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

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

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number
NR 47.91

3. Subject
deactivation of the federal cost sharing program for suppression of gypsy moth

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 ☐ 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
Need for gypsy moth suppression has decreased while the need of state resources for management of other invasive species has increased. The cost to adminster the program by the state significantly exceeds the value of the grant received. The small, spacially dispersed need for suppression of gypsy moth will be better served by the private sector. Deactivation of the state suppression program would allow private business to take over this service and the state could redirect resources to management of other invasive species.

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.
Counties, cities, towns and villages that have participated in the program, aerial pesticide applicators licenced and certified to treat forest pests in WI.

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.
Local governments that participated or might participate were approached for input and two communities responded.

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)
We expect minimal economic impact. Aerial suppression of gypsy moth has been rarely needed in recent years. Since 2011, the total acreage treated in a year has been less than 435 acres, which can be compared with the acreage treated in PA in 2016 of 135,000+. Suppression treatments are done on pest populations that are so high as to threaten defoliation. This is distinct from the treatments done to Slow the Spread (STS) of gypsy moth westward which is a national program. In WI, suppression treatments are typically small, 20-200 acres, and could be handled by a local contract arranged for by a community, a group of individuals or even a single landowner.

13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule
Resources currently used to support the state suppression program could be redirected to deal with other invasive species.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule
State resources will be applied to other invasive pests, communities will contract with businesses to serve their aerial suppression needs.

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

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Federal funding has decreased for gypsy moth as needs for management of other species has increased.

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

Illinios, Iowa, Minnesota do not have gypsy moth suppression programs. Michigan does not offer or facilitate treatments and has not applied for federal cost sharing for suppression programs done by county governments there since 2006.

17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number
Andrea Diss-Torrance	608-264-9247

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

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

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