

Regulation Proposal Form

[Print Form](#)

[Email Form](#)

Proposal Title Use of Lead-tackle on Selected Experimental Lakes in Vilas County	
Author DNR Lead Working Group	Date 07/20/2011
Location Information:	
Affected water(s) Northern Highlands Experimental Lakes (Nebish, Escanaba, and Palette)	
County Vilas County	WBIC(s) 1869700, 2339900, 1872100
Upstream/downstream boundaries, if applicable—Law Enforcement should be consulted	
Will this regulation affect Ceded Territory water and are there any anticipated impacts to tribal fisheries? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Current Regulation <p>These three Vilas County lakes are all in the Ceded Territory and this proposal needs to be reviewed by the affected tribes.</p> <p>Special regulations per s. NR 20.41 apply to the Experimental Lakes that include Escanaba, Nebish, and Palette Lakes. In addition to the general inland waters regulations, special regulations apply to: Escanaba (season open all year, 28" minimum Walleye); Nebish (continuous open season, no minimum for Smallmouth bass with zero bag limit for 9"-12"); and Palette (continuous open season, 22" minimum for Smallmouth bass with 1 bag limit and closed season for trout). Experimental waters require permits to fish and reporting of catch.</p>
Proposed Regulation <p>The proposal is to allow use of sinkers, weights, jigs, and hooks that contain lead if they exceed a minimum mass or size and to prohibit lead-containing sinkers, weights, jigs, and hooks that weigh less than 1 ounce and are smaller than 1" in any dimension. This proposal would be implemented by creating the following section:</p> <p>NR 20.41 (4) AUTHORIZED METHODS No person may fish in Escanaba, Nebish, and Palette Lakes while possessing fishing line with any sinker, weight, jig or other hook attached that weighs less than 1 ounce and measure less than 1 inch in any dimension and contain lead.</p>
Management Goal <p>Summary statement that characterizes the desired fishery (e.g. provide a naturally reproducing harvest-oriented walleye fishery; provide a bass fishery dominated by large adults that maximizes predation on smaller fishes)</p> <p>The management goal of this proposal is to improve public education about the wildlife health concerns posed by the loss of lead-containing tackle to Wisconsin's lakes, rivers and streams and is not expected to change the fishery. For wildlife, the goal is to reduce the amount of lead tackle deposited into Wisconsin waters. This proposal will also provide treatment lakes that could be studied to examine angler response and the exposure of loons to lead from the ingestion of lead-containing tackle.</p>

Description of the Water(s) and Fishery

Provide a brief description of the water(s), past regulations and other management actions. Summarize all applicable fisheries data, particularly from surveys meeting protocols (Table 1).

Escanaba, Nebish, and Palette Lakes - There are five lakes in the NHFRA which have been continuously managed as experimental research waters including Escanaba (293 acres), Nebish (98 acres), Palette (176 acres), Spruce (16.5 acres), and Mystery (16 acres). Drive-in boat access is available only on Escanaba and Nebish lakes. Access to other lakes is limited to carry-in or portage. All of the NHFRA lakes are consistently used by anglers except for Mystery Lake, a typical northern Wisconsin bog lake with a maximum depth of only 7 feet and due to its small size and shallow depth, frequently undergoes winterkills because of low dissolved oxygen levels. Consequently, the lake is seldom fished. Angler use and harvest on these lakes has been continuously monitored through a compulsory creel check since the area was established in 1946. For more information, see



SFR report SSDK
Newman 10.doc

Management Objective(s)

a) Goals are general, objectives are specific. Objectives are used to evaluate the effectiveness of your action and determine if you have achieved your goal. Provide a management objective that is specific, measurable, able to be achieved, related to the goal, and has a temporal component (e.g. increase walleye harvest rate to 0.1 fish/hour while maintaining recruitment at or above 10 YOY/mile within 5 years; increase largemouth bass RSD14 to 35 and bluegill RSD8 to 15 within 5 years)

There are no specific fisheries management objectives associated with this proposal. However, this proposal will create treatment lakes that could be studied to examine several specific metrics to evaluate angler acceptance of lead-tackle restrictions and exposure of loons to lead. These possible studies are not specifically proposed but would need to be further detailed to determine if they are feasible.

This proposal will help to reduce the amount of lead tackle deposited into Wisconsin waters. Lead tackle has been identified as a significant mortality factor for common loons and other waterbirds in Wisconsin.

b) Describe how the management objective and associated target levels for metrics were developed (e.g. lake management plan, stakeholder meeting, comparison to other water(s)).

Current Problem

Use survey data or provide context for a similar water or group of waters (e.g. lake type, watershed) to demonstrate how the fishery is not meeting the desired management objective. Identify hypothesized problem(s) you hope to address.

Lead is one of the most toxic metals known and adverse impacts due to lead exposure have been documented in numerous wildlife species. Lead deposited in the environment will persist indefinitely and will not break down over time into less-toxic compounds. Lead can poison people and animals such as loons, bald eagles, trumpeter swans, great blue herons.

In 2006 the DNR implemented a Wildlife Health Program that included performing necropsies on every dead loon that was recovered in the state. Lead was identified as a major mortality factor for common loons and lead sinkers were routinely seen on x-ray images of lead poisoned loons.

Lead poisoning from ingested tackle usually occurs in one of two ways: a lead jig head is swallowed by a fish which is then eaten by a waterbird, or lost lead tackle is picked up along with small stones and grit from the bottom of lakes by water birds to help digest food.

Proposed Regulation Justification

How is the regulation change expected to meet your objective(s)? Demonstrate expected results of the regulation using tools such as modeling, comparisons to other waters, peer-reviewed literature, etc...

In 2006 the DNR implemented a Wildlife Health Program that included performing necropsies on every dead loon that was recovered in the state. Lead was identified as a major mortality factor for common loons and lead sinkers were routinely seen on x-ray images of lead poisoned loons.

Evaluation Plan

Provide a suggested plan and timeline for evaluating whether the objectives are met in response to the regulation change. Indicate potential courses of action if objectives are not being met. If proposed regulation is not part of the "toolbox" (Table 2) the evaluation plan needs to be additionally detailed with an explanation of how the costs of evaluation will be covered.

While the intent of this rule is to protect wildlife from ingestion of toxic amounts of lead fishing tackle, the scale of this rule is not sufficient to quantify the impact on the breeding common loon and bald eagle populations. Fewer than a dozen pair of eagles and loons utilize the study lakes for feeding during the nesting season. Rather, this rule is designed to gauge acceptance of the non-lead fishing alternatives by the fishing public.

Evaluation of angler experience with lead-free tackle would be accomplished as follows:

1. Science Services staff will develop a short (1-2 pg) survey would be developed to measure years of fishing experience, tackle typically used, fish typically pursued, type of lead-free tackle used on day of survey administration, overall assessment (satisfaction) of lead-free tackle used, willingness/likelihood of purchasing similar lead-free tackle. Survey development would include input from Science Services (SS), Fisheries Management, Lead Pilot Team members, and if possible, NR Board members. Costs for this approach will be minimal (printing of surveys). It is hoped that survey administration, data entry, analysis and reporting will be covered by SS staff.
2. Science Services staff would administer the survey to anglers at Northern Highlands Fishery Research Area (NHFRA). All anglers at NHFRA must check-in prior to fishing and check-out prior to leaving. Thus we have control over survey participants. When anglers check-out, they would be given the survey and encouraged to complete it on-site -- it should take only a couple of minutes. This is a volunteer, self-administered survey, meaning we cannot force/require anglers to complete it. Thus, some anglers may choose to take the survey with them and submit via return mail; some anglers may refuse to complete it.
3. The survey will be printed on colored paper to reduce the risk of someone copying the survey and submitting multiple responses in an attempt to bias the results.
4. Survey administration will run for 12-months, thereby capturing input during both open-water and ice fishing seasons.
5. Data will be entered and analyzed using Excel or SPSS. Periodic reports of preliminary results will be produced. Final results will be used to inform any future policy changes regarding the use of lead tackle.

Previous Action

Include details on previous regulation proposals that were intended to address the current problem, if applicable.

Lead in paint, gasoline and other products and lead shot for waterfowl has been banned beginning in the 1970s. In 1994, EPA proposed a nationwide ban that failed on manufacture, importation, processing and distribution of lead- and zinc-containing fish sinkers less than 25 mm. Lead-tackle bans and restrictions have been implemented by some countries, several states, and at some national refuges and parks. Fisheries Management has purchased non-lead sinkers and distributed them to all our loaner sites since 1999 and continues dependent on cost of non-lead sinkers and other tackle. Since 2007, Fisheries Management has maintained a "Get the Lead Out" webpage (<http://dnr.wi.gov/fish/pages/gettheleadout.html>) as key source of information for anglers and has included information on lead in a variety of publications.

In 2010, a coalition of conservation, hunting and veterinary groups filed a formal petition with the

Environmental Protection Agency requesting a ban on the manufacture, processing, and distribution of lead in shot, bullets, and fishing sinkers. EPA responded that it did not have the authority to ban lead ammunition under the authority of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and that the petitioners did not demonstrate that a national ban on lead sinkers was necessary or the least burdensome alternative for reducing the risk posed by the sinkers. During this process, EPA received over 7,500 emails and more than 8,600 comments. Of the actual letters uploaded to date on regulations.gov, there were (6) letters submitted on behalf of States or signed by government officials, (10) from organizations against the ban, (3) from organizations for the ban, and (1) from an organization neither for nor against the ban.

Public Participation in Developing Proposed Regulation

Was input solicited from stakeholders when developing the proposed regulation change? Include documented comments from affected user groups (positive and negative), contacts made with local Conservation Congress Representatives, lake associations, angler groups, etc...

There has been no specific outreach with stakeholders on this specific proposal. However, over the past several decades several groups and individuals have on occasion contacted the Department regarding concerns about lead tackle and protection on waterbirds. The Department created a Lead Working Group to develop a plan to address Department use of lead that may enter the environment. In 2010, the Lead Working Group drafted the Lead Action Plan that listed the Department actions to improve education and outreach regarding lead use with the ultimate goal of reducing the amount of lead discharged into the environment as a result of hunting and fishing activities.

In 2010 the Air, Waste, and Water committee of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress included a question in the annual survey regarding support of restrictions on lead-tackle. The question was: "*Would you support efforts by the state to phase out use of the lead fishing tackle less than one inch in length and less than one ounce in weight for use in Wisconsin waters?*" It passed 1,980 yes to 1,818 no. 33 counties approved, 37 rejected, and 2 counties tied.

At the February 2011 Natural Resources Board (NRB) meeting, an information session was held on the impacts of lead on wildlife from both fishing tackle and firearm ammunition. After the session the NRB members discussed steps the Department might take in addressing the issue. As a result NRB member suggested that lead tackle restrictions could be implemented as a pilot to advance public education of the lead tackle issue on a small number of lakes.

Science Services and Fisheries Management screened and identify lakes meeting the following criteria: shorelines entirely state owned and in the Northern Highlands American Legion State Forest, lakes with recent nesting loons or loon use, and lakes with at least average angling pressure preferably with walleye as a primary species. Using these criteria a small number of lakes were identified and included Escanaba in Vilas County. Given the small number of lakes meeting the criteria, the criteria were expanded to include lakes with a bass/panfish fishery and included Nebish also an Experimental lake in Vilas County. In addition, a proposal was made to implement the pilot on the Experimental Lakes which would be less costly to implement and therefore Pallette was added. So the proposal is to restrict lead-tackle on 3 of the 5 Experimental Lakes in Vilas County.

Small Business and Fiscal Effect

Explain who is likely to be economically impacted and in what way. If possible, provide estimates.

This proposal will impact the anglers of the specific lakes included in this proposal. Those anglers will need purchase non-lead containing small tackle (any tackle, primarily jigs and sinkers, that are less than 1" or weigh less than 1 ounce). While this proposal may benefit some tackle suppliers by increased sales or negatively impact local suppliers that don't have the inventory or need to add inventory, the cost is expected to be negligible since this proposal only address lead-tackle use on the selected lakes in Vilas County.

In addition, Science Services initiated a tackle exchange program at the Escanaba Lake Research Station. When anglers check in at the station to obtain their permit, they can exchange their lead tackle for non-lead tackle. The continuation of this program is dependent on funding but could be a way to mitigate costs to the angler.

Draft Question: for inclusion in Spring Hearing questionnaire

This proposal would (insert proposed regulation):

This proposal would require anglers fishing Escanaba, Nebish, and Palette Experimental Lakes in Vilas County to use non-lead sinkers, jigs, and weights if they weigh less than 1 ounce or are smaller than 1" in any dimension. The purpose of this proposal is to protect loons and other waterbirds that have been shown to ingest tackle the majority of which is the smaller sizes of tackle and to increase public awareness of the hazard that small sizes of lead-containing tackle pose to waterbirds.

For the specific administrative rule modification, the following rule would be s. NR 20.41(4) would be created to specify the authorized methods that may be used by anglers

NR 20.41 (4) AUTHORIZED METHODS No person may fish in Escanaba, Nebish, and Palette Lakes while possessing fishing line with attached lead-containing jigs, sinkers, and weights that weigh less than 1 ounce or that measure less than 1 inch in any dimension.

The Management Goal is: The management goal is to increase public awareness of lead-free tackle and to protect loons and other waterbirds from ingesting lead-containing tackle.

This regulation proposal is one tool to help meet the management goal because: This proposal should increase awareness by some anglers of the issue of wildlife exposure to lead from lost lead-containing tackle and possibly increase the number of anglers who voluntarily choose to use non-lead containing tackle.

Do you favor : *"Would you support a condition allowing anglers to use sinkers, weights, jigs, and hooks that are less than 1-inch length in any dimension and less than 1-ounce in weight only if they are lead-free on Escanaba, Nebish, and Palette Lakes in Vilas County?"*

Fish Team Supervisor Regulation Proposal Review Checklist

Instructions: Please use this checklist as a guide for your review of the regulation proposal. A completed checklist is only necessary after you have made your decision to reject or recommend. After completion, save a copy and use the email button at the top of the proposal form to send the proposal package to the Regional Fish Supervisor, Kate Strom Hiorns (automated), and CC the proposal's author.

Proposal Title Ban Use of Lead Tackle in Select Vilas County Waters		
Author DNR Lead Team	Reviewer Mike Vogelsang	Date 7/8/11
Location Information		
Affected waterbody(ies)? Escanaba, Nebish, and Palette Lakes		
County Vilas	WBIC(s) 1869700, 2339900, 1872100	
Upstream/downstream boundaries, if applicable		
Will this regulation affect Ceded Territory water and are there any anticipated impacts to tribal fisheries? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

Current Regulation Is this complete?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed Regulation Is this complete?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Management Goals Is the goal clear and complete?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Description of the Water(s) and Fishery Are adequate data presented? If No, are adequate data available?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Management Objective Is it specific?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it measurable?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is it achievable?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is it related to the goal?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is there a temporal component?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Was the management objective developed using sufficient stakeholder input and/or data?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Current Problem Do the data or analyses demonstrate the stated problem?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Do the data or analyses indicate a cause for the problem?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed Regulation Justification (how the regulation change is expected to help the fishery meet stated Management Objectives) Is there adequate documentation that the proposed regulation will achieve objective?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Which tools were used? (Select all that apply)		
Literature (summarized and cited)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Case Study or comparison to other waters (summarized with data)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Modeling of population responses to proposed regulation (modeling results with data and assumptions)	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Evaluation Plan (Suggested plan and timeline for evaluating whether the objectives are being met in response to the regulation change)

Is there a scientifically valid evaluation plan to determine whether the regulation was effective in achieving the objective? Yes No

Were additional potential courses of action included? Yes No

Previous Action (regulation history, include whether the proposal has previously been proposed)

Is this complete? Yes No

Public Participation (documented comments from affected user groups (positive and negative), contacts made with local Conservation Congress Representatives, Lake associations, Angler groups, etc.)

Is there a summary of public involvement in the development of this regulation? Yes No

Was there sufficient public input submitted? Yes No

Small Business and Fiscal Effect

Is this complete? Yes No

Draft Question (for inclusion in Spring Hearing questionnaire)

Is there a draft question for the spring hearing questionnaire? Yes No

Does the draft question sufficiently cover what the proposal is and does it explain how it would meet the management goal? Yes No

Fish Team Supervisor Reviewer Notes:

May want to just eliminate the 1 oz / 1" clause as this may confuse anglers, just say it's a lead ban - simple. If we're attempting to educate the public about harmful effects of lead on birds we should also convey the message that lead in-general in the environment is bad...whether it's a jig, a bottom bouncer, or piece of shot.

Would advocate if this moves forward it's done on the NHFRA lakes only – better oversight and control; staff there to help answer questions directly to the public.

With lead already present in unknown amounts in the proposed lakes, difficult to measure what positive effects banning it will have. Understand that at some point we need to stop adding lead to what's already there. Need to come up with a viable evaluation plan.

Recommended Action by Fish Team Supervisor

Approve Reject

Regional Fish Supervisor Regulation Proposal Review Checklist

Instructions: Please use this checklist as a guide for your review of the regulation proposal. A completed checklist is only necessary after you have made your decision to reject or recommend. After completion, save a copy and use the email button at the top of the proposal form to send the proposal package to Kate Strom Hiorns (automated) and CC the proposal's author.

Proposal Title		
-----------------------	--	--

Author	Reviewer	Date
---------------	-----------------	-------------

Location Information

Affected waterbody(ies)? Northern Highlands Experimental Lakes (Nebish, Escanaba, and Palette)
--

County Vilas County	WBIC(s) 1869700, 2339900, 1872100
-------------------------------	---

Upstream/downstream boundaries, if applicable
--

Will this regulation affect Ceded Territory water and are there any anticipated impacts to tribal fisheries? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
--

Current Regulation Is this complete?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---

Proposed Regulation Is this complete?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---

Management Goals Is the goal clear and complete?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---

Description of the Water(s) and Fishery Are adequate data presented? If No, are adequate data available?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---

Management Objective Is it specific?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it measurable?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it achievable?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it related to the goal?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is there a temporal component?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Was the management objective developed using sufficient stakeholder input and/or data?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Current Problem Do the data or analyses demonstrate the stated problem?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Do the data or analyses indicate a cause for the problem?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed Regulation Justification (how the regulation change is expected to help the fishery meet stated Management Objectives) Is there adequate documentation that the proposed regulation will achieve objective?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Which tools were used? (Select all that apply)	
Literature (summarized and cited)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Case Study or comparison to other waters (summarized with data)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Modeling of population responses to proposed regulation (modeling results with data and assumptions)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation Plan (Suggested plan and timeline for evaluating whether the objectives are being met in response to the regulation change)

Is there a scientifically valid evaluation plan to determine whether the regulation was effective in achieving the objective? Yes No

Were additional potential courses of action included? Yes No

Previous Action (regulation history, include whether the proposal has previously been proposed)

Is this complete? Yes No

Public Participation (documented comments from affected user groups (positive and negative), contacts made with local Conservation Congress Representatives, Lake associations, Angler groups, etc.)

Is there a summary of public involvement in the development of this regulation? Yes No

Was there sufficient public input submitted? Yes No

Small Business and Fiscal Effect

Is this complete? Yes No

Draft Question (for inclusion in Spring Hearing questionnaire)

Is there a draft question for the spring hearing questionnaire? Yes No

Does the draft question sufficiently cover what the proposal is and does it explain how it would meet the management goal? Yes No

Regional Fish Supervisor Reviewer Notes:

Evaluation plan was not in draft reviewed by Fish Team Supervisor Vogelsang but has been added since. Evaluation states it is "hoped" that the work to conduct the evaluation would be covered by SS staff. I concur and would further opine that FM staff not be involved since there are not measurable (nor indeed any stated) fishery goals.

My opinion is that the proposal should be limited to the lakes on the NHFRA.

NOTE ADDED by Regs Author Schrank – After review by Fish Team Supervisor and Regional Fish Supervisor, further direction was obtained to pursue a proposal only affecting three of five Experimental Lakes therefore edits were made 7/20/11 to the Proposal section to remove other options but no edits were made to the Fish Team Supervisor and Regional Fish Supervisor's review checklists and comments. In addition, the exact rule language was developed 8/18/11 after conversations with LE.

Recommended Action by Regional Fish Supervisor

Approve Reject

Species Team Regulation Proposal Review Checklist

Instructions: Please use this checklist as a guide for your review of the regulation proposal. A completed checklist is only necessary after you have made your decision to reject or recommend. After completion, save a copy and use the email button at the top of the proposal form to send the proposal package to Kate Strom Hiorns (automated) and CC the proposal's author.

Proposal Title Use of Lead-tackle on Selected Experimental Lakes in Vilas County		
Author DNR Lead Working Group	Reviewer Sean Strom	Date 08/29/2011
Location Information		
Affected waterbody(ies)? Northern Highlands Experimental Lakes (Nebish, Escanaba, and Palette)		
County Vilas	WBIC(s) 1869700, 2339900, 1872100	
Upstream/downstream boundaries, if applicable		
Will this regulation affect Ceded Territory water and are there any anticipated impacts to tribal fisheries? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

Current Regulation		
Is this complete?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed Regulation		
Is this complete?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Management Goals		
Is the goal clear and complete?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Description of the Water(s) and Fishery		
Are adequate data presented?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
If No, are adequate data available?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Management Objective		
Is it specific?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it measurable?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it achievable?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it related to the goal?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is there a temporal component?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Was the management objective developed using sufficient stakeholder input and/or data?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Current Problem		
Do the data or analyses demonstrate the stated problem?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Do the data or analyses indicate a cause for the problem?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed Regulation Justification (how the regulation change is expected to help the fishery meet stated Management Objectives)		
Is there adequate documentation that the proposed regulation will achieve objective?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Which tools were used? (Select all that apply)		
Literature (summarized and cited)		<input type="checkbox"/>
Case Study or comparison to other waters (summarized with data)		<input type="checkbox"/>
Modeling of population responses to proposed regulation (modeling results with data and assumptions)		<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation Plan (Suggested plan and timeline for evaluating whether the objectives are being met in response to the regulation change)

Is there a scientifically valid evaluation plan to determine whether the regulation was effective in achieving the objective? Yes No

Were additional potential courses of action included? Yes No

Previous Action (regulation history, include whether the proposal has previously been proposed)

Is this complete? Yes No

Public Participation (documented comments from affected user groups (positive and negative), contacts made with local Conservation Congress Representatives, Lake associations, Angler groups, etc.)

Is there a summary of public involvement in the development of this regulation? Yes No

Was there sufficient public input submitted? Yes No

Small Business and Fiscal Effect

Is this complete? Yes No

Draft Question (for inclusion in Spring Hearing questionnaire)

Is there a draft question for the spring hearing questionnaire? Yes No

Does the draft question sufficiently cover what the proposal is and does it explain how it would meet the management goal? Yes No

Species Team Reviewer Notes:

Recommended Action by Species Team

Approve Reject