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

 Type of Estimate and Analysis ✓ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected 	2. Date 9/30/22	
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) ATCP 10		
4. Subject Dog import rabies vaccination		
5. Fund Sources Affected GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected Not applicable.	
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule ☑ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues ☐ Indeterminate ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues	☐ Increase Costs ☐ Decrease Costs ☐ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
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. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, pers. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0		
10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, pers. 227.137(3)(b)(2)? ☐ Yes ☒ No		
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The current language of s. ATCP 10.80 (2) (a) conflicts with s. 95.21 (2) (a), Stats., with regards to rabies vaccination of dogs. The current rule requires a rabies vaccination prior to import of dogs five (5) months of age or older, whereas the statute allows for rabies vaccination within 30 days after import. The department reported the rule on the 2021 biennial review of rules, as required under s. 227.29, Stats. The department is currently not enforcing the unauthorized portion of the rule. The proposed rule amends s. ATCP 10.80 (2) to align with s. 95.21, Stats. 12. 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. Not applicable.		
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. Not applicable.		
14. 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)		
The department expects the proposed rule to have minimal to no economic impact. The proposed rule would amend s. ATCP 10.80 (2) to align with s. 95.21 (2) (a) by removing the unauthorized and unenforced portion of the rule. The proposed rule does not create any new requirements.		
Entities impacted by this rule include veterinarians, dog owners, dog sellers, dog facility operators, and people who import dogs into the State. Most affected entities are small businesses, pursuant to the definition under s. 227.485 (2) (c), Stats.		
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule		

The befefit of implementing the proposed rule is to align s. ATCP 10.80 (2) with s. 95.21, Stats. If the proposed rule is not implemented, the text of s. ATCP 10.80 (2) would continue to include unauthorized and unenforced provisions. The

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

department would continue to report the unauthorized and unenforced rule during the biennial review of rules, as required under s. 227.29, Stats.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The proposed rule would align s. ATCP 10.80 (2) with s. 95.21, Stats.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

The proposed rule is specific to Wisconsin statutes. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) requires that all dogs entering the U.S. that are 12 weeks and older be currently vaccinated against rabies.

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

The proposed rule is specific to Wisconsin statutes. Rabies vaccination requirements for dog imports into adjacent states are compared below. All adjacent states require rabies vaccination prior to import for dogs over a certain age (16 weeks, 4 months, 12 weeks, 3 months), and some include exceptions for particular circumstances.

Illinois

All dogs 16 weeks of age and older are required to be vaccinated against rabies. The date of vaccination and manufacturer information must be included on the Certificate of Veterinary Inspection (CVI). These regulations do not apply to dogs consigned to hospitals, pharmaceutical companies, or licensed research institutions for research or testing. Ill. Admin. Code tit. 8, s. 25.47.

Iowa

All dogs and cats entering the state must be accompanied by a CVI indicating freedom from disease or exposure to infectious or contagious disease. Dog and cats originating from a rabies-quarantined area will not be admitted. All dogs over four (4) months of age must have a current rabies vaccination with a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) approved rabies vaccine. Iowa Admin. Code. s. 21.65.10.

Michigan

Dogs must have an official interstate certificate of veterinary inspection filled out by a USDA accredited veterinarian in the animal's state of origin. Dogs 12 weeks of age or older must be currently vaccinated against rabies. Dogs less than 12 weeks of age that are from a rabies quarantined area are not allowed entry. The disease vaccinated against (i.e., rabies), date of vaccination, and (if possible) date of expiration must be listed on the CVI. MCL s. 287.335a

Minnesota

Every dog, cat, or ferret three (3) months of age or older travelling into Minnesota must be currently vaccinated for rabies and have a valid rabies vaccination certificate. The rabies vaccine may only be administered by a licensed veterinarian. The Minnesota Board of Animal Health may exempt animals from this requirement based on the written recommendation of a licensed veterinarian who has examined the animal and determined that vaccination is contraindicated due to a medical condition or for animals entering a licensed kennel that meets certain conditions. Minnesota Rules, part 1721.0500.

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Angela Fisher	608-224-4872

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

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

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 department expects the proposed rule to have minimal to no economic impact. The proposed rule would amend s. ATCP 10.80 (2) to align with s. 95.21 (2) (a) by removing the unauthorized and unenforced portion of the rule. The proposed rule does not create any new requirements. Entities impacted by this rule include veterinarians, dog owners, dog sellers, dog facility operators, and people who import dogs into the State. Most affected entities are small businesses, pursuant to the definition under s. 227.485 (2) (c), Stats. 2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses The proposed rule would amend s. ATCP 10.80(2) to align with s. 95.21(2)(a), Stats., by removing the unauthorized and unenforced portion of the rule. The proposed rule does not create any new requirements. 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 The proposed rule would amend s. ATCP 10.80(2) to align with s. 95.21(2)(a), Stats., by removing the unauthorized and unenforced portion of the rule. The proposed rule does not create any new requirements. 5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions The proposed rule does not make changes to enforcement.

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

☐ Yes

☑ No