

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
FISCAL ESTIMATE AND
ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS**

Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

Ch. NR 10, Game and Hunting. Board Order WM-06-13

Subject

Establishing the 2013 migratory game bird seasons, waterfowl hunting zones, and regulations.

Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

None

Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule

No Fiscal Effect
 Indeterminate

Increase Existing Revenues
 Decrease Existing Revenues

Increase Costs
 Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
 Decrease Costs

The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)

State's Economy

Local Government Units

Specific Businesses/Sectors

Public Utility Rate Payers

Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than \$20 million?

Yes No

Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

This proposal will establish a general framework of season dates, bag limits, and conditions for taking migratory game birds by hunting or falconry. Primary objectives of the rule will be to reduce the amount of migratory bird-related emergency rule making that is needed each year, to simplify regulations, codify provisions already in effect by emergency rule, and repeal a sunset provision.

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)

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 50, Section IV, the department provided notice that we would accept comments on this Economic Impact Analysis from July 9 through July 22. A comment period of 14 calendar days was selected because this rule will have no or minimal economic impact locally or statewide. No comments were received.

Economic Impact

Because the hunting season frameworks proposed in this rule will be comparable or identical to those in place during previous seasons, no economic impacts are anticipated. These rules are applicable to individual hunters and impose no compliance or reporting requirements for small business, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.

Fiscal Impact

This rule will have a minor fiscal impact on the department in the first year. In future years, the department anticipates an annual saving of \$6,000 to nearly \$9,000 because of simplifications to Canada goose hunting regulations. These savings will result from no longer having to print and mail carcass tags to goose hunters. This is presented as a range of potential savings because actual costs have varied in the previous 3 years based on the price of print stock, printing, mailing, and the number of hunters. Instead of carcass tags, Horicon Zone goose hunters will need to report their harvest on a punch card and to the department by telephone, but this

infrastructure is already in place for Exterior zone goose hunters and will result in minimal costs to edit the call in program. The department anticipates a cost savings of only \$2,000 in the first year of implementation because savings will be offset by \$4,750 in expenditures for our automated license system vendor to make program updates.

Other regulations modified by this proposal will not require significant changes to past practices or procedures and will have no fiscal impact but may result in more efficient use of department staff time if the need for annual rule making is reduced.

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

Changes to the Canada goose regulations and harvest reporting will result in simpler, more understandable rules and simpler hunting practices.

Through this rulemaking process, the department will establish more general descriptions of the migratory bird hunting season in Wis. Admin. Code. For example, new rule language might start the duck season on the “last Saturday in September” instead of a specific date. Emergency rulemaking will still be required of the department as the federal frameworks are established each year, but a result would be less rulemaking overall. It is difficult to estimate a precise amount of costs and other benefits as a result of reduced rule making needs. The amount of reductions will depend on the consistency of the federal framework for migratory bird hunting regulations. The federal framework does change a certain amount every year and the amount of change varies by year. The resulting benefit will primarily be improved use of department staff time.

An alternative is to not implement a rule and continue establishing migratory bird hunting regulations entirely by emergency rule each year. The disadvantage of this alternative is that it is absolutely certain that a complete emergency rules package would need to be promulgated each year. Another disadvantage is that the permanent rules contained in NR Ch. 10 will never reflect the regulations that are actually in place. This can be a disadvantage for law enforcement officers and anyone who seeks migratory bird hunting regulation information from that source.

Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Implementing these rules may help reduce the amount of time invested in the rulemaking process by department staff. Implementing these rules will have little impact on the public except that they will continue to have good waterfowl hunting opportunities into the future. A subset of Canada goose hunters in the Horicon Zone will benefit from simplified goose hunting regulations and no need to worry about missing the permit application deadline and not being able to hunt in that zone.

Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Annually the department establishes migratory game bird hunting seasons based on a federal framework that is presented to Wisconsin by the US Fish & Wildlife Service. This proposal takes advantage of nearly all of the opportunities offered under the federal framework. One difference is that Wisconsin allows one hen mallard in the daily bag limit even though the state could allow two. This is done at the request of waterfowl hunters who want to be conservative in regulating the harvest of breeding female mallards.

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

The department establishes migratory game bird hunting seasons based on a federal framework that is presented to Wisconsin by the US Fish & Wildlife Service. Because of the federal guidelines, Wisconsin’s regulations are similar to those in neighboring states.

Name and Phone Number of Contact Person

Scott Loomans, Wildlife Regulation Policy Specialist, 608-267-2452.