

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

### Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<b>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected	<b>2. Date</b> 8/26/25
<b>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)</b> ATCP 10 (Animal Disease and Movement) and ATCP 12 (Animal Markets, Dealers and Truckers)	
<b>4. Subject</b> Swine PRRS and PEDv, and affecting small business	
<b>5. Fund Sources Affected</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	<b>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected</b> 20.115 (2) (a)
<b>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
<b>8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses <b>(if checked, complete Attachment A)</b>	
<b>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1).</b> \$0 (reduced cost to businesses and individuals)	
<b>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)?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule</b> The proposed rule would repeal current testing requirements and movement restrictions related to porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS) and porcine epidemic diarrhea virus (PEDv).  The rule with these testing requirements and movement restrictions went into effect in 2018, and was created with input and support from swine producers and industry groups. The main goal of the rule was to control the spread and reduce the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin. At the time, it was anticipated that other states would develop similar regulations; however, other states have not developed similar regulations. In 2024, the department received a letter from Wisconsin's largest swine industry group requesting that the department initiate rulemaking to repeal PRRS and PEDv swine movement rules.	
<b>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.</b> In 2024, the department received a letter from Wisconsin's largest swine industry group requesting that the department initiate rulemaking to repeal PRRS and PEDv swine movement rules.	
<b>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.</b> Not applicable.	
<b>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)</b> The affected entities would include many small businesses, pursuant to the definition under Wis. Stat. § 227.114 (1). The overall economic impact is anticipated to be minimal or reduced.  Swine producers would be affected by this rule. Direct costs to swine producers would decrease because of the repeal of PRRS and PEDv testing requirements. The rule would also reduce administrative burdens. Also affected by this rule would be animal markets, animal dealers, animal truckers, Wisconsin fairs, swine show organizers, swine exhibitors,	

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

### Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

veterinarians, veterinary diagnostic laboratories, and slaughter plants. In general, the rule change would result in less recordkeeping, paperwork, and organizational efforts by these entities.

It is unknown whether the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin has decreased due to the rule, so it is unknown whether repealing the rule would impact the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin. PRRS is the most expensive disease currently affecting US swine. According to an analysis by Iowa State University, PRRS caused an estimated \$1.2 billion per year in lost production in the US pork industry from 2016 to 2020, an 80% increase from a decade earlier.

The existing rule went into effect in 2018, and was created with input and support from swine producers and industry groups. The main goal of the rule was to control the spread and reduce the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin. At the time, it was anticipated that other states would develop similar regulations; however, other states have not developed similar regulations. In 2024, the department received a letter from Wisconsin's largest swine industry group requesting that the department initiate rulemaking to repeal PRRS and PEDv swine movement rules.

---

#### 15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

The affected entities would include many small businesses, pursuant to the definition under Wis. Stat. § 227.114 (1). The overall economic impact is anticipated to be minimal or reduced. Direct costs to swine producers would decrease because of the repeal of PRRS and PEDv testing requirements. The rule would also reduce administrative burdens. It is unknown whether the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin has decreased due to the rule, so it is unknown whether repealing the rule would impact the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin.

Without the proposed rule, the current PRRS and PEDv testing requirements and movement restrictions would remain in place.

---

#### 16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Direct costs to swine producers would decrease because of the repeal of PRRS and PEDv testing requirements. The rule would also reduce administrative burdens. It is unknown whether the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin has decreased due to the rule, so it is unknown whether repealing the rule would impact the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin.

---

#### 17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

The department administers animal disease control programs in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA APHIS). This rule does not duplicate or conflict with any federal regulations.

---

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

##### Illinois

Illinois does not have any similar regulations regarding testing requirements or movement restrictions for PRRS and PEDv.

##### Iowa

Iowa does not have any similar regulations regarding testing requirements or movement restrictions for PRRS and PEDv.

##### Michigan

Michigan does not have any similar regulations regarding testing requirements or movement restrictions for PRRS and PEDv.

##### Minnesota

Minnesota does not have any similar regulations regarding testing requirements or movement restrictions for PRRS and PEDv.

---

#### 19. Contact Name

Angela Fisher

---

#### 20. Contact Phone Number

608-224-5051

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**  
**Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis**

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)

The affected entities would include many small businesses, pursuant to the definition under Wis. Stat. § 227.114 (1). The overall economic impact is anticipated to be minimal or reduced. Direct costs to swine producers would decrease, because of the repeal of PRRS and PEDv testing requirements. The rule would also reduce administrative burdens. It is unknown whether the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin has decreased due to the rule, so it is unknown whether repealing the rule would impact the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin.

- 
2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

The affected entities would include many small businesses, pursuant to the definition under Wis. Stat. § 227.114 (1). The overall economic impact is anticipated to be minimal or reduced.

Swine producers would be affected by this rule. Direct costs to swine producers would decrease, because of the repeal of PRRS and PEDv testing requirements. The rule would also reduce administrative burdens. Also affected by this rule would be animal markets, animal dealers, animal truckers, Wisconsin fairs, swine show organizers, swine exhibitors, veterinarians, veterinary diagnostic laboratories, and slaughter plants. In general, the rule change would result in less recordkeeping, paperwork, and organizational efforts by these entities.

It is unknown whether the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin has decreased due to the rule, so it is unknown whether repealing the rule would impact the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin. PRRS is the most expensive disease currently affecting US swine. According to an analysis by Iowa State University, PRRS caused an estimated \$1.2 billion per year in lost production in the US pork industry from 2016 to 2020, an 80% increase from a decade earlier.

The existing rule went into effect in 2018, and was created with input and support from swine producers and industry groups. The main goal of the rule was to control the spread and reduce the prevalence of PRRS and PEDv in Wisconsin. At the time, it was anticipated that other states would develop similar regulations; however, other states have not developed similar regulations. In 2024, the department received a letter from Wisconsin's largest swine industry group requesting that the department initiate rulemaking to repeal PRRS and PEDv swine movement rules.

- 
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:

Repealing testing and reporting requirements

- 
4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

No accommodation for small business would be needed for this proposed rule. The proposed rule would repeal current testing requirements and movement restrictions, which would reduce direct costs and administrative burdens.

- 
5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

Not applicable. The proposed rule would repeal current testing requirements and movement restrictions.

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**  
**Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis**