Fiscal Estimate - 2005 Session

X	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supple	emental	
LRB	Number	05-3565/3		Intro	duction Nu	mber A	B-923	}	
Description Warning methods for ice holes in lakes and granting rule-making authority									
Fiscal	Effect								
Local:	No Local Gov Indeterminate 1.	Existing tions Existing tions ew Appropriation vernment Costs e Costs ive Mandato	3. Increase ry Permissiv 4. Decrease	s Existings s Revenue	5.Type Gov	rease Costs absorb withir Yes crease Costs es of Local rernment Un Towns Counties School	n agency s	r's budget No No Cities	
			., <u> </u>	П	•	Districts	District		
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS									
Agenc	y/Prepared E	<u></u>	Aut	norized S	Signature			Date	
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794 Joe Polasek				Polasek	Polasek (608) 266-2794 1/31/2006				

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DNR 1/31/2006

LRB Number 05-3565	3 Introduction Number	AB-923	Estimate Type	Original				
Description Warning methods for ice holes in lakes and granting rule-making authority								

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Bill Summary:

Current law states that a person who creates an ice hole in a lake by aeration must place a fence, of fence board or plastic roll fencing, or a barricade of uprights and rope or similar material around the hole. This bill allows lake districts and certain nonprofit corporations that create ice holes in lakes by aerating water to use warning methods other than the ones in current law if they comply with rules and requirements established by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). These alternative warning methods are only allowed if the ice hole is created for water quality projects, including fish habitat improvements or detrimental aquatic plant reductions, which have been approved by DNR. The lake district, or organization creating the ice hole, must give public notice to the area most likely to be affected by the placement of the ice hole. Under this bill, the DNR must establish rules for giving such notice, which shall include public notices in newspapers or on television or radio, notices posted at access sites on the lake, and notices mailed to each lake district property owner or to each member of the corporation creating the ice hole. DNR is also required to specify one or more of these methods of notice that must be given for each ice hole created.

The DNR does not have authority under current law or this bill to enforce the current or proposed provisions of s. 167.26, Wis. Stats. This bill will require the DNR to establish a permitting system for alternative marking and notification requirements in lieu of the current requirements. The enforcement of violations of these new rules and permits would continue to be the responsibility of the local law enforcement authorities, as are violations of the current s. 167.26, Wis. Stats., requirements.

Fiscal Estimate:

It is assumed the time need to promulgate the rules associated with this bill will take 40 hours of DNR staff time. Assuming an average of \$25.00 per hour for salary, plus fringe of \$11.00 per hour, this one-time cost will amount to \$1,400.

It is assumed there will also be some one-time costs for establishing a new DNR permitting system. The complexity of this system, to be administered by the Bureau of Fisheries Management, is unknown, making cost estimates difficult.

It is unknown how many lake districts or nonprofit corporations will apply to the DNR for approval for the use of alternative notification of the public about unguarded ice holes created by aeration. There would also likely be annual recurring costs to review, approve or deny, issue and track approvals given and to notify local authorities of the approved alternative notification situations. The Department states in this fiscal note that while ongoing permitting costs are indeterminate they could be absorbed. This assumes that there will not be a very high volume of such permits issued. If that assumption is wrong the Department may not be able to absorb associated costs.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2005 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

	Original		Updated			Corrected		Supp	olemental	
LRB	Number	05-3565/	/3		Intro	duction No	umber	AB-9	23	
Descri Warnir		or ice holes in	lakes and	granting	rule-n	naking author	ity			
annua	lized fiscal e	•								
		1,400 for rule	promulgati	on and						
II. Ann	ualized Cos	ts:			Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from:					
1 01						ncreased Co	sts	Decre	eased Costs	
	te Costs by									
		- Salaries and	d Fringes				\$			
	Position Ch				***************************************			****		
		- Other Costs	<u> </u>							
	al Assistance									
	······································	s or Organiza								
		Costs by Cat					\$		\$	
		Source of Fu	nds							
GPR	·									
FED										
	/PRS									
SEG	/SEG-S									
III. Stat	te Revenues ies (e.g., tax	s - Complete t increase, de	this only w crease in l	hen pro icense	posal fee, et	will increases.)	e or dec	rease sta	te	
						Increased R	ev	Dec	reased Rev	
	Taxes						\$		\$	
GPR	Earned									
FED										
PRO	/PRS									
	/SEG-S									
TOTAL State Revenues						·	\$		\$	
		N	IET ANNUA	ALIZED	FISCA	L IMPACT				
						<u>S</u> ta	ite		Local	
NET CHANGE IN COSTS							\$	\$		
NET C	HANGE IN R	EVENUE					\$		\$	
Agency	y/Prepared E			Author	rized S	Signature			Date	
									1/31/2006	