



## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

### Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

budget. The outcomes of this rule will be comparable to those of the DMU boundary and deer population objective reviews conducted in 2014 and initiated in 2015, which also involved County Deer Advisory Council input. The rule imposes no compliance or reporting requirements for small business, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.

---

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

This rule will propose revised deer population objectives and/or 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, and would also prevent CDACs from participating in the review of DMU boundaries and population objectives in order to manage the deer herd.

---

#### 14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Implementing these rules will not have long-range implications aside from allowing County Deer Advisory Councils and the public to continue to play an active role in deer management.

---

#### 15. 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.

---

#### 16. 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.

---

<h4>17. Contact Name</h4> <p>Meredith Penthorn</p>	<h4>18. Contact Phone Number</h4> <p>608-267-2948</p>
--	---

---

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
-