

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected | 2. Date 05/26/2021 |
| 3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) NR 20 (Fishing: Inland Waters, Outlying Waters) | |
| 4. Subject Board Order FH-29-20 (E) and FH-30-20, relating to lake trout harvest and season in Lake Michigan | |
| 5. Fund Sources Affected <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 | 6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected |
| 7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <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 | |
| 8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <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 (if checked, complete Attachment A) | |
| 9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0 | |
| <p>This rule will not impose any implementation and compliance costs. The regulation proposed in this rule will have a slight economic benefit for anglers and associated businesses.</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)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |
| 11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule This permanent rule and a companion emergency rule are necessary in order to ensure a sustainable fishery over the long-term that provides economic and natural resource benefits for all affected. This rule would restore a daily bag limit of 5 in total (of which all may be lake trout) and a continuous harvest season for lake trout. On January 1, 2021, these regulations reverted to a daily bag limit of 5 but only two may be lake trout and a harvest season running from March 1 to October 31. Allowing for a greater daily bag limit of lake trout and year-round fishing opportunities help provide diverse fishing for Lake Michigan and Green Bay anglers. | |
| 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. The main entities that will be affected by the proposed rule are anglers, charter captains, and fishing-related businesses. They will be contacted for comments during development of the permanent rule EIA. | |
| 13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. None; local governments will have an opportunity to provide comments during development of the permanent rule EIA. | |
| 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) The proposed rule will have a positive, minimal (less than \$50,000) economic impact on anglers, fishing-associated businesses, and local economies. This rule will restore lake trout fishing opportunities that were in place until the end of 2020, which will allow greater angler utilization of the lake trout resource and may help attract anglers to the area. | |

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

Each year, Wisconsin's Great Lakes fishing opportunities draw at least 178,000 anglers (as measured by the sale of the Great Lakes Salmon and Trout stamp) who spend more than 1.2 million days fishing. According to the American Sport Fishing Association, these anglers contribute \$114.3 million to the economy through direct retail expenditures and generate more than \$12.5 million in state and local tax revenue.

The department anticipates no fiscal effects of this rule. The department routinely manages Great Lakes fisheries under agency budgets, and the regulations in this rule are not a departure from previous policy.

15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule
Additional recreational fishing opportunity is the primary benefit, but the level of harvest resulting from this rule will also help maintain balance between lake trout and salmon populations, both of which feed on the same forage base (alewife). Anglers and charter businesses frequently want to target salmon, and so larger salmon populations available for them to harvest depend on alewife availability to a great extent.

Alternatives to implementing the rule include no action, which would maintain a daily bag limit of 2 for lake trout and March to October harvest season. However, the angling public has demonstrated strong support for larger bag limits and a continuous season, and has also expressed concern that a return to the more restrictive limits will limit charter business offerings to clients and reduce the value of fishing licenses and Great Lakes trout and salmon stamps. Furthermore, the reduced bag limits and specific open season do not help the department achieve the goal of a balanced trout/salmon fishery. Recreational lake trout harvest helps offset the impacts of increased Chinook salmon stocking on the alewife prey base.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule
The long-range implications are similar to the short-term implications. This rule will allow anglers to harvest more lake trout in Lake Michigan and Green Bay, year-round, which will provide good fishing opportunities while still allowing the lake trout population to work toward rehabilitation goals in Lake Michigan.

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)
Individual state or provincial agencies are responsible for managing fisheries within their state boundaries, and each jurisdiction has their own decision-making process. However, all states and provinces that border a Great Lake are signatory to the Joint Strategic Plan for Management of Great Lakes Fisheries and have collaboratively developed Fish Community Objectives for each of the Great Lakes through their individual Lake Committees.

State agencies work together through the Lake Committee process to ensure that Great Lakes management actions are communicated and discussed among the state and provincial jurisdictions. The Lake Michigan Committee has the following members on it: one representative from each state (Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana) and one representative from the Chippewa-Ottawa Resource Authority.

Lake trout harvest, seasons, and refuges were established by each agency to maximize the chances that the lakewide rehabilitation objectives set for lake trout were achievable.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 19. Contact Name Meredith Penthorn | 20. Contact Phone Number 608-316-0080 |
|---------------------------------------|--|

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