

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<p>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Original <input type="checkbox"/>Updated <input type="checkbox"/>Corrected</p>	<p>2. Date</p> <p>11/09/2023</p>
<p>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)</p> <p>NR 20, Fishing: Inland Waters; Outlying Waters, NR 25, Commercial Fishing--Outlying Waters</p>	
<p>4. Subject</p> <p>FH-11-23 (E) – Lake Superior cisco and lake trout regulations</p>	
<p>5. Fund Sources Affected</p> <p><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</p>	<p>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected</p>
<p>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule</p> <p><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</p>	
<p>8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)</p> <p><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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)</p>	
<p>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1).</p> <p>\$0</p> <p>No implementation and compliance costs are envisaged for this rule. As the lake trout quota will increase with this rule, this rule will not impose any costs on fishing businesses and no negative economic impacts are expected.</p>	
<p>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)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>No</p>	
<p>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule</p> <p>Sustainable harvest of commercial fish species such as lake trout and cisco depends upon appropriate quotas and harvest regulations. These quotas and harvest regulations will lead to optimal harvest and ensure sustainable fisheries.</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>The department will contact individuals, businesses, local governmental units and others with an interest in this rule's economic impacts during development of the permanent rule</p>	
<p>13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.</p> <p>None</p>	

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)

This rule is likely to have a minimal (less than \$50,000) total economic impact, if any, on commercial fishing businesses and sport fishing businesses. Both the lake trout quota allocation for the commercial fishery and the lake trout harvest closure trigger will increase in this rule, allowing for additional lake trout commercial harvest and more opportunities for recreational fishers to harvest lake trout with a lower risk of an early season closure. This will benefit local businesses.

This rule would require that trap nets meet the minimum mesh size requirement for preventing catch of sublegal lake whitefish. However, all commercial fishers already use trap nets with a mesh size in compliance with the proposed rules. Therefore, this rule would not require a major overhaul in gear use by state-licensed commercial fishers.

Since this rule would increase the lake trout quota, state commercial and recreational fishers would most likely benefit from implementation of this rule. Dockside value of harvested lake trout is dependent on a variety of factors including market value and fishing conditions, and fuel and other expenditures have a higher economic impact for commercial fishers than quota adjustments. Assuming a dockside value of \$1.50 per pound for lake trout, the total gain to commercial fishers due to the quota increase would be about \$7,020, and this dollar value would increase when the fish are sold to consumers. It is also important to note that whitefish harvest is also limited by lake trout harvest, so an increase in the lake trout quota also allows for additional gill net effort to be used to fish for lake whitefish. Though this rule does not apply to tribal fishers, tribal commercial fishers are also included under the quota through the Lake Superior Fishing Agreement, so they are likely to see a similar pattern for lake trout and whitefish harvest.

Sport fishing is an important contributor to local economic activity in the Lake Superior region through direct spending to hotels, restaurants, bars, and to fishing businesses such as outfitters, guide or charter services and bait and tackle stores. While the recreational lake trout harvest closure trigger may impact sport fishing activities in some years when sport fishers reach the trigger early, this rule will increase the amount of lake trout that it would take to trigger a season closure, thereby reducing the risk of an early season closure compared to other years. Also, the season has only closed early once in the past three years under a lower quota.

Related to both commercial and angler use of lake trout and cisco, harvest quotas are ideally reviewed every 2-3 years, with data collection and review occurring each year. Due to the variability of harvest quotas, there is no true baseline against which to assess changes in related economic impacts. Further, the variability leads to difficulty in estimating specific long-term economic impacts. However, this analysis surmises that continued availability of the resource has overall positive impacts.

The rule does not allow for the potential to establish a reduced fine for small businesses, nor does it establish "alternative enforcement mechanisms" for "minor violations" of administrative rules made by small businesses. Public utility rate payers and local governmental units will not be affected by the rule.

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

The rule imposing harvest revisions is necessary in order to ensure a sustainable lake trout fishery over the long-term and will result in economic and natural resource benefits for everyone who utilizes Lake Superior's lake trout population. Not implementing the rule would prevent commercial and sport fishers from fully benefitting from the quota adjustment.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Sustainable lake trout and cisco quotas will help ensure good sport, tribal and commercial fishing opportunities into the future.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

No federal statutes or regulations apply. States possess inherent authority to manage the fishery and wildlife resources located within their boundaries, except insofar as preempted by federal treaties and laws, including regulations established in the Federal Register.

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

Along with Wisconsin, Michigan and Minnesota are the only adjacent states with a Lake Superior commercial fishery. In Michigan, whitefish is the focus of the commercial fishery. Minnesota regulates several commercial fisheries on Lake Superior. Both Minnesota and Michigan have established quotas, gear requirements and other restrictions for commercial fishing in Lake Superior, working in cooperation with the Chippewa tribes in those states.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

19. Contact Name Meredith Penthorn, Fisheries Management policy specialist	20. Contact Phone Number 608-316-0080
---	--

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

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)

This rule is likely to have a minimal (less than \$50,000) total economic impact, if any, on commercial fishing businesses and sport fishing businesses. Both the lake trout quota allocation for the commercial fishery and the lake trout harvest closure trigger will increase in this rule, allowing for additional lake trout commercial harvest and more opportunities for recreational fishers to harvest lake trout with a lower risk of an early season closure. This will benefit local businesses.

This rule would require that trap nets meet the minimum mesh size requirement for preventing catch of sublegal lake whitefish. However, all commercial fishers already use trap nets with a mesh size in compliance with the proposed rules. Therefore, this rule would not require a major overhaul in gear use by state-licensed commercial fishers.

Since this rule would increase the lake trout quota, state commercial and recreational fishers would most likely benefit from implementation of this rule. Dockside value of harvested lake trout is dependent on a variety of factors including market value and fishing conditions, and fuel and other expenditures have a higher economic impact for commercial fishers than quota adjustments. Assuming a dockside value of \$1.50 per pound for lake trout and a catch of 4,680 pounds, the total gain to commercial fishers due to the quota increase would be about \$7,020, and this dollar value would increase when the fish are sold to consumers. It is also important to note that whitefish harvest is also limited by lake trout harvest, so an increase in the lake trout quota also allows for additional gill net effort to be used to fish for lake whitefish. Though this rule does not apply to tribal fishers, tribal commercial fishers are also included under the quota through the Lake Superior Fishing Agreement, so they are likely to see a similar pattern for lake trout and whitefish harvest.

Sport fishing is an important contributor to local economic activity in the Lake Superior region through direct spending to hotels, restaurants, bars, and to fishing businesses such as outfitters, guide or charter services and bait and tackle stores. While the recreational lake trout harvest closure trigger may impact sport fishing activities in some years when sport fishers reach the trigger early, this rule will increase the amount of lake trout that it would take to trigger a season closure, thereby reducing the risk of an early season closure compared to other years. Also, the season has only closed early once in the past three years under a lower quota.

Related to both commercial and angler use of lake trout and cisco, harvest quotas are ideally reviewed every 2-3 years, with data collection and review occurring each year. Due to the variability of harvest quotas, there is no true baseline against which to assess changes in related economic impacts. Further, the variability leads to difficulty in estimating specific long-term economic impacts. However, this analysis surmises that continued availability of the resource has overall positive impacts.

The rule does not allow for the potential to establish a reduced fine for small businesses, nor does it establish "alternative enforcement mechanisms" for "minor violations" of administrative rules made by small businesses. Public utility rate payers and local governmental units will not be affected by the rule.

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

Commercial fishing licensees are required to record and report all elements of their fishing activity as required by s. 29.519 (5) Wis. Stats.

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:
-

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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

Aside from adjustment of the sport fishing lake trout harvest quota, no other sport fishing regulations will change with this rule, keeping regulations consistent for recreational anglers, charter captains, and similar businesses.

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

The rule will be enforced by department conservation wardens under the authority of chapter 29, Stats., through routine patrols, record audits of wholesale fish dealers and state-licensed commercial fishers, and follow up investigations of citizen complaints.

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

Yes No
