Prohibition of the Importation of all Firewood on Commission-owned Wildlife Management Areas

Committee: Regulations

Date: November 19, 2014

Explanation:

The spread of exotic pathogens, diseases and insects to the forests of state-owned Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) endangers the wildlife resources of the state and their habitat. Due in part to the recent findings of Emerald Ash Borers within our state's boundaries, the imminent peril they pose, and the fact that the most prevalent mode of transportation of these insects is the distribution of firewood, an emergency exists for which it is necessary to retard further infestations by severely limiting the movement of firewood statewide.

An Emergency Minute Order and associated new regulation (Code 20.26) banning firewood importation onto Commission-owned WMAs was previously adopted by the Commission as an "emergency" regulation on September 18, 2014. WMD is now requesting that this regulation be permanently adopted by approval of a Minute Order at the December Commission Meeting.

Prepared by: Martin Blaney, Habitat Coordinator

20.26	FIREWOOOD IMPORTATION PROHIBITED ON COMMISSION- OWNED WMAs
10-14	It is unlawful to import, transport, or carry firewood into a Commission-owned WMA by any means, or to cause to be imported, receive, or to assist in any manner in the importation of firewood into a Commission-owned WMA. "Firewood" means all wood of any species, cut or not cut, split or not split, regardless of length, which is (a) in a form and size appropriate for use as a fuel or (b) destined for use as fuel. PENALTY: Class 1

FINANCIAL / ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS COMPLETELY (Attach additional pages if needed)

DEPARTMENT: Arkansas Game & Fish Commission

DIVISION: Wildlife Management

PERSON COMPLETING THIS STATEMENT: Martin Blaney

TELEPHONE #:479-747-2003 FAX #: 479-967-5103

EMAIL:martin.blaney@agfc.ar.gov

SHORT TITLE OF THIS RULE: Prohibition to the Importation of Firewood on State-owned WMAs.

1. Does this proposed, amended, or repealed rule or regulation have a financial impact?

Yes: No: X

- 2. Do you believe that the development of a financial impact statement is so speculative as to be cost prohibitive? Yes: X No: If "Yes", please explain: It would be very difficult to ascertain a cost to the general public wanting to bring firewood on agency lands when permitted campers are allowed to use dead and downed wood on these properties.
- 3. If the purpose of this rule is to implement a **federal** rule or regulation, please give the incremental cost for implementing the regulation. Please indicate if the cost provided is the cost of the program.

Current Fiscal Year		Next Fiscal Year		
General Revenue	\$	General Revenue	\$	
Federal Funds	\$	Federal Funds	\$	
Cash Funds	\$	Cash Funds	\$	
Special Revenue	\$	Special Revenue	\$	
Other (Identify)	\$	Other (Identify)	\$	
Total	\$ 0.00	Total	\$0.00	

What is the total estimated cost by fiscal year to any **party** subject to the proposed, amended, or repealed rule? (Estimated cost includes fees, administrative penalties, reporting, record keeping, equipment, construction, labor, professional services, revenue loss, or other costs associated with compliance.) Identify the **party** subject to the proposed rule, and explain how they are impacted.

Current Fiscal Year: \$0.00 Next Fiscal Year: \$0.00

Party Subject to Rule: General public.

Effect on Party Subject to Rule: Must find alternative to bringing firewood when camping on WMAs.

5. What is the total estimated cost by fiscal year to the **agency** to implement this rule? Explain the financial benefit to the agency from implementing this rule.

Current Fiscal Year: \$0.00 Next Fiscal Year: \$0.00

Financial Benefit to Agency: Greater protection for forest heath and sustainability.

6. Do alternative means exist for accomplishing the objectives of the rules that might be less burdensome to small business? Yes: No: X

Why were such alternatives not proposed: N/A

7. Compare this rule with federal and state counterparts: Other state agencies and federal partners are considering further control of the movement of firewood onto their properties.