ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

DEPARTMENT NAME
Fish and Game Commission

CONTACT PERSON
Margaret Duncan, Economist

EMAIL ADDRESS
@wildlife.ca.gov

TELEPHONE NUMBER
916-653-4676

A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACTS  Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.

1. Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate whether this regulation:

- ☒ a. Impacts business and/or employees
- ☐ b. Impacts small businesses
- ☐ c. Impacts jobs or occupations
- ☒ d. Impacts California competitiveness
- ☐ e. Imposes reporting requirements
- ☐ f. Imposes prescriptive instead of performance
- ☒ g. Impacts individuals
- ☐ h. None of the above (Explain below):

If any box in Items 1 a through g is checked, complete this Economic Impact Statement.

If box in Item 1.h. is checked, complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.

2. The estimates that the economic impact of this regulation (which includes the fiscal impact) is:

- ☒ Below $10 million
- ☐ Between $10 and $25 million
- ☐ Between $25 and $50 million
- ☒ Over $50 million [If the economic impact is over $50 million, agencies are required to submit a Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c)]

3. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: 75 approx.

Describe the types of businesses (Include nonprofits):
Commercial Herring permit holders (75) & recreational herring anglers (unknown #)

Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: 100%

4. Enter the number of businesses that will be created: 0 eliminated: 0

Explain: The Pacific Herring (Herring) fishery business stimulus is largely influenced by foreign market demand for Herring and roe.

5. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts:
- ☐ Statewide
- ☒ Local or regional (List areas): San Francisco, Tomales, Humboldt, Crescent City Bays

6. Enter the number of jobs created: 0 and eliminated: 0

Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacted: commercial fishing and fish handling jobs

7. Will the regulation affect the ability of California businesses to compete with other states by making it more costly to produce goods or services here?

- ☐ YES
- ☒ NO

If YES, explain briefly:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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B. ESTIMATED COSTS  Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.

1. What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime? $ N/A

   a. Initial costs for a small business: $   Annual ongoing costs: $   Years: 
   b. Initial costs for a typical business: $   Annual ongoing costs: $   Years: 
   c. Initial costs for an individual: $   Annual ongoing costs: $   Years: 
   d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: The FMP implementing regulations aim to be responsive to environmental and socioeconomic impacts with no new compliance or reporting costs to representative private persons or businesses.

2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of total costs for each industry: Commercial Fishing 69%, Petroleum 10%, Real Estate 7%, Professional Service 8%, Food/Beverage 2%, Wholesale Trade 4% with multipliers for direct, indirect, and induced impacts.

3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements. Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted. $ N/A

4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs? YES   NO

   If YES, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: $   

   Number of units: 

5. Are there comparable Federal regulations? YES   NO

   Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal regulations: Legislature mandates resource mgt. with FGC authority

   Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: $ N/A

C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS  Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.

1. Briefly summarize the benefits of the regulation, which may include among others, the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety and the State's environment. Benefits will accrue to fishermen, processors, and the State's economy in the form of a healthy environment, and maintaining a sustainable herring population, which is quantified each year.

2. Are the benefits the result of: specific statutory requirements, or goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority?

   Explain: CA legislature mandates sustainable resource mgt. & provides the FGC authority to implement regulations toward that end.

3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation over its lifetime? $ uncertain sustainability value

4. Briefly describe any expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California that would result from this regulation: N/A

D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION  Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.

1. List alternatives considered and describe them below. If no alternatives were considered, explain why not: No other alternatives were considered in the implementing regulations for the California Pacific Herring Fishery Management Plan (FMP) because several alternatives had been refined during the FMP development process with stakeholder and public input along with the best available science.
2. Summarize the total statewide costs and benefits from this regulation and each alternative considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation:</th>
<th>Benefit:</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$550 - 650 K</td>
<td>$0 - 10 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1:</td>
<td>Benefit: N/A</td>
<td>Cost: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2:</td>
<td>Benefit: N/A</td>
<td>Cost: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: The future benefits of resource health are difficult to predict given other biological and environmental factors beyond the Agency's control; such systemic benefits are difficult to monetize.

4. Rulemaking law requires agencies to consider performance standards as an alternative, if a regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or equipment, or prescribes specific actions or procedures. Were performance standards considered to lower compliance costs?  

☐ YES  ☒ NO

Explain:

E. MAJOR REGULATIONS Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.

California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) boards, offices and departments are required to submit the following (per Health and Safety Code section 57005). Otherwise, skip to E4.

1. Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business enterprises exceed $10 million?  

☐ YES  ☒ NO

If YES, complete E2. and E3
If NO, skip to E4

2. Briefly describe each alternative, or combination of alternatives, for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed:

Alternative 1:

Alternative 2:

(Attach additional pages for other alternatives)

3. For the regulation, and each alternative just described, enter the estimated total cost and overall cost-effectiveness ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation:</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Cost-effectiveness ratio:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1:</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Cost-effectiveness ratio:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2:</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Cost-effectiveness ratio:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Will the regulation subject to OAL review have an estimated economic impact to business enterprises and individuals located in or doing business in California exceeding $50 million in any 12-month period between the date the major regulation is estimated to be filed with the Secretary of State through 12 months after the major regulation is estimated to be fully implemented?  

☐ YES  ☒ NO

If YES, agencies are required to submit a Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment (SRIA) as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c) and to include the SRIA in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

5. Briefly describe the following:

The increase or decrease of investment in the State:

The benefit for innovation in products, materials or processes:

The benefits of the regulations, including, but not limited to, benefits to the health, safety, and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment and quality of life, among any other benefits identified by the agency:
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT  Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 6 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.

☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are reimbursable by the State. (Approximate)
   (Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).
   $ __________________________
   ☐ a. Funding provided in ________________________________________________________________
      Budget Act of __________________ or Chapter ____________, Statutes of _________________
   ☐ b. Funding will be requested in the Governor's Budget Act of
      ________________________________________________________________
      Fiscal Year: ________________

☐ 2. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are NOT reimbursable by the State. (Approximate)
   (Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).
   $ __________________________
   Check reason(s) this regulation is not reimbursable and provide the appropriate information:
   ☐ a. Implements the Federal mandate contained in ___________________________________________
   ☐ b. Implements the court mandate set forth by the ____________________________________________ Court.
      Case of: ________________________________________________________________ vs. ______________
   ☐ c. Implements a mandate of the people of this State expressed in their approval of Proposition No.
      ________________________________________________________________
      Date of Election: ________________________________
   ☐ d. Issued only in response to a specific request from affected local entity(s).
      Local entity(s) affected: _____________________________________________________________
   ☐ e. Will be fully financed from the fees, revenue, etc. from: ________________________________
      Authorized by Section: __________________________________ of the ________________________ Code;
   ☐ f. Provides for savings to each affected unit of local government which will, at a minimum, offset any additional costs to each;
   ☐ g. Creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a new crime or infraction contained in
      ________________________________________________________________

☐ 3. Annual Savings. (approximate)
   $ __________________________

☐ 4. No additional costs or savings. This regulation makes only technical, non-substantive or clarifying changes to current law regulations.

☒ 5. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any local entity or program.

☐ 6. Other. Explain
   ________________________________________________________________
B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT  

Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.

☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

$    

It is anticipated that State agencies will:

☐ a. Absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.

☐ b. Increase the currently authorized budget level for the          Fiscal Year

☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

$    

☒ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any State agency or program.

☐ 4. Other. Explain

C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS  

Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.

☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

$    

☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

$    

☒ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.

☐ 4. Other. Explain

FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE

Original signature on file 5/3/19

The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD. 399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6601-6616, and understands the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or departments not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.

AGENCY SECRETARY

Original signature on file 7/3/19

Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD. 399.