

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 06/04/2021
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) NR 19, Miscellaneous Fur, Fish, Game and Outdoor Recreation; NR 20, Fishing: Inland and Outlying Waters; NR 21, Wisconsin-Minnesota Boundary Waters; NR 22, Wisconsin-Iowa Boundary Waters; NR 23, Wisconsin-Minnesota Boundary Waters	
4. Subject FH-14-20, minor changes to fishing regulations on inland, outlying and boundary waters	
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	
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 rule will correct minor errors and inconsistencies to ensure that administrative code language that governs fishing in inland, outlying, and boundary waters is accurate and properly reflects the desired management of Wisconsin waters.	
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. This is a level 3 economic impact analysis (minimal economic impact of less than \$50,000). A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website for review by businesses, sectors, governmental units, and individuals. The department may contact interested organizations and individuals to notify them of the comment period.	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. This is a level 3 economic impact analysis (minimal economic impact of less than \$50,000). A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website for review by businesses, sectors, governmental units, and individuals. No local governmental units are expected to be impacted by this rule.	
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 minimal impact on anglers, with no economic impacts expected. As with any change in regulations, there will be a requirement for anglers to learn the new rules. However, a majority of this rule change clarifies code to reflect existing policies for which anglers must already comply, or reduces the complexity of fishing regulations on connected waters. The department works to notify the public of new regulations via press releases, the internet, and fishing regulations pamphlets.	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

The proposed rule does not impose any compliance or reporting requirements on small businesses nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.

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

The rule is being pursued to ensure the rule language that governs fishing in inland, outlying, and boundary waters is accurate and properly reflects the desired management of Wisconsin waters. An alternative would be to leave the code as is, which leads to confusion among the public and law enforcement and may also result in inadequate management of fisheries resources.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Fishing regulations, such as length and bag limits or season dates, are used as a tool to ensure good fishing exists into the future. The department has used different types of fishing regulations in order to: control angler impacts on fish populations; maintain numbers and sizes of fish in a lake or stream; provide different types of fishing experiences, such as fishing for dinner or for a trophy fish; and make access to fishing as fair as possible.

This rule includes minor changes to administrative code that support existing policies and fisheries management goals.

17. 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.

18. 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 the same. 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.

<h3>19. Contact Name</h3>	<h3>20. Contact Phone Number</h3>
Meredith Penthorn	608-316-0080

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
-