

RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

MEMORANDUM

TO: Wolf Working Group Members (WWG) and WDFW Staff
FROM: Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE
SUBJECT: Action Items from the July 12-13 Meeting #3 – Final
DATE: August 29, 2007

This memo includes action items agreed to during the July 12-13 meeting, a list of future meeting dates, and a brief summary of WWG discussions for your information.

Please note that action items may include some tasks applicable to all WWG members. Please review the action item list for tasks assigned to you and/or the Working Group in general (highlighted in yellow), and let us know if we missed any action items or if you have questions.

Upcoming Meeting	When and Where	Suggested Agenda Items
WG Meeting #4	Thurs-Fri, Sept. 13-14 <i>Ellensburg, WA</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued discussion of key issues in Chapters 3 and 4 (including revised versions) Review of draft Chapters 5, 6, and 7
WG Meeting #5	Mon-Tue, Oct 29-30 <i>Ellensburg, WA</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBD

I. ACTION ITEMS

Task	Who	Completed by
1. <u>Action Items Memo</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute draft memo for review Provide edits/comments on Action Items Memo to RESOLVE 	RESOLVE WWG Members	Tuesday, July 24 Tuesday, August 7
2. <u>Comments on Chapter 5 (outline) and Chapter 6</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide comments on draft chapters/outlines to WDFW 	WWG Members	Tuesday, August 7

Task	Who	Completed by
3. <u>Website</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update website as necessary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher profile • Highlight call-in numbers 	WDFW	Wednesday, July 25 <i>(Timed to coincide with notification of the public meetings)</i>
4. <u>Scoping Meetings</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share information on dates and locations of scoping meetings 	WDFW	Friday, July 27
5. <u>PowerPoint Presentations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share Carolyn Sime's presentations by mail • Put other PowerPoint presentations on WDFW WWG web site 	WDFW	Friday, July 27
6. <u>Other Background Documents</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share documents identified at meeting (during Carolyn Sime's presentations) on CD 	WDFW	Friday, July 27
7. <u>Eco-region analysis</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide analysis including population and prey issues, habitat issues 	WDFW	Wednesday, August 15
8. <u>Federal/State Interplay</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share additional information on federal/state legal overlap 	WDFW	Thursday, August 30
9. <u>Habitat model</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional analysis, run with additional data/parameters 	WDFW	Thursday, August 30
10. <u>Target Populations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on numbers of wolves (BPs) using other states, models – provide something to react to 	WDFW	Thursday, August 30
11. <u>Compensation Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work to flesh out program (beyond confirmed losses) 	WDFW	Thursday, August 30

Task	Who	Completed by
12. <u>Draft Plan</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide revised drafts of Ch 3, 4, and 6 Provide drafts of Ch 5 and 7 	WDFW	Thursday, August 30
13. <u>Hard Copy Packet Distribution</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mail information to Daryl Asmussen and Jeff Dawson 	WDFW and RESOLVE	Ongoing
14. <u>Map of Washington</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring large map of Washington for reference in future WWG meetings 	WDFW	All future meetings
15. <u>Definition of Extirpation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include definition of extirpation in Glossary section of Plan 	WDFW	December 6

II. OVERVIEW OF DISCUSSIONS

Day 1 – July 12, 2007

A. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Donny Martorello, WDFW, welcomed the members to the Wolf Working Group (WWG) meeting and thanked participants on behalf of WDFW for their involvement. He reminded the group that the draft chapters the group has been receiving are just that – drafts – and are subject to significant change as a result of work by this group and other input. He also noted that WDFW was beginning to inform other relevant groups (e.g., the WA Game Management Advisory group) about the WWG efforts and development of the wolf management plan, and as such members might receive inquiries as a result. A member requested that WWG members be provided with the names of individuals that might be inquiring. Mr. Martorello then turned the meeting over to the facilitator, Paul De Morgan of RESOLVE who reviewed the agenda and the contents of the members' meeting packets. For a list of attendees, see attachment A below.

The focus of the meeting was described as review and discussion of two key chapters of the draft plan addressing wolf/livestock conflict management (Chapter 4) and wolf conservation (Chapter 3), along with some preliminary discussion of several additional chapters. Mr. De Morgan reviewed the meeting groundrules and the following issues were noted:

The facilitator would check in with the group at the end of WDFW's initial presentation to make sure that the order of the agenda still made sense (discussion of Chapter 4 before Chapter 3) and whether the group wanted additional information and discussion regarding the extent of suitable wolf habitat in the state.

B. Conceptual Approach to Wolf Management – Focus on Chapters 3 and 4

Presentation: Rocky Beach, WDFW

Rocky Beach, WDFW, gave a presentation outlining the Department's approach to drafting the Wolf Management Plan. He indicated that while the Department had expected to use the best and most appropriate elements of other states' plans, their efforts had resulted in the observation that Washington had significant differences from other states, including:

- Washington is the smallest western state but has the second largest population
- It is not currently in "core" wolf range
- It has a different political and agricultural environment ("The Washington Way")

Mr. Beach noted that WDFW wants to utilize the best of all the different state approaches. Mr. Beach also reviewed the WDFW organizational charts to identify key players in wolf management.

Mr. Beach highlighted the following key elements of the Department's approach:

- Address the conflict (livestock/wolf) issues first because minimization of conflict is essential to achieving other wolf conservation goals
- Tie conflict resolution approaches to local (eco-regional) population status rather than to state-wide listing status
- Wolf "recovery" is tied to establishing (1) viable populations (2) across a significant portion of its range
- With 9 eco-regions statewide, downlisting and delisting triggers will occur when viable populations are established in 2 regions and 4 regions (for "endangered-to-threatened" and "threatened-to-delisted," respectively)

He noted also the Department's decision not to develop specific target numbers for wolf recovery (viable populations) at this time because there was no significant in-state data to provide to the relevant models. At this point and throughout the meeting, the Department received questions and resistance from the group regarding this approach. The members desired to see the Department make an attempt at modeling likely habitat areas and providing draft target population numbers.

C. Chapter 4 – Wolf-Livestock Conflict

Presentation: Donny Martorello, WDFW

Donny Martorello, WDFW, provided an overview of the Department's approach to wolf/livestock conflict management. He emphasized that the key to success for conflict management and wolf conservation generally was to delink conflict response from the wolf's statewide listing status and to link appropriate responses according to the wolf's status in the state's defined eco-regions. Consequently, the state would have additional flexibility to respond to and manage conflicts in eco-regions where wolf populations were better regardless of the statewide listing status of the species (although the status in neighboring eco-regions might be relevant to determining the appropriate response).

To focus discussion on high level/big picture issues regarding the approach to conflict management, WDFW developed a list of key issues for discussion drawn from WWG member comments received prior to the meeting and in discussions at the meeting:

- Goal statement for the Chapter (what should it be)
- Conflict management tied to eco-region wolf status
- Whether Table 1 (setting out conflict management tools and timing of their use) provides a reasonable approach
- Timing of lethal control
- Compensation
- Economic impact (covered in another chapter but raised here by members)
- Connection of control measures to overall recovery
- Funding mechanisms to sustain USDA Wildlife Services related to wolf conservation and conflict management

Goal Statement. With respect to a goal statement for this chapter on wolf/livestock conflict management, the WWG members had a robust discussion. Members made a variety of suggestions, including:

- A timely response or even same-day service should be a goal for WDFW
- Compensation should be fully funded – even minimal losses will be problematic for the livestock industry
- The goal statement should be clear that wolves are being re-established, not newly established and that they have a right to be on the landscape
- Constituent education is important
- Funding is a key element – funding should come from WA citizens as a whole who want wolf restoration (not just on livestock producers and/or sportsmen) – and perhaps also from fees/taxes on visitors – WDFW should aggressively seek full funding for wildlife services associated with wolf recovery
- Zero conflict might be a good goal – but it may also be unrealistic/unachievable and therefore not helpful as a meaningful goal – it might be best referenced as something to “strive for” in a preamble to the Chapter along with an acknowledgement that individual losses can represent a significant impact

After several iterations, one proposed goal statement was left on the table for further discussion, as follows:

Manage wolf/livestock conflicts in a way that maintains an economically viable livestock industry throughout the state of WA while ensuring wolf recovery.

Eco-regional Approach. With respect to an eco-regional approach to conflict management (i.e., management actions keyed to the status of wolves in that eco-region), the WWG had another robust discussion. Although there were some concerns about whether such an approach would work under relevant laws/regulations, there was generally support among the members for the flexibility of the approach outlined by the Department. In addition, WWG members offered the following comments:

- In addition to status in the relevant region, consider the need to support overall recovery (e.g., avoid actions that would unnecessarily impede dispersal)
- The approach may present some challenges for management at the edges of the eco-regions (including state lines) (e.g., when a landowner’s property or a pack of wolves straddles an eco-region border)

- The definition of residency will require some clarification to address border issues (to account for the mobility of wolf packs)

Table 1 Tools. WWG members discussed the tools for wolf/livestock conflict management outlined in Table 1 of the latest draft of Chapter 4. Comments included the following:

- Many of these tools will be difficult to implement in 80% of Eastern WA where cattle roam freely across vast areas of rangeland – there is little supervision, and losses are rarely confirmed by carcasses
- This also raises the issue of how compensation would work in such circumstances:
 - Some suggested producers would need to establish a baseline (pre-wolf) loss rate and then measure the difference in loss rates as wolves enter the area
- Distinctions should be drawn (in both the use of management tools and in compensation approaches) based on whether depredation was on public (federal/state) or private land.
- Requirements for individualized permits may be too burdensome and the nature of the permitting requirement should be clarified
- Limitations on lethal take by private landowners (limited to takes during actual depredation) are too restrictive
- Responsiveness of the Department will be key in ensuring livestock producers' confidence in the system/approach – and adequate funding will be important to ensuring that responsiveness
- Will there be places in the state where wolves will not be acceptable
- Are there areas in the state where successful wolf recovery could occur with lower levels of conflict (e.g., large contiguous blocks of forested public lands)?

Habitat Suitability Model. At this time, at the request of WWG members, Donny Martorello, WDFW, provided an overview of the *Habitat Suitability Model for Wolves in Washington*. He described how the model was run using the most significant (predictive) parameters according to runs of the model in other states (e.g., forest cover, elk availability, human impacts, and the availability of large tracts of public lands).

D. Conservation “Principles”

Presentation: Montana's Experience – Carolyn Sime, Statewide Wolf Coordinator, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

Carolyn Sime provided WWG members with a thorough overview of the Montana experience in managing wolf recovery. She listed the “Top Ten Lessons, so far” from the Montana wolf recovery experience:

- Engage the public and involve elected officials from all levels
 - High levels of interaction and potential for conflicts must be addressed:
 - risking tolerance and acceptance
 - tap native wisdom
- Slow, methodical work at the ground level matters!
- Maintain the people-centered, interest-based approach
- Recognize that the challenges are not technical or scientific; they are social and economic and revolve around people
 - include everyone and balance interests

- strive for fair & equitable outcomes
- Everyone owns the challenges; everyone is responsible for mutual solutions
- Five-Second Rule (wait before responding – consider all the alternatives)
- Acknowledge that things are different outside national parks:
 - people enter the equation
- Land matrix changes, but still functionally connected as an ecological unit (for now)
- Different missions and management frameworks
- “Natural regulation” vs. management
 - not mutually exclusive
 - problem-solving becomes multi-disciplinary
 - go find the experts
 - play well with others

E. Chapter 3 – Wolf Conservation

Presentation: Introductory comments on draft language – Rocky Beach, WDFW

WDFW presented a summary of Chapter 3 dealing with wolf conservation. Key points included the following:

- This is a core chapter in the plan
- Guiding principles include:
 - Wolf distribution over a significant portion of its range in WA.
 - Achieving a viable population
- Distribution is based on 9 state eco-regions
- Triggers for downlisting and delisting are also based on eco-regions:
 - 2/9 eco-regions to reach Threatened status
 - 4/9 eco-regions to reach Sensitive status
- Population Goals will be set as wolves enter each eco-region
- MVP and Carrying Capacity models were considered, but found insufficient
- Without the establishment of wolves there are too many variables
 - Prey models do not have precision
 - Predator/predator relationships may differ
 - Basic life history parameters may vary

At this point, the WWG concluded its session for the day.

Day 2 – July 13, 2007

At the outset of Day 2, the WWG continued its consideration of Chapter 3. Several issues were identified for discussion:

- Suitability of downlisting and delisting goals
- Approach for determining statewide wolf population objectives (in the future)
- Strategies to address conservation
- Translocation to accelerate dispersal
- Dependence on wolf status and management in Idaho

- Re-colonization slow if dependent on natural dispersal
- Develop own source population
- Options post delisting – controlled hunting
- Where/where not to have wolves

The discussion that followed was somewhat free ranging across these subject areas, but overall addressed a number of key issues related to the Chapter. Points of discussion included the following:

Delisting definition

- Establishing wolf populations in only 2 eco-regions may not necessarily be sufficient/adequate to support down-listing and it will be important to keep the “significant portion of range” requirement in mind as well (e.g., Blue Mountains and Canadian Rockies regions may not be adequate for downlisting, whereas the Canadian Rockies paired with a population in the Cascade Range could be a good match).
- Some members suggested the goal for moving from endangered to threatened should include having populations established in at least 2 eco-regions – at least one of which is in the Cascades.

Modeling and Population Objectives

- Generally, WWG members indicated they really need to see some numbers. Some baselines/starting points for discussion using the available modeling approaches (Minimum Viable Population or Carrying Capacity models) would be useful. WDFW’s concerns about significant uncertainties were acknowledged, and members indicated they would remember that when looking at results.
- On the other hand, modeling presents lots of problems. Sometimes they generate little more than just a number, and they may not be very predictive in this case.
- Other entities have identified target numbers (e.g., 10 breeding pairs for the USFWS, 15 breeding pairs for Montana). A possible solution is to bring in outside expertise in the form of a technical/science advisory group.
- One proposed objective discussion was to downlist and then delist as soon as possible (though some suggested ASAP might not always be the best for the species)

Eco-regions Approach

- A thorough analysis of the eco-regions would be very helpful. The analysis should include discussion of prey availability, potential wolf populations, potential conflicts, available habitat, dispersal security, the potential to be a “source” area, etc.
- There was a suggestion that the Department should consider combining some of the eco-regions – larger blocks may mean more flexibility.

Translocation

- A pro-active translocation program was suggested as a way to address strong concerns that successful wolf dispersal from the Washington/Idaho border to the Cascades may be problematic due to human settlement patterns, and potential reductions in numbers of animals moving in from Idaho following federal de-listing in that state.
- The translocation approach discussed for Washington differs from the USFWS reintroduction approach in Central Idaho and Wyoming in that only young wolves from

packs residing in Washington would be moved at a time when the young wolves normally disperse from their natal pack. No livestock depredating wolves would be moved in a translocation program.

- An aggressive translocation program could be beneficial to getting wolves delisted as rapidly as possible. Translocation could help shorten the time to achieve successful recovery which would lead to earlier delisting and greater management flexibility in dealing with depredation problems. Less time before recovery could also result in lower overall costs and impacts when compared to an extended recovery time taking several decades (suggested by WDFW as the outer range of how long recovery could take with natural dispersal). The greater management flexibility could also help ensure that counties adjacent to Idaho not bear an extended burden should natural dispersal be unsuccessful.
- There are downsides to translocation as well (e.g., moving what is perceived as a “problem” into a new area). There are significant other issues and concerns that would need to be addressed as well (e.g., costs of a translocation program will be high).
- While translocation efforts might result in a “fast” delisting, it may take a long time to establish the translocation program if it meets substantial resistance from within the receiving communities (e.g., lawsuits).
- From a social acceptance perspective, it may be better to allow wolf populations to spread by natural dispersal rather than by sudden and artificial introduction from one part of the state to another. The long/slow model allows time for acceptance within the communities and time for the managing agency to learn how to accomplish its task most effectively. There are significant social challenges with hard reintroduction (from one part of the state to another). People need time to adjust to change – failure to provide that time can create animosity toward the animal and the government. The agency will need public help/support.
- If there is no translocation program, then the Department will need to make sure that natural dispersal is facilitated – this may reduce flexibility in conflict management in some circumstances.
- Use the public review process associated with this plan as an opportunity to get public review of translocation possibilities (including areas for sourcing and delivering wolves) and potential numbers. On the other hand, pulling specific potential translocation ideas into this process may substantially slow/delay the process as it is likely to see substantial local resistance or debate in the selected areas

Conservation Strategies

- Social acceptance will be a key to the survival of wolves.
- Conservation easements, land purchases (careful), management agreements should all be tools that are considered.
- The question was asked whether there would be limitations on hunters (elk, deer) in wolf areas? While WDFW indicated this was not planned, sometimes there will be limitations on deer and elk hunters and loss of deer and elk hunting opportunity when wolves reestablish and other times there will not. That outcome is a function of both the deer or elk population densities and the wolf population densities for a specific location.
- How are private landowners going to be supported so that they can support wolf recovery – safeguards are needed for private landowners (e.g., safe harbor agreements, easements)
 - Given the lack of large blocks, we will need the active cooperation of private landowners

- But bull trout resulted in many impacts to landowners that were not expected or identified in advance.
- Any/all Federal legal questions related to the state plan need to be resolved or clarified for the members.
- There will likely be interest in eventual controlled hunting – it would be better to clarify that option possibility up front to help win support from those who might be interested.
- Areas of growing human population will have impacts on wolf habitat
- There should be an effort to apply adaptive management to the wolf recovery process and plan (e.g., the plan should be revisited/revised at least once every ten (10) years). The plan should also be reviewed when a “trigger” for downlisting is activated (e.g., a downlisting to threatened from endangered).

Idaho Management Impacts and Need for Washington Source Population

- There remain a number of concerns regarding the dependence of WA wolf recovery on how Idaho manages its recovery process in the future. If ID undertakes population reductions, this could make the dispersal of wolves from ID into WA much less likely. This again underscores the benefits of having a WA based source population.

F. Chapter 4 – Wolf-Livestock Conflict (*Revisited*)

At this time, the WWG returned to discuss some outstanding issues related to Chapter 4 on wolf/livestock conflict. The group addressed several issue including lethal control, compensation and the eco-regional approach, and key comments and questions are outlined below.

Timing of Lethal Control

- The one-strike (before a lethal take is authorized) rule seems not to facilitate recovery. There are other incremental approaches to conflict management (e.g., Montana considers various factors including the size of the pack; place in landscape, the potential for future conflict, the location of the take; and producers considerations). Possible incremental steps include employing a collar; an incremental (single animal) take; then a pack take.
- The one-strike rule is good for livestock community concerns on one level, but if agency compensation is sufficient and timely, then the livestock community would be much more willing to give flexibility to management.
- The Department should look to non-lethal methods as much as possible to at least buy time and determine the next steps with an individual wolf in terms of risk.
- The Department will also have to learn to deal with other affected parties (e.g., new land/home owners) through direct contact and through outreach and education.

Compensation

- There is a strong linkage between compensations and the livestock community’s acceptance of wolves. Compensation is part of an important safety net necessary for wolf recovery.
- Although there is some resistance to the concept of compensation, even that might be relieved in part by including a plan for phasing it out over time. The funds saved from a phase out could be used to research new ways to deter wolf takes.
- The costs of compensation should be borne by all of those who benefit from wolf re-establishment – not the livestock and not just WDFW and its sportsmen constituents – it

should be part of societal cost. WDFW supports (bill) idea that compensation is part of big game management.

- Livestock producers noted that it is not just about a one-time loss. Proven losses (carcasses) are easier to verify; un-provable depredation is more challenging; and un-provable changes in livestock habits/behavior that affect overall production (grazing, weight gain, breeding) are the most difficult. Producers will need to establish a production history in order to set baseline to demonstrate the impacts of the wolf on the landscape on livestock. This could be termed producer assistance rather than simple compensation.
- Compensation and contracting with USDA Wildlife Services will require substantial additional funding for the Department and the plan needs to reflect a strategy to obtain those funds.

Eco-region Analysis

At this point the WWG members revisited the topic of the habitat/eco-region modeling and analysis. The Department noted that the eco-region approach was not set in stone, but that there was substantial information on the state's eco-regions on the Department's website. The Department re-iterated that it was not trying to employ a traditional "zone" system for recovery (identifying zones that must have wolves and those that must not). Here the zones are really a tool to improve flexibility in conflict response based on local population status. As the status of wolves on either side of a line become the same, the line effectively vanishes. WWG members made some specific suggestions including the following:

- Run the model to identify the best suitable blocks
- Run the model with deer instead of just elk
- Assess land with "realistic" eye for whether wolves will prefer it (a "gut check" on the modeling process)
- Incorporate seasonal migratory routes for prey, including ungulate winter ranges
- Use the models to predict dispersal habitat for wolves

G. Chapter 5 – Wolf-Ungulate Interactions

Presentation: Montana's Experience – Carolyn Sime, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

Presentation: Status and Trends of Deer and Elk Populations in Washington – Jerry Nelson, WDFW

The WWG received two presentations related to ungulate/wolf interactions. The first focused on the experience of Montana in monitoring, understanding and managing wolf/ungulate interactions. The second summarized the status of herds in WA. Some of the key lessons learned from that experience include the following:

- Impacts are possible on ungulate populations
 - The degree of impact is variable and changes through time
 - The impact is localized
 - Total predator density area is important
 - Wolf density, wolf:prey ratios, livestock density, & "other" carnivore density interact
 - Drought, winters, and habitat are important
 - Land development effects the outcomes

- Lethal wolf control for livestock/wolf conflicts buffers impacts so far (i.e. lowered wolf density) in most areas
- Ungulates use habitats differently now

In response to the impacts of wolves on ungulates, Montana has opted to undertake the following activities:

- Increased monitoring efforts of both carnivores and ungulates
- Research on both predators and prey species (wolf, elk, black bear, grizzly bear, lion, deer)
- Adjusting hunter opportunity
- Outreach

The WWG did not have time to review and discuss Chapters 6 and 7.

H. Next Steps

At the next meeting (September 13-14, 2007, the groups will continue discussion of these chapters (3 and 4) and will likely have newly revised drafts for discussion. The group will push off discussion of Chapters 8-13. Additional next steps are captured in the action items, above.

I. Public Comment

Jane Titland – MRNP Associates – Ms. Titland provided some brief comments for the WWG members. Her comments included:

- Noting that humans are outcompeting other creatures on the landscape.
- Recalling comments made during the kickoff meeting that not having wolves was not an option, but there was also the recognition that full restoration was also unlikely
- Reminding the group that quick solutions may raise the suspicion of undue influence and that although this public process may seem slow, it is important.

Ms. Titland submitted written comment at the meeting.

J. Parking Lot – Ideas for Future Consideration

The following issues were identified during the meeting and will be addressed as the WWG moves forward:

- Outreach to constituents
- Economic costs and benefits

These will be added to the existing list of Parking Lot ideas:

- Consider adding a “definitions” section
 - Definition of malicious
- Implementation – what will be the WWG involvement after plan development? Ongoing “advisory group” role?
- Further discussion of conservation/recovery language
- Development of compensation program
- Legal Issues to Address:

- What “in the act” options do property owners have?
- Idea of different management areas within the state
- Critical Habitat Rule – clarification of how SEPA requirements overlay with the Wolf Management Plan especially regarding implications for habitat designations/restrictions
- Definition of extirpation

Attachment A
July 12-13 WWG Meeting Attendees
(Based on attendance sign-in sheets)

WWG Members in Attendance:

- Daryl Asmussen
- John Blankenship
- Duane Cocking
- Jeff Dawson
- Paula J. Del Giudice
- Jack Field
- George Halekas
- Kim Holt
- Colleen McShane
- Jasmine Minbashian (Alternate)
- Hon. Ken Oliver
- Tommy Petrie, Jr
- Gerry Ring Erickson
- John Stuhlmiller
- Arthur Swannack
- Greta M Wiegand
- Georg Ziegeltrum
- Bob Tuck

WWG Members Not in Attendance:

- Derrick Knowles

WDFW Project Staff and RESOLVE Staff in Attendance:

- Rocky Beach
- Paul De Morgan
- Madonna Luers
- Donny Martorello
- Jerry Nelson
- Turner Odell
- Gary Wiles

Other Individuals in Attendance:

- Jane K. P. Titland
- Kristin Mitchell
- Bill Gaines