

Regulation Proposal Form

[Print Form](#)

[Email Form](#)

Proposal Title Panfish Bag Limit - 10 on Little Hills Lake, Waushara County	
Author David Bartz - Fish Biologist	Date 16 July, 2012
Location Information:	
Affected water(s) Little Hills Lake	
County Waushara	WBIC(s) 105200
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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Current Regulation Panfish - 25 in total
--

Proposed Regulation Panfish - 10 in total

Management Goal 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) Increase the density and improve the size structure of the bluegill population.
--

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). Little Hills is an 81 acre, clear water, seepage lake with a maximum depth of 23 feet. Like many lakes in Waushara County, it is highly developed and lacks littoral habitat. This lack of habitat and the 14" size limit on Largemouth bass had resulted in a high density, slow growing population of largemouth and a low density population of Bluegill. In August of 2005, the 14" size limit was successfully removed. This was done to encourage harvest of smaller bass, reduce their numbers and help bring balance back to the fishery. Along with this, a rule proposal was submitted to reduce the bag limit for panfish from 25 to 10. At that time the proposal was not accepted. Since then this recommendation has been submitted by members of the Lake Association and the Conservation Congress at previous Spring Hearings. It was most recently passed as a Conservation Congress question and returned to the WDNR for review. We support the recommendation and are submitting it again.
--

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 Since removal of the 14" size limit, CPE of largemouth bass >8" has been reduced from 294/hour to 169/hour. Despite this reduction in numbers, growth rates for largemouth has remained relatively unchanged. Bluegill numbers have steadily increased and growth rates above age 4 are now above the statewide average, with fish reaching 7" at about age 5. PSD's have been around 40 in the last two surveys (2010-2011). We hope to continue to see increases in Bluegill abundance and PSD levels with the added protection of a reduced bag.

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)).

Numerous lakes in this area have encountered the same problems as Little Hills. Size limits on Largemouth Bass have been removed on a number of them, and we would like to give added protection to the slowly recovering Bluegill fishery. Much discussion has been carried out with the local Lake Association and riparians. They are in favor of this proposal.

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.

High density, slow growing Largemouth Bass population with low density Bluegill. Bass numbers have been reduced due to no size limit since 2005. Bluegill abundance, growth and overall size structure has also improved, but we hope to see further improvements with the reduction in bag.

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...

We hope to give added protection to a slowly responding Bluegill population. Bluegill CPE has increased from a low of 8.9/hour >3" in 2004 to a high of 251/hour >3" IN 2011. Higher recruitment has been documented in the last two surveys with YOY (1-1.5") common to very common. PSD levels have increases and although better than the past, could be improved.

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.

Largemouth Bass and Bluegill populations will be monitored using current baseline lakes sampling protocol, SE II. Aging data will be collected in various years to monitor changes in growth over time and effects that the current regulations may be having on the populations.

Previous Action

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

Removal of the 14" size limit has been successful in reducing the largemouth bass density. Bluegill numbers and recruitment have improved and this proposal is intended to decrease angler harvest and give added protection to the bluegill fishery.

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...

Yes, local Lake Associations are in favor of these changes, have submitted local recommendations and the Conservation Congress has approved the local recommendation.

Small Business and Fiscal Effect

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

Draft Question: for inclusion in Spring Hearing questionnaire

This proposal would (insert proposed regulation):Reduce the bag limit for Bluegill (panfish) from 25 to 10.

The Management Goal is:Reduce harvest on bluegill and improve size structure of the population.

This regulation proposal is one tool to help meet the management goal because:Reduced bag limit should give added protection to the slowly recovering Bluegill fishery.

Do you favor : Reducing the bag limit for Bluegill (panfish) from 25 to 10?

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 Ten panfish bag limit on Little Hills Lake		
Author David Bartz	Reviewer Schumacher	Date August 6, 2012
Location Information		
Affected waterbody(ies)? Little Hills Lake, an 81-acre central Wisconsin seepage lake		
County Waushara County	WBIC(s) 105200	
Upstream/downstream boundaries, if applicable		
Will this regulation affect Ceded Territory water and are there any anticipated impacts to tribal fisheries? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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:

Overfishing of quality-sized panfish is a common occurrence in small central Wisconsin lakes with good public access. A panfish reduction bag limit from 25 to 10 is a common management practice used to increase angling escapement. I support this proposal.

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 Bag limit reduction on panfish from 25 to 10 on Chalk Hills Lake		
Author Bartz	Reviewer Schumacher	Date August 6, 2012
Location Information		
Affected waterbody(ies)? Chalk Hills Lake		
County Waushara	WBIC(s) 105200	
Upstream/downstream boundaries, if applicable N/A		
Will this regulation affect Ceded Territory water and are there any anticipated impacts to tribal fisheries? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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:

I approve this proposed regulation change because the proposed regulation change is a commonly applied management practice for small, heavily fished lakes where we want to improve survival and quality of panfish, primarily bluegill.

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		
-----------------------	--	--

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

Location Information

Affected waterbody(ies)?

County	WBIC(s)
---------------	----------------

Upstream/downstream boundaries, if applicable
--

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

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

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

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

Description of the Water(s) and Fishery Are adequate data presented?	Yes <input 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 type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it measurable?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it achievable?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is it related to the goal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is there a temporal component?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Was the management objective developed using sufficient stakeholder input and/or data?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

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