

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

<b>1. Type of Estimate and Analysis</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected	<b>2. Date</b> March 8, 2024
<b>3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable)</b> Chapter NR 10,	
<b>4. Subject</b> Elk management	
<b>5. Fund Sources Affected</b> <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	<b>6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected</b>
<b>7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
<b>8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers <input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses <b>(if checked, complete Attachment A)</b>	
<b>9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1).</b> \$0	
<b>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)?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule</b> This rule implements changes related to elk management and hunting regulations that have emerged from the Department's 2024 elk management plan.  Current rules establish two elk ranges that serve a 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 an elk management zone that is open to hunting. This rule changes the names and boundaries of these zones, and further divides them by creating elk hunting subunits within these zones. This change may reduce hunting pressure on elk in specific portions of a zone 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 season which ends on the Sunday nearest December 15th.. There was no biological reason to have split season dates and this will be a simpler season framework for hunters and other outdoor recreationists to remember. This will also add more days available for hunters to pursue elk.  Since reintroduction, the elk population has been managed using a numeric goal as a long-term population goal to guide management efforts, which allows for little population size flexibility and adaptation with conflict or nuisance. The elk management plan proposes to manage the elk population using adaptive management by adopting an objective-based approach. This approach aligns population ranges with associated objectives and is founded by managing elk towards a density of 1 elk/sq. mile across each management zone. A list of metrics is utilized to guide management decisions based on current elk status on the landscape. A numeric population goal doesn't take into account or offer flexibility the ability to direct or react to the direction the elk population is trending. It also doesn't allow the department the flexibility to address elk nuisance and conflict at the herd level. An adaptive approach would allow the elk population to grow to an	

## ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

### Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

increased size while addressing localized conflict.

This rule also expands both the north and central elk management zones boundaries. The boundary expansions allow for increased management opportunity.

---

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 April 2024 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 be posted on the department's website during a 10 day period in April 2024 and various interest groups, including local governments, may be contacted.

---

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. The changes in this rule will also help to manage the elk population, reduce elk-related conflict levels and increase hunters' welfare.

---

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 and I (core elk range) are closed for hunting in the September/October periods but open in the December period. Unit X is comprised of 10 counties while Units H and I combined are about half of a county in total. Michigan has a statewide elk population goal of 500-900 and Minnesota's population goal is 230-300.

---

19. Contact Name	20. Contact Phone Number
Josh Spiegel	715-558-0648

---

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
-