

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis ☒ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected	2. Date August 17, 2026
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) Ch. NR 10, WM-17-25	
4. Subject Administering the elk hunting license drawing	
5. Fund Sources Affected ☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S	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 ☐ Specific Businesses/Sectors ☐ 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)? ☐ Yes ☒ No	
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule Current rules establish the application procedures for issuing elk hunting license. Prior to 2025, the department had not issued permits that allowed harvest of antlerless elk. Allowing harvest of antlerless elk will slow growth of the elk herd and address agricultural damage in locations where that is needed. Previously, the department held a single elk application and drawing and then had successful applicants choose whether they wanted an antlered or antlerless carcass tag until all tags were claimed. This was administratively cumbersome, and some hunters turned down the opportunity for an antlerless elk carcass tag in hopes that they would be successful in a future antlered carcass tag drawing. This rule creates separate drawings for antlered versus antlerless elk carcass tags. This recognizes hunter preferences by allowing hunters to apply for one permit type or the other, or to apply for both. The rule will also clarify how the once-in-a-lifetime restriction will be administered	
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 September 2026 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 September 2026.	
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 fiscal effects on the private sector or small businesses. No costs to the private sector or small businesses are associated with compliance to these rules. Additionally, the cost of the elk hunting application is established in state statute and will not be impacted by this rulemaking.	
15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule Implementing will provide clarity to hunters who wish to apply for either an antlerless elk carcass tag only, an antlered elk carcass tag only, or for both. Additionally, it would allow the department to more effectively administer the elk drawings and reduce the amount of	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

staff time needed to notify drawing winners

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 elk hunting 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. 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)

Minnesota has separate either-sex and antlerless elk seasons. Hunters must select a season, zone and license type when applying for an elk license. Elk licenses are only available to Minnesota residents, and they may only be issued one elk license in their lifetime.

Michigan offers one elk application and three options within the application, an any-elk license (either antlered or antlerless elk), an antlerless elk license, or only receiving a preference point. Michigan's elk licenses are available only for Michigan residents. Hunters who draw an any-elk license are ineligible for future drawing for the rest of their life with the exception of the Pure Michigan Hunt. Michigan hunters who draw an antlerless-only elk license are ineligible for future drawings for ten years.

Illinois and Iowa do not have elk hunting seasons.

19. Contact Name
Scott Karel

20. Contact Phone Number
608-206-0222

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

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
