

Rule Summary and Fiscal Analysis (Part A)**Agriculture**

Agency Name

Animal Industry

Division

Peter Esselburne

Contact

8995 E. Main St. Reynoldsburg OH 43068 - 3399

Agency Mailing Address (Plus Zip)

614-728-6430

Phone

614-995-4585

Fax

901:1-5-03

Rule Number

NO CHANGE

TYPE of rule filing

Rule Title/Tag Line

Brucellosis herd test.**RULE SUMMARY**

1. Is the rule being filed consistent with the requirements of the RC 119.032 review? **Yes**

2. Are you proposing this rule as a result of recent legislation? **No**

3. Statute prescribing the procedure in accordance with the agency is required to adopt the rule: **119.03**

4. Statute(s) authorizing agency to adopt the rule: **941.03**

5. Statute(s) the rule, as filed, amplifies or implements: **941**

6. State the reason(s) for proposing (i.e., why are you filing,) this rule:

Originally filed to bring the state into compliance with National Control/Eradication Program (USDA, APHIS, VS)

7. If the rule is an AMENDMENT, then summarize the changes and the content of the proposed rule; If the rule type is RESCISSION, NEW or NO CHANGE, then summarize the content of the rule:

Defines and sets standards for a brucellosis herd test

8. If the rule incorporates a text or other material by reference and the agency claims the incorporation by reference is exempt from compliance with sections 121.71 to 121.74 of the Revised Code because the text or other material is **generally available** to persons who reasonably can be expected to be affected by the rule, provide an explanation of how the text or other material is generally available to those persons:

This response left blank because filer specified online that the rule does not incorporate a text or other material by reference.

9. If the rule incorporates a text or other material by reference, and it was **infeasible** for the agency to file the text or other material electronically, provide an explanation of why filing the text or other material electronically was infeasible:

This response left blank because filer specified online that the rule does not incorporate a text or other material by reference.

10. If the rule is being **rescinded** and incorporates a text or other material by reference, and it was **infeasible** for the agency to file the text or other material, provide an explanation of why filing the text or other material was infeasible:

Not Applicable.

11. If **revising** or **refiling** this rule, identify changes made from the previously filed version of this rule; if none, please state so:

Not Applicable.

12. 119.032 Rule Review Date: **7/28/2003** and **07/20/2008**

(If you answered NO to question No. 1, provide the scheduled review date. If you answered YES to No. 1, the review date for this rule is the filing date.)

NOTE: At time of final filing, two dates are required: the current review date plus a date not to exceed 5 years from the effective date for Amended rules or a date not to exceed 5 years from the review date for No Change rules.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

13. Estimate the total amount by which *this proposed rule* would **increase / decrease** either **revenues / expenditures** for the agency during the current biennium (in dollars): Explain the net impact of the proposed changes to the

budget of your agency/department.

This will have no impact on revenues or expenditures.

0

n/a

14. Identify the appropriation (by line item etc.) that authorizes each expenditure necessitated by the proposed rule:

700-401

15. Provide a summary of the estimated cost of compliance with the rule to all directly affected persons. When appropriate, please include the source for your information/estimated costs, e.g. industry, CFR, internal/agency:

n/a

16. Does this rule have a fiscal effect on school districts, counties, townships, or municipal corporations? **No**

17. Does this rule deal with environmental protection or contain a component dealing with environmental protection as defined in R. C. 121.39? **No**