

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 WM-03-17 modifying Chs. NR 10 Game and Hunting, NR 11 Closed Areas, NR 12 Wildlife Damage and Nuisance Control, NR 15 Game Refuges, and NR 19 Miscellaneous Fur, Fish, Game and Outdoor Recreation .

3. Subject

The 2017 wildlife management spring hearing rules related to hunting, trapping, refuges and closed areas, and wildlife nuisance control.

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

State Fiscal Impact

One provision of this rule would eliminate the need to apply in advance and pay a \$3.00 application fee for a fall turkey hunting permit authorization. We anticipate essentially no fiscal impact as a result of discontinuing the fall turkey permit drawing. The revenue loss is almost entirely offset by hunters who would have been unsuccessful in the drawing but can now purchase a license and by eliminating mailing/administrative expenses. Additionally, savings in staff time and effort currently devoted to the fall drawing could be redirected to other activities and is equivalent to more than \$8,700 in the customer service bureau alone.

- Revenue would decrease by \$3 times the number of applications submitted by non-patrons, $(55256 - 44665) \times \$3 = \$31,773$
- Revenue would increase because more than 320 non-patron license holders who would have been unsuccessful in the permit drawing could, under this proposal, purchase a \$15.00 license and tag, $320 \times (15 - 3) = \$3,840$.
- Expenditures would decrease by \$27,375 as a result of not needing to communicate with permit winners by mail, Label merge, paper, cutting, press set up = \$2,778. Additional significant savings result from eliminating the cost of mailing the cards, $55,256$ (notification to all permit winners) + $43,135$ (permit mailed to patrons) $\times .25 = \$24,597$.
- Revenue loss of \$31,773 - Savings of \$27,375 - revenue increase of \$3,840 = \$558 in revenue loss.

Additionally significant staff time could be saved and directed to other priorities, primarily in the customer service bureau. $[(\# \text{ hrs to review drawing results} \times \sim \$65/\text{hr IT staff}) + (\# \text{ calls attributed to fall turkey} \times \text{length of call} \times 1\text{hr}/60 \text{ min} \times \text{CSR rate w/ overhead} \sim \$30/\text{hr})] = [(3 \text{ hrs} \times \$65/\text{hr}) + (4500 \text{ calls} \times 3 \text{ min}/\text{call} \times 1\text{hr}/60 \text{ min} \times \$30/\text{hr})] = [\$1950 + \$6750] = \$8,700$

This rule omnibus rule package modifies a number of other hunting and trapping seasons and regulations. The department already administers a complex suite of hunting and trapping season frameworks and issues related licenses and permits and enforces applicable hunting and trapping regulations. These rules will not establish new programs or result in significant procedural or policy changes and the department does not anticipate any new costs related to administering these seasons

State economic impact

Because the hunting season framework proposed in this rule will be very similar to those in place during previous seasons, no economic impacts are anticipated. We do not anticipate that these rules will result in significant changes in the activities of hunters and trappers, their related expenditures, or the economic activity that results. These proposals will contribute to providing good opportunities for hunting and trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in those activities.

7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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) |

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

- Yes No

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

All of the policies in this rule are generally consistent with past board policies of regulating fish and game harvest and managing department lands for conservation purposes and authorizing the removal of nuisance wild animals in certain situations.

A number of these proposals are recommendations of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress to the Natural Resources Board and initiating a process to promulgate those rules fulfills a role of the board and the congress established in s 15.348 Stats.

This proposal would simplify the season framework and expand opportunities by establishing that the fall turkey and pheasant hunting seasons as well as the fisher trapping season are always open on the New Year's Holiday weekend. These seasons currently close on December 31. The archery deer season was historically among the seasons that closed on December 31. The current Sunday nearest January 6 closure was a recommendation of the Deer Management for 2000 and Beyond effort and it was first in effect for the 2002 season. Presumably, the change was made to expand hunting opportunities by assuring that the archery deer season would always be open on the New Year's Holiday weekend. We do not think extending these seasons by a handful of days will have any impact on pheasants, turkeys, or fisher populations. This is a time of year when hunting and trapping pressure is low. In particular, fisher harvest is controlled by permit issuance and, if a noticeable amount of new harvest were to occur, it would be automatically accounted for in future years permit levels. This will provide additional opportunity for the limited number of people who will take advantage of it at a time when many people do have vacation or leave from work.

Providing the option for an extended archery season in certain units is a recommendation of the Conservation Congress. Current regulations provide for archery and cross deer season that run continuously from the Saturday nearest September 15 through the Sunday nearest January 6. Current rule also provides Farmland Zone County Deer Advisory Councils (CDACs) the option of recommending an antlerless only Holiday Hunt from December 24 through January 1. The proposed rule modification would provide CDACs with the option of recommending that the archery and crossbow seasons run through January 31 in any unit where they also recommended a Holiday Hunt season framework.

Eurasian collared doves are currently a protected species in Wisconsin because that is the default status for any species which is not otherwise listed. Collared doves are present in the state and have been encountered by mourning dove hunters. Classifying them as unprotected species would allow harvest of this exotic species. Monk parrots are not known to present at this time but they have become established in Chicago and could naturally colonize in Wisconsin cities. Monk parrots are listed as a prohibited species under Ch. NR 40, Invasive Species Identification, Classification and Control. In most situations, the possession, transportation, transfer and introduction of monk parrots is prohibited. The department can give permission to people who wish to remove animals. This proposal would eliminate the requirement that people first get the department's permission to destroy monk parrots.

The proposal may allow the department to issue antlerless deer hunting permits directly to hunters who have access to public lands which are enrolled in the Deer Management Assistance Program and for which antlerless permits are available under the program. Currently, tags are sold to a landowner or authorized representative who must distribute the tags. The current distribution method, used primarily by private landowners for private lands, may not be an efficient distribution method for owners of larger properties such as industrial forest that is open to the public for deer hunting.

This proposal could consolidate fisher management zones from the current six so that there would be only two zones. The extensive zone configuration was important when the species was still expanding its range but is no longer needed now that fisher are well established and distributed.

Consolidating the current three otter management zones so that there would be two would make the zone configuration consistent with the current bobcat and the proposed fisher management zones. Eliminating the 13,000 animal population goal for otters is recommended because population estimates may not be precise enough to assist with species management.

This proposal would eliminate or reduce the size of wildlife refuges on wildlife management areas which are no longer needed for conservation purposes. Changes being considered include eliminating what is commonly known as the Rat River refuge in Winnebago County and the Van Loon beaver/otter closed area in La Crosse County. The proposal would reduce the size of the Theresa Marsh no entry refuge in Washington and Dodge counties.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

Current regulations prevent novice hunters, anglers, and trappers from participating in more than one training event that involves waivers of regulations. This change is a recommendation of the Conservation Congress and would allow someone to participate in more than one learn-to-hunt-event. Some novice hunters feel the need for additional training before becoming a license purchaser. The availability of these courses may allow participation in more than one event while still meeting demand from first time participants and may increase the recruitment of new hunters.

Fall turkey permits are currently allocated through a drawing and hunters are required to apply for a permit in advance. Fall harvest levels and hunting pressure may be low enough that a drawing is no longer needed in order to maintain a safe harvest level. If the drawing were eliminated, each hunter would receive one fall permit with the purchase of their license, which would be valid in the zone of their choice. With this simplification, hunters would no longer need to remember to apply for a fall turkey permit by a certain deadline, and would no longer have to pay a \$3.00 application fee.

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.

No effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated.

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)

No effects on small businesses, sectors, utility rate payers, local governmental units, or the state economy are anticipated. The hunting regulations proposed in this rule will not be significantly different than those in place during previous seasons. These rules are applicable to individual hunters and impose no compliance or reporting requirements for small business, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.

These rules are not expected to significantly affect currently available outdoor opportunities and no impacts to the economic activities of hunters, trappers, or outdoor recreation enthusiasts are expected.

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

These proposals will contribute to providing good opportunities for hunting and trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in those activities. The proposal does simplify a number of antiquated regulations on the possession and use of firearms that will result in more easily understood regulations. Elimination of the fall drawing for turkey hunting permits is a regulations simplification that will make it more convenient to obtain that license/permit.

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 participate in hunting activities.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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)

These rule change proposals do not represent significant policy changes and do not differ significantly from surrounding states. All surrounding states have regulations and rules in place for the management and recreational use of wild game and furbearer species and for the use of state owned lands for public hunting which 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, Regulations Policy Specialist	608-266-5206

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