

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

Ch. NR 20, Fishing: Inland Waters; Outlying Waters

3. Subject

Board Order FH-10-16 related to Fishing regulations on inland, outlying, and boundary waters, the 2017 fisheries management spring hearing agenda.

4. Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected

None

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

These rules will modify fishing regulations with a management objective to provide excellent fishing opportunities statewide.

For instance, this proposal would implement slot size limits and a 5 fish daily bag limit on more than 30 lakes around the state. The management goal of the slot limit is to improve bass growth and size structure by increasing harvest of smaller bass, and ultimately profiding a bass fishery with a more desirable mix of ages and sizes.

These rules would implement a 3 fish daily bag limit and 18 inch size limit for walleyes in all waters of 7 Southeastern counties and a handful of additional waters. The management goal of the proposed change is to increase the density of adult walleye, increase maximum sustainable yield and improve natural reproduction. Walleye in this region are often not reaching their full growth potential because intensive angling pressure on these waters leads to overharvest of quality size walleye. This proposal is one tool that will help improve the average size and abundance of walleye. This will allow female walleyes to spawn at least one more year before they are legal for harvest.

This proposal would increase the minimum lenth limit for muskellunge to 50 inches on more than 20 waters that are managed as trophy fisheries. Many of these waters already provide only limited harvest opportunities and this proposal would simplify regulations by consolidating a variety of regulation types. The management goal for these waters is to provide a low-density, trophy muskellunge fishery.

This proposal would allow year-round fishing for bass, walleyes and northern pike on the Black river in west central Wisconsin. This is a regulation type that is in effect on many river systems across the state and provides opportunities such as early spring walleye fishing while maintaing the fishery.

These rules modify panfish harvest regulations on a number of lakes across the state. In one situation, the bag limit is increased in order to reduce the population density and improve over all size structure. In most situations, the bag limit is reduced to 10 and a crappie size limit may be established in order to distribute harvest among anglers and improve overall numbers of fish.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

This rule makes a handful of other lake and species-specific regulations for species such as lake trout at Goto lake in Langlade County or northern pike at Browns lake in Racine County and Big Muskego in Waukesha.

Regulations which apply to the fishing practice of motor trolling are currently set to expire in April 2018. This proposal would establish permanently that trolling while using up to three lines per person is allowed in most counties. In some counties, trolling is restricted to the use of one line per person with a maximum of three lines used in a boat. Those counties are; Florence, Iron, Lincoln, Oneida, Sheboygan, Vilas and Waupaca.

Finally, these rules would establish new size and bag limit options from which the department can select when establishing a bag or size limit in certain situations. The first option is for bodies of water where a special regulation is in effect. The department could use the process under current rules to replace the special regulation with a general county-wide regulation which is already in place for that county.

Another option would be available for a body of water where fish consumption advisories have been established. On those waters, a size limit could be established that allows consumption of fish of sizes which may be consumed under the recommendations of the advisory. The department could establish a bag limit of zero where the recommendation is that no fish should be consumed.

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.

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 50, Section II, this is a level 3 economic impact analysis. The department sought comments from individuals, businesses and associations and local governments by posting a notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis on the department's website from March 7 to 21. The board order and preliminary economic impact analysis were available for review and comments on the website during that period. No comments were received.

The primary entities who will be affected by the proposed rules are recreational anglers. No effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated. We do not anticipate any fiscal impacts on the department or statewide economic impacts.

Fiscal impacts on the department are also summarized in this analysis.

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

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 50, Section II, this is a level 3 economic impact analysis. The department sought comments from interest groups, individuals, and associations that represent local governmental units by posting a notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis on the department's website from March 7 to 21. The board order and preliminary economic impact analysis were available for review and comments on the website during that period. No comments were received.

No effects on local governments are anticipated.

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)

Economic Impact

These rules will modify fishing regulations with a management objective to provide excellent fishing opportunities statewide. Improved fishing will have a beneficial impact on the economy (Governor's Executive Order 50, none or minimal economic impact - less than \$50,000). We expect the impact to be minimal, however.

Wisconsin currently provides many high quality fishing opportunities. These rules will maintain excellent fishing opportunities as well as the economic benefits of spending by anglers.

State Fiscal Impact

The department anticipates no fiscal impact resulting from these rules. The department currently conducts a variety of activities related to managing fisheries, selling licenses, providing law enforcement services, and related research. The department will

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

continue to conduct the same activities under the regulations proposed in this rule and does not anticipate any new or reduced expenditures.

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

These rules will result in continuing to provide excellent fishing opportunities for a variety of species on waterbodies across the state. The economic impacts that result from spending by anglers will continue to benefit retail businesses and service providers in every corner of the state. Continually evaluating the condition of our waters and responding with regulations that maximize the productivity of those waters is necessary to maintain and improve fishing opportunities.

Wisconsin is consistently among the top ten states in the number of anglers and in the amount of angler expenditures. According to the most recent American Sportfishing Association report, 1,246,777 anglers had total estimated expenditures of \$1,459,883,024 in the state in 2013. Retail sales had a total multiplier or ripple effect of \$2,005,402,272. More than 18,000 jobs are supported by the retail expenditures of anglers and result in \$565,658,587 in salaries and wages. Federal tax revenues generated in Wisconsin are estimated to total \$143,422,987 and state revenue is estimated by \$132,312,905.

REPORT CITATION

Southwick Associates. *Sportfishing in America: An Economic Force for Conservation*. Produced for the American Sportfishing Association (ASA) under a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Sport Fish Restoration grant (F12AP00137, VA M-26-R) awarded by the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA), 2012.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Managing for balanced fisheries that provide excellent opportunities that meet the interests of many types of anglers will maintain excellent fishing opportunities and broad participation. The economic activity that results from our popular sport fisheries will also be maintained well into the future.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

No federal regulations apply. None of the rule proposals violate or conflict with federal regulations. Individual state or provincial agencies are responsible for managing fisheries within their state boundaries and each jurisdiction has their own decision making process.

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

All of Wisconsin's surrounding states utilize comparable harvest regulations as tools to distribute angler harvest and manage for high quality fisheries. They utilize general regulations that apply to many bodies of water and, when appropriate, apply specialized regulations on specific waterbodies or in regional areas.

17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number
Scott Loomans	608-267-2452

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
-