

Legislative Analysis



REPEAL: HUNTING BAN ON FROGS

Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

Senate Bill 316 (proposed H-1 with proposed amendment)

Sponsor: Sen. Darwin Booher

House Committee: Natural Resources

Senate Committee: Natural Resources

Complete to 10-31-17

Analysis available at
<http://www.legislature.mi.gov>

SUMMARY:

Senate Bill 316 would amend the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (NREPA) by repealing Part 455 (Frogs) to allow for the hunting and collection of frogs at any time of the year and for any reason. Part 455 comprises Sections 45501, 45502, 45503, and 45504.

Currently, Section 45501 of NREPA prohibits a person from hunting frogs from November 16 to the Friday immediately preceding the opening of the fishing season on black bass, which is sometime in late spring. Additionally, it prohibits a person from spearing frogs with the aid of an artificial light at any time. SB 316 would repeal this section to allow year-round hunting of frogs and repeal the prohibition on spearing frogs with the aid of an artificial light.

Section 45502 states that Part 455 does not prevent the purchase, sale, or possession of frogs legally taken or shipped from outside the state, while Section 45503 allows the Department of Natural Resources to issue permits to take frogs at any time of the year if the frogs are for scientific or experimental purposes. Finally, Section 45504 sets forth penalties for a violation of Part 455. All of these sections are also repealed by the bill.

This bill and House Bill 4787 are tie-barred to one another, which means neither is enacted unless both are enacted. HB 4787 would amend NREPA by making changes to ice fishing shanty regulations. The amendment would strike this tie-bar.

MCL 324.45501 et al.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The bill would reduce costs for state and local law enforcement by eliminating certain restrictions on frog hunting, thereby reducing required enforcement actions. The bill would also reduce fine revenue by removing frog hunting under certain conditions as a finable offense. The extent of these reductions is dependent on the number of frog takings that otherwise would have been subject to the statute repealed by the bill. Consequently, the magnitude of the bill's fiscal impact is unknown.

Legislative Analyst: Emily S. Smith

Fiscal Analyst: Austin Scott

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.