



## **Economic Impact Analysis Virginia Department of Planning and Budget**

---

**4 VAC 10-30 – Virginia State Forest Regulations**  
**Department of Forestry**  
December 12, 2013

---

### **Summary of the Proposed Amendments to Regulation**

The State Forester proposes to: 1) increase the annual permit fee to hunt, trap, fish, ride bikes, or ride horses in a state forest from \$15 to \$20, and 2) add and amend language to reflect current practice.

### **Result of Analysis**

To the extent that the small fee increase is needed to fund the maintenance of state forests for the use and benefit of those using the forests for recreation, the benefit of the proposed amendment likely exceeds the cost.

### **Estimated Economic Impact**

Prior to 2012, the Code of Virginia (§ 10.1-1152) stated that the State Forester is authorized, with the approval of the Board, to require any person who hunts, fishes, traps, rides mountain bikes, or rides horses on any of the lands described in § [10.1-1151](#) to obtain a special use permit. A special use permit to engage in these activities on any such lands would be issued for a fee, not to exceed \$15 annually, as fixed by the State Forester. Permits to trap on such lands could be issued in combination with the hunting permits, or separately, at a fee not to exceed \$15 annually for each such permit, to be fixed by the State Forester.

Chapter 484 of the 2012 Acts of Assembly removed the explicit \$15 fee from statute, and instead specifies that the fee is to be established by regulations promulgated by the Department of Forestry. The State Forester proposes to set the fee as \$20 in these regulations.

State forests are financially managed through special revenues generated from timber sales and use permit sales; no general funds are provided towards their management. The small proposed fee increase will go toward maintaining the forests for the use of those paying the fee.

### **Businesses and Entities Affected**

The proposed amendments affect the estimated 6,000 to 7,000 individuals who use state forests for hunting, trapping, fishing, and biking, camping or horseback riding.<sup>1</sup>

### **Localities Particularly Affected**

The regulations potentially affect anyone interested in hunting, trapping, fishing, biking, camping or horseback riding, but may particularly affect those who live near the state forests. The 23 state forests are located in the following counties: Appomattox, Bedford, Buckingham, Carroll, Chesterfield, Craig, Cumberland, Essex, Fauquier, Grayson, King and Queen County, King William, Lancaster, Nelson, New Kent, Prince Edward, Prince William, Rockbridge, Rockingham, Russell, Shenandoah, Sussex, and Washington

### **Projected Impact on Employment**

The proposal amendments are unlikely to significantly affect employment.

### **Effects on the Use and Value of Private Property**

The proposed amendments are unlikely to significantly affect the use and value of private property.

### **Small Businesses: Costs and Other Effects**

The proposed amendments are unlikely to significantly affect small businesses.

### **Small Businesses: Alternative Method that Minimizes Adverse Impact**

The proposed amendments are unlikely to adversely affect small businesses.

### **Real Estate Development Costs**

The proposed amendments are unlikely to affect real estate development costs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data source: Department of Forestry

## **Legal Mandate**

The Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) has analyzed the economic impact of this proposed regulation in accordance with Section 2.2-4007.04 of the Administrative Process Act and Executive Order Number 14 (10). Section 2.2-4007.04 requires that such economic impact analyses include, but need not be limited to, a determination of the public benefit, the projected number of businesses or other entities to whom the regulation would apply, the identity of any localities and types of businesses or other entities particularly affected, the projected number of persons and employment positions to be affected, the projected costs to affected businesses or entities to implement or comply with the regulation, and the impact on the use and value of private property. Further, if the proposed regulation has an adverse effect on small businesses, Section 2.2-4007.04 requires that such economic impact analyses include (i) an identification and estimate of the number of small businesses subject to the regulation; (ii) the projected reporting, recordkeeping, and other administrative costs required for small businesses to comply with the regulation, including the type of professional skills necessary for preparing required reports and other documents; (iii) a statement of the probable effect of the regulation on affected small businesses; and (iv) a description of any less intrusive or less costly alternative methods of achieving the purpose of the regulation. The analysis presented above represents DPB's best estimate of these economic impacts.