

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

Sections of NR 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, and 26 relating to the regulation of fishing

3. Subject

Housekeeping changes to ensure the rule language that governs fishing in inland, outlying, and boundary waters is accurate and properly reflects the desired management of Wisconsin waters. The rule is in response to recent legislative changes and to the interests of the public and both Law Enforcement and Fisheries Management staff.

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule

No Fiscal Effect Increase Existing Revenues Increase Costs
 Indeterminate Decrease Existing Revenues Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
 Decrease Cost

7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)

State's Economy Specific Businesses/Sectors
 Local Government Units Public Utility Rate Payers
 Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)

8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?

Yes No

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

The objectives are to:

- add language to respond to newly created statutory language,
 - remove sections of code that are outdated or have been replaced by other statute or code changes,
 - correct errors that occurred during the drafting of rules, and
 - add or repeal language to clarify intent of original rules.
-

10. Summary of the businesses, business sectors, associations representing business, local governmental units, and individuals that may be affected by the proposed rule that were contacted for comments.

The proposed rule will have minimal impact on businesses and members of the public. As with any change in regulations, there will be a requirement for anglers to learn the new rules. However, a majority of this rule change clarifies code to reflect existing policies with which anglers must already comply. The Fisheries Management Bureau works to notify the public of new regulations via press releases, the internet, and fishing regulations pamphlets. The following organizations were contacted by the Department for economic impact comments: Wisconsin Conservation Congress, WI Wildlife Federation, Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission, WI Association of Lakes, WI Bow Hunters Association, WI Archery Alliance, WI Traditional Archers, WI Federation of Great Lakes Sport Fishing Clubs, WI Council of Sport Fishing Organizations, Federation of Fly Fishers - Wisconsin Council, Musky Clubs Alliance of Wisconsin, Inc., Salmon Unlimited, Trout Unlimited - WI Council, Walleyes for Tomorrow, WI Bass Federation, Izaak Walton League-Wisconsin Division, Lake Michigan Fisheries Forum, Wisconsin Aquaculture Association, American Fisheries Society-Wisconsin Chapter, Natural Resources Foundation of WI, Gathering Waters, River Alliance of Wisconsin, UW Sea Grant, League of WI Municipalities, WI Towns Association, WI Counties Association, Northeast WI Great Lakes Sport Fishermen, and Great Lakes Sport Fishermen of Milwaukee.

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.

The open comment period was conducted during November 2012. No local governments commented or requested to participate in the development of the EIA.

12. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

Governmental Units and the State's Economy as a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)

The Department only received one comment during the EIA comment period and it was not related to an economic impact. The Milwaukee Great Lakes Sport Fishing Club stated it was in favor of amending rules to make it easier to donate fish to local charities in Milwaukee.

It is not expected that there will be any economic impact directly related to these rule changes on anglers or fishing-related businesses. The proposed rule does not impose any compliance or reporting requirements on small businesses nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.

13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

The proposed rule will include non-substantive changes to administrative code that support existing policies and goals. Fishing regulations in this rule, such as length and bag limits or season dates, are used as a tool to ensure good fishing exists into the future. The goal of fish management, as stated in s. NR 1.01(2), is "to provide opportunities for the optimum use and enjoyment of Wisconsin's aquatic resources, both sport and commercial. A healthy and diverse environment is essential to meet this goal and shall be promoted through management programs."

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The goal is to ensure the rule language that governs fishing in inland, outlying, and boundary waters is accurate and properly reflects the desired management of Wisconsin waters.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Authority to promulgate fishing regulations is granted to states. None of the proposed changes violate or conflict with federal regulations.

16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

Fisheries management rules are generally similar in the states surrounding Wisconsin. Each bordering state regulates fishing by the use of seasons, bag limits and size limits. Specific seasons and bag and size limits may differ for species among the surrounding states, but the general principles are similar. Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois all have statewide seasons and bag and size limits for fish species, along with special or experimental regulations on individual waters. The Department meets with the Michigan and Minnesota departments of natural resources each year to discuss management and regulation changes.

<h3>17. Contact Name</h3> <p>Kate Strom Hiorns</p>	<h3>18. Contact Phone Number</h3> <p>608-266-0828</p>
--	---

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

1. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separately for each Small Business Sector, Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)

N/A

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

3. Did the agency consider the following methods to reduce the impact of the Rule on Small Businesses?

- Less Stringent Compliance or Reporting Requirements
- Less Stringent Schedules or Deadlines for Compliance or Reporting
- Consolidation or Simplification of Reporting Requirements
- Establishment of performance standards in lieu of Design or Operational Standards
- Exemption of Small Businesses from some or all requirements
- Other, describe:

4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)

- Yes No
-