### Administrative Rules

**Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis</th>
<th>2. Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected</td>
<td>March 11, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter NR 10 Game and Hunting, WM-11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Subject</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating to revising white-tailed deer 3-year deer management unit boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Fund Sources Affected</th>
<th>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues ☐ Increase Costs ☐ Decrease Costs ☐ Decrease Costs ☐ Could Absorb Within Agency’s Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ State’s Economy ☐ Local Government Units ☐ Public Utility Rate Payers ☐ Specific Businesses/Sectors ☐ Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ $0 ☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be $10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes ☒ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 2021 - 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will posted on the department’s website during a 14 day period in March 2021.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These rules, and the legislation which grants the department rule making authority, do not have a fiscal effect on the private sector or small businesses. These rules are applicable to individual sportspersons and impose no compliance or reporting requirements for small business, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule
This rule will propose revised 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 in order to manage the deer herd.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. Contact Name
Scott Karel

20. Contact Phone Number
608-206-0222

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


6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)
   - ☐ Yes   ☐ No