



DUEY STROEBEL

STATE SENATOR • 20TH DISTRICT

Testimony on SB 618

October 19, 2021

Thank you Chairman Stafsholt and members of the Senate Committee on Sporting Heritage, Small Business and Rural Issues for holding a public hearing on Senate Bill 618, a bill I authored with Rep. Callahan to help initiate the process of simplifying the dense, complicated web of regulations imposed on Wisconsin's sportsmen and women. SB 618 would require the Department of Natural Resources to repeal three existing rules on hunting, fishing or trapping for each new rule it promulgates relating to hunting, fishing or trapping.

To put the issue into perspective, look no further than the sheer volume of regulatory requirements imposed on Wisconsin's sporting community. Chapter 29 of the statutes houses our legislatively-enacted laws on fish and game regulation. It spans 80 pages. The DNR's administrative code chapters regulating hunting, fishing and trapping span over 400 pages.¹ If one were to include the DNR's guidance documents (booklets) explaining Wisconsin's fish and game regulations, this figure jumps to over 650 pages, which is over 8 times longer than the enabling statutes.

In short, a significant amount of red tape has been imposed on Wisconsin's sportsmen and women over the years. Navigating and complying with this red tape only becomes more burdensome as it continues to pile up. This directly undermines the shared, longstanding goal of increasing participation in Wisconsin's rich sporting tradition.

While the "one-in, three-out" concept of SB 618 may seem rather crude or novel, it's a concept that has been proposed or implemented in other states, at the federal level, and in other Western countries.²

A reasonable level of regulation is of course necessary to preserve Wisconsin's precious natural resources for current and future generations. There is a distinction to be made between regulations explicitly required by state statute or federal law versus those that exist at the discretion of the DNR. Nevertheless, right-sizing the amount of regulation imposed on our sportsmen and women is what this bill is all about.

Wisconsin's statutes governing the administrative rulemaking process (Chapter 227) already provide a mechanism for the DNR to work with the Legislature to identify outdated, unnecessary, overly-burdensome or outright unauthorized rules to repeal in conjunction with the promulgation of any new rule relating to hunting, fishing or trapping. Thank you again Chairman Stafsholt and members of the committee for your consideration of SB 618.

¹ See Chapters NR 1, NR 8, NR 10-13, and NR 16-25 in the Wisconsin Administrative Code

² Idaho Executive Order 2020-01 (one-in, two-out); Oklahoma Executive Order 2020-03 (one-in, two-out); Ohio Revised Code § 121.95(F) (one-in, two-out); U.S. Senator Mark R. Warner, "To revive the economy, pull back the red tape." *Washington Post*, December 13, 2010, <https://bit.ly/3AVRkA2>; RED Tape Act, S. 1944, 114th Congress, 2015-16; Executive Order No. 13771, 82 Fed. Reg. 9339 (January 30, 2017), Lessening Regulatory Costs and Establishing a Federal Regulatory Budget Act of 2017, H.R. 2623, 115th Congress, 2017-18; Government of Canada, "Red Tape Reduction Act", S.C. 2015, c. 12; United Kingdom Department for Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS), "One-in, two-out: statement of new regulation", July 10, 2013, <https://bit.ly/3n9YEDx>



CALVIN CALLAHAN

STATE REPRESENTATIVE • ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 35

Office: (608) 266-7694
Toll Free: (888) 534-0035

Rep.Callahan@legis.wi.gov
P.O. Box 8952
Madison, WI 53708-8952

Testimony in Support of Senate Bill 618

Senate Committee on Sporting Heritage, Small Business, & Rural Issues

October 19, 2021

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for holding a public hearing on Senate Bill (SB) 618. I'd like to thank Sen. Stroebel for working with me on this important legislation.

For decades, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources has been putting up burdensome and unnecessary regulations that get in the way of enjoying the outdoors. As Wisconsinites, we understand the need to conserve our resources. However, overregulation is not the way to do it. We should be making it easier for folks to get outside and exercise their rights, not harder.

The proposal before you today allows us to cut the red tape the department has put up over the years, while maintaining those rules the department believes are most important. Under SB 618, for every rule that the department promulgates relating to hunting, fishing, or trapping, the department must also repeal three existing rules relating to hunting, fishing, or trapping. Wisconsin's sportsmen and women have an incredible impact on our state, and this legislation helps us to recognize this impact.

Thank you again for this opportunity to testify in support of SB 618. I look forward to seeing your support on this important legislation.

Bill: 618, Relating to: requiring the repeal of hunting, trapping, and fishing administrative rules in conjunction with promulgation of new rules.

By Senators Stroebel, Kapenga, Felzkowski and Feyen; cosponsored by Representatives Callahan, Brandtjen, Dallman, Edming, James, Knodl, Magnafici, Moses, Mursau, Penterman, Swearingen, Krug, Wichgers and Thiesfeldt.

October 19, 2021

**Testimony of: Margaret (Maggie) Honig
Resident of Fitchburg, WI**

I believe this bill represents an inappropriate governance method, so I oppose this bill.

I am not unsympathetic to the frustrations of having lots of rules to follow. Any time an organization has been around a long time, rules accumulate and there should be occasional paring down.

That said, **the method of paring down should be thoughtful and not simply be a numbers game.** Numbers games give the appearance of carelessness and pettiness, neither of which are characteristics that elected officials should be known for.

The statement that for every one rule proposed, three must be eliminated can be useful for keeping a conversation going, but is **entirely inappropriate as a method of governing.**

This bill, as stated, undermines the public's ability to trust this governing body. To illustrate the reasoning embodied in this bill:

- There are too many people in our prisons. Suppose you propose a similar bill, that for every person going into prison, three must be released?
- The student-to-teacher ratio needs fixing; there are too many students per teacher. Suppose you propose a bill that for every new student, three students must be expelled?

Clearly, more thought needs to go into this proposal.

The DNR rules, while frustratingly abundant, are on the books for various reasons that need to be considered before removal, each on its own merits. Not as simply an equation.

I think this bill, as stated, represents an unacceptable attitude toward governing this state. For that reason, I cannot, and will not, in good conscience, vote for anyone who votes to support this bill.