

From the PLPOA Sport Fishing Committee

Tom Sherman, Fred Manuel and Dave Majkrzak

June 17, 2016

Attachment to email to Jim Walters June 17, 2016

Recently we all received two sets of "data", and two sets of "please retract the data" emails from you. Is there corrected data coming? Is what you sent the second time supposed to be correct? No explanation was sent with either email explaining the reason for the retraction.

Regardless, we have a couple of questions/comments:

1. The 242 count as noted in your report seems extremely low after stocking for many years. How was this number calculated and how does it compare to prior estimates? Seems extremely low in light of all the muskie follows and strikes observed by non-muskie fisherman. Also the range for 95% confidence of 120-530, is that large of a range something that can generate any accurate conclusions?
2. How many fish did you actually recapture this year? Note: no one from Pelican Lake was informed of the survey this Spring, or asked to witness the activity. We are very disappointed in this oversight, and are wondering how you managed to alert the press.
3. As you had stocked muskie every other year in past years, so that natural reproduction could be monitored, why is there no reference to "stocked" or "natural reproduction" noted on any caught and/or recaptured fish? Do you not care if the adult fish today are stocked or from natural reproduction?
4. Last year your emails stated target quantities of muskie are .33 to .25 fish per surface area. (or 1 fish per every 3-4 acres). That would have put Pelican at 991 to 1308 fish.

Now you are saying the target is .25 to .10 fish per surface area (or 1 fish per 4 - 10 acres). Why the change? What scientific data or research showed the original target to be wrong?

5. You originally said the "0" fall walleye electroshocking in 2014 was an anomaly, and now a "0" has occurred again in fall 2015. The 2015 walleye survey had "0" one year old fish (first time in over 10 years), these are very troubling signs.

After telling us (PLPOA) stocking of walleye fingerlings in prior years was "a waste", "not needed - as you knew what you are doing", "forage for the muskie that are stocked weeks later", the PLPOA decided not to stock \$8000 of walleye at our expense last fall. Now the Lake Management Plan from the MNDNR will spend \$20,000 to \$30,000 dollars on walleye fingerlings

this fall if fall walleye electroshocking numbers are "below average". If we don't have a walleye problem, why are you now offering to stock walleye fingerling for the first time in over 20 years?

6. The recent walleye tournament numbers (average walleye/boat) are down about 30 % from the 2014 numbers (lowest number since 2010). But up slightly from last year, 2015. we see you did not mention that in this summary, but you were happy to point that out a few years ago when the trend was upward. But we all know fishing tourney numbers are not a good indicator for walleye population.

But more important is the lack (again), of many small walleye being caught by the tourney fisherman. We had one tourney fisherman tell us he only caught 1 walleye under 15 inches, and several years ago he would have caught 20 -25. This is a bad indicator, again, second year in a row....And yes, they caught big fish.....sounds like Mille Lacs.

7. Adult fish are counted. We believe it is time the MNDNR tells people that for every adult muskie in the water, there is another 3.72 muskie "immature" fish in the water. These fish are part of the population as well.

8. The recent Kerr report quotes a Wisconsin study where 1 adult muskie can eat up to 20 walleye a year. $242 * 20$ is 4840 walleye we can't catch and eat for supper. The recent walleye tournament had 69 boats bring in 406 fish in 2-8 hour days of fishing. Your muskie are eating 12 times that number of walleye. We do not call that "ecologically benign" or "zero impact".