

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
FISCAL ESTIMATE
AND ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS**

Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

Ch. ATCP 30, Pesticide Product Restrictions Appendix A (“Atrazine Prohibition Areas”)

Subject

Updating the Maps in Ch. ATCP 30 Appendix A Using Computerized Mapping Technology

Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

20.115 (7)(r), Stats.

Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule

No Fiscal Effect
 Indeterminate

Increase Existing Revenues
 Decrease Existing Revenues

Increase Costs
 Could Absorb Within Agency’s Budget
 Decrease Costs

The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)

State’s Economy

Local Government Units

Specific Businesses/Sectors

Public Utility Rate Payers

Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?

Yes No

Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

Chapter ATCP 30 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code describes prohibitions on pesticide use. Appendix A to ch. ATCP 30 consists of maps that show Atrazine Prohibition Areas where atrazine currently may not be applied as a pesticide, primarily due to the fact that groundwater samples tested in those areas have attained or exceeded a regulatory standard under ch. NR 140, Wis. Adm. Code.

DATCP is not adding to or changing any of the current Atrazine Prohibition Areas on any of the maps in Appendix A. This rule merely replaces existing (in many cases outdated) maps with updated maps that have been created in the past year using computerized mapping technology. Because the maps in this proposed rule are current and more accurate (containing changes such as roadways that have been added since the existing maps were made, modified street names, and adjustments to other surface features shown on maps), the possibility of inadvertently using atrazine within an Atrazine Prohibition Area is less likely to occur.

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)

There will be no economic or fiscal impact.

Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

An alternative to the rule is to do nothing. Implementing the rule will decrease the possibility of atrazine users inadvertently using atrazine within an Atrazine Prohibition Area.

Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

None.

Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Atrazine product labels approved by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (and implementing regulations) identify the legal application rate of product use (“label rate”), depending

on factors such as crop type, timing of crop emergence, and erodibility of soils. EPA does not require the establishment of prohibition areas for atrazine in its regulations.

Wisconsin's maximum atrazine application rates are set by administrative rule at about half the rates normally allowed under the federal label. Wisconsin restricts atrazine use based on the actual testing and finding of groundwater contamination in an area and then maps the areas where atrazine is prohibited. Maps are shown in Appendix A of ch. ATCP 30 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

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

None of the surrounding states generates maps relating to atrazine prohibitions in its administrative rules. Relating to atrazine prohibitions: Iowa restricts atrazine application rates to half the federal label rate in 23 counties; Illinois and Michigan do not have state regulations concerning atrazine; and Minnesota has a voluntary use limitation program when surface water or groundwater contamination exceeds a level of concern.