

LAW E596 – WILDLIFE LAW SEMINAR

WINTER 2021

SYLLABUS

Todd A. Wildermuth

Class Times: MW 9:30 a.m. - 10:20 p.m., via ZOOM

Prerequisites: None

Course Description

This course is an advanced survey of the laws and regulations of wildlife management in the United States. We will approach our in-class sessions in a seminar style, which has a specific meaning both in the law school and in my particular teaching.

In the standard, instrumental terms of UW Law, a seminar:

limits enrollment,

grades free of the curve, and

requires a research paper that involves submission of one complete first draft, followed by joint review in conference between student and instructor, and subsequent revision into a second full draft.

In addition, my particular sense of a seminar entails:

focused readings on foundational and current issues within that topic;

discussion-dominated class sessions;

grappling aloud, collectively, with difficult and complex ideas that have no single “answer”; and

deliberate effort to explore public and individual discord with courtesy and fair consideration, inviting rigorous and honest critique of differing viewpoints supported by solid argument – even when disagreeing strongly.

Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes

The first objective of this course is to provide an advanced overview of how wildlife law has taken shape over a few centuries, first in the English common-law tradition and then with the addition of a series of state and federal statutes and accompanying regulations. Wildlife law has a rich history. We can track many cultural developments within the United States through the changes in our wildlife laws. We will see how wildlife law continues to evolve today, as our attitudes toward the rest of life continue to change, and as the environment itself undergoes massive alterations from human activity.

The second objective of this course is to reinforce for students the ongoing intermixture in our legal system of (a) statute-based and common-law-based legal traditions, and (b) state and federal sources of legal authority. Wildlife is largely managed by the individual states. But in very significant ways that state management must

also conform to national norms set either by national statutes (chiefly those aimed at special, protected classes of wildlife) or by international agreements.

A third objective of the course is to teach students to how wildlife law relates to wildlife science, broadly conceived – including such disciplines as conservation biology, ecology, evolution, and genetics. Wildlife law is based on a combination of moral values and technological assessments. We will probe where each of those is operating and with what degree of balancing between them. We will also examine where we run up against the limits of science and where the law has to operate in the absence of perfect information.

By taking this course, students should be able to:

- Identify the English common-law origins for the underlying authority of states to manage wildlife;
- Identify and analyze various common-law claims for torts (injury or property) related to the activities of wildlife on private land;
- Identify and analyze claims of wildlife ownership and responsibility, including those of capture and loss;
- Research, interpret, criticize, and apply provisions of the multiple federal laws related to wildlife, such as the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and management of wildlife on federal lands;
- Research, interpret, criticize, and apply various laws related to civil enforcement or criminal prosecution of wildlife law violations;
- Draft a substantial research paper on wildlife management in the broader context of state and federal law, synthesizing the principles and skills described above.

Required Text

We will be using the revised edition of *Wildlife Law: A Primer* (SECOND edition, 2019) published by Island Press. I am a co-author on this required text and therefore abide by UW policy preventing me from benefiting financially from this requirement. The book was meant to be affordable, is published by a non-profit press, and I have signed back over all my royalties to the press to support more non-profit book publication.

CANVAS Website

Most class readings will consist of a combination of material printed in the book and online materials available through Canvas. Both the draft and final versions of your seminar paper will be submitted via Canvas.

Class Attendance

I have pasted below the required ABA language on course attendance. The short version: you are required to participate in at least 80% of course. What does that mean for this class in the current online environment? It means that you must attend at least 80% of the Zoom sessions, including 80% of your group's discussion days.

OVERALL QUALIFIER AND STATEMENT OF REASONABLENESS:

I understand that the world is a complicated place right now. Any number of things may conspire against participation on any day. Your best plans may go awry at any moment. The Internet may fail. Commitments outside of class may unavoidably interfere. The guidelines here are meant to set clear expectations, establish a

stable routine, lay out the assumptions I have relied on to design the course for effective learning, and comply with the applicable ABA standards. But a rule of reason must always apply, and of course it will. The very best way for me to accommodate variations from the set plan is for you to communicate clearly with me as early as you can. If the course as I have laid it out poses definite problems and you see them right away, please email me immediately to work out a plan. If you encounter challenges that develop later, or at the last moment, please email me at the earliest point you can. Know that my first thought will always be to support your ongoing health, full participation, and effective learning.

Under changes to ABA Accreditation Standard 304, adopted in August 2004, a law school shall require regular and punctual class attendance. At any time after the fifth week of a course (halfway through a summer session course), a student who has been determined by the instructor to have attended fewer than 80 percent of the class sessions in any course will be required to drop the course from his or her registration upon the instructor's so indicating to the Academic Services Office.

An instructor may also impose stricter attendance standards or other sanctions for nonattendance, including lowering of a grade, provided that students are informed at the start of the course of the instructor's attendance rules and possible sanctions.

Religious Accommodation

Washington state law requires that UW develop a policy for accommodation of student absences or significant hardship due to reasons of faith or conscience, or for organized religious activities. The UW's policy, including more information about how to request an accommodation, is available at Religious Accommodations Policy (<https://registrar.washington.edu/staffandfaculty/religious-accommodationspolicy/>). Accommodations must be requested within the first two weeks of this course using the Religious Accommodations Request form

(<https://registrar.washington.edu/students/religious-accommodations-request/>).

Grading

This is a small class so I would strongly prefer it if you have your video on and, when a chat question is posed, participate in the chat. I understand that sometimes video will not work or is inconvenient. Still, please do if you can.

Law school seminars are not subject to the grading curve.

The grading for this seminar has two components: class participation and paper research-and-writing. You will see that my overall approach is to assume that a student who participates fully and submits two fully conforming, timely drafts will receive no less than an A- in the course. Doing less results in set deductions. Students who meet all requirements and also significantly extend class material in a novel way will receive an A.

Class Participation

If you come prepared to discuss the material in each class your group is assigned, are engaged in the discussion (e.g. paying attention and contributing when appropriate), and approach in-class discussions with good-faith effort, you should expect full credit in this area.

While in discussion, you should demonstrate: active engagement with ideas, respectful treatment of your colleagues' contributions, robust sharing of the speaking space/time, and a commitment to an exchange of evidence and reason rather than assertion of presumed authority or fixed position.

My starting point is that anyone who attends class and meets the simple engagement criteria above will receive full participation points for the class.

However, if you do not meet the 80% mark for participation, I will deduct one partial grade for each unexcused "absence." This applies with equal force to the discussion-day requirement and the general attendance requirement.

In other words, if you have more than four unexcused absences from Zoom or more than one missed discussion day, each unexcused absence will result in a half-step deduction from your final exam grade. For example, a raw score of A on the final paper would be marked down first to an A-, then to a B+, then to a B and so on, for each absence.

Seminar Paper

Your paper must demonstrate that you have applied and extended a concept (or multiple concepts) from seminar reading/discussion to a different setting.

Good papers have a mix of descriptive claims and prescriptive claims. Your paper should make at least one central prescriptive claim—that is, an argument that some legal action (lawsuit, legislation, rulemaking, etc.) should be taken under state or federal law.

Your seminar paper must be original in its contribution, though it should actively borrow from ideas and examples that have been previously asserted in other contexts. The paper requires the discovery and novel assembly of materials that you dig up on your own.

The standard for novelty of your paper is similar to that of a law-review article, though your paper will not be nearly as long.

Your original contribution could, for example, be a close and detailed rebuttal of something asserted elsewhere. (That type of paper works for this course but would not necessarily be publishable by journal standards, as the paper's application might be too limited for general publication.)

Your paper must draw some of its material from primary federal, state, and local legal sources such as: statutes, regulations, ordinances, and proposed bills, or from "model" versions of the same.

Your paper must draw some of its material from secondary sources such as: government reports, policy papers, published legal literature, published non-legal literature, and reputable and appropriately qualified Internet-only sources.

The specific deliverables of the paper are as follows:

Your paper should be 4000 words before counting citations. (For perspective: if the paper had no citations, this would come in around 15 pages using the parameters below.)

The paper should be formatted using 12-point Times New Roman font, double-spacing, and 1.0-inch (top/bottom) and 1.25-inch (left/right) margins.

For your citation system you should use the Bluebook (or consult with me to argue for a compelling alternative).

A draft introduction, outline, and list of preliminary references for your paper is due on Canvas by 11:59 p.m. on Sunday, February 21. This draft proposal package should indicate all of the main factual and analytical components that will sustain your argument, be coherently formatted, and arrive at sufficiently developed claims/conclusions to support one-on-one discussion.

A complete draft of your paper is due on Canvas by 11:59 p.m. on the last day of the Winter exam period: Friday, March 19. The complete final draft should show that you have incorporated our one-on-one discussion.

This is the final due date for those students who will not be enrolled in the spring quarter. However, it is not uncommon for these papers to take longer to process and digest than a typical term paper. If you are going to

be enrolled in the spring quarter (i.e., are not completing your degree at the end of the winter quarter), then you are welcome to discuss with me an alternative date in the spring quarter to submit your final paper to be assessed for a final grade. In order to reduce pressure on everyone in the end of the year rush, in no circumstance will any final papers will be accepted after April 28, 2021.

My starting point is that anyone with coming into the paper with full participation grades begins with the default of a final A- grade.

For a draft proposal package that is late, you can count on an automatic deduction of a final half-grade. There is only one truly hard deadline in this course; this is it.

For a final draft that significantly fails to conform to word count, formatting, or citation standards, I reserve the right to deduct a half-grade.

For a final draft that fails to address comments raised in our discussion or otherwise fails to extend in-class principles in a significant manner, the maximum final grade remains an A-.

For a final draft that met all deadlines, addressed all relevant comments, conformed to all formatting requirements, and extended seminar materials in a novel, convincing, and well-supported manner, the final grade will be moved up to an A.

For a combination of missed participation and paper benchmarks, grades lower than a B, including no credit for the course, are possible.

Academic Integrity:

The University of Washington provides the language below regarding academic integrity, which is a useful outline of the university-level guidelines. As you know, the law school posts its detailed honor code here ([Links to an external site.](#)). Adhere closely to them, as violations face serious consequences.

The University of Washington takes academic integrity very seriously. Behaving with integrity is part of our responsibility to our shared learning community. If you are uncertain about if something is academic misconduct, ask me. I am willing to discuss questions you might have.

Acts of academic misconduct may include but are not limited to:

Cheating (working collaboratively on quizzes/exams and discussion submissions, sharing answers and previewing quizzes/exams)

Plagiarism (representing the work of others as your own without giving appropriate credit to the original author(s))

Unauthorized collaboration (working with each other on assignments)

Concerns about these or other behaviors prohibited by the Student Conduct Code will be referred for investigation and adjudication.

Students found to have engaged in academic misconduct may receive a zero on the assignment (or other possible outcome).

Disability-Related Needs

I want everyone to succeed in this clinic and appreciate diverse learning styles. If anything in this course or in my manner of instruction is impeding your ability to learn the material, please feel free to contact me for a meeting at any point during the course. You do not need to have any formally established DRS accommodations to request such a meeting.

If you have already established accommodations with Disability Resources for Students (DRS), please communicate your approved accommodations to me at your earliest convenience.

If you have not yet established services through DRS, but have a temporary health condition or permanent disability that requires accommodations (conditions include but not limited to: mental health, attention-related, learning, vision, hearing, physical or health impacts), you are welcome to contact DRS at 011 Mary Gates Hall or 206-543-8924 or uwdrs@uw.edu or disability.uw.edu. DRS offers resources and coordinates reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities and/or temporary health conditions.

Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process between you, your instructor(s), and DRS. It is the policy and practice of the University of Washington to create inclusive and accessible learning environments consistent with federal and state law.

Sustaining Mental Health

This class is designed to be stimulating, healthy, and rigorous. It is meant to increase your positive engagement with the law and its best possibilities. If you find this class alienating or disempowering – on its own, or in the large context of your education – I invite you to speak to me early on so we can correct course.

It is important that we take care of ourselves inside and outside of class, and throughout our professional lives. There are many different kinds of support services on campus such as the Counseling Center and Hall Health-Mental Health Clinic. If you find yourself in need of mental health services, please do think of me as a ready and connecting resource.

If you are specifically concerned about yourself or a friend who is experiencing emotional distress and/or may be at-risk for suicide, you can call SafeCampus at 206-685-7233 (SAFE). They provide 24/7 help for risk assessment and will also help you connect to campus resources. You can read more about their services at <https://depts.washington.edu/safecamp/>.

Class Schedule

Here is a starter schedule for the class, which will be updates as the quarter progresses. The page numbers are keyed to the book, which is abbreviated WLP.

If I adjust readings, I will provide at least one week advance notice of any changes.

Class Meeting

Topic

Readings

WEEK ONE

Jan. 4

Class Intro

- Is (Links to an external site.) There Any Humane Way to Kill a Mouse?
- “The Great Crow Battle of Portage Bay” 1 (Links to an external site.), 2 (Links to an external site.), 3 (Links to an external site.)
- Graves v. Dunlap, 87 Wash. 648 (1915)

Jan. 6

1: The Basics

- WLP 1-18
- A new breed of hunters (Links to an external site.)... (NYT -Feb 5, 2019)
- State v. Kuenzi, 332 Wis.2d 297 (2011)
- State v. Klingelhoets, 341 Wis.2d 432 (2012)
- Wisconsin Federated Humane Societies, Inc. v. Stepp, 356 Wis.2d 326 (2014)

WEEK TWO

Jan. 11

(Group A)

2: State Ownership and the Public Interest

- WLP 19-36
- Rosenfeld v. Jakways, 67 Mont. 558 (1923)
- Fields v. Wilson, 186 Or. 491 (1949)
- [YouTube

VIDEO (Links to an external site.)

] “13-35474 USA v. State of Washington” 17:30-19:30 (9th Cir. Oral Argument, 2015)

- The Public Trust in Wildlife (Links to an external site.), 2013 UTAH L. REV. 1437 (2013) 1438-1441, 1465-1477, 1486-1488, 1493, 1503-04

Jan. 13

(Group B)

3: Capturing and Owning

- WLP 37-56

- Barr v. City of Roslyn, 2010 WL 395824 (2010)

- State v. Kerr, 163 Idaho 96 (2017)

- State v. Cramer

- Idaho Seizure Statute

WEEK THREE

Jan. 18

MLK DAY – NO CLASS

Jan. 20

(Group C)

Focus: Hunter Interference (WI/WA)

- News articles 1 (Links to an external site.), 2 (Links to an external site.), 3 (Links to an external site.)

- Wolf Patrol Video Project Package: 1 (Links to an external site.), 2 (Links to an external site.), 3 (Links to an external site.), 4 (Links to an external site.), 5 (Links to an external site.), 6 (Links to an external site.), 7 (Links to an external site.)

- WI Hunter Harassment Law (Links to an external site.)

- Dec 2020 District Court opinion

OPTIONAL/FYI

- Jan 2021 appeal - opening brief

- District Court Litigation Package: Docket, Complaint, Plaintiff MSJ, Defense Reply/MSJ

- Corollary WA Laws: RCWs 77.15.180 (Links to an external site.), .210 (Links to an external site.), .212 (Links to an external site.)

WEEK FOUR

Jan. 25

(Group D)

4: Wildlife on Private Land

- WLP 57-75

- Cawsey v. Brickey, 82 Wash. 653 (1914)

- State v. Vander Houwen, 163 Wash.2d 25 (2008)

- RCW 77.36 (Links to an external site.) Wildlife Damage [SKIM ONLY]

- State, Dept. of Fisheries v. Gillette, 27 Wash.App. 815 (1980)

Optional:

- WA wolf depredation compensation program info

- Jan 2019 WDFW Press Release -- Ferry County

- RCW 77.12.240 (Links to an external site.) -- Statute authorizing property protection

- Associated WAC for property protection: 220-440 (Links to an external site.)

- Swinger v. Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

3 Wash.App.2d 1033 (2018)

Jan. 27

(Group A)

5: Inland Fisheries

- WLP 76-95

- Springer v. Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., 510 F.2d 468 (1975)

- Griffith v. Holman, 23 Wash. 347 (1900)

- Creveling v. Washington State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, 142 Wash.App. 827 (2008)

- Creveling v. Treser, 245 Fed.Appx. 575 (2007)

Optional:

- Snively v. Jaber, 48 Wash.2d 815 (1956)

- USGS Report on WA navigability

- Seattle U. Comment on WA "floating" law

WEEK FIVE

Feb. 1

(Group B)

6: Constitutional Framework

- WLP 96-116

- State of Missouri v. Holland, 252 U.S. 416 (1920)

- Kleppe v. New Mexico, 426 U.S. 529 (1976)

Optional:

- Connecticut ex rel. Blumenthal v. Crotty, 346 F.3d 84 (2003)

["B. The Nonresident Lobster Law Violates the Privileges
and Immunities Clause"]

Feb. 3

(Group C)

7: State Game Laws and Nuisance Species

- WLP 117-140

- State v. Romain, 295 Mont. 152 (1999)

- Spann v. Carter, 648 Fed.Appx. 586 (2016)

- State v. Burnham, 289 Or.App. 783 (2018)

OPTIONAL:

- State v. Dupuis, 197 A.3d 343 (2018)

WEEK SIX

Feb. 8

(Group D)

Tribal Rights to Wildlife

- WLP 159-179

- United States v. Washington, 853 F.3d 946 (2017)

[ONLY read "Historical Background" (pp. 4-8) and
"Washington's Duty under the Treaties" (pp. 11-15)]

OPTIONAL:

- skim Upper Skagit Indian Tribe v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, 871 F.3d 844 (2017)

Feb. 10

(Group A)

Tribal Rights to Wildlife (cont.)

-Minnesota v. Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa Indians (Links to an external site.), 526 U. S. 172

- Herrera v. Wyoming (Links to an external site.) (2018)

OPTIONAL:

-listen to oral arguments of Mille Lacs (Links to an external site.) and Herrera (Links to an external site.)

WEEK SEVEN

Feb. 15

Presidents' Day – NO CLASS

Feb. 17

(Group B)

10: Key Federal Statutes

- WLP 180-181 [skip details of Lacey Act], 192-205

- MBTA REVISED case-study: 1, 2, 3, 4

[MBTA case-study package from beginning of quarter -- LEFT HERE BUT YOU CAN IGNORE THEM : 1 (Links to an external site.), 2 (Links to an external site.), 3 (Links to an external site.), 4 (Links to an external site.), 5 (Links to an external site.)]

- Eagle permit [skim very generally] here (Links to an external site.)

OPTIONAL (but irresistible)

- fun bird migration facts (Links to an external site.)!

- migration is efficient (Links to an external site.); that's why birds migrate!

Feb. 21 (SUNDAY)

DRAFT PAPER PROPOSAL DUE

SEE SYLLABUS ABOVE FOR COMPONENTS OF PAPER PROPOSAL PACKAGE

WEEK EIGHT

Feb. 22

(Group C)

12: ESA – Listing and Critical Habitat

- WLP 233-256

- FYI: Gallagher Blog on Statutes at Large here (Links to an external site.) [note that the updated link for the compiled statutes is here (Links to an external site.)]

- From the Stat. version of the ESA, ONLY read the following subsections in section 4:

(a)(1)

(a)(3)(A)

(b)(1)(A)

(b)(2)

(b)(3)(A)

(b)(3)(B)

(f)(1)-(5)

- Alaska Oil and Gas Association v. Pritzker, 840 F.3d 671 (2016) [ONLY read section IV. A. (pdf pp. 5-10)]

Feb. 24

(Group D)

ESA Listing in Focus: 2019 Change to "Foreseeable Future"

[Our focus will be on one specific 2019 revision -- the regulatory codification of "foreseeable"]

- FYI: A short description (Links to an external site.) of all 2019 ESA rule revisions; pdf here

- FYI: A short summary (Links to an external site.) analysis of all 2019 ESA rule revisions by a policy org (the "overview" and "analysis" tabs)

- A good explanation (Links to an external site.) from the policy org as to why the revision to the term "foreseeable" matters, with an analysis of its most frequent time horizons

- The final 2019 rule (Links to an external site.) that includes the new "foreseeable" component. Read only (a) the explanation of "foreseeable future" on pp. 45020-1 and (b) the agency's responses to comments on "foreseeable future" on pp. 45026-34. The responses to comments are very detailed and can blur together; so pick only one or two of the comments/responses you like and focus your reading there.

- A copy-and-paste, homemade "compare versions" document of the relevant CFR as it existed before the rulemaking, the draft rule making proposal, and the final published rule. I've also included the foundational statutory language.

- And, lastly, an interesting effort late in the Trump administration to effectively re-litigate the bearded seal listing: an outside petition (Links to an external site.) from an interesting alliance. Formally, that petition received a denial (Links to an external site.) at the (mere) 90-day stage; ouch. Focus your attention on "analysis of petition" section starting on p. 76020. And within that focus, focus in particular on the subsection "foreseeable future" on pp. 76021-3. That should, with any luck, bring all of today's reading together.

- FYI: But, the story is not done, as the de-listers will get another chance as part of this (Links to an external site.) status review initiated simultaneously with the denial -- and in this round the government takes on the duty of digging up and analyzing all scientific updates.

WEEK NINE

Mar. 1

(Group A)

13: ESA Protections

-WLP 257-277

- United States v. Lowe, Slip Copy (2021)

[This is the "Tiger King" case; read ONLY section I and section III 1.a (on the ESA merits). NOTE that there are close descriptions of animal harm in this reading and you may freely elect to not read it and/or to not join the discussion]

- Columbia Riverkeeper v. United States Army Corp of Engineers, --- F.Supp.3d ---- (2020)

[Read ONLY the three introductory paragraphs and then section E: "Defendant NMFS's ITS - Take Limits"]

- People for Ethical Treatment of Property Owners v. United..., 852 F.3d 990 (2017)

[Read ONLY the two introductory paragraphs and then Section III.B (which runs from pdf p. 7 to the end of the document)]

Mar. 3

(Group B)

Focus: ESA – Grizzly Bears

The current path of the grizzly bear under the ESA is moving along (at least) three related paths:

1. Effort to reinvigorate the Grizzly recovery plan

- this is where we will focus our long reading for today

- please READ this (Links to an external site.) opinion from Dec 2020 (pdf here); it will feel very procedural, but I assure you it is relevant, important, and interesting procedure in the end; the Center filed a notice (Links to an external site.) of appeal in this case on Feb 11, 2021.

2. Effort to fight the delisting of the GYE grizzly population

- The Trump administration attempted to delist the Yellowstone population of the grizzly bear from the ESA
- A district court overturned the rule in 2018 (opinion here, fyi, but we are not reading it)
- In July of 2020, the 9th Circuit held up the great bulk of the lower court opinion. See CA9 opinion here. We will read only section B on the FWS's failure to adequately assess genetic exchange.

3. Effort to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades

- To get you excited and mix in some video, watch this 8-minute video (Links to an external site.) on N. Cascades Grizzlies [additional video info (incl. funders) here (Links to an external site.)]
- There was a whole EIS process going and then it was abruptly cut off; see here
- And now the latest lawsuit has followed. Please read the following portions of this (Links to an external site.) complaint: (a) paragraphs 1-11, and (b) paragraphs 94-99. Try to connect this reading to the very first reading in this class session. That is: do you see how the plaintiffs are flip on its head their loss on the recovery plan issue? Do you think it will work?

WEEK TEN

Mar. 8

(Group C)

Getting to the Sea: The Marine Mammal Protection Act

- MMPA in full, simply for reference
- In general: 1 (Links to an external site.), 2 (Links to an external site.)
- PNW case study: 1 (Links to an external site.), 2 (Links to an external site.), 3 (Links to an external site.), 4 (Links to an external site.)

OPTIONAL supplemental multi-media materials for case study:

You get a view of that here (Links to an external site.) in writing, and (hooray!) in an Oregon Field Guide video here (Links to an external site.) [old=here (Links to an external site.)] (from 2015, on the Columbia, all the way to the dam) and here (Links to an external site.) [old=here (Links to an external site.)] (from 2018, on the Willamette).

Mar. 10

(Group D)

The Long Reach of the MMPA - Promise among the Peril

- Video (Links to an external site.): How did we get here? [bottom of page]
- A win (Links to an external site.) Download win (Links to an external site.) in the Court of International Trade
- And a ban: 1 (Links to an external site.), 2 (Links to an external site.)

DEADLINE: FINAL PAPER DUE TO CANVAS 11:59 p.m., Friday March 19

Leftover/Spare material from 2019 Grizzly Bear case study

(was in original syllabus for 2021; switched for current material on 21 Feb 2021):

In general: recent case on grizzly recovery plan covered here (Links to an external site.)

PART I: YELLOWSTONE POPULATION

- Crow Indian Tribe v. United States, 343 F.Supp.3d 999 (2018)

[You may safely SKIP in "Discussion" sections I.B.1 (subject matter jurisdiction) and all of II (the recalibration/model issue)]

- GreenWire articles on ruling above and actions that follow:

1 (Links to an external site.), 2 (Links to an external site.), 3 (Links to an external site.), 4 (Links to an external site.) [Please try first; increase UW usage report!]

1, 2, 3, 4 [PDF versions if you can't get the link to work]

PART II: NORTH CASCADES "POPULATION"

- 8-minute video (Links to an external site.) on N. Cascades Grizzlies [additional video info (incl. funders) here (Links to an external site.)]

- IGBC pages:

1 (Links to an external site.) - note the map of 6 populations, also "overview"

2 (Links to an external site.) - note the characteristics and populations of the 6 "recovery ecosystems"

3 (Links to an external site.) - description of the N.Cascades Ecosystem

- Draft EIS [overall source here (Links to an external site.) and here (Links to an external site.)]

1 - News Release

2 - FAQs

3 - Exec. Summary of DEIS (read ONLY pp. i-v and Fig. 1)

[SUPPLEMENTARY - NOT REQUIRED READING]

- Parks Canada guide (Links to an external site.) on how to handle a bear attack

- Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Inc. v. Servheen, 665 F.3d 1015 (2011)