ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

| 1. Type of Estimate and Analysis | | |
|--|--|--|
| Original Updated Corrected | | |
| 2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number | | |
| Board Order CS-05-17(E) modifying Ch.'s NR 10 Game and Hunting, and 20 Fishing: Inland Waters; Outlying Waters. | | |
| 3. Subject | | |
| Customer and Outreach Services rules related to the automated system for delivering recreational license products. | | |
| 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 Indeterminate Decrease Existing Revenues | ☐ Increase Costs ⊠ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☐ Decrease Cost | |
| State Fiscal Impact These rules will result in minor revisions to forms that will require our contractor to revise the programming. This expense is built in to our current vendor contract and the department will not incur change order fees. | | |
| The department is currently administering a statewide automated licensing system. We are enforcing regulations and requirements to validate carcass tags after harvesting certain animals and already require harvest registration through an automated system. These rules are minor revisions to those requirements that will result in no new or continuing costs for the department. | | |
| 7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) | | |
| □ State's Economy □ Spec | cific Businesses/Sectors | |
| Local Government Units Publ | ic Utility Rate Payers | |
| Sma | Il 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 policies in this rule are consistent with past policies of issuing recreational licenses through an electronic based system using a network of local vendors and department offices.

Various methods to manage the public harvest of wild animals or sturgeon are available to the department. The department requires the use of carcass tags for certain species when that will assure equitable distribution of harvest, regulations compliance, or to limit harvest to a very specific level. Hunters purchase tags or, when demand exceeds supply, apply to be included in random drawings for tags.

For wildlife species, carcass tags are required to hunt or trap deer, bear, elk, wild turkey, sharp-tailed grouse, Canada goose when extra harvest control measures are being implemented, bobcat, fisher, otter, and wolves when they are not listed as a threatened or endangered species. A carcass tag is also required when an angler intends to harvest, or keep, a lake sturgeon during an open fishing season.

Immediately upon harvesting an animal for which a carcass tag is required, the carcass tag must be validated. Under current rules, this is done by marking the tag with a pen or pencil. Under these proposed rules, the department will be able to allow carcass tags to be validated by other methods as indicated on the tag, cush as by separating a portion of it.

Registration of harvested animals is another requirement that helps assure compliance with regulations and provides important management information to the department. Current rules require that a registration verification number, provided by the department

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

at the time of harvest registration, be written on the validated carcass tag. Under these rules, hunters will still be required to register or report their harvest for certain species. Hunters will not be required to record a harvest registration verification number on their tag. With the current statewide automated license system a conservation warden only needs the number origninally printed on the tag by the department in order to electronically verify if an animal was registered.

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 will be a level 3 economic impact analysis for this permanent rule. A notice for Solicitation of comments on this analysis for the companion permanent rule will be posted on the department's website during 2017 and various interest groups will be contacted by email.

In nearly all situations, there will be no effects but the rule will result in improved convenience for people who are required to use a harvest tag and register harvest with the department after taking certain species. The department would continue to contract with a variety of private retail outlets to deliver services which will basically be the same and include licenses and registrations for outdoors related activities.

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. A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis of the companion permanent rule will be posted on the department's website during a 14 day period beginning in 2017. The department will seek comments by contacting interest groups, individuals, and associations that represent local governmental units.

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)

No economic impacts are anticipated as a result of these rules. The department currently contracts with a vendor and provides automated licensing to the public at private retail outlets, department service centers, and online. Those include a range of retail outlets such as convenience stores, department stores, small sporting goods shops, as well as large retailers of outdoors-related merchandise. These rules will not result in any changes to this framework for license delivery.

The rule will result in improved convenience for people who are required to use a harvest tag and register harvest with the department after taking certain species.

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

Under these proposed rules, the department will be able to allow carcass tags to be validated very conveniently, such as by separating a portion of it. Some people have expressed concern about being required to have a writing implement available while in the field, as was previously required.

The rule will result in improved convenience for people who are required to use a harvest tag and register harvest with the department after taking certain species.

Under these rules, hunters will still be required to register or report their harvest for certain species. Hunters will not be required to record a harvest registration verification number on their tag. With the current statewide automated license system a conservation warden only needs the number originally printed on the tag by the department in order to electronically verify if an animal was registered.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The long range implications of this rule proposal will be the same as the short term impacts. These proposals will contribute to the maintenance of the current economic activity generated by people who purchase licenses, permits, and registrations and participate in a variety of outdoor recreational activities.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

Federal regulations allow states to manage the wildlife resources and state-owned lands located within their boundaries provided they do not conflict with regulations established in the Federal Register. None of these rule changes violate or conflict with the provisions established in the Federal Code of Regulations.

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

Under the proposal, Wisconsin's rules and automated licensing system will not differ significantly from surrounding states. All surrounding states have an automated system in place for the issuance of recreational licenses. Their systems are established based on needs that are unique to those state's resources and public desires.

| 17. Contact Name | 18. Contact Phone Number |
|--|--------------------------|
| Scott Loomans, Wildlife Regulation Policy Specialist | 608-267-2452 |

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.