

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, October 01, 2026 4:05:39 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 01, 2026 4:08:50 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:11
IP Address: 173.40.193.125

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Ray Ward
City/Town:	kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	iceyfreeze71@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

Thank you for looking for balance on our regulations. This looks like a reasonable daily and possession limit

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, October 06, 2026 8:48:28 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 06, 2026 10:09:44 AM
Time Spent: 01:21:15
IP Address: 72.250.178.161

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Sam Weyers
City/Town:	Columbia Falls
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	Louieshero@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

I have fished Little Bitterroot lake for better part of 15 years. I have watched the fishery decline year after year. Not only with Kocanee, but with Kamloop rainbows, too. I support the proposed revised higher limits on Kocanee. I feel the over abundance of smaller (10-12") fish is a result of over population, not spawn quality from LMR. IF FWP believes the poor spawn from LMR is the cause, they should rely on multiple other lakes with substantial Kocanee populations to manage it better, not just Little Bitterroot.

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Optional: Upload your comments

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, October 07, 2026 11:24:50 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 07, 2026 11:45:49 AM
Time Spent: 00:20:58
IP Address: 174.45.241.123

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Chancy jeschke
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	chancyfish@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

I support Wargos position to keep Bitterroot lake Salmon 20 fish

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, October 07, 2026 9:50:01 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 07, 2026 9:50:47 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:45
IP Address: 72.174.136.244

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Tristan Higgins
City/Town:	Columbia Falls
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	tristan.higgins@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

I strongly oppose every single change proposed by Wargo. Native species should be the priority for fisheries management, these amendments are not science based and would be harmful to native fisheries. Instead of expanding the slot limit on lake trout, it should be eliminated.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#5

COMPLETE

POOR QUALITY

Flagged for the following:

⚠gibberish

Collector:

Started:

Last Modified:

Time Spent:

IP Address:

Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Thursday, October 08, 2026 9:10:20 AM

Thursday, October 08, 2026 10:04:03 AM

00:53:43

35.150.71.159

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:

City/Town:

State/Province:

Email Address:

Clayton Elliott

Butte

MT

clayton@basinstrategies.com

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

These are comments regarding all five proposed amendments on behalf of Montana Trout Unlimited.

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

2026-10-06_COMM_AMDTS_27-28FishRegCommissionMTUComments FNL.pdf (149.5KB)

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, October 08, 2026 1:00:41 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 08, 2026 1:15:03 PM
Time Spent: 00:14:21
IP Address: 193.19.109.101

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Troy Smith
City/Town:	Whitefish
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	hightrails406@gmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

I am a firm believer in a good compromise. I believe Wargo has valid points and I also see the need to ensure a good hatchery program. Could there be a middle ground and move to 15 fish per day and 30 in possession?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, October 08, 2026 2:13:04 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 08, 2026 2:18:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:40
IP Address: 216.211.179.237

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Beth Gardner
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	Cutthroat@montanasky.net

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

Please see attached comments on behalf of the Flathead Valley Chapter of Trout Unlimited

Q3

Optional: Upload your comments

Response to Wargo Fishing Regulation Amendment.docx (18.2KB)

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, October 08, 2026 3:51:13 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 08, 2026 4:07:42 PM
Time Spent: 00:16:29
IP Address: 47.5.18.37

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Greg Foley
City/Town:	Kalispell
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	gcfoley@hotmail.com

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

I support this amendment. It makes sense to me to keep the limits as they are and to monitor the population more closely before making any radical changes.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 09, 2026 4:22:13 PM
Last Modified: Friday, October 09, 2026 4:40:38 PM
Time Spent: 00:18:25
IP Address: 216.211.176.99

Page 1

Q1

Contact information

Name:	Joe Wargp
City/Town:	Columbia Falls
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	mjwargo@montanasky.net

Q2

Please comment on Wargo Amendment #1

I agree with Wargo Amendment #1. I see no need to reduce the limit to 10/20 possession. There are plenty of salmon in Little Bitterroot lake. Lake Mary Ronan has had a 10/20 limit forever but that is a much smaller lake. The salmon population there would still be fine if it weren't for the introduced perch population which destroyed the salmon fishery. Keeping predatory fish species out of Little Bitterroot lake would be the best for overall salmon survival.

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Optional: Upload your comments



October 8, 2026

Montana Trout Unlimited
312 North Higgins, Suite 200
P.O. Box 7186
Missoula, Montana 59807

Montana Fish and Wildlife Commission
ATTN: 2027/28 Fishing Regulation Proposals
P.O. Box 200701
Helena, Montana 59620-0701

Submitted via online form at fwp.mt.gov

Re: Montana Trout Unlimited written comments on *Proposed 2027-2028 Fishing Regulations, COMMISSIONER AMENDMENTS*

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Commissioner Amendments to the *Proposed 2027-2028 Fishing Regulations* that will be discussed by the Montana Fish and Wildlife Commission (Commission) at the October meeting. We appreciate the opportunity to provide written comments to these amendments proposed by Commissioners. Thank you in advance for your consideration of these comments.

Founded in 1964, Montana Trout Unlimited (MTU) is the only statewide grassroots organization dedicated solely to conserving, protecting, and restoring Montana's coldwater fisheries. Montana Trout Unlimited is comprised of 13 chapters across the state and represents more than five thousand Trout Unlimited members and supporters. Several of our chapter leaders and local members helped inform the comments on the proposed changes that are found below.

Wargo Amendment #1 - MTU does not have a position on this amendment proposed to the regulations for kokanee on Little Bitterroot Lake.

Wargo Amendment #2 – MTU opposes this amendment to bull trout regulations on Hungry Horse Reservoir and the South Fork of the Flathead. We continue to be concerned with the declining populations of bull trout in this watershed, and throughout northwestern Montana. We do not believe that extending the catch and release season for an additional two months is warranted or will aid in slowing or stopping the population decline. While we appreciate the discussion about water

THE VOICE FOR HEALTHY RIVERS & WILD TROUT SINCE 1964

temperatures and stress on fish, we believe that the July 1 start date better reflects the opportunity for fish to get up into the river system and not be in a congregated reach prior to the catch and release season. Ultimately, there are tools available to restrict angling when water temperatures become critical, but the ultimate stressor to bull trout related to angling is handling at all water temperatures. Regarding the boundary, we share the department's view that thoughtful consideration of the boundary may be warranted, but that it should include intentional implementation strategies to help the public understand the change.

Wargo Amendment #3 – MTU opposes this amendment dealing with gear restrictions on the lower Flathead River. We have supported in the past and will continue to support the best science related to gear restrictions and mortality. That science is what led to the establishment of the current single point hook restriction in the Flathead system. While we can appreciate and support the desire to increase catching and harvest of non-native species in this watershed, the lower Flathead continues to remain an important part of the habitat for bull trout and cutthroat trout, particularly in their migratory life history. Further, it is not clear that these current gear restrictions are in any way meaningfully reducing angler opportunity.

Wargo Amendment #4 – MTU opposes this amendment dealing with fishing regulations on Flathead Lake. As reflected in our comments on the main package of fishing regulation changes, we have and will continue to support a unified regulation across both the north and south half of the lake as well as the robust co-management goals for the lake. We commend the department for working with the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes to get us towards that goal. It would be a tremendous affront to those efforts to now pull the rug out from underneath that partnership. Further, we support Mack Days as both an important angling opportunity and economic driver to the region as well as a fisheries management tool to reduce lake trout populations and benefit native fish. Unfortunately, this amendment would potentially mean the end of that effort as well.

Gagnon Amendment #1 – MTU does not have a position on this amendment proposed to the regulations for lower Yellowstone River.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the Commissioner amendment proposals. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or if you need additional information regarding the comments that we have submitted (via email at kelley@montanatu.org or by phone at 406-543-0054). Again, we thank you for the opportunity to comment, and we appreciate the open public process used by the Fisheries Division and Department to make these changes.

Respectfully,



Kelley Willett
Acting Executive Director
Montana Trout Unlimited

Response to Wargo Fishing Regulation Amendments

Due to the very short timeframe allotted for public comment, the Flathead Valley Chapter of Trout Unlimited will only comment on Wargo's proposed fishing regulation Amendment #4. The chapter is strongly opposed to this amendment.

First, a brief history is important. For the past 20+ years the Flathead Lake Co-Managers (CSKT Tribes and Montana FWP) had promulgated disparate fishing regulations on Montana's largest natural lake. The Flathead Valley Chapter of Trout Unlimited (FVTU) had consistently pointed out that this uncoordinated approach flies in the face of sound science and failed to accomplish stated objectives to balance the fishery. At times, the relationship between the Co-Management agencies has been acrimonious, to say the least.

Finally, in 2026, the agencies restored some public trust by reaching an agreement to manage the lake with a consistent set of fishing regulations. In 2026 CSKT (on a differently timed regulation setting cycle than MFWP) made the changes that were agreed to. While FVTU continues to question the effectiveness and appropriateness of the lake trout slot limit, we were at least heartened to see that consensus Co-Management was back in play.

The proposed Amendment #4 will fracture Co-Management unity and likely cause major backlash from the Tribes. And deservedly so. It's simply very bad public policy to abruptly backtrack on an interagency agreement. This will generate bad press about MFWP and will reflect poorly on the State of Montana.

There seems to be no biological evaluation of what Amendment #4 would achieve. Is there any evidence that supports broadening the Lake Trout slot limit and reducing the catch and possession limits? This last-minute proposal flies in direct opposition to the long-stated Co-Management Plan objectives as well as the recently updated MFWP Statewide Fishery Management Plan.

We fear this amendment would run the very real risk of collapsing the CSKT Tribes Mack Days tournament and associated Lake Trout suppression efforts. Not only

would this devastate native fish recovery but it has negative economic impact. Mack Days generates substantial angler interest and economic revenue. This event brings in anglers from all over the state. Amendment #4 will alienate the very anglers the Commission hopes to represent.

If lake trout suppression efforts are terminated, over 100,000 fewer Lake Trout would be removed annually, likely resulting in yet another trophic disruption to the fishery and further harm to native Bull and Cutthroat Trout. These actions would stand in direct conflict with the recovery of the Threatened Bull Trout in the Flathead watershed. Please discard this ill-conceived proposed amendment and stick with consensus-based, scientific approach to fisheries management.

Comments prepared by the Flathead Valley Chapter of Trout Unlimited Board