

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Type of Estimate and Analysis<br><input type="checkbox"/> Original <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected  | 2. Date <span style="float: right;">May 15, 2023</span> |
| 3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)<br>NR Ch. 10, Game and Hunting Ch. 45, Use of Department Properties   |   |
| 4. Subject The 2023 Wildlife Management spring hearing rule.  |   |
| 5. Fund Sources Affected<br><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<br><input type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs<br><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)<br><input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors<br><input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers<br><input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses <b>(if checked, complete Attachment A)</b>  |   |
| 9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1).<br>\$ 9,600  |   |
| 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)?<br><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  |   |
| 11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule<br>Annually, the department submits rule change proposals relating to hunting, trapping and wildlife management. Specifically, individual sections of this rule proposal will:<br><br><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Allow the use of F-shot while hunting small game and game birds.</li><li>2. Simplify the rules for quartering deer, bear and elk.</li><li>3. Make youth antlerless permits valid on either public or private lands.</li><li>4. Increase the student registration fee for trapper education.</li><li>5. Allow individuals to aid disabled trappers in the field without holding specific harvest permits or authorizations for that animal.</li><li>6. Allow the issuance of an either sex diseased deer replacement permit.</li><li>7. Allow landowners to shoot a bear in the act of killing, wounding, or biting a domestic animal without the need for written authorization from DNR.</li><li>8. Regulate target shooting on department properties in Brown County.</li></ol> |   |
| 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.<br><br>A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis was posted on the department's website in March 2023. No comments were received during the open comment period. No fiscal effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated.   |   |
| 13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.<br><br>None at this time. Local Government units are not anticipated to be impacted by this rule.   |   |

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

### Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

---

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 provision raising the student trapper education fee could have an economic impact on individuals seeking the training. An average of 1,200 people a year attend trapper education and the current fee is \$12. This proposal would explore a modest increase of \$8 in the trapper education fee to help cover the increased costs of implementing the program (insurance, venues, publications, instructor reimbursement, etc.). We anticipate the total economic impact of the rules would be very minimal for a total of roughly \$9,600 (1,200 X \$8) per year.

---

15. 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

---

16. 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 providing good opportunities for hunting and trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in those activities.

---

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

States possess inherent authority to manage the wildlife resources located within their boundaries, except insofar as preempted by federal treaties and laws, including regulations established in the Federal Register. None of these rule changes violate or conflict with the provisions established in the Federal Code of Regulations.

---

18. 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 that are established based on needs that are unique to that state's resources and public desires.

---

19. Contact Name  
Scott Karel

20. Contact Phone Number  
608-206-022

---