

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

Ch. NR 10, Game and Hunting; Board Order WM-08-17 and companion emergency rule

3. Subject

Revisions to deer management unit boundaries and three-year white-tailed deer population objectives

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

None

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

Deer unit boundaries and population objectives are reviewed every 3 years according to s. NR 10.104 (3), Wis. Adm. Code and Voigt case stipulations (Chippewa treaty rights). County Deer Advisory Councils are charged to gather public input and develop deer harvest quotas and antlerless tag recommendations under s. NR 10.104(5)(c). CDACs review deer herd metrics to develop recommendations for three-year deer population objectives of either increasing, maintaining or decreasing the herd in each county's DMU(s). These population objectives and DMUs serve as the foundation for managing the deer herd and determining annual antlerless deer harvest quotas, antlerless tag levels and deer season structures. These rules will allow CDACs to provide recommendations to the department pertaining to revising DMU boundaries and three-year population objectives, which will be in effect from 2018 - 2020.

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.

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 50, Section II, this will be a level 3 economic impact analysis. A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website in October 2017 and various interest groups may be contacted by email.

No fiscal effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated. The outcomes of this rule will mainly affect stakeholders in deer management, including conservation organizations, the Chippewa tribes, the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, the Wisconsin Conservation Congress, deer hunters, agricultural producers, private landowners, foresters and timber producers, transportation commissions, tourism and retail industries, and recreational wildlife viewers. However, no fiscal impacts for these groups are anticipated.

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.

Local governments with a stake in this review will participate in the EIA development.

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)

Economic impacts are anticipated to be minimal. The only costs to the department would relate to administering the CDAC meetings and updating Ch. NR 10, which can be absorbed in the department's budget. The outcomes of this rule

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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.

17. Contact Name

Meredith Penthorn

18. Contact Phone Number

608-267-2948

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
-