## Zero-Based Regulation Prospective Analysis

Fill out entire form to the best of your ability, unless submitting a Notice to Negotiate only fill out 1, 2, and 5

**Agency Name:** Idaho Department of Lands

Rule Docket Number: 20-0401-2301

1. What is the specific legal authority for this proposed rule?

| Statute Section (include direct link) | Is the authority mandatory or discretionary? |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Idaho Forestry Act                    | Mandatory                                    |
| Idaho Code Title 38, Chapter 1        |  |
|                                       |  |

2. Define the specific problem that the proposed rule is attempting to solve? Can the problem be addressed by non-regulatory measures?

The Zero-Based Regulations framework offers the opportunity to eliminate redundancy, remove outdated requirements and improve readability of IDAPA 20.04.01. As part of this process, some updated improvements to the rules may be recommended.

- 3. How have other jurisdictions approached the problem this proposed rule intends to address?
  - a. Is this proposed rule related to any existing federal law?

| Federal citation | Summary of Law (include direct link) | How is the proposed Idaho rule more stringent? (if applicable) |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
|                  |                                      |  |

| b. How does this proposed rule compare to other state law | b. | How does | this prop | osed rule | compare to | other state | laws |
|---|----|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|------|
|---|----|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|------|

| State      | Summary of Law (include direct link) | How is the proposed Idaho rule more stringent? (if applicable) |
|------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Washington |                                      |  |
| Oregon     |                                      |  |
| Nevada     |                                      |  |
| Utah       |                                      |  |
| Wyoming    |                                      |  |
| Montana    |                                      |  |
| Alaska     |                                      |  |
| South      |                                      |  |
| Dakota     |                                      |  |

- c. If the Idaho proposed rule has a more stringent requirement than the federal government or the reviewed states, describe the evidence base or unique circumstances that justifies the enhanced requirement:
- 4. What evidence is there that the rule, as proposed, will solve the problem?
- 5. What is the anticipated impact of the proposed rule on various stakeholders? Include, how will you involve them in the negotiated rulemaking process?

| Category   | Potential Impact   |  |
|--|--|--|
| Fiscal impact to the state General Fund, any dedicated fund, or federal fund | No impact. These rules are already in place and their administration is funded with current allocations of state General Fund and Fire Dedicated funds.                                      |  |
| Impact to Idaho businesses, with special consideration for small businesses  | The proposed changes will make it easier for contractors/operators to understand and comply with existing regulations and promote forest health and resiliency.                              |  |
| Impact to any local government in Idaho                                      | No impact anticipated. IDL will schedule a minimum of two public meetings for the negotiated rulemaking as well as meet with stakeholder groups that express interest in rule modifications. |  |

6. What cumulative regulatory volume does this proposed rule add?

| Category                             | Impact |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Net change in word count             |        |
| Net change in restrictive word count |        |