associated with this proposed rule will be the testing of swine for PRRS and PED prior to movement. If the producer moves swine on a regular basis, at most, such testing would be done on a quarterly basis (testing must be done within 90 days before movement). The movement of and number of swine in the herd will be the greatest factors in determining cost. Minimum costs to test a small herd for PRRSv and PEDv would be $72.25 and a large herd would be $182.75. See the Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for more information on the fiscal effect on small businesses.

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

Department staff met several times with the Wisconsin Pork Association's PRRS/PEDv Eradication Task Force to develop the contents of this proposed rule. The task force is comprised of veterinarians, pork producers representing a variety of Wisconsin farms, and other industry representatives. Many of the small business fiscal effects were discussed and determined at those meetings. Meetings were also held with the Wisconsin Show Pig Association and Wisconsin Pork Association.

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:

Many of the businesses affected by this rule are "small businesses." For the most part, this rule does not make special exceptions for small business, because disease does not differentiate or respect business size. There will be some costs to producers to test their herds for these diseases, but such costs will be minimal compared to the substantial economic burden of these highly infectious diseases to Wisconsin's $136 million swine industry.

4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

N/A

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

If certain disease testing requirements are not met and/or veterinarian statements are not included when swine are moved:

- A person importing swine to Wisconsin must get an import permit from the Department.
- The Department will quarantine a swine herd. To release the quarantine, the owner will be required to have a veterinarian develop a herd plan. Certain information must be included in the herd plan and the Department will provide sample herd plans to assist veterinarians in herd plan development.

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)

☐ Yes ☒ No