

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<b>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected	<b>2. Date</b> 8/29/2019
<b>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)</b> Ch. NR 10, WM-17-19	
<b>4. Subject</b> Ruffed Grouse Management	
<b>5. Fund Sources Affected</b> <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	<b>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected</b>
<b>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
<b>8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers <input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)	
<b>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1).</b> \$680,200	
<b>10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule</b> To monitor the ruffed grouse population, the department utilizes annual drumming surveys and estimates harvest annually through a small game hunter survey. Ruffed grouse drumming activity declined 34% statewide from 2017 to 2018. The decline was greatest in the northern region, with a 38% decline in drumming grouse detected. This area contains the most extensive early-successional forest habitat and healthiest ruffed grouse populations, so focus is generally placed on trends in the northern region. Also, estimated ruffed grouse harvest declined from 262,943 in 2016 to 185,336 in 2017, a 29.5% decline. This represents the lowest estimated harvest in the 34 years the department has been conducting the small game hunter survey.	
<b>12. 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.</b> These rules will impact hunters who pursue ruffed grouse and hunting related businesses for whom ruffed grouse hunters and their associated expenditures generate revenue. However, the closure will occur after the peak period for ruffed grouse hunting activity which is in October and November and no significant impacts are expected. .	
<b>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.</b> None at this time. Local Government units are not anticipated to be impacted by this rule.	
<b>14. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economy as a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)</b> These rules are applicable to individual sportspersons and impose no compliance or reporting requirements for small business, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule. However, there might be an economic impact to small business who depend on ruffed grouse hunters for revenue. This rule may shorten the ruffed grouse season by almost one month, which could result in decreased revenue during that time.	
According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-2011 (USFWS 2011), grouse hunting in Wisconsin accounts for only 7% of the total hunting effort (hunting days) in	

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

Wisconsin. The Wisconsin DNR or the USFWF does not keep specific data on hunting expenditure related to grouse hunting. Additionally, the closure will occur after prime portions of the season that are most desirable to travelling hunters. Based on the limited number of days that hunters dedicate to grouse hunting relative to other types of hunting in Wisconsin, we do not expect that the impact of limiting the grouse hunting season in Wisconsin on hunting expenditure (reduced expenditure) will be significant.

Since 88% of all hunters in Wisconsin hunted deer (USFWS 2011), we assumed that hunting expenditure associated with grouse hunting to be minimal and not totally mutually exclusive from expenditure made towards other forms of hunting. The most likely economic impact will be related to a reduced hunting trip related expenses. The USFWS 2011 estimate hunting trip related expenses in Wisconsin to be about \$358 million dollars (\$358,000,000).

Assuming only 1% of hunting related expenditure in Wisconsin was dedicated towards grouse hunting (  $0.01 * \$358,000,000 = \$3.58$  million dollars ), we expect that the impact of reducing grouse hunting season by about 19% of the days allowed will reduce hunting related expenditure by about \$680,200 (  $0.19 * \$3,580,000$  ) per year.

The alternative is not to implement this rule, which will imply that grouse population in Wisconsin will continue to decline dramatically. This will be devastating to the hunting community, industry and state economy.

---

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

This rule would provide potential benefits to the state's ruffed grouse population, the department recommends closing the 2019 ruffed grouse season early. The alternative would be to leave the grouse season framework as is or shortening the grouse season to a date different than the proposed January 5<sup>th</sup> closure.

---

### 16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The long range implications of this rule proposal will be the same as the short term impacts. These proposals will generally contribute to providing good opportunities for hunting and trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in those activities

---

### 17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Federal regulations allow states to manage the wildlife resources located within their boundaries provided they do not conflict with regulations established in the Federal Register. None of these rule changes violate or conflict with the provisions established in the Federal Code of Regulations.

---

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

Minnesota and Michigan's ruffed grouse season ends on January 1<sup>st</sup>. Iowa's ends on January 31<sup>st</sup>. Illinois does not have a ruffed grouse season.

---

### 19. Contact Name

Scott Karel

---

### 20. Contact Phone Number

608-267-2452

---

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)

---

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
-