

## 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> September 26, 2019
<b>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)</b> NR 10, WM-01-19	
<b>4. Subject</b> Black bear 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> None
<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 type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers <input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses <b>(if checked, complete Attachment A)</b>	
<b>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1).</b> \$ \$0 (No implementation and compliance cost anticipated)	
<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> Historically, zone-specific numeric population goals have been used as a target for bear population management decision. However, establishing numeric goals that accurately reflect habitat suitability and biological carrying capacity is exceedingly difficult. As well, social constraints to bear population growth vary through space and time and it is difficult to respond to this variation yet maintain populations at or near established goals. Managing toward goals also may sacrifice long-term hunter opportunity, as it may lead to decisions to reduce or stabilize bear populations when further growth would be socially acceptable. Numeric population goals or target ranges may unnecessarily restrict decisions in a management arena where flexibility in annual quota-setting discussions would allow wildlife managers to maximize hunter opportunity and satisfaction while responding to social concerns.  Bear management zones were first incorporated into Wisconsin's bear management framework in 1987, when the state was divided into three zones. Range expansion into southern Wisconsin presents unique challenges for wildlife managers. Prior to 1985, it was believed that black bears could not coexist with people in this zone and liberal harvests were used to limit population growth. A public survey completed in 2018 revealed that a majority of southern Wisconsin residents are willing to reside near bears. Reconfiguring the current bear management zone structure may be a valid option for addressing local areas of elevated bear-human conflict and/or chronic agricultural damage issues.	
<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> A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website in June 2019 and various interest groups may be contacted. No fiscal effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated.	
<b>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.</b> A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website during a 14 day period in October 2019 and various interest groups, including local governments, may be contacted. This rule is not anticipated to impact local governments.	

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

---

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)

These rules, and the legislation which grants the department rule-making authority, do not have fiscal effects on the private sector or small businesses. No costs to the private sector or small businesses are associated with compliance to these rules.

---

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

These rules will offer greater flexibility when making bear population management decisions which will potentially offer better long-term hunter opportunity. Additionally, implementing a new bear management zone structure will better align population management decisions with spatial variation in habitat quality and negative human-bear interactions.

---

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 bear hunting and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in bear hunting

---

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

States possess inherent authority to manage the wildlife resources located within their boundaries, except insofar as preempted by federal treaties and laws, including 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 has 10 bear permit areas, though most of the state is a "no quota area," including the western edge of the state and everywhere south of St. Cloud. Michigan has 10 bear management units, with six in the upper peninsula and three in the northern lower peninsula. Over half of the lower peninsula is closed to bear hunting.

To establish bear quotas, Minnesota has separate "quota" and "non-quota" zones. Quota zones define Minnesota's higher-quality, heavily forested primary bear range in the northcentral and northeastern parts of the state. Quotas are established for each quota zone, with permit levels set using estimates of hunter success. No-quota zones are established outside of primary bear range, and permits are sold over the counter. They utilize population models to estimate bear population size and trend by zone. Models utilize age information derived from teeth submitted from harvested bears. In quota zones, information on trends in nuisance complaints and damage influence quota-setting decisions.

Michigan has separate zones and time periods. Quotas are established for each zone, with permit levels set using estimates of hunter success. Michigan utilizes population models to estimate bear population size and trend by zone. Models utilize age information derived from teeth submitted from harvested bears. Also derive some population metrics from hunter surveys. Information on trends in nuisance complaints and damage influence quota-setting decisions. This Michigan state bear plan states "Perceived and measured social tolerance is given strong consideration when making harvest recommendations."

Neither Minnesota or Michigan has a waiting period for hunters who purchase their license during the bear season.

Illinois and Iowa do not have bear hunting seasons

---

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
-