Contact information:						Please comment on the Upper Missouri River Reservoirs 2022 Regulation Changes.
Name:	Company:	City/Town:	State/Prov	Proposal	Position	Open-Ended Response
Dave Greger		Gallatin Gateway	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	We have been fishing the river in the Townsend area for probably 18 years now. The fact that Ron Spoon thinks that there are more walleye in the river now is crazy. The fishing has drastically gotten worse in the last 5 years. If we don't protect it with a slot limit it will be ruined like the lake has been ruined. FWP should listen to to the people that have been fishing it for a long time. I have bought a place on fort peck and selling my place at canyon ferry. What a shame
Mike Sedlock		Helena	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I'm totally opposed to the FWP proposed walleye limit change in the river section for these reasons; 1. these are the same fish that move between the lake and the river. 2. the current limits are finally on the right path to preserve some of the larger spawning age walleye with the current regulations. 3. it would be too easy for an angler to harvest 5 walleye all over 15 inches and claim he caught them in the river section, law enforcement nightmare.
Susie Hedalen		Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Dear Commissioner's and Montana State Leaders, As a resident of Broadwater County with a home just one mile from Canyon Ferry Reservoir I strongly urge you to keep the current walleye regulation's. I am an avid angler and enjoy fishing in accordance with the current regulations. Our community thrives off of the walleye fishing and myself, neighbors, and fellow anglers do not agree with the proposed changes. The walleye fishing brings tourism, revenue, and supports many local businesses. Furthermore, walleye fishing is a life long sport that is important to our families and is passed down through generations. Sincerely, Susie Hedalen
Robert Dennee		Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Please keep the walleye limit in the river from Tosten Dam to the Hwy 287 bridge the SAME as in Canyon Ferry Reservoir, one fish over 15 inches. Thanks...
Kane Urdahl		Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Hello, I do not support the regulation change proposed above especially regarding the river above Canyon Ferry and changing the walleye regulations within the river. The two "bodies" of water (river and lake) should be managed the same. I say this because the fish are not stationary to one body of water. Walleye travel through both the river and the lake depending on the time of year. Based off of gill netting data and last years walleye tournament at Canyon Ferry, the changes made to the regulation has shown positive affect on both size distribution and density. Why make the changes now when we are showing improvement? Even if the population is slightly over objective, I fell the increase in size shown is last years Data will draw more fisherman to the lake which will reduce the population back within objective goals. Don't throw the last few years of improvement in the fishery out the window by allowing more liberal regulations in the river.
Jesse Langner		Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Please don't change current walleye regulations on the upper Missouri. It is good to see more quality walleyes with current slot limit.
Troy Warburton		Toston	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	When folks wanted you to have a separate protection limit on that section of river to protect the big fish that go up there, you said it wouldn't matter since they aren't river resident fish. That all the fish in the river are the same fish as the lake. Why are we gonna loosen the protection on fish over 15" in the river knowing they are the same fish the still need protected in the lake. It's backwards if anything. Leave the river alone and continue to protect the few fish we have over 15" please.
Chris McFadden		Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I strongly disagree on the proposed changes to the walleye limit on the Missouri River above the Townsend bridge. The whole logic behind this proposal is absolutely mind boggling. After attending the Walleyes Unlimited meeting in Townsend where Fish and Game presented, it was very clear that this proposal completely ignores science and is being proposed off of personal beliefs. This proposal will have a direct negative impact on Canyon Ferry which is finally trending in the right direction after years of mismanagement. I highly encourage this proposal get rejected and continue with the current regulations until more studies can be completed.
Patrick		Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Please don't change current regulations in this area. I would like to see the walleye stay big and healthy. I do not support any changes. The management separation of the river and canyon ferry is inappropriate. Same fish swim and spawn in both. Protect our walleye.
Chet Hunter		Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Please do not change the river management. Let's keep it one fish over 15" per day.
				Unclear		I don't support the changes being proposed.
				Unclear		I do not support the proposed change. Size does matter.
Devon		Three Forks	MT	Unclear		I do not support the proposed change to the upper Missouri proposal
ALLEN L CHRISTOPHERSEN		Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Feb. 1, 2023 FWP Commission Comments on the FWP proposal to change the walleye fish limits on the Missouri River from Townsend to the Toston Dam. I am not a hard core walleye fisherman, however in reviewing this proposal to change the walleye limits on this section of river I find it glaringly wrong. I attended the public meeting with folks at the Townsend Rod and Gun Club building. I had not read anything ahead of the meeting so I have been trying to be open minded on both sides of this proposal. I find now that I am very much opposed to making the proposed changes to the walleye limits on that section of the river for the following reason: •It was stated in the meeting the primary concern is protection of the trout fishery in this section of the river and taking more walleye out will help with that. However, the FWP staff there admitted there is NO data that shows the trout population is changing in numbers, sizes and that there is no stomach content data from this section of the river that walleye are in-fact eating trout. No data. •It was stated that there were four walleyes captured in the fry traps in Deep Creek over the past 4 or 5 years. However, those walleyes were not checked to determine IF they had trout fry in their stomachs or any evidence that they were there after trout fry. NO data or evidence. •It was stated that the walleye moving into the river in late spring have already spawned out so they are not reproducing in that section of the river. •The walleye moving into the river are the larger fish out of the reservoir so these are the spawning population, and it was stated that this is a small part of the reservoir population. However, this is the spawning population and with this proposal will be extremely vulnerable to overfishing by people seeking larger walleyes. Many people finding this out will target this portion of the river and it will take no time at all to remove this size class out of Canyon Ferry. Its like removing the bull elk tag permits in the Elkhorn Mountains and opening it up to public antlered bull hunting. The trophy population will be no better than any other hunting unit within a year or two. Allowing this large walleye take out of the river will do the same. •There is no research or intensive data of any kind from the fish in this section of the river that the walleye presence is impacting the trout fishery in any way. Not even ANY data that they are eating trout at all. •You do not change just established 2 years ago fishing regs without having hard data over a period of time that indicates what is being eaten by whom and how many. Let the current regulations run until there is a 3–5-year hard data trend that shows changes occurring. You do not make these changes based upon data-less feeling or assumptions; you must require the hard data before you approve such type changes. There is none of that now for trout and walleyes depredation on any fish in the river. •Please tell the fisheries people to collect number and size survey data for rainbow, brown and walleyes in the river. Tell them to develop a river use period of specifically when the walleye run out of Canyon Ferry and into the river, where they go, when they leave and late season surveys that show they are gone and what numbers of trout are then present. •Tell the fisheries people to show clear trend data that shows 3–5-year trend data on sizes and numbers of trout/brown surveyed, seasonal variations of numbers by species. • Tell the fisheries people to conduct stomach content surveys of walleye and trout to determine who is eating who and how much and how many and sizes. •Do not approve these changes until you have solid trend data that clearly shows walleye numbers need to reduced but even then a complete open bag limit of any size is completely unjustified now as there just is no data to back up this proposal. Please do not approve this request. Please reject this proposal until you see long term trend data that clearly shows a need to make some kind of changes but do not remove the brood stock walleye from Canyon Ferry. Thank you. Al Christophersen 406-439-0197
Gunner Cox		Townsend Mt	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	This regulation change should not happen.i disagree with what you guys are trying to do. What you guys are pretty much trying to do is kill our Walleye because you guys just want to protect the brown trout when we do not care about the trout because you guys stock so many in Canyon Ferry and there's so many in there that we don't need anymore. You guys are also lying to us about information you guys are giving the wrong information when we have the facts and all you guys want is for trout to be protected. i disagree with the decision.
Jason rager		Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I feel that not having the same regulations in the river as in the Reservoir will be detrimental to the goal of bettering the population of walleye. The river regulations need to match the same slot limit and as the Reservoir.
Don Pyrah		Lewistown	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	The CAC opposed the proposed regulation change based upon differing regulations for the body of water. I encourage the commission to oppose the proposed FWP regulation change as well.
JAMES WASHBURN		TOWNSEND	MT	Unclear		I agree with the regulation change. I like the simplification of it. I am also glad to see that we are trying to promote aillegally introduce species to gain more attraction
Jim Ackerman		Townsebd	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am opposed to the changes proposed. If the state of Montana chooses to allow the degradation of waters of the state by reducing nutrient standards of POTW's, disregarding riparian zones and dewatering rivers for irrigation than your attempt to reduce predators on the trout population is a farce attempt to improve trout populations.
Jim Olmstead		Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	All Walleye regardless of size will eat any small fish. So smaller Walleye will also eat the small Brown trout. This proposal does not make sense to me.
Brian Rooney		Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I strongly oppose the new regulations for the Missouri River. I have been a local in Townsend for over 30 years. I have seen the impact on regulations in Canyon Ferry Reservoir. I attended the meeting with the FWP team and left there thinking there is not any solid reason for these changes other than opinions of your team. I believe we should look at the ethics involved in your proposed changes. Unfortunately, there are lots of "sportsman and women" that view your rules as the "ok" thing to do. The reality is there has to be some sort of ethical solution in order to insure that future generations will have the same opportunities that we have been blessed to have. This without a doubt will affect the Canyon Ferry walleye fishery that groups have fought so hard to protect. Please take our future generations into consideration and let the regulations align with the current regulations in Canyon Ferry reservoir. Thank you for letting the public have a voice please listen.

Fred J	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Support	1st, why are you recording an email address to comment? I fully support the recommendation to change the walleye regulation for the Toston to CF section on the Missouri River. Support central fishing district reg. The river section is supposed to be managed for cold water species as stated in the mgmt. plan. 30-40 years ago people, including myself, used to come here to catch brown trout. Now it's rare to even catch one! The walleye have invaded and are expanding into new territory as well as shifting species composition in the river while gobbling up everything they can. Lets keep in mind that the almighty walleye were ILLEGALLY introduced into CF and completely changed the reservoir fishery as well as FWI mgmt. which should have never happened. Please FWP, lets not just listen to the vocal minority of the walleye group, or, the commissioners personal agendas. Manage with science and biology! Final comment is, the current 15 inch reg. on CF and the river is just ridiculous.
Tom wold	Townsend	MT	Outside the scope		I'm not sure where you are getting your information on the size of walleyes on canyon ferry reservoir as the majority of them are 15".I fish canyon ferry year long and the majority of walleyes that I'm catching are in the 10-11" range. I think you need to make the limit at 5 walleyes and only 1over 15". This Reservoir does not have good size walleyes in it.
VERN PARROW	Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg on river		I would like to voice my opinion on the proposed changes to the walleye limits regarding the Missouri river from Toston dam to Canyon Ferry. "ALL" the walleye in the river spends the late fall, winter and early spring in the reservoir according to the past studies conducted by FWP. It has been a challenge to protect the walleye 15" and larger in Canyon Ferry for years due to the limits set by FWP. We are now starting to see the average size of walleye increase in the lake. By changing the size limits in the river, it would directly affect the overall goal of increasing the size of walleye in the reservoir. I agree with continued efforts to protect the Brown Trout in the water system. however, FWP has been doing studies on the Brown Trout numbers in the Missouri river system since 1994 without seeing any major changes or impact from the shared waters with walleyes. Thank you for your consideration of my opinions on managing both species!
Eric Sorensen	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I appose the regulation changes for Walleye I am the Manager at Canyon Ferry KOA and talk to fisherman on a daily bases and what you guys are claiming isn't accurate.
JesseTaylor	Helena	MT	Unclear		I oppose these changes
Russ Nolen	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye the science is not there to warrant a regulation change
Amy Harrell	Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am writing to express great displeasure with the proposed regulation changes regarding bag limit on the Upper Missouri River. I don't think the testing methods and resulting data accurately portray the location and movement of walleye between Canyon Ferry Resevoir and the Missouri River. We, and people my husband and I know, feel that there is alot of migration. Reg changes to the river will greatly impact the lake. Allowing the keeping of fish from the river with no size limit will destroy our spawning population. We all want a balanced and healthy fishery but killing all the walleye is not the answer!
Brett Harrell	Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Are you trying to eradicate the walleye population in the Missouri River and Canyon Ferry? Killing 5 walleyes over 15" a day in the river will surely affect our population of spawners and decimate our fishery. Please do not change our current regs! We fisherpeople feel like this rule change was sprung very quickly without giving enough time to see real results of last years regs. Not enough time to accurately interpret data.
Tim denton	Townsend	MT	Unclear		No. Don't change it.
Norm Comfort	Bozeman	MT	Unclear		No
Paul A. Orth	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	if this policy is approved by the commission, it WILL absolutely decimate this river walleye fishery within 2 years. The fish and game dept don't make knee jerk decisions on a 1-year survey. FACT, the 2-year average is 46.49 percent of walleye are under 15". Thats not 50 percent. It needs to wait another year. It's all about the brown trout. Never forget it was the policy of the past Fish Wildlife and Parks that decimated the top 10 brown trout fishery in the country. FACT. Thank you fo your service on this issue.
Terry Schlieve	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose any changes from the current regulations. No size or limit restrictions is only a management practice to eliminate walleyes from the River which is crazy because 90. % of fisherman are fishing for walleye.
Bob E Jensen	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am opposed to changing the limit in the Missouri River stretch between Toston and Canyon Ferry that Fish Wildlife & Parks is proposing. Is this how we manage our fisheries--by making the limit "simple and easy to implement" a/ka/ convenient? After the discussion held at the 01/24/2023 meeting in Townsend, it was apparent the data was questionable, and possibly even incorrect. I also think that brown trout in the river are doomed because of all the irrigation pressure, warm water in the river, and the moss in the river which is caused by nitrates. Please keep the limit we have now. Thanks for your consideration.
Craig Jach	Arcadia	MI	Unclear		Vacation in Townsend, Mt. Fish the Missouri. Opposed
Phylis Price	Townsend	MT	Unclear		Not supporting. Vote No
Laura Sprague	Townsend	MT	Unclear		No
Dwaine Robertson	Townsend	MT	Unclear		Totally opposed!!!!!!!!
Diania Colby	Townsend	MT	Unclear		I am opposed ! Vote No
Jimmie Eloff	Libertyville	IL	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change. We travel out of state to fish for Walleye and feel this would be detrimental.
Robert Bright	Laurel	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Oppose 100%. Walleye are the only thing supporting this place. The old trout fishermen are gone!
Timothy R McAlpine	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the limit change to the river section. Once again, (as with every walleye limit and all limit changes since the 20-fish/no possession limit of the 90's), FWP contradicts the ecology of the system, angler preference, and harvest satisfaction, to suppress the potential walleye fishery naturally supported by the system, and the potential high quality angler experience. Removing the size limit will move anglers from the reservoir, crowding the river, creating an unsustainable harvest of all walleye as well as reducing trout numbers. Today, there is no data to trigger nor justify the change. I live on the river near the highway bridge and have fished the river by jet boat since 1985. Never, have I seen a trout in the belly of a harvested walleye. In fact, what the biologists won't reveal to the commissioners is that occasional walleye belly samples contain (the dreaded) northern pike fingerlings, along with the normal insects, sculpins, and suckers. Please consider the parameters of the river system....Water flows are historically down and going down. Water temps are historically high and getting higher every year. The system has not been a classic cold water system for years and is less and less as time goes on. Trout predation by pelicans, cormorants, and last few years we see a steady increase in number of river otters, is a huge impact. TOO BAD...an individual employee, or maybe a few FWP employees with their anti "invasive unauthorized walleye" attitudes and personal trout preferences are allowed to suppress what should be a world class walleye fishery in the upper Missouri reservoir system. Thank you, Timothy R McAlpne
Anita Wesner	Townsend	MT	Unclear		Vote No
Chase Masolo	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I disagree with the change in the regs because they believe that the walleye are eating trout when they have zero evidence of this happening.
Richard Tramp	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Dear Sirs I'm writing this commit in response to proposed change in regulation in the Missouri River between Canyon Ferry and Toston Dam. After listening to a presentation by FWP fish department presented in Townsend. I determined it is a knee jerk decision by the department. The presented regulation has only been in effect for only two years and showing positive improvements in the fishing on Canyon Ferry and up the river. The presentation did not show any reason for the change in relations for the river. The river is showing an increase population of Rainbow trout. We need to make decision based on good science. I would think it would be a better decision would be if we give the presented regulation more time so you can make a better decision and not a knee jerk decision. Thank you
Greg Moos	Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change. If this change happens people will be able to keep all the broodstock which could be catastrophic for the whole system.
Caed melone	Great falls	MT	Perch reg in Holter and walleye reg in river		While perch population in holter are above average there is no biological evidence to show that an over abundance is detrimental to the fisheries while perch are the primary forage for over 80% of the lakes species. Secondly the walleye upwards of canyon ferry should not be changed to central district regs. Size limit of one over fifteen has allowed more opportunities for smaller fish to be kept resulting in a slow rise in larger fish species catch of walleye. With that being said it's also improved the brown trout fishing in canyon ferry by drastic numbers. Smaller walleye are more detrimental to brown trout spawning in canyon ferry. The 15" and below walleye are what the brown trout fight against when spawning. If anything it should be 15 walleye daily and one over 15". Or a regulated slot limit in future instances
Robert Michael	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am opposed to the change in the regulation and believe the changes to the Missouri River could have a serious and irreversible affect on the Walleye populations.
Robert Chandler	Bozeman	MT	Outside the scope		This should be made a trophy walleye fishery there is so many small walleye in the lake. Stop harvest in walleye period do not stock more trout walleye fishing will bring more revenue to the lake and local businesses. There is already too many trout in this area!!!
Sean Eckert	Townsend	MT	Perch reg in Holter and walleye reg in river	Support	I agree with both proposals.
Joseph Medina	Helena	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I disagree with fwp on the proposed regulation change on the Missouri River being different than canyon ferry. The river and lake are the same walleyes and need to be regulated as such. Fwp has no evidence that walleyes are harming trout in anyway. More research needs to be done before a regulation change can be done. I am asking the commission to reject this proposal. Further more enforcing a walleye regulation change from canyon ferry to the Missouri River will be a enforcement nightmare and cost tax payers a lot of money in lawyer fees
Melissa nizdil	Alpharretta	GA	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Please do not change the walleye regulation I would hate to see the walleye population get depleted.
Mark nizdil	Alpharretta	GA	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	As a land owner in Townsend I actively oppose the regulation change.

Bridger shoemaker	Helena	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Montana FWP Please please please do not change anything for walleyes on the upper Missouri! We have finally seen a rise in big walleyes in the river system that hasn't been there since the 80's. FWP has never had a interest in walleyes in the upper Missouri even though they bring in 10x's the amount of money trout will ever bring in and walleyes are native to the Missouri River! It sucks watching our walleye populations go to shit because of out of state funding because they like the trout. I really wish montana fwp would listen to the public and do what's best! A 5 fish limit with one over 15" inches moving forward for the foreseeable future would benefit the river system very very well. Montana fwp should take notes from South Dakota and what they have done for the walleyes!
Gary Schnicke	Three Forks	MT	Perch reg in Holter and walleye reg in river	Support	The increase in perch possession limit on Holter seems reasonably based on recent surveys. The same can be said for the proposed change in walleye size limits in the riverine habitat above Canyon Ferry Res. To hold to similar regulations in both environments when the population size structure is so different makes absolutely no sense. Lastly I want to comment on the current size limits for walleye in Canyon Ferry Res., even tho no changes are currently proposed. As a former fisheries biologist from Michigan who had many years of experience managing a variety of different walleye fisheries, I have to bluntly say that you are managing the walleyes in Canyon Ferry in exactly the WRONG way. I know everyone's goal is to have a size structure with more larger fish. You will never accomplish that with the current regulations, trust me, the way to have more larger Walleyes is to institute a minimum size limit of 15 inches. Your own data from the tag/harvest study shows that you are over harvesting the walleye in Canyon Ferry. The only ways to correct for that is to reduce harvest with a minimum size limit and possibly a reduced bag limit. Try it and you will be amazed!
Chris	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am a business owner in town and get business from the walleye fisherman that are in town and from out of town. I DO NOT support changes in the upper Missouri walleye regulations which will impact the size and quantity of walleyes. I vote NO!
Dale Gilbert	Ulm	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	FWP says that current limits are not biologically justified ….they claim in their write up for the Commission meeting that the population is stable, and has changed "and in 2021 and 2022 is now dominated by fish larger than 16"." Their electro fishing data does not support this. In fact, the histograms provided at the CAC meeting in December showed: in 2021 only 39.08% were larger than 16", and in 2022, 53.8% were larger than 16". The two year average is 46.49%. Looking at that same data from 2016-2019, after the telemetry study, and the most recent three years from 2020-2022 the numbers of 15" & larger fish on average has reduced. At the Walleyes Unlimited meeting with FWP 1/24/23, histograms were provided that now showed an additional 14 walleye for 2022 that weren't on the histograms provided at the December CAC meeting but no explanation was provided as to why it was changed. The following is based on the original data, which is what was they apparently based their recommended changes on. Fact is, in addition, their Catch Per Unit Efforts (CPUE)/minute has dropped the past three years to .31, .33, and .33 which is on average only 71.4% of the prior 4 years average CPUE of .4525. Also, If you consider the FWP did not include the data from electro fishing in the Dry Creek section in 2021…. (3 walleye in 111 minutes)….if it was included like it was in 2022, the CPUE in 2021 would be reduced to .275/ min. vs. the reported .33/min. If Dry CK data was excluded in 2022, then CPUE would be .414, but then that is the result of spending 70.7% in the BEL HWY section which has historically had the highest CPUE. The amount of time spent electro fishing in the different sections has changed significantly by year….where efforts appear to be made where their CPUE are higher….or simply not done in some sections….like in 2022 where no time was spent at YORK vs. 9.08% in 2021, and 14.22% in 2020? And, over the past three years, they have gotten absolutely 0 fish greater than 25" so those larger "memorable and trophy class" year classes of fish have disappeared. Their recommendation is inconsistent with page 16 of the UMRRMP directives to "Consider impacts with adjacent reservoir management goals, strategies, and regulations when implementing river management actions." The proposal to allow 5 fish of any size, really reduces the incentive for anglers to harvest numbers of smaller fish to keep relative abundance numbers within reason, and the plan goals, and would allow 5 times the harvest of fish 15" and greater which is totally inconsistent with the current regulations and efforts to improve PSD on the reservoir. The statement by FWP that harvest in the river with this change in regulations would not impact the reservoir fishery is also not supported. Data from the 2015 telemetry study shows, of the fish implanted in the river, that 30.8% migrated back into the reservoir from July 30- Sep. 17. Other tag returns from anglers in 2021 and 2022 show 66.6% and 100% respectively came from the reservoir. The telemetry study also documented that 90% of the CFR anchor tagged fish tag returns were from Canyon Ferry, 10% from the river. They also documented 28% of the river anchor tagged tag returns came from Canyon Ferry….clearly showing harvest of fish in the river would likely impact the reservoir fishery. The proposed change ignores the impacts on the adjacent reservoir management goals, strategies, and regulations. FWP claims the standard 5 fish limit is simpler…yet it would appear to be practically impossible to enforce when anglers access the river below the bridge or from the silos. Anyone who fishes the river could have 10 fish with 5 over 15" and claim all the better fish came from above the bridge. How could anyone prove otherwise? They also claim the change would reduce predation on juvenile brown trout….yet they have no documentation that the walleye in this system have been detrimental to the trout population…in fact they have acknowledged it is "unquantified" in their spring 2022 presentation slides. They state they are seeing walleye in their Deep Creek rotary trap claiming this is detrimental to the trout. The fact is, that they have gotten 4 walleye in the past 3 years in the Deep Creek trap vs. approximately 3325 trout. This is about 1 tenth of 1%…..which is negligible and insignificant at best. In April 2021, FWP attempted to implement a more liberal regulation for the river and they got 128 public comments with 70.3% opposing their proposal becaus it has been documented that the fish in the river….are not a separate and distinct population. They are fish that migrate into the river each year, and migrate back out into the reservoir each fall. The majority of those fish were concentrated downstream of river kilometer mile 6.4 during the telemetry sampling. Overall, changing the limit in the river would likely increase pressure and further suppress the "quality" 15" & larger fish in the river and the reservoir that the current regulation is trying to protect to allow a better year class distribution and an improved PSD for the reservoir consistent with the UMRRMP goals. I am opposed to this change…it is not based on the data available and does not adhere to the UMRRMP. The statements and claims are not supported by the data and in some cases, simply just not true. Their misrepresentations mislead the public and the commission. This is not right. I believe that limits for walleye in the river need to be kept the same as they are on the reservoir and request their proposal be amended.
Sam Deschene	Townsend	MT	Perch reg in Holter and walleye reg in river	Oppose	Walleye limit on River portion from Townsend to Toston dam- I do not believe this new regulation proposal is in the best interest of the fishery. After talking with fwp biologists and fisheries managers, very many things are being assumed and not proven or even considered. For instance, the studies for fish population in the river are only conducted at a time when the fish are migrating up the river to spawn, so naturally you will have a larger class of fish in the system because they are the fish that are of breeding age. This is also likely a result of the more liberal limit of the smaller fish in the lake. So to say the lake and river populations of walleye here need different regulations is hogwash. There has been little to no population studies in the river in the winter months or during the summer to determine that the walleye population in the river has the same size structure and number as during the spring and fall. It was also mentioned at the meeting of fwp and the upper Missouri chapter and public that the walleye do not use the river to spawn and that is 100% no true. Walleye will spawn in many different habitats and zones of lakes and rivers and for them to say that they do not is very discrediting. There was also a bit of the data we received from fwp that was slightly skewed. They had take population samples in several months of the spring of 2022 and threw some of them out because the data didn't match what they wanted to see for population because of the late run off and flow levels. It was also mentioned that the walleye that are in the river system and tributaries are eating brown trout fry and this is the cause of the decline in brown trout. Yet there has not been any dietary study on any of the fish species in these reaches of the rivers and tributaries to conclude that this is the case. I strongly urge the commission to deny this regulation change. The lack of testing and science behind the proposed change is very concerning. They biologists say that the brown trout population is still declining, but angling data would suggest the opposite. Several people, including myself have noticed an increase in the catch rate of down trout both in the summer from boats and during the winter while ice fishing. Perch limit in Holter reservoir- I would urge to commission to wait at least one more year to change any regulations for the reservoir. The population of perch in this lake i up but the relative size is down due to a strong spawn several years ago and the bulk of fish from that hatch are not to a practical size to harvest yet.
Brandon Domenico	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose this regulation change. The science and numbers are simply not there to make such a change. This will decimate a great walleye area for years/decades to come. Please don't do this.
Kim Eloff	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am against the proposed changes that will affect the size of the spawning, mature walleye in the river
Brian Blom	Lafayette	IN	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	We visit Montana to fish and see relatives. I've noticed a decline in numbers and size of the walleye we catch. So I would recommend NOT to change the regulations on the river to protect more of the larger fish.
Michelle Blom	Lafayette	IN	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am against changing the regulations that will impact the number of larger walleye in the Missouri River. My husband and I travel to Montana to fish and visit family. We have noticed a decline in the quality of fish in the lake and river. So we would like the spawning females to be protected.
Austin Barnhardt	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I believe the river and the reservoir should be treated as one unit and that the current regulations should stay in place, with the walleye limit being 10 daily with one over 15, possession should be twice the daily limit.
Shane Pursley	Helena	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Stop with the no limits on the walleye. You have already ruined the genetics of what could have been a world class fishery. When you took.the limits off below holter look at how many walleye were killed and left on the banks to waste.
Cameron Nizdil	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the change to the walleye regulation based on the fact that fwp is using opinion rather than science to make a detrimental limit change. This change has unforeseen walleye population consequences.
jim gillespie	helena	MT	Perch reg in Holter and walleye reg in river		I don,t agree with removing the creel size of one over 15 inches for walleye on the missouri above canyon ferry at this time. The fish from the reservoir are the same fish that migrate out of and use the river for a period of time every year. Until there is a better harvestable size of fish in the reservour the regulation should not be changed. The change on Holter Res. for perch from 25 daily and 25 in possession to 25 daily and 50 in possession would not be to detrimental to the fishery. We need enforcement in all the areas , anything would be better than not seeing a warden at all. The river above Townsend and a change in walleye limits would be hard to govern, I have fished that area since the 70s and have never even see a warden in the cottonwood area or any other part of the river..
Dean Carmichael	Townsend	MT	Unclear		I oppose the channge
Scott D Keller	Great Falls	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am against having the Walleye limits different for Canyon Ferry Reservoir and the river upstream. FWP data proves that the Walleye use both bodies of water. Having a higher limit in the river will have an impact on the Walleye in Canyon Ferry Reservior.

Chris Wanner	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I by no means support this purposal change from toston dam to canyon ferry delta. To me this seems to be in ulterior driven motive, no data to prove what they are saying. Wild trout numbers in that section are almost as best as they ever been! This limit change would and will directly affect canyon ferry reservoir. The average size of fish migrating into the river is the size we are trying to protect on the lake. This makes absolutely zero sense
Joe bushilla	Townsend	MT	Outside the scope		I live on this lake and have been fishing every week for more years than I can count. That being said I have landed all makes and models of fish in this body of water and have cleaned and cooked them for my family. My findings while cleaning trout they most often had walleye in the stomach and the walleye had sculpin crawfish and zoo plankton. I have seen a very large drop in the quality of walleye in this body of water and that's really is disappointing to see. The majority of anglers at canyon ferry are here for the good tasting fish. Walleye! Walleye! Most people catch a trout smash its head in and toss it back. Way too many of them. That's the truth. This was once the largest used body of water for walleye and perch and more than enough trout for the taking. I feel this lake would bring thousands of anglers if it was returned to the way it was. Just like fort peck strong and a great fishery for all to enjoy. Please do not destroy this body of water. It will ruin Townsend and Silos Joe.
Terry Torgerson	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Your proposal for the new limit and size of walleye is based on not enough test results for the decline of brown trout in the river from the silos to the Toston dam, u need at least 5 more years and stomach samples to prove the walleye are the problem!
Adam Ellis	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I disagree with changing the regulations in the Missouri river different than canyon ferry. FWP is trying to protect trout in the river but have zero science that walleye are eating the trout when they head upstream.
Austin zeadow	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I disagree with changing the regulations in the River from canyon because it was an unthought out and irresponsible decision buy not being able to prove there reasoning why.
Devon Zeadow	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I strongly disagree with the decision to change the limits to River
Kolter howes	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I disagree with changing the regulations in the Missouri River due to the lack science. It should be the kept the same as canyon ferry. Also this will be difficult for enforcement to enforce these regulations. Thank you.
Skyla Stuart	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am against the regulation changes to change the Missouri river regulations from canyon ferry - commission please object the FWP they have no science or proof to back up the changes they're want to make. Please leave regulation the same.
jeffrey moos	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science does not warrant regulation change
Greg Jensen	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleyes.
Sam Trammel	MARIETTA	GA	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change. If this change happens people will be able to keep all the broodstock which could be catastrophic for the whole system.
Reese overstreet	Billings	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change
Stephen C	Camarillo	CA	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change. If this change happens people will be able to keep all the broodstock which could be catastrophic for the whole system.
Zachary emilson	Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science does not warrant a regulation change
Michael Kuczynski	Ennis	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I'm opposed to the regulation change for the Walleye. I do not feel there has been enough study and and sufficient science to make this regulation change .
Matt Balyeat	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change." If this change happens people will be able to keep all the broodstock which could be catastrophic for the whole system.
Blisse Voigt	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change
Dennis Kavanagh	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change. If this change happens people will be able to keep all the broodstock which could be catastrophic for the whole system.
Beth Moos	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	i oppose the regulation change for Upper Missouri River reservoir 2022. I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change.
Derek Veneman	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the change to walleye regulation, the science is construed and does not uphold warrant for change at this time.
Alan Hibbard		MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change.
Taylor	Milton	GA	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant regulation change.
Bud Loughney	Roberts	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the walleye regulation change as this will could change the whole system if people are allowed to keep the brood stock.
Ben Husband	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change.
Ashley Flanagan	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye. There is not enough science there to warrant a regulation change.
Jim eloff	Toensend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose changing the walleye creole regulation as recently proposed. It is important to keep brood stock in the system so having no size restrictions would be harmful to future populations of walleye. I have read all the research the biologists are using and it has holes in it and doesn't warrant the changes proposed. I've read a study that was done on the Canyon Ferry system and over 65% of the people that use the lake and river are targeting walleye. It is important to protect walleye for recreation and economic reasons.
RJ	Camarillo	CA	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change.
Tyler B Mills	Green Bay	WI	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change. If this change happens people will be able to keep all the broodstock which could be catastrophic for the whole system
Randyn Gregg	White Sulphur Springs	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the changes to the upper Missouri this would wipe out the brood stock of walleye
Douglas J Breker	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to 5 walleye of any size on the Missouri river from Canyon Ferry reservoir to Toston dam. Leave it as it is with 10 walleye and only 1 of those over 15". There is not sufficient accurate/complete/ unskewed data to support this change. This proposed change will damage the walleye fishery in Canyon Ferry by reducing the quantity of quality walleye.
Rowan Rapp	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I oppose the regulation change to walleye, the science is not there to warrant a regulation change.
LaVerne Sultz	Kaliispell	MT	Walleye reg on river and Perch reg on Holter	Support	The Flathead Valley Chapter of Trout Unlimited supports changing to the District standard regulation to allow removal of more walleye from this stretch of river and the reservoirs. We also support adopting the Holter Reservoir regulation to allow 25 yellow perch and 50 in possesion. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Lucky Sultz Conservation Chair Flathead Valley Chapter of Trout Unlimited
Dan Crockett	Missoula	MT	Walleye reg on river	Support	Dear Commisioners, Just a quick vote of support for modifying the current regulation of 10 daily, only one over 15 inches, to the Central Fishing District standard regulation of five walleye per day, 10 in possession. As FWP fisheries staff say, the current regulation is unnecessarily restrictive and there is no biological reason to restrict walleye harvest to this extent. The standard walleye limit has the advantage of being simple and easy to implement. Thank you.
Steven Harada	Wolf Point	MT	Walleye reg on river	Support	Walleyes Unlimited of Montana adamantly opposes the proposed regulation change to walleye limits upstream of Canyon Ferry to Toston Dam on the Missouri River. This will cause negative impacts to the Canyon Ferry walleye fishery and is not reasonable or biologically prudent to consider the walleye solely Missouri River fish. The impacts will also cause confusion with different regulations from the river to the reservoir. WUM feel the regulations should stay the same between the reservoir and the river. Steve Harada WUM Executive Director
Danny Goyette	Great Falls	MT	Outside the scope		I am in agreement with changing the regulations at Canyon Ferry to the same as the current Central district. The current 10 walleye limit is ridiculous. Trying to get rid of the Walleye is not in the best interest for most fishermen fishing there.
Nate Messer	Helena	MT	Outside the scope		DO NOT change the current regulations on Canyon Ferry. The current regulations are adequate. Need to give the fishery a chance for a couple years and then revisit. Need to get rid of those trout that eat all the young species in the lake. Be nice to see a more diverse fishery.
Jake Tuck	Great Falls	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	I am opposed to changing the walleye limit in tha Missouri River above Canyon Ferry.
Bryan Tomlinson	Harlowton	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Leave the Walleye limit the same as Canyon Ferry Reservoir. You don't have any scientific proof that the walleye are impacting the "Sacred" Trout fishery. I strongly oppose any limit changes
Jeffrey Koski	Bozeman	MT	Walleye reg on river	Oppose	Please leave the regulations the same as the reservoir and give the fisherie a chance to improve the quality of the fish in the system. A change to the regulations in the river system doesn't make sense with the fish bring the same fish.
Lance Kresge	BOZEMAN	MT	Walleye reg in river	Oppose	The telemetry study shows that the fish in Canyon Ferry are the same fish in the river to Toston dam, and the regulations should be the same for that entire section. The regulations on a walleye should not be different depending on where the exact same fish is located at different times of the year. The more liberal regulation on quality fish in the river would be counterproductive considering the PSD goal in the reservoir is not being met. I am very much against different regulations in the river based on the actual biology along with the public comments that came in last year when this exact thing was tried. Not to mention the enforcement of the different regulations would be almost impossible since most of the river fisherman launch outside of the proposed new regulation area.

Chet Cook	Bozeman	MT	Perch reg in Holter and walleye reg in river		1. I support the regulation change of Yellow Perch under the assumption the population surveys will remain consistent in the next 1-2 years and would be adjusted again in the future if the population reduced below targets. 2. I do not support the walleye regulation change for the river section as I do not believe there is adequate data to suggest that the walleye found during the electrofishing surveys are solely living in that small section of river. If fish monitoring data suggests that these walleye live only in that river section I would be more open to the suggested regulation change.
Robbi Robinson	Great Falls	MT	Unclear		I agree with the proposed changes the CAC has recommended.
Brian	Three forks	MT	Walleye reg in river	Oppose	Although at first glance I was ecstatic about the change in regulations upstream of the 287 bridge, after thinking about it for a moment I don't think it's a good idea. We all know that the Canyon Ferry (herein referred time as "CF") walleye population has been struggling. By maintaining a larger breeding population in the upper Missouri the juvenile and mature walleye will continue to thrive in this location and provide an inflow into CF. If anything change to 10walleye with no more than 1 over 20". Which will still lower the numbers of big walleye north of 287 without completely decimating the adult population.
Jacob Spurlock	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg in river	Oppose	Keep the regulations the same for walleye 5 fish 1 over 15 it's working just fine!! Seeing bigger fish more often! Don't change a thing!!!!
Matt l Zeadow	Townsend	MT	Walleye reg in river	Oppose	This is the same thing fwp tried to do two years ago and 78% of people that did the survey didnt want this to happen. i would like to see the science that supports doing this regulation change. This is going to be a night mare for enforcement when someone such as myself puts in at broadwater bay and drives from broadwater bay to york island fish all day come back out to broadwater bay with 5 fish over 15" that is then illegal or no ? The fish in the river section are the same fish as the lake and the lake has not in the past two year met the managment goals for PSD in the lake and now you want to remove larger size fish in the lake/river so it will even lower the PSD in the lake. This doesnt surprise me in any way shape or form that FWP is trying to do this i just hope the commission looks back at them trying this two years ago and sees what the people really want. I looked at the river telemetry study and this is not justified the walleyes in the river over the past 7 year have gotten smaller and smaller every year in the river so i cant see how the FWP can justify doing this regulation. This is a nightmare for everyone commission please stop this as the people dont want this.
Troy Heiser	Belgrade	MT	Walleye reg in river	Oppose	To whom it may concern, it is hard for me to fathom that we are bringing 2023-2026 fish removal projects up for comment again. I do not agree with having separate limits on Canyon ferry Lake and the Missouri River to Toston. The slot limit that was proposed should stay The same on the Missouri river as it is on Canyon ferry lake. Once again common sense logic and reasoning has escaped the The personnel at Montana fish wildlife and parks we as tax paying citizens of the great state of Montana would appreciate if you would stop wasting our hard earned tax dollars. so in conclusion if you could direct our hard earned tax dollars to a project worthy of our money and time that would be greatly appreciated. Troy Heiser sixth generation Montanan