

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis
 Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number
NR 809, Safe Drinking Water

3. Subject
The Revised Total Coliform Rule

4. Fund Sources Affected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
---	---

6. 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

7. 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)

8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?
 Yes No

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule
The Total Coliform Rule portion of the federal Safe Drinking Water Act was revised. The DNR must incorporate these revisions into administrative rule ch. NR 809.

10. 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.
The DNR convened a stakeholder workgroup consisting of representatives from Barron County, Sauk County, the Madison Water Utility, the Wisconsin Towns Association, the Wisconsin Housing Alliance, the Tavern League, the School Administrators Alliance, the Municipal Environmental Group, Wisconsin Rural Water Association, and several state agencies.

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.
The DNR convened a stakeholder workgroup consisting of representatives from local units of government including: Barron County, Sauk County, and the Madison Water Utility. The workgroup also had members from organizations that work closely with additional parties effected by this rule, including: the Wisconsin Towns Association, the Wisconsin Housing Alliance, the Tavern League, the School Administrators Alliance, the Municipal Environmental Group, Wisconsin Rural Water Association, and several other state agencies. The stakeholder workgroup did not directly coordinate with the Department on development of this EIA. They did however, provide feedback when presented with the material.

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)
This rule applies to all public drinking water systems in the state. Examples of public drinking water systems include those owned and operated by municipalities, privately owned mobile home parks, businesses that employ at least 25 people, schools, churches, restaurants, and bars. Most of the economic burden of the rule falls to the DNR and its partner agencies responsible for inspecting and monitoring of these water systems.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

For a detailed analysis of the projected economic impact of this rule, please see attached document, "Potential Economic Impact of Implementing the Revised Total Coliform Rule in Chapter NR 809."

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

The Environmental Protection Agency promulgated this rule in the federal Safe Drinking Water Act. By implementing this rule the DNR retains primacy for implementing the Safe Drinking Water Act in Wisconsin. If the state does not implement this rule, that responsibility would be returned to the federal government.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

None

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

This is a federal rule. All states have to comply with the requirements of this rule if they want to maintain primacy for implementing the Safe Drinking Water Act.

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

This is a federal rule. All states have to comply with the requirements of this rule if they want to maintain primacy for implementing the Safe Drinking Water Act.

17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number
Steve Elmore	(608) 264-9246

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
-