

Office of Regulatory Management
Economic Review Form

Agency name	Board of Wildlife Resources
Virginia Administrative Code (VAC) Chapter citation(s)	4 VAC 15-320
VAC Chapter title(s)	Fish: Fishing Generally
Action title	Creel and length limits; stocking authorizations
Date this document prepared	October 11, 2022

Cost Benefit Analysis

Table 1a must be completed for all actions. Tables 1b and 1c must be completed for actions (or portions thereof) where the agency is exercising discretion, including those where some of the changes are mandated by state or federal law or regulation. Tables 1b and 1c are not needed if **all** changes are mandated, and the agency is not exercising any discretion. In that case, enter a statement to that effect.

- (1) Direct Costs & Benefits: Identify all specific, direct economic impacts (costs and/or benefits), anticipated to result from the regulatory change. (A direct impact is one that affects entities regulated by the agency and which directly results from the regulatory change itself, without any intervening steps or effects. For example, the direct impact of a regulatory fee change is the change in costs for these regulated entities.) When describing a particular economic impact, specify which new requirement or change in requirement creates the anticipated economic impact. Keep in mind that this is the proposed change versus the status quo. One bullet has been provided, add additional bullets as needed.
- (2) Quantitative Factors:
 - (a) Enter estimated dollar value of total (overall) direct costs described above.
 - (b) Enter estimated dollar value of total (overall) direct benefits described above.
 - (c) Enter the present value of the direct costs based on the worksheet.
 - (d) Enter the present value of the direct benefits based on the worksheet.
- (3) Benefits-Costs Ratio: Calculate d divided by c OR enter it from the worksheet.
- (4) Net Benefit: Calculate d minus c OR enter it from the worksheet.
- (5) Indirect Costs & Benefits: Identify all specific, indirect economic impacts (costs and/or benefits), anticipated to result from the regulatory change. (An indirect impact is one that results from responses to the regulatory change, but which are not directly required by the regulation. Indirect impacts of a regulatory fee change on regulated entities could include a change in the prices they charge, changes in their operating procedures or employment levels, or decisions to enter or exit the regulated profession or market. Indirect impacts also include responses by other entities that have close economic ties to the regulated entities, such as suppliers or partners.) If there are no indirect costs or benefits, include a specific statement to that effect.

- (6) Information Sources: Describe the sources of information used to determine the benefits and costs, including the source of the Quantitative Factors. If dollar amounts are not available, indicate why they are not.
- (7) Optional: Use this space to add any further information regarding the data provided in this table, including calculations, qualitative assessments, etc.

Table 1a: Costs and Benefits of the Proposed Changes (Primary Option)

<p>(1) Direct Costs & Benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to striped bass slot limits in Kerr Reservoir, expansion of the walleye limit in portion of the New River, technical changes to nomenclature of tributaries of the Dan, Staunton, and Roanoke Rivers; limits on gar and bowfin harvest during certain periods. <p>Direct Costs: Direct costs and benefits of recreational freshwater fisheries management actions are difficult to determine individually. All changes made are intended to benefit Virginia’s recreational fishery, which is enjoyed by an estimated 800,000 individuals annually. The overall financial benefits of Virginia’s recreational fishery has been estimated at \$568 Million (American Sportfishing Association). The species impacted by these changes are not eligible for commercial sale, therefore the only potential cost of imposing a more restrictive slot or possession limit would be the value to an angler of keeping a fish. This would likely impact anglers targeting gar and bowfin, as these fisheries are almost entirely harvest oriented. In the case of the species impacted by these changes, the number of individuals impacted and the extent to which they are impacted by being required to keep fish of a different size is likewise indeterminate.</p> <p>Direct Benefits: As referenced above, specific financial impacts of individual management actions are difficult to definitively describe, though all contribute to the greater benefits of the fishery that are alluded to under the costs description of this section. All of these efforts aim to provide quality fishing opportunities, making more, larger fish available for capture. And because many anglers release all fish they catch, more restrictive size or bag limits may create additional interest as fisheries respond and anglers are more concerned about catching than keeping. The regulations on striped bass and walleye are likely to generate increased interest and expenditures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a more specific process for the Department’s issuance of fish stocking authorizations.
--	---

	<p>Direct Costs: There should be no cost to the regulated community associated with this change.</p> <p>Direct Benefits: The establishment of a more specific, more predictable fish stocking authorization process, with specific time requirements placed upon the Department, should provide benefits to the regulated community. Assigning a projected financial benefit to this is not possible based on current information, but any impact is expected to be positive.</p>		
(2) Quantitative Factors	Estimated Dollar Amount	Present Value	
Direct Costs	(a) Indeterminate	(c) Indeterminate	
Direct Benefits	(b) Indeterminate	(d) Indeterminate	
(3) Benefits-Costs Ratio	Indeterminate	(4) Net Benefit	Indeterminate
(5) Indirect Costs & Benefits	Indeterminate		
(6) Information Sources	Department of Wildlife Resources freshwater fisheries management data		
(7) Optional			

Table 1b: Costs and Benefits under the Status Quo (No change to the regulation)

This table addresses current requirements and the implications of not making any changes. In other words, describe the costs and benefits of maintaining the current regulatory requirements as is.

(1) Direct Costs & Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments to striped bass slot limits in Kerr Reservoir, expansion of the walleye limit in portion of the New River, technical changes to nomenclature of tributaries of the Dan, Staunton, and Roanoke Rivers; limits on gar and bowfin harvest during certain periods.
-----------------------------	--

	<p>Direct Costs: Leaving the status quo in place would avoid making scientifically-demonstrated necessary amendments to freshwater fisheries regulations, which while difficult to reduce to dollars in the case of small amendments, are likely to cause negative fiscal implications for the economic impact of recreational fishing in Virginia.</p> <p>Direct Benefits: The status quo would avoid any disruption to anglers accustomed to current requirements, though again, there is not anticipated to be a measurable fiscal impact to associate with this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a more specific process for the Department’s issuance of fish stocking authorizations. <p>Direct Costs: There are no direct costs associated with leaving the status quo in place, although lack of a predictable authorization process may leave in place some indirect costs.</p> <p>Direct Benefits: There are no direct benefits associated with leaving the status quo in place.</p>		
(2) Quantitative Factors	Estimated Dollar Amount	Present Value	
Direct Costs	(a) Indeterminate	(c) Indeterminate	
Direct Benefits	(b) Indeterminate	(d) Indeterminate	
(3) Benefits-Costs Ratio	Indeterminate	(4) Net Benefit	Indeterminate
(5) Indirect Costs & Benefits	An indirect cost of the status quo is the lack of a predictable fish stocking authorization process. Additionally, not amending freshwater fishing regulations to the latest science and survey data has an indirect cost to the overall benefits of recreational freshwater fishing to Virginia.		
(6) Information Sources	Department of Wildlife Resources freshwater fisheries management data		
(7) Optional			

Table 1c: Costs and Benefits under an Alternative Approach

This table addresses an alternative approach to accomplishing the objectives with different requirements. These alternative approaches may include the use of reasonably available alternatives in lieu of regulation, or information disclosure requirements or performance standards instead of regulatory mandates.

(1) Direct Costs & Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to striped bass slot limits in Kerr Reservoir, expansion of the walleye limit in portion of the New River, technical changes to nomenclature of tributaries of the Dan, Staunton, and Roanoke Rivers; limits on gar and bowfin harvest during certain periods. <p>Direct Costs: No alternatives other than the change being made or the status quo are deemed to have any fiscal implications.</p> <p>Direct Benefits: No alternatives other than the change being made or the status quo are deemed to have any fiscal implications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a more specific process for the Department’s issuance of fish stocking authorizations. <p>Direct Costs: No alternatives other than the change being made or the status quo are deemed to have any fiscal implications.</p> <p>Direct Benefits: No alternatives other than the change being made or the status quo are deemed to have any fiscal implications.</p>		
(2) Quantitative Factors	Estimated Dollar Amount	Present Value	
Direct Costs	(a) Indeterminate	(c) Indeterminate	
Direct Benefits	(b) Indeterminate	(d) Indeterminate	
(3) Benefits-Costs Ratio	Indeterminate	(4) Net Benefit	Indeterminate
(5) Indirect Costs & Benefits	Indeterminate		
(6) Information Sources	Department of Wildlife Resources freshwater fisheries management data		

(7) Optional	
--------------	--

Impact on Local Partners

- (1) Describe the direct costs and benefits (as defined on page 1) for local partners in terms of real monetary costs and FTEs. Local partners include local or tribal governments, school divisions, or other local or regional authorities, boards, or commissions. If local partners are not affected, include a specific statement to that effect and a brief explanation of the rationale.
- (2) Quantitative Factors:
 - (a) Enter estimated dollar value of total (overall) direct costs described above.
 - (b) Enter estimated dollar value of total (overall) direct benefits described above.
- (3) Indirect Costs & Benefits: Describe any indirect benefits and costs (as defined on page 1) for local partners that are associated with all significant changes. If there are no indirect costs or benefits, include a specific statement to that effect.
- (4) Information Sources: describe the sources of information used to determine the benefits and costs, including the source of the Quantitative Factors. If dollar amounts are not available, indicate why they are not.
- (5) Assistance: Identify the amount and source of assistance provided for compliance in both funding and training or other technical implementation assistance.
- (6) Optional: Use this space to add any further information regarding the data provided in this table, including calculations, qualitative assessments, etc.

Note: If any of the above information was included in Table 1, use the same information here.

Table 2: Impact on Local Partners

(1) Direct Costs & Benefits	Local partners are not anticipated to be affected by these regulatory changes.
(2) Quantitative Factors	Estimated Dollar Amount
Direct Costs	(a) N/A
Direct Benefits	(b) N/A
(3) Indirect Costs & Benefits	N/A
(4) Information Sources	Department of Wildlife Resources freshwater fisheries management data

(5) Assistance	N/A
(6) Optional	

Economic Impacts on Families

- (1) Describe the direct costs and benefits (as defined on page 1) to a typical family of three (average family size in Virginia according to the U. S. Census) arising from any proposed regulatory changes that would affect the costs of food, energy, housing, transportation, healthcare, and education. If families are not affected, include a specific statement to that effect and a brief explanation of the rationale.
- (2) Quantitative Factors:
 - (a) Enter estimated dollar value of direct costs.
 - (b) Enter estimated dollar value of direct benefits.
- (3) Indirect Costs & Benefits: Describe any indirect costs and benefits (as defined on page 1) to a typical family of three that are most likely to result from the proposed changes.
- (4) Information Sources: describe the sources of information used to determine the benefits and costs, including the source of the Quantitative Factors. If dollar amounts are not available, indicate why not.
- (5) Optional: Use this space to add any further information regarding the data provided in this table, including calculations, qualitative assessments, etc.

Note: If any of the above information was included in Table 1, use the same information here.

Table 3: Impact on Families

(1) Direct Costs & Benefits	Families are not anticipated to be affected directly by these regulatory changes. As noted above, differences in which fish are permitted to be retained can result in some cases, either positively or negatively, in numbers of fish that may be taken home from a fishing trip for food, those any estimates on that with respect to these changes would be speculative at best.
(2) Quantitative Factors	Estimated Dollar Amount
Direct Costs	(a) N/A
Direct Benefits	(b) N/A
(3) Indirect Costs & Benefits	No indirect costs and benefits are anticipated.

(4) Information Sources	Department of Wildlife Resources freshwater fisheries management data
(5) Optional	

Impacts on Small Businesses

- (1) Describe the direct costs and benefits (as defined on page 1) for small businesses. For purposes of this analysis, “small business” means the same as that term is defined in § 2.2-4007.1. If small businesses are not affected, include a specific statement to that effect and a brief explanation of the rationale.
- (2) Quantitative Factors:
 - (a) Enter estimated dollar value of direct costs.
 - (b) Enter estimated dollar value of direct benefits.
- (3) Indirect Costs & Benefits: Describe the indirect benefits and costs (as defined on page 1) for small businesses that are most likely to result from the proposed changes.
- (4) Alternatives: Add a qualitative discussion of any equally effective alternatives that would make the regulatory burden on small business more equitable compared to other affected business sectors, and how those alternatives were identified.
- (5) Information Sources: describe the sources of information used to determine the benefits and costs, including the source of the Quantitative Factors. If dollar amounts are not available, indicate why not.
- (6) Optional: Use this space to add any further information regarding the data provided in this table, including calculations, qualitative assessments, etc.

Note: If any of the above information was included in Table 1, use the same information here.

Table 4: Impact on Small Businesses

(1) Direct Costs & Benefits	Positive benefits are anticipated for the striped bass changes, indeterminate benefits for the walleye changes, and potential negative short term impacts for the gar/bowfin changes. The striped bass community was supportive of the striped bass changes and this will likely benefit guides targeting these species in Kerr Reservoir and tackle shops in the area. Some guides target gar and bowfin via bow and arrow in the spring, but the availability of other fishes without limits such as carp and snakehead should result in no net loss.
(2) Quantitative Factors	Estimated Dollar Amount
Direct Costs	(a) Indeterminate

Direct Benefits	(b) Indeterminate
(3) Indirect Costs & Benefits	Indeterminate
(4) Alternatives	Indeterminate
(5) Information Sources	Indeterminate
(6) Optional	

Changes to Number of Regulatory Requirements

For each individual VAC Chapter amended, repealed, or promulgated by this regulatory action, list (a) the initial requirement count, (b) the count of requirements that this regulatory package is adding, (c) the count of requirements that this regulatory package is reducing, (d) the net change in the number of requirements. This count should be based upon the text as written when this stage was presented for executive branch review. Five rows have been provided, add or delete rows as needed.

Table 5: Total Number of Requirements

Chapter number	Number of Requirements			
	Initial Count	Additions	Subtractions	Net Change
4 VAC 15-320-25	62 (creel and slot limits overall; various species)	3	2	1
4 VAC 15-320-60	1 (authorization required to stock fish)	3	0	3