

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

NR 20 Fishing: Inland Waters; Outlying Waters and NR 23 Wisconsin-Michigan Boundary Waters

3. Subject

Modifications in walleye harvest management in Ceded Territory waters

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

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)

State's Economy Specific Businesses/Sectors
 Local Government Units Public Utility Rate Payers
 Small Businesses **(if checked, complete Attachment A)**

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

Yes No

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

The rule will provide the flexibility necessary to adjust angler regulations to potentially alleviate and minimize regional social and economic disruption associated with reductions in walleye bag limits on off-reservation waters within the Ceded Territory.

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 department solicited comments on the economic impact of rule FH-18-14 from organizations and individuals, including the Wisconsin Conservation Congress, the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation, and other related organizations, as well as the Wisconsin Counties Association, League of Wisconsin Municipalities, and the Wisconsin Towns Association. No comments were received.

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.

No local government units requested to coordinate with the department on preparation of the EIA.

12. 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)

Exact economic impact of the rule is unknown. The proposed rule does not directly affect businesses; it affects sport anglers. No expenses are imposed on businesses, business associations, public utility rate payers, or local governmental units. The proposed rule would not adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, jobs, or the overall economic competitiveness of the State, but is expected to have an indeterminate positive impact on all of the above listed entities by encouraging additional participation in angling by both local citizens and visiting tourists.

No additional compliance or reporting requirements will be imposed on small businesses as a result of these rule changes. No implementation or compliance costs are expected to be incurred.

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

Current adjustments to walleye daily bag limits in late spring may result in restrictive angling regulations that directly affect anglers and indirectly affect those who provide equipment, food, lodging and other support to both local and visiting anglers. This rule will provide the department with the flexibility necessary to adjust angler regulations to

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

potentially alleviate and minimize regional social and economic disruption associated with reductions in walleye bag limits on off-reservation waters within the Ceded Territory.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The current model of reducing angling bag limits to ensure a sustainable walleye harvest has become increasingly unpredictable in recent fishing seasons, and angling harvest management may be better accomplished with a stable set of regulations that achieve results similar to annual bag limit adjustments.

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.

In Minnesota, several bands of Lake Superior Chippewa have harvested walleye and northern pike from Mille Lacs since 2000. Annual allowable total catch quotas are calculated for the lake and apportioned between tribal members and anglers. The State of Minnesota adjusts the size of fish allowed for angler harvest annually (a “harvest slot” limit), based on walleye population size and the age composition of that population.

Off-reservation spear harvest also occurs in Michigan, and the state of Michigan and the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission use the same model for calculating Safe Harvest that is used in Wisconsin. Michigan has no specific response to tribal harvest in the regulations for state anglers but may consider such adjustments in the near future.

17. Contact Name

Steve Hewett, DNR Fisheries Section Chief

18. Contact Phone Number

608-267-7501

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
-