

SUBJECT: Request adoption of Board Order WM-16-09, revisions to NR 10 relating to white-tailed deer population goals.

FOR: OCTOBER, 2009 BOARD MEETING

TO BE PRESENTED BY: Keith Warnke, Big Game Biologist

SUMMARY:

The department is required to conduct deer management unit boundary and overwinter population goal reviews at three-year intervals. The department gathered input for this review from a stakeholder advisory panel, through 40 public meetings, and five hearings held during the month of August.

Changes to the over winter population goal are recommended in 15 units. Population goals would be increased in 13 units and would decrease in two.

No boundary changes are recommended at this time. During the next three years a study will be conducted to identify the population monitoring benefits of consolidating existing DMUs. The study would be a comparison of the precision gained from unit consolidation relative to the 2009 DMU structure.

Population goals and DMUs serve as the foundation for managing the deer herd and determining deer hunting season structures. The proposed population goals are based on; 1) carrying capacity as determined by unit population responses to habitat quality and historical records of winter severity, 2) hunter success in harvesting and seeing deer and public deer viewing opportunities, 3) ecological and economic impacts of deer browsing, 4) disease transmission, 5) concern for deer vehicle collisions, 6) Chippewa treaty harvest, 7) hunter access to land in a deer management unit, 8) ability to keep the deer herd in a deer management unit at goal, and 9) tolerable levels of deer damage to crops.

RECOMMENDATION: Adoption of Board Order WM-16-09, revisions to NR 10 relating to white-tailed deer population goals.

LIST OF ATTACHED MATERIALS:

- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|---|-----|-------------------------------------|----------|
| No | <input type="checkbox"/> | Fiscal Estimate Required | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Attached |
| No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Environmental Assessment or Impact Statement Required | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | Attached |
| No | <input type="checkbox"/> | Background Memo | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Attached |

APPROVED:

Tom Hauge
Bureau Director, Tom Hauge

Laurie Osterdorf
Administrator, Laurie Osterdorf

Matt Frank
Secretary, Matt Frank

10/5/09
Date

10/5/09
Date

10/5/09
Date

cc: Laurie J. Ross - AD/8
Keith Warnke, WM/6

Scott Loomans, WM/6

Tom Hauge, WM/6

DATE: September 24, 2009

FILE REF:

TO: Natural Resources Board

FROM: Matt Frank 

SUBJECT: Deer Management Unit Boundary and Goal Review

Recommendation

The department is requesting board adoption of proposed changes to the over winter population goal in 15 Deer Management Units (DMU) (Table 1) (Figure 1). The Department is proposing raising deer population goals in 13 DMUs and lowering them in two DMUs.

Description of Policy Issues

There are currently 131 DMUs with established goals. Over winter population goals and DMU boundaries serve as the foundation for managing the deer herd and determining deer hunting season structures.

Related Administrative Code

Administrative code requires the Department to conduct DMU boundary and goal reviews at three-year intervals. The most recent review was completed in January, 2005.

NR 10.104 (3) THREE YEAR REVIEWS. The department shall review, and seek public comment, regarding the need to modify the boundaries or population goals for all deer management units every 3 years. For deer management units in the ceded territory as defined by s. NR 13.02 (1), the department shall also consult with the Wisconsin Chippewa bands in a government to government manner.

Goals and boundaries are defined in administrative code, which also provides guidance to the Department in establishing them.

NR 1.15 (2) (a) Deer population goals. The department shall seek to maintain a deer herd in balance with its range and at deer population goals reasonably compatible with social, economic and ecosystem management objectives for each deer management unit. Deer population goals are to be based on:

1. Carrying capacity as determined by unit population responses to habitat quality and historical records of winter severity.
2. Hunter success in harvesting and seeing deer and public deer viewing opportunities.
3. Ecological and economic impacts of deer browsing.
4. Disease transmission.
5. Concern for deer-vehicle collisions.
6. Chippewa treaty harvest.
7. Hunter access to land in a deer management unit.
8. Ability to keep the deer herd in a deer management unit at goal.
9. Tolerable levels of deer to crops.

NR 10.104(2) DEER MANAGEMENT UNITS. (a) The deer management unit boundaries are as described in s. NR 10.28.

(b) *Management unit size and configuration.* Deer management unit boundaries shall be established to encompass areas of similar land use, soils and vegetative cover, and be of sufficient size to permit accurate monitoring of herds.

(c) *Unit boundaries.* Unit boundaries shall be readily identifiable features of the landscape such as roads and rivers. When road boundaries are used, the department shall give priority to use of numbered and lettered highways.

2009 DMU review process

This DMU review process began during the summer of 2008. To date, it has consisted of public meetings held around the state to collect input along with a parallel stakeholder panel to further involve stakeholders in the review. In August, the department held seven public hearings around the state.

Stakeholder advisory panel

A stakeholder advisory panel (Panel) made up of representatives from Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, Conservation Congress, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation, Wisconsin Deer Hunters Association, Wisconsin Bowhunters Association, Wisconsin County Forest Association, DNR Forestry, University of Wisconsin Forestry and Wildlife Ecology, University of Wisconsin -Botany, Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association, Quality Deer Management Association, Wisconsin Bear Hunters Association, and National Wild Turkey Federation was assembled to collaborate with the department on the 2008 DMU boundary and goal review, gather constituent input, and consult with the department on proposed changes. The Panel attended three Saturday meetings, held several conference calls, communicated via their web site, and conducted a web based survey that generated over 7,400 responses to help inform their decision making. The Panel's final report is available on the Department's website.

Public hearings summary

Hearings were held in West Bend, LaCrosse, Wausau, Green Bay, Ashland, Rhinelander, and Menomonie and were attended by over 200 people (Table 2). Sixty-one comments were received via a website comment form, and we receive dozens of written comments via letters and email. Hearing attendance was generally light and appearances and registrations were in support of the proposed changes. The exception to this was at Green Bay where there was a well-organized push to increase goals and debate the definition of deer range.

A summary of comments received is characterized by the following comments, "goal in DMU 62B should be increased to 35"; "9-day season is enough"; "need to increase goals more"; "too many timber wolves"; "definitely need a 16-day gun season"; "raise goal in DMU 37"; "goal in DMU 39 should be 15"; "need to protect farming and the environment"; "don't see very many deer"; "adjacent landowner of 30-40 acres doesn't allow anyone to hunt"; "if DMU 69 went to EAB, would think seriously about not hunting"; "over-hunting herd - fewer antlerless tags should be given"; "baiting of deer should be banned (why deer sightings have dropped off)"; "allowing significant gun hunting in October or earlier in November. would seriously disrupt the bow season"; "EAB should be eliminated"; "deer harvest does not have a direct correlation to deer population".

Tribal consultation

We consulted with the Voigt Intertribal Task Force on two occasions (June and September). The Task Force proposed that all DMUs in ceded territory have goals that fit into ranges defined by the Task Force. Included in their input was the request that we not lower the goal in DMU 3. Based on this input and the input from the public and local biologists, the department is not recommending a change to goal in DMU 3 (see below). At this point, we believe we have consensus with the Task Force on DMU goals. The remaining obstacle to complete consensus is that the Task Force proposed reinstating DMU 5, which was eliminated in the previous DMU review, and the department is not proposing to do this.

Department recommendations

The department considered the points of consensus and recommendations from the Panel, information collected at the public hearings, and biologist and deer advisory committee input when making these recommendations. The department recommends no DMU boundary changes until we evaluate the potential benefits to population estimation of unit consolidation. The department will report on this evaluation at the beginning of the next DMU review (2012).

The department recommends that the board adopt changes to the over-winter population goal in 15 DMUs (Table 1) (Figure 1). In two DMUs the goal would be decreased, and in 13 DMUs our recommendation is to increase the over-winter goal.

- The department recommends decreasing the goal in DMU 49A. The recommended decrease is consistent with the Panel consensus. DMU 49A is a northern forest DMU with a goal of 25 dsm. The Panel consensus indicated that the department could recommend reducing goals in northern forest units where the goal was 25 dsm. We recommend reducing the over winter goal in 49A to 20 dsm of range due to concerns for forest regeneration and composition impacts.
- The proposal that went to hearing recommended that the DMU 3 goal be reduced to 15 deer per square mile of deer range (dsm) due to concerns for forest regeneration and composition. There was some public input to support this decrease; however, due to the public input received at hearings and through comments, input from local wildlife biologists, and input received through the tribal consultation process (the Voigt Task Force recommends a goal between 16 and 21 dsm), the department recommends no change to the goal in DMU 3.
- The department recommends an increase in the goal in DMU 14 from 14 to 18 dsm, and in DMU 6 from 12 to 15 dsm. These changes differ from the Panel's consensus however, the input from the public meetings was for an increased goal in these units and department biologists and staff are confident that these units can be managed at these goals without herd control seasons and that agricultural damage and forest composition and regeneration impacts are not of great concern at the higher goal.
- The department recommends reducing the goal in DMU 68B from 30 dsm to 25 dsm. The Panel did not reach consensus on any recommendations for DMUs where the current goal is 30 dsm. DMU 68B is adjacent to the CWD zone and is chronically over goal. Hunter pressure in DMU 68B is not high enough to maintain the population at 30 dsm without an EAB-type season structure, and the unit has a history of high agricultural damage.
- The department recommends increasing the goal in metro units 59M, 60M, 64M, and 77M from 10 to 15 dsm. The Panel's consensus recommended that the department evaluate metro unit goals. We received some public input to increase goals in some metro units. The department concluded that 15 dsm was a reasonable objective for these metro units and balanced hunter and residents desire to hunt and observe deer with the areas' proximity to urban centers. In metro unit 1M, the department concluded that 47 of the 51 square miles of total area in the unit are inside the city limits of the City of Superior and the goal should remain at 10 dsm.
- The department recommends increasing the goal in DMUs 59B and 77C from 15 to 20 dsm, and in DMUs 60A, 60B, 64, and 80B from 20 to 25 dsm. Also the department recommends that the goal in DMU 57 be increased from 22 to 25 dsm. These recommendations are consistent with the Panel consensus. Department biologists and staff are confident that these DMUs can be managed at these goals without herd control seasons (several continue to need herd control to get down to goal) and that agricultural damage and ecosystem impacts are not likely to exceed tolerable levels at the higher goal. The department will continue to monitor the effects of deer populations in these DMUs and may take action to reduce goals in the future if substantial negative impacts are documented.

Timeline

After board adoption, legislative review will hopefully be complete by the end of the year. The Effective date of the changes would be March 2010, in time for deer season setting in April.

The next DMU review is scheduled for 2013. As directed by the Natural Resource Board, the department will update the 1995 environmental assessment on deer population goals and harvest management prior to the 2013 DMU review.

Rule Development

These rules were developed with assistance from the bureau of Legal Services.

Small Business and Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

These revisions to Ch. NR 10, Wis. Admin. Code, relating to deer management unit over winter population goals, impose no compliance or reporting requirements for small businesses, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule. Therefore, under s. 227.19 (3m) Stats., a final regulatory flexibility analysis is not required.

Legislative Council Rules and Clearinghouse Report

All comments received by the department from the Legislative Council Clearinghouse have been incorporated (see attached report).

Table 1. Deer management units where a change is recommended to deer goal densities.

Deer Management Unit	Current Goal Density	Proposed Goal Density
6	12	15
14	14	18
49A	25	20
57	22	25
59B	15	20
59M	10	15
60A	20	25
60B	20	25
60M	10	15
64	20	25
64M	10	15
68B	30	25
77C	15	20
77M	10	15
80B	20	25

Figure 1. Deer management units where a change to the over winter goal is recommended by the department.




Table 2. Public Hearing Appearance Forms Summary

	# testified	Total Attendance	As interest may appear	In support	In opposition	No position indicated	Total forms completed
8/13/09, West Bend	2	7	0	0	2	0	2
8/18/09, Wausau	6	48	5	7	1	16	29
8/18/09, Rhinelander	1	2	0	0	1	1	2
8/19/09, Green Bay	16	85	13	3	46	23	85
8/19/09, La Crosse							
8/27/09, Ashland	4	7	2	0	1	3	6
8/31/09, Menomonie	1	4	1	2	0	1	4
	30	207	22	16	51	53	142

Fiscal Estimate — 2009 Session

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental	LRB Number <hr/> Bill Number	Amendment Number if Applicable <hr/> Administrative Rule Number WM-16-09
---	---------------------------------	--

Subject
 Revisions to deer management unit population goals.

Fiscal Effect
 State: No State Fiscal Effect
 Indeterminate

Check columns below only if bill makes a direct appropriation or affects a sum sufficient appropriation.

<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Appropriation	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs — May be possible to absorb within agency's budget.
<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Appropriation	<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Create New Appropriation		<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs

Local: No Local Government Costs
 Indeterminate

1. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory	3. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory	5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected: <input type="checkbox"/> Towns <input type="checkbox"/> Villages <input type="checkbox"/> Cities <input type="checkbox"/> Counties <input type="checkbox"/> Others
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory	4. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory	<input type="checkbox"/> School Districts <input type="checkbox"/> WTCS Districts

Fund Sources Affected <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	Affected Chapter 20 Appropriations
---	---

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Summary:

The Department recommends changes to the overwinter goals for 10 deer management units:

- DMU 3: decrease goal from 16 to 15 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 6: increase goal from 12 to 15 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 14: increase goal from 14 to 18 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 49A: decrease goal from 25 to 20 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 57: increase goal from 22 to 25 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 59B: increase goal from 15 to 20 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 59M: increase goal from 10 to 15 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 60A: increase goal from 20 to 25 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 60B: increase goal from 20 to 25 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 60M: increase goal from 10 to 15 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 64: increase goal from 20 to 25 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 64M: increase goal from 10 to 15 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 68B: decrease goal from 30 to 25 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 77C: increase goal from 15 to 20 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 77M: increase goal from 10 to 15 deer per square mile of deer range
- DMU 80B: increase goal from 20 to 25 deer per square mile of deer range

Assumptions:

A potential fiscal impact of increasing deer population goals is an increase of agricultural damage and associated claims and abatement costs. Fiscal impacts are not anticipated as a result of this rulemaking, however, because the proposed increases are minor, five or fewer deer per square mile of deer range. Some units currently have deer populations which are actually higher than the proposed goals.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

None

Prepared By: Joe Polasek	Telephone No. 266-2794	Agency Department of Natural Resources
Authorized Signature 	Telephone No. 266-2794	Date (mm/dd/ccyy) 06-2-09

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet — 2009 Session
 Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

- Original Updated
 Corrected Supplemental

LRB Number	Amendment Number if Applicable
Bill Number	Administrative Rule Number WM-16-09


Subject
 Revisions to deer management unit population goals.

One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):

Annualized Costs:		Annualized Fiscal Impact on State Funds from:	
		Increased Costs	Decreased Costs
A. State Costs by Category			
State Operations — Salaries and Fringes		\$	\$ -
(FTE Position Changes)		(FTE)	(FTE)
State Operations — Other Costs			-
Local Assistance			-
Aids to Individuals or Organizations			-
Total State Costs by Category		\$ 0	\$ - 0
B. State Costs by Source of Funds			
GPR		\$	\$ -
FED			-
PRO/PRS			-
SEG/SEG-S			-
State Revenues	Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)	Increased Revenue	Decreased Revenue
GPR Taxes		\$	\$ -
GPR Earned			-
FED			-
PRO/PRS			-
SEG/SEG-S			-
Total State Revenues		\$ 0	\$ - 0

Net Annualized Fiscal Impact

	<u>State</u>	<u>Local</u>
Net Change in Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0
Net Change in Revenues	\$ 0	\$ 0

Prepared By: Joe Polasek	Telephone No. 266-2794	Agency Department of Natural Resources
Authorized Signature 	Telephone No. 266-2794	Date (mm/dd/ccyy) 06-02-09



WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL RULES CLEARINGHOUSE

Ronald Sklansky
Clearinghouse Director

Richard Sweet
Clearinghouse Assistant Director

Terry C. Anderson
Legislative Council Director

Laura D. Rose
Legislative Council Deputy Director

CLEARINGHOUSE RULE 09-053

Comments

[NOTE: All citations to “Manual” in the comments below are to the Administrative Rules Procedures Manual, prepared by the Legislative Reference Bureau and the Legislative Council Staff, dated September 2008.]

5. Clarity, Grammar, Punctuation and Use of Plain Language

- a. In the plain language analysis, the first use of “deer management units” should be followed in parentheses by the acronym “DMVs” to which they are referred later in the section.
- b. In the plain language analysis, the word “overwinter” should be replaced by the phrase “over winter” in order to be consistent with the use of the term in the remainder of the first paragraph.
- c. In the summary of factual data and analytical methodologies, the word “for” should be deleted after the word “ability.”

**ORDER OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD REPEALING, AMENDING
AND REPEALING AND RECREATING RULES**

The Wisconsin Natural Resources Board proposes an order to amend NR 10.104(4)(b) relating to deer management unit population goals.

WM-16-09

Analysis Prepared by the Department of Natural Resources

Statutory Authority and Explanation: Statutes that authorize the promulgation of this rule order include sections 29.014, and 227.11, Stats. These sections grant rule making authority to the department to establish seasons and bag limits for hunting that ensure the citizens of the state continued opportunities for good hunting and that all rules promulgated under this authority are subject to review under ch. 227, Stats.

Statutes Interpreted and Explanation: In promulgating this rule s. 29.014 and 29.889(12) Stats. have been interpreted as allowing the department the authority to establish deer population goals to assure the health and vigor of the deer herd and to prevent overabundant populations of deer that can lead to agricultural, environmental and property damage.

Related Statute or Rule: Deer unit boundaries and goals are reviewed every 3 years according to s. NR 10.104 (3), Wis. Adm. Code and Voigt case stipulations (Chippewa treaty rights).

Plain Language Rule Analysis: There are currently 131 deer management units (DMUs) with individual over winter populations goals and a statewide over winter population goal of approximately 737,000 deer. Over winter population goals and DMUs serve as the foundation for managing the deer herd and determining deer hunting season structures. All goals referred to in this rule are the over winter deer population goal for a DMU. The hunting season population will generally be substantially larger than the over winter population goal.

The Department is proposing raising deer population goals in 13 management units and lowering the goal in two.

Deer Management Unit	Current Goal Density	Proposed Goal Density
6	12	15
14	14	18
49A	25	20
57	22	25
59B	15	20
59M	10	15
60A	20	25
60B	20	25
60M	10	15
64	20	25
64M	10	15
68B	30	25
77C	15	20
77M	10	15
80B	20	25

These changes are recommended to provide hunters with more deer hunting opportunities in instances where goals are proposed for increases and to alleviate agricultural damage in the instances where the goals have been recommended

for a decrease. The department does not anticipate significant ecological, agricultural or forestry impacts because of the proposed goal increases. However, there is a concern that a higher goal with low hunter densities will mean continuous herd control seasons.

Federal Regulatory Analysis: Provided state rules and statutes do not relieve individuals from the restrictions, requirements and conditions of Federal statutes and regulations, regulation of hunting and trapping of native species has been delegated to state fish and wildlife agencies. Additionally, none of the proposed rules exceed the authorities granted the states in 50 CFR 10.

State Regulatory Analysis: All of Wisconsin's neighboring states have established management units for the purpose of managing deer populations. By using units with identifiable boundaries, deer populations can be monitored and kept at various population levels to more effectively control the deer herd and to address regional differences in habitat, population (human and deer) and to reduce conflict with other land uses such as residential, agricultural or forested.

Summary of Factual Data and Analytical Methodologies: The Department has evaluated the need for deer population goal reviews based on the following criteria: 1) Intolerable level of agricultural damage when at goal; 2) Ability of hunters to harvest enough deer to keep the population at the goal level; 3) Hunter demand for antlerless permits; 4) Vehicle-deer accident rate; and 5) Hunter buck harvest success rate. In addition, an Environmental Assessment was prepared in 1995. Copies of *Deer Population Goals and Harvest Management Environmental Assessment* are available from the department upon request.

Analysis and Supporting Documents Used to Determine Effect on Small Business or in Preparation of Economic Impact Report: These rules, and the legislation which grants the department rule making authority, do not have a significant fiscal effect on the private sector or small businesses.

Effects on Small Businesses: These rules are applicable to individual sportspersons and impose no compliance or reporting requirements for small businesses, nor are any design or operational standards contained in the rule.

Agency Contact People: Keith Warnke, 101 S. Webster St., PO BOX 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921. (608) 264-6023, keith.warnke@wisconsin.gov or Scott Loomans, 101 S. Webster St., PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921. (608)267-2452, scott.loomans@wisconsin.gov

Deadline for Written Comments: The deadline for written comments was August 31, 2009.

Section 1. NR 10.104(4)(b) is amended to read:

NR 10.104(4)(b) *Unit goals.* The deer population goals for each deer management unit described in s. NR 10.28 shall be expressed as the number of deer per square mile of deer range in January and are as follows:

<u>Management Unit</u>	<u>Deer</u>	<u>Management Unit</u>	<u>Deer</u>	<u>Management Unit</u>	<u>Deer</u>
<u>Goal</u>		<u>Goal</u>		<u>Goal</u>	
1.....	20	37.....	25	62B.....	25
1M.....	10	38.....	20	63A.....	25
2.....	18	39.....	20	63B.....	25
3.....	16	40.....	20	64.....	20 25
4.....	15	41.....	25	64M.....	40 15
5.....	20	42.....	20	65A.....	30
6.....	12 15	43.....	15	65B.....	30
7.....	15	44.....	17	66.....	25
8.....	20	45.....	20	67A.....	25
9.....	20	46.....	25	67B.....	25
10.....	25	47.....	25	68A.....	30
11.....	20	48.....	20	68B.....	30 25
12.....	17	49A.....	25 20	69.....	25
13.....	15	49B.....	25	70.....	25
14.....	14 18	50.....	20	70A.....	25
15.....	22	51A.....	25	70B.....	25
16.....	25	51B.....	25	70E.....	25
17.....	15	52.....	20	70G.....	30
18.....	20	53.....	25	71.....	25
19.....	20	54A.....	25	72.....	20
20.....	18	54B.....	25	73B.....	20
21.....	25	54C.....	25	73D.....	20
22.....	20	55.....	25	73E.....	22
22A.....	20	56.....	30	74A.....	20
23.....	20	57.....	22 25	74B.....	20
24.....	20	57A.....	25	75A.....	20
25.....	20	57B.....	25	75C.....	20
26.....	20	57C.....	30	75D.....	20
27.....	20	58.....	25	76.....	20
28.....	15	59A.....	20	76A.....	25
29A.....	15	59B.....	15 20	76M.....	10
29B.....	12	59C.....	25	77A.....	20
30.....	15	59D.....	20	77B.....	15
31.....	20	59M.....	40 15	77C.....	15 20
32.....	21	60A.....	20 25	77M.....	40 15
33.....	20	60B.....	20 25	78.....	15
34.....	17	60M.....	40 15	80A.....	15
35.....	20	61.....	20	80B.....	20 25
36.....	25	62A.....	25	81.....	15

Section 2. Effective Date. This rule shall take effect the first day of the month following publication in the Wisconsin administrative register as provided in s. 227.22(2)(intro.), Stats.

Section 3. Board Adoption. This rule was approved and adopted by the State of Wisconsin Natural Resources Board on

_____.

Dated at Madison, Wisconsin _____.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

By _____
Matthew J. Frank, Secretary

(SEAL)