



WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL RULES CLEARINGHOUSE

Scott Grosz and Jessica Karls-Ruplinger
Clearinghouse Co-Directors

Terry C. Anderson
Legislative Council Director

Laura D. Rose
Legislative Council Deputy Director

CLEARINGHOUSE RULE 14-029

Comments

[NOTE: All citations to “Manual” in the comments below are to the Administrative Rules Procedures Manual, prepared by the Legislative Reference Bureau and the Legislative Council Staff, dated November 2011.]

2. Form, Style and Placement in Administrative Code

a. The introductory clause lists two provisions that are not treated in the rule order: s. NR 20.20 (9) (d) and (60) (f). [It appears that both provisions were repealed under Clearinghouse Rule 13-019.] References to those provisions should be removed from the introductory clause. [s. 1.02 (1), Manual.]

b. In SECTION 2, the treatment may consist solely of inserting the underscored text, “20.15 (4) or”.

c. Where multiple provisions of s. NR 20.20 are repealed and intervening provisions are untreated, those repeals may be included within a single SECTION of the rule. For example, the following sets of SECTIONS could be consolidated: 4 through 6; 8 through 15; 21 through 24; 26 and 27; 29 and 30; 39 through 42; 46 and 47; 51 and 52; and 57 through 59. [s. 1.04 (2) (a) 4., Manual.]

d. In each of the SECTIONS in which the first row of the chart in s. NR 20.20 is wholly removed with respect to a given county and the second row is renumbered accordingly, the change could be more efficiently accomplished by repealing the deleted subdivision and renumbering the second subdivision. For example, the changes in SECTIONS 7, 17, 28, 31, 38, 43, 45, 53, and 56 could be drafted in that manner.

5. Clarity, Grammar, Punctuation and Use of Plain Language

a. The exact meaning of the phrases “3 hooks, baits, or lures” and “only 1 hook, bait, or lure”, which appear in SECTION 61 and elsewhere, could be clarified. “Hook”, “bait”, and “lure” do not appear to be defined terms within the Wisconsin Administrative Code. Absent definitions or a more precise description, it seems that different anglers might interpret those limitations differently.

b. In SECTION 60, does the existing reference to “Lake Michigan tributaries” in s. NR 20.20 (73) (a) 4., as renumbered, present a conflict with the addition of references to Lake Michigan tributaries in s. NR 20.20 (73) (a) 1. and 2., as treated by the proposed rule?