

# #1

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 11:09:12 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 11:20:14 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:01  
**IP Address:** 72.175.117.221

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Larry hayes  
**City/Town:** Billings  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** larryhayes@montana.com

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

A typical lure trolled in a lake or large river has several hooks. To remove one or more hooks could change the action making that lure worthless. A single hook on some lures would require the fish to almost swallow the lure to properly hook it. A deeply hooked fish may die. A fish hooked upon the strike, not swallowed, can normally be safely released. On an 8 inch rapalla which hook would be remove? Front or back.

---

#2

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 1:58:11 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 2:04:11 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:59  
**IP Address:** 216.47.54.217

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Roy O'Connor  
**City/Town:** Missoula  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** rsoc2001@yahoo.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I strongly support the amendments proposed by Commissioner Walsh regarding treble hooks not being classified as single hooks. Treble hooks are much more damaging to fish that are regulated or desired to be released. I would support single hooks only on all trout streams where species are considered endangered and/or protected. Also I support daily and possession limits are at 3 for Western streams.

Thanks, Roy O'Connor

---

#3

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 2:16:55 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 4:41:07 PM  
**Time Spent:** 02:24:12  
**IP Address:** 97.180.236.217

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Jason Brininstool  
**City/Town:** Missoula, MT  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** jbrininstool@gmail.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I support both of Commissioner Walsh's amendments which will both preserve and protect our wild fisheries as we venture into continued seasons of heat, low snow pack, declining flows, and increased water temperatures. People come from long distances to fish our amazing rivers and streams while simultaneously adding a boost to our state and local economy. We need to implement whatever further protections we can to sustain this resource for the future.

---

# #4

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 7:26:09 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 7:28:12 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:02  
**IP Address:** 72.175.178.116

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Philip B Gilbert  
**City/Town:** LAUREL, MT  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** scrounge2@hotmail.com

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Oppose the Change to the Daily and Possession limits for Combined Trout in the Central District  
When grandma farts, go and kick the dog because we don't want to blame grandma. Commissioner K.C. Walsh went over and kicked the Catch-and-eat fishermen because the catch-and-release group is killing too many fish. If 97% of the fish are caught by fly fishermen and there is a significant mortality in their released fish, then it would seem that the solution would be to stop fly fishing. After all, a fly angler goes and hooks a fish, torments it and then finally just throws it back in the river after taking a photo of their great conquest. What justification is there for needless torture of an animal so that an angler can feed their ego? Every year we are told to follow hoot owl regulations to minimize the torture and needless death of fish in our rivers. How many times has the same fish experienced a near-death experience on the Madison? Or only later to die downstream and become feed for some raccoon. The catch-and-keep angler, like the Montana hunter is looking at providing organic food for their family, not for something to feed their ego. Montana has a great concern for game management. FWP's has a number of biologists that study fish populations and the pressure on fish. If we believe in Science we should listen to what they say. "FWP has no biological concerns with the current standard limits. Reducing limit amounts would restrict opportunity for the few harvest-oriented anglers and not result in population level effects." There has long been a disdain by the Fly-Line elite of the riff-raff catch-and-eat anglers. We have special rivers and regulations that cater to that elite. Don't approve this proposal on the pretense that it will provide a bounty of new trout to be tortured and die so out-of-state fly fishermen can satisfy their egos. The majority of the harvest-oriented anglers are Montana residents and there is no biological reason to reduce limits on the bounty of a Montana harvest.

---

#5

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 9:54:45 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 22, 2024 10:10:30 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:45  
**IP Address:** 73.92.73.30

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Joe Brescia</b>
City/Town:	<b>alder</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>jbrescia@aga-ca.com</b>

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

good clarification

---

#6

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 23, 2024 7:24:23 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 23, 2024 7:37:40 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:13:17  
**IP Address:** 108.174.122.52

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Phil Watrous  
**City/Town:** DARBY  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** watwed2014@gmail.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Commissioner, I disagree with your proposal to reduce existing possession limit. I agree with FWP that current regulations would not affect fish populations. Thank you.

---

#7

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 24, 2024 5:45:58 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 24, 2024 5:47:39 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:41  
**IP Address:** 174.218.164.48

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Andy Guy  
**City/Town:** Swan Lake  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** flyfishin24@yahoo.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I support the change from 5 to 3. We definitely need to do this.

---

#8

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 24, 2024 10:33:22 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 24, 2024 10:53:46 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:20:23  
**IP Address:** 206.127.90.76

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Eric Roberts  
**City/Town:** Helena  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** trampusln@gmail.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Fish and Wildlife Commissioners,

I urge a "no pass" by the commission for this proposed amendment. Based on the provided rationale by Commissioner Walsh this amendment is based on the values of the commissioner rather than the overall interests of the angling public. Specifically, the rationale implies harvest angling does not constitute a quality angling experience and that newcomers to the state will erode catch-and-release ethos. Despite this perception, wild fish populations in Montana have proven their resiliency in light of climate change, pathogens, changing angling demographics, and angler harvest. Making this broad scale change across the Central and Western Fishing Districts based on perceptions of overharvest on the Madison River and further reducing angling opportunities for harvest anglers is not warranted, nor should this change be made based on value judgements of harvest-oriented anglers.

I likely have comments on the other proposed amendment, however, as I post this on 10/24 at 10:50 am, the hook definition amendment is not posted to the FWP website. The website assures the amendment would be posted on 10/23.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.  
Eric Roberts

---



#9

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 24, 2024 3:11:38 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 24, 2024 3:49:27 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:37:48  
**IP Address:** 174.231.89.94

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Dale Gilbert</b>
City/Town:	<b>Ulm</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>MtWalleyeLLC@gmail.com</b>

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I am concerned with the proposed Hook Definition Amendment and how it would be applied statewide. I think the definition as is ...is fine. I think if the goal is to provide for less mortality in single hook waters, those waters should have the exception better explained that multiple hooks on lures used in single hook waters is simply not allowed.

---

# #10

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 27, 2024 7:29:10 AM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 27, 2024 7:35:56 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:46  
**IP Address:** 192.230.161.29

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Brent</b>
City/Town:	<b>Fairfield</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>wapitiguy@hotmail.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I am not in favor of the proposed change to a "3 daily and in possession" trout limit for the Western and Central district. Department data counters the need to make this proposed change and until further data (not anecdotal social data) is available to support the proposed change, please maintain the existing "5 daily and in possession" trout limit for these areas.

---

# #11

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 27, 2024 12:05:33 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 27, 2024 12:24:37 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:19:03  
**IP Address:** 75.143.220.117

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Gordon R Robinson</b>
City/Town:	<b>GREAT FALLS</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>somwill99@hotmail.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

This is a horrible suggestion/amendment. Obviously a pro trout bias to this and not a care in the world about any other fishermen or species. Crank baits and the such are made for a reason and the fishing of many species is specific to these type baits. I agree that there may be specific waters on which this is a good idea and should be considered. Some catch and release waters would benefit from such a regulation, but a blanket amendment is not appropriate. Not to mention the cost involved to the average walleye, musky fishermen etc. The typical crankbait cost from \$6 to \$20 and this amendment would render many non effective. Today's crankbaits are tuned to work a specific way and many could not be modified. Some could be modified and still operate, but this is an unknown. I personally have 100 or more crankbaits, jig baits etc. so to render many non usable would be an expense I can't afford. Perhaps, \$600 to \$1000 is not a lot of money to an executive of Simms fishing and board member to TU.....but to the average person it's a lot of money considering all the costs involved in fishing. I oppose this amendment in the strongest way.

---

# #12

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Sunday, October 27, 2024 8:33:07 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, October 27, 2024 8:35:55 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:47  
**IP Address:** 67.143.192.34

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>JIM HOMISON</b>
City/Town:	<b>STANFORD</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>jim.homison@yahoo.com</b>

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Commissioners,

Reducing the Daily and Possession Limits for Combined Trout to "3 daily and in possession" is a regulation change that should not be approved by the FWL commission so I urge commissioner to leave this proposal on the cutting room floor, at least at this time.

Reducing these limits from 5 to 3 may, in fact, have the opposite the intended effect of reducing trout mortality.

In my experience, when daily/ possession limits are reduced, harvest oriented anglers tend to hi-grade their catch by keeping larger fish (self imposed size limits) and in the process release an increased number of smaller fish. Again from personal experience, smaller fish are more susceptible to hook mortality after release than larger fish and I find this to be especially true for trout as opposed to less fragile species such as bass or channel catfish.

Secondly, this proposal seems to have come out of the blue, rather late in the game during the regulation setting process. Even though established procedures are being followed, a regulatory change of this magnitude (affecting untold miles of streams and rivers in roughly half the state) should be given more time to ripen with greater opportunity for public involvement.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Jim Homison  
FWP-R4 Citizens Advisory Council Member  
Stanford, Montana  
406-868-3566  
October 27, 2024

---

# #13

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 28, 2024 1:20:51 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 28, 2024 1:22:51 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:00  
**IP Address:** 174.205.229.23

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Don Pyrah</b>
City/Town:	<b>Glasgow</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>dpyrah2@gmail.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Unnecessary regulation change. Definition of hook is adequate already

---

#14

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 23, 2024 9:55:06 AM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 28, 2024 2:10:28 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 174.215.16.123

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** David Helmers  
**City/Town:** Plentywood  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** dhelmers54@hotmail.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Hi Commissioner Walsh,  
I would like to see a change in the fishing regulations to allow crossbows for the disabled in the taking of carp and other tras fish.  
Thank you,  
David Helmers

---

# #15

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 28, 2024 2:33:04 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 28, 2024 2:49:08 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:16:04  
**IP Address:** 47.47.129.214

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Jean Sauvageau</b>
City/Town:	<b>Billings</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>jeansauvageau@spectrum.net</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

There is no legitimate reasoning to reduce the trout limit in the Central District. I am very against this proposal. I see this as a push from the guide industry to eventually change to all catch and release so they can make more money...  
The rainbow and brown trout are an invasive species brought in from foreign lands therefore should have no limit. Also as far as I know we do not have good data on mortality rates for a caught and released fish.

---



# #16

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, October 28, 2024 5:27:28 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, October 28, 2024 5:42:52 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:23  
**IP Address:** 108.147.32.26

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Brian Dunaetz</b>
City/Town:	<b>Three Forks</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>bdunaetz@yahoo.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Again, this is something proposed with no scientific backing or valid cause; just a government official who feels the need to change the laws so he or his friends (who may or may not be professional guides) can catch bigger fish. As an angler in the Central district (specifically the Madison river that the Mr Walsh references) I can say that the fishing is just as good if not better than it's ever been! This proposed rule change caters to the out of state fly fishing crowd and does not take into consideration the local population who keep fish in-order to feed our family. With the increased cost of living, wild game is ESSENTIAL to the local community and quite a few of us would be reliant upon the government if we didn't have the ability to go catch fish for dinner any time we need to. For me with a family of 5 having a 3 fish limit would have a negative impact upon our ability to survive.

Rule/regulation changes MUST be based upon scientific FACT, NOT at the whim of a "commissioner".

---

# #17

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 10:16:50 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 10:25:07 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:17  
**IP Address:** 174.45.84.0

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Scott Vollmer  
**City/Town:** Gallatin Gateway, MT  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** vollmerscott@yahoo.com

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Dear Commissioners,

I am in full support of the amendment brought by Commissioner Walsh regarding the definition of a hook. I am also in full support of the Department's suggested language. The intent of this amendment was to eliminate the possibility of using lures and flies with as many as 3, 4, or more hooks attached. This type of fishing gear can be hard on our salmonid populations, leading to hook scars and potential mortality. This concern is heightened in waters where treble hooks are allowed or where salmonid populations are at risk. This is a common-sense amendment that that benefits the conservation of many salmonid species in many places. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Scott Vollmer  
MOGA Vice-President  
Gallatin Gateway, MT

---

# #18

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 11:29:05 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 11:44:48 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:42  
**IP Address:** 162.57.254.49

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Mike Wade  
**City/Town:** Savage  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** birdsnwalleyes@gmail.com

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I believe the current definition of a hook is adequate and should not be changed. Many popular stickbaits and crankbaits are factory designed with 3 treble hooks. I do not believe these lures should have to be modified to make them legal in Montana. I believe a lure with multiple hooks should still be considered a single hook.

---

# #19

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 12:54:58 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 1:04:44 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:45  
**IP Address:** 96.3.210.2

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Sam Deschene  
**City/Town:** Townsend  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** redneck\_fisherman123@yahoo.com

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Hook Definition- I strongly disagree with the amendment that was put forth. If you were to pass this many anglers would have to modify baits that they are buying straight out of the packaging. These modificatons would also make many baits that are made with multiple hooks not function properly and would make some unusable. We need to keep this definition the same.

---

# #20

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 2:13:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 2:19:14 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:43  
**IP Address:** 63.153.1.211

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Tanner Rask</b>
City/Town:	<b>Belgrade</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>tanner.rask@gmail.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

This amendment should not pass. A lure with multiple hooks should be allowed as "one hook", or just change the wordage. In fact, amendments such as these only make the regulations more difficult to interpret for new outdoorsmen and women, as well as veteran outdoorsmen like myself.

---

# #21

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 2:17:07 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 2:21:57 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:50  
**IP Address:** 97.121.211.10

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Email Address: **kenoneill33@gmail.com**

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

This is not a good idea at all , from what I'm reading. I troll for almost all fish in Montana and All of the factory crank baits have 2 trebles . So this would make all the sporting goods stores in Mt have to fix or change inventory to meet this. Also I would like to point out I think 2 trebles a line ( for lures ) is good .

Big huge no for me !

---

# #22

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 2:40:49 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 2:46:58 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:08  
**IP Address:** 66.135.72.193

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Jim VVashro</b>
City/Town:	<b>Kalispell</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>jsjvash@montanasky.us</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Flathead Wildlife, Inc. is opposed to the proposed amendment to reduce the Combined Trout Limit in the Western and Central District for Rivers and Streams from 5 to 3 fish daily. Fishing regulations should be based on science and provide a demonstrable change in the targeted fish population in the least restrictive manner. The proposed amendment is an unsupported and unnecessary restriction in the regulations with no biological benefit.

There is no evidence presented to show existing harvest levels are impacting trout populations in the vast majority of streams. Surveys demonstrate many anglers already practice catch and release so a limit reduction would have little biological benefit but would represent a major decrease in opportunity for those anglers wishing to keep fish for a meal.

The amendment references the Madison River and maintaining fishery quality. Studies have indicated the Madison may be overpopulated and would benefit from more harvest, allowing remaining fish to grow bigger and therefore improving quality. The existing Combined Trout River Limit works well, any limit reductions should be applied specifically to waters where data shows harvest is a problem. Keeping three 15" trout in the Central District may provide a good meal but in northwest Montana trout run more in the 8"-12" range and 3 fish would not provide a family meal.

Leave the existing Hook Definition as is. This is only an issue in a few waters in the Western District where FWP is proposing single hook regulations, deal with it there. Changing the definition statewide will cause confusion.

Jim Vashro, FWI President

---

# #23

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 3:40:43 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 3:59:10 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:18:27  
**IP Address:** 146.75.175.62

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Neal Cote</b>
City/Town:	<b>Missoula</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>mrpikemt1@yahoo.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I am against this Amendment. The hook definition as it was previously written should not be changed. If we change this to the proposed then whole categories of fishing lures and techniques will be illegal if not modified. If we change it, then retail sales of those lures will be affected as well as manufacturers. The previous rule designated that a single hook could be a treble hook which allows for no modification of existing lures. This change does not change hooking mortality. If greater protections are needed, the better solution would be fishing closures instead of lure modifications. This makes KC Walsh's amendment look like a single hook fly fishing only change. If that is its intention, then designate areas for this as opposed to changing lure definition.

---



# #24

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 8:36:20 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 8:45:55 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:34  
**IP Address:** 67.143.192.122

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>John W Brown</b>
City/Town:	<b>Florence</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>ratherbefishing46@gmail.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

the 5 fish limit should remain the hook is moot go barbless

---

# #25

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, October 29, 2024 11:43:41 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 12:04:18 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:20:36  
**IP Address:** 104.28.111.95

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Thomas Tyre</b>
City/Town:	<b>Billings</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>ttyre76@icloud.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

If it ain't broke don't fix it. Changing the combined trout limit may cause more harm than good. Allowing a person to keep 3 trout without the 18" size limit could reduce the quantity of larger fish available to anglers and remove more of the mature female spawners from the streams and rivers. This could reduce the total number of fish in the stream. Leave the fish hook definition alone. Many good lures contain 2 or more hooks. The new definition would make them illegal to use without alterations causing stores to quit carrying them.

---

# #26

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 5:00:41 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 5:19:52 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:19:10  
**IP Address:** 64.79.35.217

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Chet Cook  
**City/Town:** Bozeman  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** chet.cook1@gmail.com

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I am strongly opposed to the Hook Definition Amendment by Commisioner Walsh. Please provide notable scientific evidence that shows a lure with multiple hooks (ie crankbait) has a strong negative impact on a certain fish species or fishery. This feels like a very one sided amendment being backed by high dollar trout conservationists. I am hopeful that the commission can read between the lines and see how much this would impact the majority of the fisherman in this state who are contributing the most money via license sales, equipment purchases, etc.

---

# #27

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 9:38:57 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 9:50:52 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:54  
**IP Address:** 174.45.253.80

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>William Wemple</b>
City/Town:	<b>Bozeman</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>BillWemple@icloud.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

The proposal fails to address the reason or need for the change or distinction. Many lures come standard with two to three hooks ready out of the package and this seems like unnecessary regulation and over reach without context or reasons. Not all fisheries and species are targeted with multiple hooks but turning a treble hook into three hooks when many lures come with two trebles thus equaling six hooks and would then become illegal? Suggest limiting lures on a line separately from hooks on a lure. Creating more confusing regulation without context or stating the reason for it seems unnecessary.

---

# #28

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 10:18:09 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 10:23:07 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:58  
**IP Address:** 108.147.32.26

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name: **Tom Smith**  
City/Town: **Gallatin county**  
State/Province: **MT**

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Commissioner Walsh has a clear conflict of interest considering he is the Executive Chair and majority state holder in Simms fishing products, a local high end fly fishing brand that caters to rich out of staters.

This amendment to force locals to keep less trout proves that he is working in this position specifically to aid the commercial fly fishing guides along with the out of state tourists who pay his company millions of dollars each year.

I would like to formally request that Commissioner Walsh be removed from his position with FWP due to this clear and obvious conflict of interest along with this attempt to change the law for his own personal gain!

---

# #29

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 12:45:09 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 12:50:28 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:18  
**IP Address:** 70.33.57.73

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Ryan Zachary Nutt  
**City/Town:** Billings  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** ryannutt@hotmail.com

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I do not agree with your amendment on the Hook Defination. Maybe focus your energy/assets on acquiring more access and camping sites in lieu of restricting our fishing lure options which have been in place for many years.

---

# #30

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 9:30:00 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 2:08:09 PM  
**Time Spent:** 04:38:09  
**IP Address:** 216.129.239.11

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	Nancy Delekta
City/Town:	Cameron
State/Province:	MT
Email Address:	nancy@beartoothflyfishing.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Dear Commissioner Walsh,

Please consider the following comments.

On the Definition of a Hook, I agree this needs more discussion and input prior to finalizing. There should be photographs of both Lures and Flies that have one or more hooks and varied definitions to properly match the pictures.

It seems that an articulated fly streamer with two hooks should be allowed. It is allowed in the general regulations. This as a fly is not as problematic to the fish as a Treble Lure would be. Hook and Line Limits are also not properly defined in the regulations in different places. This process should evolve with input to help with consistency and agreement on the various rules and definitions. I de barb all my hooks but was present at an FWP commission meeting regarding the Flathead where several scientists were present and justified that barbs or no barbs do not scientifically make a difference in the mortality rates when Trout and other fish are caught. They also had similar scientific comments regarding multiple versus single hooks. More analysis seems to be needed to warrant changing the rules.

We have had several people contact us to question the 2024 FWP Regulations on hooks. Most of the questions were asked because there were no helpful answers or definitions in the regulations themselves. Of note, page 64 in the Central District has confusing wording for the newly defined regulations from Varney Bridge to Ennis Bridge and from Ennis Bridge to Ennis Lake. This and other sections of the regulations should be addressed in the overall hook definition process. It is not Black and White.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Delekta

---



# #31

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 3:35:47 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 4:04:50 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:29:02  
**IP Address:** 184.166.97.230

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

City/Town: **Missoula**  
State/Province: **MT**

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I am strongly opposed to the possession limit amendment. This amendment is a solution in search of a problem. There are no biological concerns with the current district standard. This amendment will only restrict opportunity and have no effect on fish populations. The commission should be focused on maximizing opportunity, not unnecessarily restricting it.

I am strongly opposed to the hook definition amendment. While it makes sense that a hook should mean a single hook, this amendment is using a change in definition to significantly alter fishing regulations. If this is truly a clean-up amendment to better clarify a definition, then a concurrent change in the language surrounding hooks per line should occur to protect the continued use of popular lures that have more than 2 hooks. Otherwise, this amendment is a disingenuous way to remove the use of certain types of tackle.

Overall, I question why these significant amendments are coming out of left field at the end of a long, thorough public review process coordinated by FWP. This amendment process is short-changing the public.

---

#32

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 4:19:10 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 5:19:43 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:00:32  
**IP Address:** 205.149.11.224

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Bob Julian  
**City/Town:** Belgrade  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** bridgerview.bob@gmail.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I strongly object to Mr. Walsh's proposed change in the definition of a "hook" for the following reasons:

- There is no evidence or data that supports the need to modify the current regulations regarding the definition of a "hook". Apparently this is simply an arbitrary assertion by Mr. Walsh to support his fly fishing interests.
  - It would appear that changing this definition would outlaw nearly all the lures I currently use to fish for Walleye, Bass, Northern Pike, Trout and other fish. And, whether Mr. Walsh understands this or not, these multi-hook lures are standard lures when fishing for these species of fish.
  - Changing the definition of a hook appears to be a solution looking for a non-existent problem.
  - If the regulation must be clarified, then the one offered by FWP staff seems to be sufficiently clear, and will not alter the current use of multi-hook lures.
-

# #33

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 5:51:31 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 5:54:49 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:17  
**IP Address:** 174.45.224.242

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Bruce Bates</b>
City/Town:	<b>Billings</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>batesbruce29@gmail.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

There is absolutely no reason for changing the definition of a fish hook on all of our crank baits. Treble hooks are fine. If you want to release a fish easier, bend the barbs closed. Don't mess with our fishing lures!

---

# #34

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 6:35:26 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 8:08:50 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:33:24  
**IP Address:** 24.72.196.214

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>George David Nison</b>
City/Town:	<b>Billings</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>Crispy.Critter6002@tctwest.net</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Daily Possession Amendment should be denied. After reading the "Rationale and Background" there is actually NO justification for a change to Daily/Possession Limits. FWP has Biologists in the field that gather information to 'justifiably' make those kinds of recommendations, not you or I off the top of our heads. Without "DATA" to support the amendment I am against it!!!

Hook Definition Amendment should be denied. When reading the "Rationale and Background", and taking it 'literally', I and every other fisherman would have to modify those "100's of dollars" worth of lures etc. in our tackle boxes with 3 hooks. Also the 'Outdoor Retailers' would be constrained on their sale of same!! To approve the amendment serves NO logical/justified purpose!!

---

#35

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 10:28:39 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 30, 2024 10:35:48 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:09  
**IP Address:** 66.113.54.92

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Matthew D. Morris  
**City/Town:** Choteau  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** mdm2@rocketmail.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

As a life long Montana Resident, I strongly oppose both proposed rule amendments. I will be in contact with my local representative to express my concerns and opposition as well. These rules appear to be a taking of rights to promote the state as a sport fishery for recreational fishing rather than for the utilization of streams to feed the public.

---

# #36

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 6:30:06 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 6:54:22 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:24:16  
**IP Address:** 174.45.238.192

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name: **Bob Klein**  
City/Town: **Billings**  
State/Province: **MT**  
Email Address: **rr8klein@gmail.com**

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I am commenting specifically on the Hook Definition Amendment as proposed by Commissioner Walsh. As a an avid sport fishermen in Montana, I am adamantly opposed to any regulation change that completely eliminates crank baits with multiple hooks attached. The change as proposed by Commissioner Walsh is not supported by any data whatsoever to warrant any changes. Crank baits, with multiple hooks, have been used by fisherman for over a hundred years. The proposed change would impact crank bait companies, who have been successful in providing fisherman with desired products. Quite frankly, I am not surprised that Commissioner, Walsh would attempt to make such a proposal, knowing his business background at Simms. AS I STATED EARLIER IS TOTALLY OPPOSED TO THE HOOK DEFINTION AMMENDMENT,...BOB KLEIN 198 Quietwater Ave Billings Mt 59105

---

#37

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 6:50:23 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 7:16:38 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:26:14  
**IP Address:** 72.175.116.114

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Lee Deming  
**City/Town:** Laurel  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** leedeming@gmail.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

It seems to me, a lifelong MT angler, that this proposal is being driven by a disdain for those anglers who would like to keep a few fish for consumption. Does the data support this proposal? Are too many fish being taken in both the Western and Central Districts? The proposal itself admits that the vast majority of anglers already practice catch and release so whatever impact this proposal has will be minimal on the fish populations. All it will do is anger catch and keep anglers. Additionally, if there is a water body that requires lower limits, I trust that the FWP will identify that problem and approach the Commission with data and proposals for water body specific recommendations rather than impose restrictions on 2/3's of the State. I urge the Commission to reject this proposal.

---

# #38

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 9:27:56 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 9:36:22 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:25  
**IP Address:** 135.134.85.199

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name: **rick granot**  
City/Town: **Helena**  
State/Province: **MT**  
Email Address: **lilrockmt80@gmail.com**

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Using your proposed definition of a single hook would completely change and hinder fishing in almost every body of water. I'm not really sure why it needs to be changed but in the interest of every angler in Montana please keep our old rule of what a hook is. The last thing we need to do it to make things harder. Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable and fun sport not something I need to sit down with a lawyer first to make sure I cover all my bases

---



#39

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 9:50:53 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 10:02:15 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:21  
**IP Address:** 172.56.201.6

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Mike Sedlock  
**City/Town:** Helena  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** mikesedsaid@gmail.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I'm totally opposed to this amendment. This amendment is not needed. The FWP biologists have stated that the current hook regulations does not have an impact on our fish populations. Similar studies have not shown excessive fish mortality from multiple hooks. Why change something that isn't broke!

---

# #40

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 10:15:08 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 10:27:19 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:12:11  
**IP Address:** 174.231.81.133

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Dale Gilbert</b>
City/Town:	<b>Ulm</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>MtWalleyeLLC@gmail.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

I am opposed to the proposal, even as amended. It is very confusing and appears to make lures with more than two hooks illegal. This makes many of my crankbaits and jigs illegal statewide.

If the point is to make single point hooks the only legal means in select waters, it would be better to simply clarify that lures with multiple hooks are not allowed in single point hook waters. I'd even suggest they be barbless to help reduce mortality in heavily fished, catch and release fisheries.

---

# #41

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 4:12:41 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 4:16:44 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:02  
**IP Address:** 97.121.198.99

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

Name:	<b>Ronald Nutt</b>
City/Town:	<b>Belgrade</b>
State/Province:	<b>MT</b>
Email Address:	<b>smn72ren@gmail.com</b>

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Hook definition amendment is a CROCK !! DO NOT AMEND

---

# #42

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 4:19:25 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 4:39:42 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:20:17  
**IP Address:** 174.45.36.114

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Jerry Darwin Wells  
**City/Town:** Helena  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** [salmotrutta70@gmail.com](mailto:salmotrutta70@gmail.com)

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Given that FWP has just recently adopted a state wide fisheries Mgt plan that is by the far the most in depth and complete plan written and received extensive public review and FWP just finalized new statewide fishing regulations, I don't think it makes sense to now change the general trout limit to 3 from 5 in the Western and Central districts. All of the available data on our rivers indicate that very few anglers keep any trout. Given that, it is unlikely that there would be a measurable biological impact of changing the limit from 5 to 3. If population conditions warrant further restrictions, regions can implement emergency actions as has recently been done on the Big Hole River. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

# #43

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 4:55:40 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 6:04:21 PM  
**Time Spent:** 01:08:41  
**IP Address:** 192.161.71.31

---

Page 1

## Q1

Contact information:

**Name:** Douglas Dreeszen  
**City/Town:** BALLANTINE  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** ramsrus@tctwest.net

---

## Q2

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Montana FWP Commission

I would like to make a comment on Commissioner Walsh's proposed amendment changing the daily and possession limits for combined trout in the Central District for rivers and streams to "3 daily and in possession". I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF THIS PROPOSAL. As mentioned, I refer to the Central District. About 10 years ago there was a proposal by former Commissioners Vermillion and Coulton to change the current limit of trout on the Yellowstone River from the standard limit of trout of 5 daily and in possession, with only 1 over 18 inches, to a much smaller size and possession. This was met with an enormous opposition from anglers in the Billings and Livingston areas. Their proposal was defeated. Furthermore, since that time, there was considerable work done by the MT FWP to standardize the limits of trout on several tributaries of the Yellowstone River (Stillwater and Boulder Rivers), to stop much confusion on the size and limit of trout in these waters as anglers sometimes fished several of these waters on an outing. An enforcement nightmare was eliminated by standardizing the limit on these streams.

At the time of Vermillion and Coulton's proposal I found that only 5% of the fishermen kept any fish, per FWP creel census. I would imagine that since that time, fewer anglers keep any fish, so why do you want to penalize a few anglers for keeping a few trout. I know numerous fishermen who fish the Yellowstone, Stillwater and Boulder Rivers, including myself and my wife, and all your proposal will do is take away opportunity away from the many folks who fish and keep a few trout.

It appears to me this is just another attempt by the fly-fishing anglers and the Fishing Outfitters to keep trout fishing to themselves.

In checking with my contacts within the MTFWP, they are not in favor of this proposal.

Thank you for allowing me to comment and please curtail this proposed amendment.

---

#44

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 8:19:25 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, October 31, 2024 8:20:51 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:26  
**IP Address:** 208.78.80.9

---

Page 1

**Q1**

Contact information:

**Name:** Dani Arps  
**City/Town:** Dillon  
**State/Province:** MT  
**Email Address:** dani.arps@yahoo.com

---

**Q2**

Please comment on Fishing Regs Amendment - Commissioner Walsh

Please do not change to the 3 fish limit and leave the hooks alone. This is crazy.

---