ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis	2. Date
Original Updated Corrected	January 8, 2021
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) NR 10	
4. Subject Elk management	
5. Fund Sources Affected	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule	
☑ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues	Increase Costs Decrease Costs
Indeterminate Decrease Existing Revenues	Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)	
State's Economy	
Local Government Units Public Utility Rate Payers	
Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)	
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1).	
\$0	
10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)?	

11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule

This rule implements changes related to elk management and hunting regulations that have emerged from the Department's 2020-2030 elk management plan.

Current rule establishes two elk ranges that serve dual purpose as elk management zones. They include the Clam Lake zone and the Black River zone. Hunters were previously allowed to harvest elk in any part of the elk management zone. This rule changes the names and boundaries of these zones, and further divides them by creating elk hunting units within these zones. This will prevent the overharvest of elk in a single subzone by specifying that tags are valid in one or more subzone.

The elk season is statutorily required to begin on the Saturday nearest October 15th. It previously ran for thirty consecutive days and then reopened on the second Thursday in December and continued for nine consecutive days. This rule eliminates the current closed period between the seasons and instead offers a single consecutive ending on the Sunday nearest December 15th.

This rule also updates the elk population goals for each managmeent zone. The previous population goal was 1,400 elk for the northern zone. The new population goal for the northern zone will be 1,400 +/- 20%. The previous population goal for what is now the central elk heard was 390 elk. It will now be 300 + - 20%.

12. Summary of the Businesses, Business Sectors, Associations Representing Business, Local Governmental Units, and Individuals that may be Affected by the Proposed Rule that were Contacted for Comments.

A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will be posted on the department's website in January 2021 for fourteen days and various interest groups may be contacted. No fiscal effects on small businesses, their associations, or local governments are anticipated.

13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA.

A notice for solicitation of comments on this analysis will posted on the department's website during a 14 day period in

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

January 2021.

14. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economy as a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)

These rules, and the legislation which grants the department rule making authority, do not have a fiscal effect on the private sector or small businesses. These rules are applicable to individual sportspersons and impose no compliance or reporting requirements for small business, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.

15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

These proposals will generally contribute to providing good opportunities for hunting and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in those activities.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The long range implications of this rule proposal will be the same as the short term impacts. These proposals will generally contribute to providing good opportunities for hunting and trapping and maintenance of the economic activity generated by people who participate in those activities.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

States possess inherent authority to manage the wildlife resources located within their boundaries, except insofar as preempted by federal treaties and laws, including regulations established in the Federal Register. In general, hunting and trapping within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore follows state regulations. However, in some instances, there are specific restrictions set in place by the federal government. None of these rule changes violate or conflict with the provisions established in the Federal Code of Regulations.

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

Only Michigan and Minnesota have regulated elk seasons. Minnesota has four separate hunting zones encompassing existing herds. Hunting is currently only allowed in two zones (20 and 30), with the majority of hunting in zone 20. Minnesota has five consecutive nine-day long seasons that take place from August 22 through November 1 plus an additional 9-day season from December 5-13. Michigan has three separate hunting "periods". Period one is Sept 1-4, Sept 18-21, and Oct 2-5. Period two is Dec 12-20. Period three is Jan 13-17. In Michigan, Elk Management Units X, H, I. Units H/I (core elk range) are closed for hunting in the September/October periods but open in the December period. Unit X is 10 counties in size, H/I combined are about half of a county in total. Michigan has a statewide elk popluation goal of 500-900 and Minnesota's population goal is 230-300.

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Scott Roepke	715-896-4947

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

1. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separately for each Small Business Sector, Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

3. Did the agency consider the following methods to reduce the impact of the Rule on Small Businesses?

Less Stringent Compliance or Reporting Requirements

Less Stringent Schedules or Deadlines for Compliance or Reporting

Consolidation or Simplification of Reporting Requirements

Establishment of performance standards in lieu of Design or Operational Standards

Exemption of Small Businesses from some or all requirements

Other, describe:

4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form) □ Yes □ No