ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

| 1. Type of Estimate and Analysis | | |
|--|---|--|
| □ Original | | |
| 2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number | | |
| Sections of chs. NR 20 and 23 related to fishing in inland, outlying, and boundary waters | | |
| 3. Subject | | |
| The rule will make changes to fish size limits, bag limits, seasons, and other regulations related to fishing in inland, | | |
| outlying, and boundary waters | | |
| 4. Fund Sources Affected | 5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected | |
| □ GPR □ FED □ PRO □ PRS □ SEG □ SEG-S | | |
| 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) | | |
| • | cific Businesses/Sectors | |
| | lic Utility Rate Payers | |
| Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A) | | |
| 8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million? | | |
| 9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule | | |
| Rule changes are proposed to protect and enhance the State's fish resources. | | |
| 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 primarily affect sport anglers. The Department contacted organizations with an interest in | | |
| fishing, such as the WI Conservation Congress, the WI Association of Lakes, the WI Council of Sport Fishing | | |
| Organizations, Walleyes for Tomorrow, and many others for comments on the rule's economic impact. In addition, the | | |
| WI Towns Association, League of WI Municipalities, and WI Counties Association were contacted for comments. No | | |
| comments were received by the Department. | | |
| 11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA. | | |
| The economic impact open comment period was conducted from November 23 to December 7, 2012. No local | | |
| governments commented on the rule and therefore no LGUs participated in the development of the EIA. | | |
| 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) | | |
| It is not expected that there will be any economic impact directly related to these rule changes. The proposed rule will | | |
| primarily affect sport anglers. Regulations are already in place and this rule is intended to continue protection and | | |
| enhancement of the State's fish resources. One intention of the rule is to help maintain or improve the general economic | | |
| impact of fishing throughout Wisconsin. | | |
| | | |
| The proposed rule does not impose any compliance or reporting requirements on small businesses nor are any design or | | |
| emptional standards contained in the min The min does not allow for the notantial to establish a reduced fire for small | | |

operational standards contained in the rule. 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.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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

Fishing regulations are in place to help meet management goals and objectives for waters and their fish species, such as providing a trophy walleye fishery or a bass fishery that maximizes predation on smaller fishes. New regulations are proposed when management goals have changed or the Department must address a critical need, such as a major fish population decline. They are based on input solicited from stakeholders when the proposals were developed as well as plans for evaluating the regulations after they are in place. Alternatives, such as not making the regulation changes, have been discussed by Fisheries Management Bureau policy staff but are not recommended in order to meet fisheries management goals. As stated in s. NR 1.01(2), Wis. Adm. Code, the Department's goal 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 existing policy behind fishing regulations is to provide diverse fishing opportunities throughout the State and that policy will be continued and enhanced by these rule changes. Based on the management goals for individual waters and species, the Fisheries Management Program strives to provide:

consumptive opportunities where anglers can fish for a meal from a self-sustained fish population;

quality and memorable opportunities where anglers can catch large fish and the density of adult fish in the populations are sustained or increased; and

trophy opportunities where anglers can catch large trophy-size fish and the survival of older and larger fish is increased.

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.

| 17. Contact Name | 18. Contact Phone Number |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Kate Strom Hiorns | 608-266-0828 |

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