## Fiscal Estimate - 2005 Session

	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supple	mental
LRB	Number	05-1563/2		Intro	duction Numb	er Al	B-279	
<b>Subje</b> Trespa		ent authority for	wardens					
	No State Fisc Indeterminate Increase E Appropria Decrease Appropria	e Existing tions Existing	☑ Increase Revenues ☑ Decrease Revenues	s Existing	☑ Increase absorb \ ☑ ☐ Decreas	within age	May be p ency's bu	
	Indeterminate  1. Increase Permiss  2. Decrease	e Costs sive  Mandator	4. Decrease	e Mand Revenue	Cour □Scho	ected ns [ nties [ ool [	Overnmen Village Others WTCS Districts	Cities
Fund S	Sources Affe PR PED		PRS 🛭 SEG	G 🔲 SE	<b>Affected Ch.</b> EGS 20.370(3)(mu	• •	opriation	s
Agend	y/Prepared l	Ву	Au	thorized S	Signature			Date
DNR/	Joe Polasek (	(608) 266-2794	Joe	Polasek	(608) 266-2794			4/14/2005

# Fiscal Estimate Narratives DNR 4/14/2005

LRB Number	05-1563/2	Introduction Number	AB-279	Estimate Type	Original			
Subject		-						
Trespass enforcement authority for wardens								

### **Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate**

Bill Summary: The bill authorizes a court to calculate an amount to be imposed for a trespass violation that is committed by a citizen engaged in an activity related to hunting or fishing in Wisconsin. Of the calculated amount, 35 percent is the forfeiture for the violation, which is deposited into the common school fund, and 65 percent is a hunting and fishing trespass surcharge imposed for the violation, which is deposited into the Conservation Fund.

Fiscal Estimate: The Department estimates implementation of the bill will result in \$193,200 in additional annual costs, and the equivalent of 1.8 FTE in warden staff time. In addition, the bill would increase revenue by an estimated \$15,100 annually. More detail follows.

The Department contacted county sheriff departments for information on the number of trespass complaints they received in 2004, the number of those complaints related to hunting or fishing (when known), and how many arrests were made. Based on the information received back from 21 counties, there were 324 fish and wildlife-related trespass complaints received in 2004. Of these complaints, 78 (24%) resulted in citations. Since the 21 counties are 29% of the 72 Wisconsin counties, it is estimated that the state will have approximately 1,100 trespass complaints (324 / 29%) and 270 citations (78 / 29%). For comparison purposes, Minnesota DNR wardens issued 250 citations for trespass in 2004, which would equate to approximately 1,288 complaints (assuming the same 24% ratio).

It is assumed Wisconsin wardens would receive about 1,100 trespass complaints annually and issue about 250 citations. It is also assumed that from start to finish, 3 hours would be required to respond, investigate, and process each trespass complaint, and each complaint would require about 30 miles of travel.

- 1,100 complaints X 3 hrs = 3,300 hrs = 1.8 FTE (Salary/fringe/operations/travel/overtime = \$100,000/FTE) = \$180,000
- 1,100 complaints X 30 miles = 33,000 miles X .35/mile = \$11,500 in travel costs

Of all complaints received by the Bureau of Law Enforcement, 20.8% are received via the DNR Hotline. Based on 1,100 anticipated total complaints, it is assumed about 231 will come in as Hotline calls. It is assumed it would take 1/2 hr. per call to collect the information, type up the complaint, contact a warden, relay the information and update final hotline disposition for a total of 115.5 hrs. The Hotline is typically operated by an LTE at about \$15/hr or ~ \$1,700.

The 2005 State Uniform Bond Schedule establishes a base forfeiture for land trespass violations of s. 943.13, Wis. Stats. at \$100. This bill specifies that, of the penalty imposed by the court, 35% shall be the forfeiture imposed and 65% shall be a hunting and fishing trespass surcharge paid into the Conservation Fund. Assuming, from page 1, that 250 citations are issued for hunting and fishing related trespass violations and that there was a 93% conviction rate (based on other hunting & fishing violation conviction rates), there would be approximately 232 convictions with \$65 per conviction going into the Conservation Fund or ~ \$15,100.

#### **Long-Range Fiscal Implications**

## Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2005 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

$\boxtimes$	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supplemental		
LRB	Number	05-1563/	2	Intro	duction Nu	ımber .	AB-279		
<b>Subje</b> Trespa		ent authority fo	or wardens						
I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):									
II Ann	ualized Cos	te:	Appropriated Figure I properties founds for						
II. AIII	iualizeu Cos	is.			Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from Increased Costs Decreased Costs				
A. Sta	te Costs by	Category							
		- Salaries and	Fringes		\$170,0	000			
	E Position Ch				(1.8 F				
Stat	e Operations	- Other Costs			23,2	200			
Loca	al Assistance								
Aids	to Individual	s or Organizat	tions						
Т	OTAL State	Costs by Cate	egory		\$193,2	200	\$		
B. Sta	te Costs by	Source of Fu	nds						
GPF	₹								
FED	)								
PRO	)/PRS								
SEG/SEG-S				193,2	200	37.73			
III. Sta (e.g., t	te Revenues ax increase,	s - Complete t , decrease in	this only whe license fee, e	en proposal ets.)	will increase	or decreas	e state revenues		
					Increased F	Rev	Decreased Rev		
GPF	R Taxes					\$	\$		
	R Earned								
FED									
	D/PRS								
	S/SEG-S				15,1				
TOTAL State Revenues					\$15,1	100	\$		
NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT									
NET 0111105 N. 00070					ate				
NET CHANGE IN COSTS NET CHANGE IN REVENUE				\$193,2					
NEIC	HANGE IN F	KEVENUE			\$15,1	00	\$		
							T- :		
Agency/Prepared By				Authorized	Signature		Date		
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794 Joe				Joe Polasek	e Polasek (608) 266-2794 4/14/20				