

## Changes to fishing at Mandanna Lake: Public survey results

**Question 1:** Do you agree with this regulation change?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	42%
No	25	58%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Question 2: Why or Why not?

For those that answered YES, open-ended answers were as follows:

- Fish in lakes has been greatly restricted around carmacks
- reasonable as long as the lake stock is constantly monitored to ensure stocks do not drop to unsustainable levels. As well, First Nations should have to report their catch so all user group harvest is fully understood.
- Nice to see some past restrictions pay off, and sacrifices for recovery should be rewarded with returning opportunities.
- It's a reasonable approach. Catch and release is a necessary option some times.
- I think this regulation change is a good compromise between opening up harvest of fish on this lake by allowing some harvest by licenced anglers, and limiting catch and release fishing to reflect traditional values. The Little Salmon/Carmacks First Nation Final Agreement specifies that Mandanna Lake is a First nation food fishery lake and so it is important to reflect First Nation values in the rules for fishing on this lake.
- Seems like a good limit to maintain trout levels
- If First Nation supports proposal and there is ongoing monitoring and enforcement I agree
- This lake seems hard enough to access, so with a careful opening (ie. only 1 fish under 60cm that can be kept) I think it is reasonable.
- Fair
- Protect traditional land for future generation.

For those that answered NO, open-ended answers were as follows:

- When this limitation is not based on the best available science, then it is particularly frustrating (and, I expect, would be less likely to be adhered to).
- Because in the pass of peacock fishing everything out.
- Give the stocks more time to recover. There is little to no way to enforce the aggregate catch limit; voluntary restriction are proven to be ineffective.
- Having grown up in Carmacks Mandanna was and still is a hidden gem. I learned to fish and trap by the elders and opening the lake up will take away the First Nation traditional element.
- Don't agree with catch & release sport fishing; fish dies.
- I want it to come back in numbers.
- I don't think so. Because there will be no fish for our future use.
- Fish population still too low.
- Because if this happens, there will be no fish for future generations, especially if there is sport fishing.
- No fly-in fishing or sport fishing.
- The lake can't handle that kind of fishing.

### Question 3: If no, what would you recommend?

- Keep regulations as they are now.
- Keep closed for a few more years and see if fish population increases.
- Who needs 5 fish when fishing recreationally?
- Keep it the same.
- Extend ban for another 5 years...want to ensure the resource is more than recovered!!
- In this case, I am in favour of a cautious return to lake trout harvest (1 per day, < 26" long), and a broader approach to live release education to reduce fish mortality and provide information on First Nation perspectives on fish harvest. For the reasons outlined above, however, I am strongly opposed to an aggregate daily catch limit of five fish.
- Keep it as is.
- Continue to protect stocks.
- Let the lake recover, protect the area.
- Leave it be.
- Let the fish come back.
- Wait for population to recover.
- Recommend that fishing at Mandanna remain closed til fish count goes back up.
- Release unharmed.
- Cut off sport fishing, let it recover.

### Question 4. Are you a Yukon resident?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	43	100%
No	0	0%
Grand Total	43	100%

### Question 5. Which community do you live in?

	Frequency	Percent
Whitehorse	23	53%
Carmacks	16	37%
Other	4	9%
Grand Total	43	100%

### Question 6. Are you of Aboriginal ancestry?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	11	26%
No	26	60%
Prefer not to say	6	14%
Grand Total	43	100%

**For more information,  
please contact**

Robert Perry  
Senior Fisheries Biologist  
Robert.Perry@gov.yk.ca  
867-667-5117

