

**From:** [Wedde, Kim](#) on behalf of [FWP Fishing](#)  
**To:** [Roberts, Eric](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL]  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 16, 2021 1:13:43 PM

---

**From:** rivergeorge52@aol.com <rivergeorge52@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 12, 2021 4:35 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing <fwpfsh@mt.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]

My opinion, being a lifetime resident of Montana, is to make the Missouri River and Canyon Ferry have the same regulations concerning the new walleye regs!

**From:** [Wedde, Kim](#) on behalf of [FWP Fishing](#)  
**To:** [Roberts, Eric](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Upper Missouri River management plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 16, 2021 2:05:39 PM

---

**From:** RANDY <fshbwlred@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 15, 2021 9:31 AM  
**To:** FWP Fishing <fwpfsh@mt.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Upper Missouri River management plan

Good Morning.

First of all I think you are making great strides by making necessary change to the limits.

My comments to the proposed plan would be 5 walleye per day. 10 in possession of which on 1 per day can be over 15" with a maximum of 24". For both the lake and the river above Canyon Ferry Dam.

I would also like the same put into place Below Holter Dam. That area needs some protection as well.

Thanks,

Randy Redfern  
State President  
Walleyes Unlimited of Montana  
406-672-6305

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Robert Cummings <rcummings543@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 26, 2021 5:30 AM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]

Need to put the limit down to five. A leave it at 1 over 25 in need to make the limit the same for Hauser holder Canyon Ferry the whole Missouri river systems thank you for letting us put in input

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Robert Dennee <rpdennee@bresnan.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 25, 2021 5:36 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Cc:** 'Bob and Phyllis'  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed Changes - Canyon Ferry and Hauser

I support the proposed changes to Walleye Harvest limits on Canyon Ferry and Hauser reservoirs.

I fish for walleye on Canyon Ferry several times each year, especially June-September.

I've noticed that in recent years, there is somewhat of a decline in numbers of walleyes in Canyon Ferry, and the size remains quite small.

Changing the daily limit to 10 fish makes sense.  
Allowing removal of only 1 fish over 15" also makes sense.

Thanks..  
Bob Dennee  
406-579-3011

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Dick & Colleen Hoffman <montana@hoffman.ph>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 25, 2021 10:21 AM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Canyon Ferry and Hauser Resivior Walleye

It,s about time to see some changes for the better at these two bodies of water. Something like this should have happened 10 years ago. Agree with the lower limit, but why not go to 6 per day and 12 in possession. Agree with the only one over size for now but you should also put a lower end size on of no fish kept under 12 inch's. Washington state has this in their reg's and it appears to be working there. Let's act now and maybe my sons and grand kids will see walleye fishing back close to what is was like in the late 1990's

Dick Hoffman, Florence Mt

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Ed Heinlein <edsbeejuice@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 8:18 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Upper Missouri R. management planned changes

I know you have heard my recommendation before, but insist that you cannot act upon it. Regardless, I shall once again offer my suggestions.

I accept your findings of the walleye population densities and sizes. What I fail to understand is why you insist mainge management changes based solely on fishing pressure?

IF these fish populations had adequate forage upon which to actually thrive, you would not only see greater fish populations, but sizes as well! You have already proven my recommendation in Tiber and Fort Peck Res.

I suspect you will once again default to your past rathionals that no forage fishes may be introduced into the Upper Missouri chain of reservoirs. I am abundantly aware that management decisions are no longer made for the benefit of the sportsman or the species in question, but rather based on political pressures.

So, that is my recommendation.....I know my suggestions fall on deaf ears.....that is a shame.

Sincerely,  
Ed Heinlein

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** John Olson <johanpursnipen@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 7:03 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Canyon ferry Reservoir

Our fishery is in need of food. Walleyes crawling along the bottom with the perch for blood worms is not ideal. The walleyes are undernourished and skinny. I purpose a small minnow be introduced as a source of food. The trout, perch and walleyes would all benefit.

I also purpose the introduction of Bluegills and black crappie. Both are excellent gamefish that would bring fisherman in.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android \[go.onelink.me\]](#)

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Dean Blomquist <deanblomquist@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 4:15 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Upper Missouri Walleye

I agree with and support your recommendation of your preferred alternative of changing bag limits on Canyon Ferry, Houser, and the river above Canyon Ferry. In the long term, I would like to see conditions that would be conducive to having the same limits as the rest of the state.

Dean Blomquist  
4068615201



## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** chukari@outdrs.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 3:15 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Canyon Ferry Walleye Limits

### Response to your survey:

There's too much pressure on the walleye, I believe there should be no more than 5 daily with 1 over 20 in. There's really no meat on a 15" fish. Too many people have come here to "load up"

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Jeffery Hamling <jeffhamling@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 3:15 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Canyon ferry

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Canyon ferry has the potential to be one of the most productive walleye fisheries in Montana. I support the reduction in daily limit. I fish this reservoir 2-3 times per week. I've noticed the numbers of perch are way down over the past few year perhaps lending to a smaller overall walleye. Not sure if planting perch or other baitfish is an option but it would certainly pay dividends in the long run. I also have caught large pike in the last few years. I never caught them before but now they seem to be becoming a more common occurrence. I'm sure this has impacted the perch populations as well.

Thanks.

Dr Jeff Hamling. DDS, MS.

Sent from my iPhone

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** FWP General  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 2:53 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Walleye- Canyon Ferry & Hauser

---

**From:** Ronald Russell <rbrussell1947@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 2:18 PM  
**To:** FWP General <fwpgen@mt.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Walleye- Canyon Ferry & Hauser

Just want to send my support for the proposed reduction of daily limits on walleye.

Ron Russell  
Ennis, Montana

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Bob Waller <ruwaller@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2021 2:08 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Walleye Regs

I strongly oppose the size limit, the daily limit of ten is fine. No size limits. Bob Waller 406-582-8491

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Pete Jellar <admin@petestackleshop.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 2, 2021 7:52 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I support the 1 over 15" walleye and a 10 fish limit on Canyon ferry.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** William Wemple <billwemple@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 3:34 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Walleye management

It is nice to see a proactive approach regarding this species. Please consider, perch rearing in 1 or two of the ponds on the south end of the lake. It would enhance perch fishing and provide an annual influx of feed for large walleye, burbot and trout, without adding another species to the upper Missouri. If someone could respond to this suggestion with an approximate cost and viability of the project, perhaps a fund raising and timeline could be applied and the fishing public could have a say/support an initiative to improve fishing for all species.

Sent from my iPhone

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Jeffrey Koski <jeffkoski@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 9:23 AM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Canyon Fishing regulations

Thank you for recognizing the deficiency in size and numbers of walleyes in Canyon Ferry. Please implement the 10 fish limit and 1 fish over 15" as soon as possible. The regulation should include the River from Toston to Canyon Ferry.

Jeff Koski  
10 Legacy Trail  
Bozeman MT

Sent from my iPhone

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** dlkumlien@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 3:33 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed changes to Missouri River regs Toston to Canyon Ferry

Dear Montana FWP,

I write to express my concern regarding the proposed regulation changes to the Missouri River between Toston and Canyon Ferry. It appears that MTFWP is proposing regulations to encourage the expansion of the population of walleyes which are an illegally introduced fish? I understand that the Canyon Ferry walleye fishery provides a lot of angling opportunities, but I don't like the idea that regulations are being proposed to help expand the river dwelling walleye population to the detriment of the river's trout population.

Sincerely,

Dave Kumlien  
Bozeman, Montana



## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** James Gustafson <jag5656@bresnan.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 11, 2021 3:41 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Canyon Ferry

10 fish limit, 1 fish over 15" is a reasonable plan.

Sent from my iPhone

## Milligan, Valisa

---

**From:** Larry Harrell <larry.harrell1950@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 11, 2021 9:27 PM  
**To:** FWP Fishing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Walleye limits

I feel your proposal is a great idea for these lakes

Sent from my iPhone



P.O. Box 7186 Missoula, MT 59807 (406) 543-0054

10 March 2021

Hank Worsch, FWP Director  
Eileen Ryce, FWP Fisheries Division Administrator  
Eric Roberts, FWP Fish Management Bureau Chief  
Montana Fish & Wildlife Commission  
Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks  
1420 East 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Helena, MT 59620

RE: Comments on Proposed Regulation Changes for the Missouri River from Toston Dam to Canyon Ferry Reservoir

Dear Fish, Wildlife and Park and Fish & Wildlife Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on potential changes to walleye regulations for the Missouri River from Toston Dam to Canyon Ferry Reservoir. In short, our organization strongly encourages you to maintain the current, well-established regulations in this stretch of river.

Montana Trout Unlimited (MTU) represents the interests of more than 4,000 members statewide in protecting, conserving, and restoring coldwater fisheries and their habitats, especially in regard to wild and native trout. Because walleye have been introduced to wild and native trout waters in Montana and these non-native fish are highly predacious on trout, as well as other prey species, it is sometimes necessary for us to consider how walleye are managed as part of our mission to conserve trout. That is certainly the case regarding the proposed changes to a valuable, sustainable wild trout fishery below Toston.

The proposal to change walleye regulations below Toston has numerous flaws. First, MTU maintains that any management decisions should be based on the three-year running averages of monitoring data, not a single year of population, size and/or age-class data as is the case in this proposal. Second, any proposal dealing with regulation changes should include a 'no-action' alternative, so that the public has a fair chance to understand and comment on the fact that no change to

regulations is required. By foregoing a 'no-action' alternative, the current proposal implies that one of the three regulation changes to benefit more, larger walleye is imminent, if not required, rather than optional. Furthermore, if changes to walleye regulations are being considered, those considerations ought to also include the option of suppressing walleye in this stretch of river. The current population of walleye below Toston are a result of the illegal introduction of this species to Canyon Ferry. FWP should not be promoting the expansion of an illegal introduction, as this proposal does. Just the opposite, FWP ought to consider suppressing the expansion of any and all illegal fish introductions. Doing otherwise sets a bad and potentially costly precedent by rewarding illegal introductions. Encouraging future illegal introductions by accepting, then promoting the expansion of past illegal introductions risks upending all of Montana's fisheries, overturning all reasonable fishery management, and inadvertently spreading aquatic invasive species.

All three regulation changes being proposed during this comment period risk negative impacts to this section of river's wild trout fishery. That fishery is part of one of Montana's most popular trout angling destination rivers. The upper Missouri accounts for approximately 12% of all trout angling in the state (and growing), generating tens of millions of dollars in economic activity annually. By changing walleye regulations from the "monitor" stipulation in the Statewide Fisheries Management Program and Guide (SFMPG), all three options in this proposal jeopardize this prized trout fishery. It is inconceivable that encouraging more, larger highly-predacious, walleye will *not* negatively impact wild trout and the value of this fishery for Montanans and many thousand visitors who prize the state's trout waters.

MTU and its members are not anti-walleye. We have repeatedly supported management of walleye fisheries where they currently exist as a result of historic stocking, such as in the many reservoirs in eastern and central Montana. On the other hand, it's reasonable to expect FWP not to manage in ways that benefit this highly predacious fish in one of the nation's best wild trout tailwaters. In fact, MTU is fine with the changes that FWP is simultaneously proposing for walleye regulations in Canyon Ferry and Hauser reservoirs. But we strongly oppose efforts to extend the robustness of those walleye fisheries beyond the reservoirs, up- or downstream.

Again, we appreciate your commitment to continue wise, science-based management of our fisheries. You will be hearing similar comments from many of our members and chapters. Please contact me anytime if you have questions, need clarification, or wish to share thoughts on these comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "David Brooks".

David Brooks  
Montana Trout Unlimited  
david@montanatu.org

Cc:

Pat Tabor  
Pat Byorth  
KC Walsh  
Lesley Robinson  
Brian Cebull



March 12, 2021

FWP Reservoir Plan  
P.O. Box 200701  
Helena, MT 59620

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the Pat Barnes Chapter of Trout Unlimited, we want to thank you for allowing us opportunity to comment on potential changes to the Upper Missouri River Management Plan. As a local chapter in the greater Helena area we represent over 500 concerned members who advocate for coldwater resources as they relate to trout. The following comments are in regard to potential changes in walleye management being proposed by FWP. Specifically, we are concerned about how the potential management considerations will affect the overall trout populations and management thought the entire watershed.

In conjunction with Montana Trout Unlimited, PBTU would like FWP to consider the following concerns:

- The Missouri River below Toston dam to Canyon Ferry is a valuable, wild trout fishery that is and has been supported by the Statewide Fishery Management Plan for many years. Walleye are an unintended introduction to this section of river because of the illegal introduction of this species to Canyon Ferry. FWP should continue to prioritize the trout fishery in this section of river through management decisions that do not add any risk to its sustainability or population dynamics.
- The proposal to consider changing regulations to this stretch of river has significant procedural flaws. It is being compelled by a single year of monitoring data on walleye, rather than the scientifically justified three-year trends that have governed consideration of regulations changes in Montana for decades. This proposal also fails to include a 'no-action' alternative that evaluates the merits of maintaining the current regulations. Furthermore, any proposal to reconsider regulation changes in this section of river for a species of fish that resulted from an illegal introduction downstream should include the option of active suppression through more liberal harvest regulations or other departmental actions.
- As for the three regulation changes being vetted in this proposal, they all risk detrimental impacts to the trout fishery by promoting more large, predatory, nonnative, illegally introduced walleye in this section of river.
- Because the trout fishery in the Missouri River above and below the three main reservoirs is one of the most popular in the state, accounting for more than 12% of trout angling in Montana, and generating tens of millions of dollars annually for

Montana's economy, it is reasonable to ask FWP to uphold the established regulations that require management of this stretch of river be first and foremost for wild trout.

We appreciate your time and consideration and hope that the decision to adjust the walleye regulations is taken with the utmost attention to the wild and self-sustaining trout populations in the watershed.

Sincerely,

Taylor Todd, Conservation Chair, PBTU Board