



Citizens for Responsible Wildlife Management
PO Box 14245
Tumwater, WA 98511-4245
Telephone: 360-456-1334
Fax: 360-923-0762

Dedicated to wildlife management based on science, common sense, reasoned conservation practices and time proven consumptive use management principles

Lies, Misleading Statements, Illegal Activities & Misrepresentations by the Proponents of I-713

The proponents of Initiative 713 consistently lied, engaged in illegal activities, intentionally misled the public and made numerous misrepresentations throughout the entirety of their 1999-2000 campaign and beyond as to the content and impacts of their initiative. These practices started with the use of statements, photographs and mailings to convince voters to sign their initiative, continued throughout their campaign as evidenced in a variety of ways and persisted beyond the campaign into legislative hearings conducted in 2001 and 2002 chaired by Representative's Doumit and Buck and Senators Jacobsen and Oke. These practices included:

Misleading newspaper editorial boards and the public regards body piercing traps

Wayne Pacelle, Lisa Wathne (employees of HSUS) and others employed by the Pro-713 Campaign repeatedly asserted throughout the I-713 campaign that body-piercing traps would be legal should the measure pass into law. The Seattle PI made specific reference to this claim in its October 8, 2000 editorial in favor of I-713.

On June 11, 2002 the Washington State Attorney General issued ruling AGO 2002 No. 3 wherein the conclusion stated that body piercing traps for use in controlling moles and gophers were made illegal under I-713. The Attorney General's Opinion reinforced information (a FAQ compiled by the Department of Fish & Wildlife and vetted by the Office of the Attorney General) in May 2000 and provided to the Pro 713 campaign at that time. The Seattle PI has never admitted they were duped by the proponents of I-713 nor corrected the public record with reference to its October 2000 editorial statement.

Despite possessing accurate information provided by WDFW and vetted by the Attorney General the Pro-713 campaign intentionally and willfully repeated their false claims before editorial boards, on the campaign trail at citizen forums, etc. and in the Washington State Voters Guide when they submitted their official statement to the Office of the Secretary of State in August 2000.

Misrepresenting I-713 to the Washington State Legislature

Lisa Wathne (HSUS) provided public testimony before the Senate and House Natural Resources Committees in 2001 and 2002 in support of an effort to legalize mole traps and provide relief to the timber industry from the effects of I-713. She stated in 2002 before the House Committee that the information provided by the I-713 campaign to the public "could be" construed as misleading but that it was "unintentional" on her part. As the initiative was a boilerplate measure previously passed in other states by HSUS and their national allies - and the public record was documented to the contrary of her statement - the conclusion of the Committee Chair was that she appeared to be engaged in an effort to mislead the Legislature – an observation that she denied.

The effort by the proponents of Initiative 713 carried over into the 2003-04 Legislative Session as manifested in the form of multiple efforts to have the legislature sanction their misrepresentations by amending the initiative to their criteria. In 2004, the proponents attempted to expand the underlying authorities of the initiative employing many of the same arguments used during the 2000 campaign. Each of these attempts failed.

The Senate repeatedly challenged public statements by Miss Wathne during the campaign resulting in contradictory comments on the public record before the Committee about her intent and the effects, impacts and purposes of I-713. In 2000 the Senate voted to overturn I-713 in its entirety. In 2002 the House constructed a timeline of year 2000 events documenting precisely when Miss Wathne knew for a fact (May 10, 2000) that I-713 would result in specific outcomes. This timeline proved beyond doubt that HSUS knew of the impacts of 713 well in advance of preparation of the Voters Guide and public debate on the measure; that the permit process in the measure was fatally flawed; that economic damages would be significantly greater than stated by HSUS; that mole traps would be banned and similar examples.

The House came within one vote of a constitutionally mandated two-thirds vote of overturning 713 in its entirety in 2000. The House and Senate passed comprehensive legislation in 2003 that amended I-713 to address the multiple public safety, nuisance wildlife and similar problems resulting from passage of I-713 only to have the measure vetoed by Governor Gary Locke.

Illegal campaign activities – TV Ad Purchases

The Pro-713 campaign was found to have seriously violated WA State Public Disclosure law as it relates to political campaigns by failing to properly and adequately disclose over a half million dollars in television advertising. The nature of the violations were so egregious that the Public Disclosure Commission referred the case to the Attorney General for possible legal action since the ability of the PDC to assess penalties were woefully inadequate relative to the seriousness of the violations. Because the Pro-713 campaign was a surrogate for HSUS versus a wholly financed affiliate the Attorney General had to send the case back to the PDC where the Pro-713 campaign was fined the maximum possible. The fine was finally (quietly) paid, in full, in 2003.

Illegal campaign activities – Undisclosed Financial Support

In August, 2000 a line-by-line analysis of income and expenditures filed by the Pro-713 campaign to the Public Disclosure Commission determined that their campaign had not reported a single expenditure for campaign staff yet it was a matter of documented public fact that the campaign employed at least three full-time employees. A complaint registered with the PDC resulted in the campaign reporting nearly \$70,000 in previously undisclosed contributions to the campaign by HSUS in the form of salaries, travel and similar expenses for four individuals. If the complaint had not been filed the Pro-713 campaign would not have disclosed this information. Since 2000 a consistent, similar pattern of HSUS providing undisclosed contributions to initiatives in Alaska, Florida and elsewhere has become evident.

Illegal Campaign Contributions -- Grants to Animal Rights Groups

During the I-713 campaign about a dozen, or so, Washington State animal rights organizations are known to have conducted mailings to solicit signature-gathers and to raise money for the Pro-713 campaign. The opposition campaign was unable to identify the funding source(s) for these activities – none of which were reported to the PDC as cash or in-kind contributions with the exception of one organization when the opposition filed a complaint.

The opinion of the opposition campaign at the time (late 1999 through 2000) as these mailings came to light was that the organizations conducting the mailings were receiving outside funding. As a source for these funds was never identified formal complaints could not be filed with the Public Disclosure Commission. The one incident reported to the PDC (Progressive Animal

Welfare Society or PASW) was dismissed on the ground that the group insisted that their mailings were “informational” and they did file a report for a specific letter they mailed. A second letter they mailed was never reported to the PDC.

In the summer of 2003 a research project - unrelated to the I-713 campaign - involving a line-by-line review of HSUS IRS Form 990, Part II Line 22 Detail for the years 1998-2003 produced the finding that at least five Washington State animals rights organizations active in the Pro-713 campaign received \$12,650 in “contributions” from HSUS in 1999 and 2000 with \$150 paid to one organization in early 2001. None of these organizations received contributions from HSUS in the three years before the 1999-2000 campaign nor have they received contributions (with the one \$150 exception) in any year following the I-713 campaign. These findings were discussed with the PDC and they advised that while the findings suggested campaign-related financing violations worthy of investigation might have occurred the observations were not reported in a timely manner hence a formal complaint was not filed.

Unreported Expenditure – Uncompensated Volunteers collected all the I-713 Signatures

The proponents of I-713 – in multiple statements to the voting public, the press and before the legislature – made numerous statements specifying that the signatures for I-713 had been collected by an all volunteer effort. What the proponents did not state – and when confronted avoided providing a truthful response about – was that they regularly bussed in signature-gatherers from Canada, Oregon and Idaho in the last 5-6 weeks of that phase of their campaign.

This information came to light in a series of emails they distributed to their support base and provided to the opposition campaign some eighteen months after the election. A through line-by-line review of the Pro-713 reports to the PDC did not show expenditures for transportation, feeding or housing these signature-gatherers despite the fact that these emails clearly stated such costs would be covered by the Pro-713 campaign. While an argument can be made that these were not “paid” signature-gatherers it is absolutely clear that individuals bussed into the state received “compensation” in the form of transportation, food and housing. None of the costs connected to this Pro-713 activity were ever reported under Washington State law to the citizens of the state.

Unauthorized illegal use of names and organizations in the voters guide

Mr. Kurt Beardslee and his organization (Washington Trout) were listed in the 2000 Voters Guide as having participated in the writing of the voters guide statement in favor of I-713. This highly illegal use of a name and misrepresentation of support was exposed by Bob Mottram of the Tacoma News Tribune (*Surprising thing about I-713 statement is author, October 25, 2000*).

In August 2000 a second case of the illegal use of an organizational name in the Voters Guide (the Mid Sound Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group) was detected before the guide was printed and the name of the organization was removed from the Voters Guide endorsement list by direct order of the Office of the Secretary of State (archived correspondence files between the office and-No 713 campaign). A third incident is suspected to exist but has not been proven.

Staged photo's of cats depicting trapping practices illegal in Washington State

Exposed by Brad Shannon of the Olympian (*Anti-trap photo misleading, June 13, 2000*). The Pro-713 repeatedly asserted that “thousands of cats were being trapped” in Washington state and presented a photograph in its campaign literature as “proof” of their assertion. The photograph was exposed as fake in June 2000. It was subsequently proven that the photograph had been staged in a Canadian photography lab by a group of anti-trapping advocates with a documented track record in Canada of producing intentionally false photographic depictions of animals in traps.

Misleading Statement's in the Voters Guide

Despite documentation from other states that clearly demonstrated mole traps would be banned, the proponents (HSUS, etc.) blatantly misled the voters by asserting that mole traps would not be illegal under I-713. Misleading statements regarding the impacts of the measure including the proposed permit process and the commercial uses for mole fur were also presented to the voters without regard for the truth. These matters, and similar examples, were fully exposed in public hearings before the Washington State legislature in 2001 & 2002.

False & Misleading Statements to Editorial Boards

Miss Wathne asserted before the *Seattle Weekly* Editorial Board that she was working closely with the department to craft rules in advance of passage of I-713 that would accommodate a concern voiced by the *Seattle Weekly* editorial board. An inquiry to WDFW resulted in a letter from the WDFW director to the editorial board flatly denying that such activities were underway and noting that it would be a violation of state law for the department to engage in the activities claimed by the Pro-713 campaign.

Numerous statements before multiple editorial boards involving the experience of other states (question's of law and legal status, were mole traps banned, etc.) where trapping bans had passed (most notably the *Tacoma News Tribune*) resulted in a formal letter from the Department of Natural Resources from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts flatly denying these assertions, and others, made by HSUS and Miss Wathne.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts letter was particularly forceful on the subject of mole traps. This letter made it abundantly clear that HSUS knew before they brought their measure into WA State that it banned mole traps and further knew that their measure would create serious wildlife management issues. These matters were thoroughly exposed in the article Management by Majority written by Ted Williams and published in the May-June 1999 issue of *Audubon*. It was not until very late into the campaign (a few days before the election) that an editorial board (The Olympian) managed to get Miss Wathne (HSUS) to admit that mole traps were covered under the provisions of I-713 and that other statements by the Pro 713 were false and misleading.

False & Misleading Statements in Public Debate

In addition to numerous misrepresentations regarding mole traps and trapping in general during the I-713 campaign the proponents repeatedly stated in public forums that endangered avian species were regularly trapped in Washington State and that the WSU College of Veterinary Medicine was inundated with endangered avian species injured in traps on a regular basis. The WSU College of Veterinary Medicine flatly refuted that statement and noted that over a ten-year period only four birds had been treated for conditions similar to those described by the Pro-713 campaign as proof of trapping causing "untold deaths of endangered birds." The College of Veterinary Medicine released records to public scrutiny proving that traps had injured none of the birds claimed as injured by the Pro-713 campaign and documenting that the injuries treated were the consequence of incidental injuries from predators.

Misrepresentation of fact regards injured pets

The experience of a Kitsap County homeowner who wrote a powerful letter to the editor to the Bremerton Sun illustrates the consistent practice of the I-713 proponents to intentionally mislead the public by misrepresenting information regarding injuries to pets as a consequence of trapping. The Pro-713 campaign promoted the death of a specific dog in an otter trapping situation at a private home as illustrative of practices common all across the state killing and maiming hundreds of thousands of household pets every year.

Lacking public records to document their claim that hundreds of thousands of dogs and cats died every year from trapping the Pro-713 campaign solicited examples they could use (by an email

that received wide distribution). They secured 27 examples through this approach raising the total incidents used in their campaign to 60 “events” offered as “proof” of their claims. By the end of the campaign in November 2000, thirty-one of the sixty so-called documented incidents of pet injury resulting from trapping had been solidly documented as false and misleading.

The above referenced Kitsap County incident was one of these incidents. The Kitsap homeowner was outraged when an incident at his home appeared on the Pro-713 campaign list of “proven examples of trapping killing hundreds of thousands of pets.” The dog owner involved was illegally trespassing on posted property with an unleashed dog -- in a private residential area with a leash law. The dog crawled under the homeowner’s home and stuck its head into a properly licensed and posted trap set for otter and the dog was killed. The irresponsible behavior of the pet owner was never mentioned by the Pro-713 campaign -- nor was a court order assessing criminal and civil penalties against the dog owner.

Supporters of I-713 repeatedly stated before and during the campaign that "for every 'target' animal killed by a trapper, studies indicate there are up to 10 'non-target' victims." Despite repeated requests to document the statement from the media and numerous private interests Miss Wathne and the Pro-713 did not document their claim.

The *Olympian* in an editorial published on May 23rd 2003 calling for repeal of I-713 stated, “The math didn't add up. In the two years prior to adoption of the initiative, trappers took 20,000 beaver, fox, otter, raccoon, muskrat, mink, coyote and other fur-bearing animals in Washington State. Using the math of initiative proponents, that meant up to 200,000 cats, dogs, sheep and other "non-target" animals had been snared in traps. Yet the Humane Society could document only 60 cases of pets caught in traps in the last 20 years.”

Misrepresentation of Endangered Species Protection

I-713 proponents repeatedly assured the media, press and public - throughout and beyond their campaign - that the use of trapping to protect endangered species (a common practice prior to passage of I-713 to protect avian species that nest on the ground, to protect pygmy rabbits from coyote predation and similar examples) was an allowable practice under the measure. The same claim had been used in California and elsewhere where HSUS and its allies had brought their boilerplate initiative to the ballot in Washington State.

At the time the initiative was before the voters in Washington State the National Audubon Society had taken the California edition of the Pro-713 boilerplate initiative to court arguing that the so-called environmental controls actually worked to prevent prudent and responsible use of trapping technologies to protect endangered species. The California Courts concurred with this argument. In 2001 the 9th Circuit Court upheld the California Court decision. Throughout the entirety of the I-713 campaign the proponents denied – in the most absolute of terms – that their initiative was a hindrance to protecting endangered species. The proponents ceased to make this argument in all public forums upon release of the 9th Circuit decision.

Falsehoods about the I-713 Permit System

The I-713 proponents – both before and after passage of the initiative argued that the permit system detailed within the initiative would not be an obstacle to using trapping to deal with wildlife-related issues and concerns. These statements were false in 2000 and continue to be false today. Property owners cannot engage in responsible, proactive, regulated trapping regimes designed to protect their livelihoods and property. An application for a permit can occur only after damage has been incurred and the applicant can prove that all possible alternatives have been pursued prior to filing of an application. These considerations have led to a a totally unacceptable condition wherein dealing with serious wildlife damage and predation on livestock has become a thriving division of Three S's Industries of America – shoot it, shovel it and shut up. As a direct consequence of this condition we are losing valuable information on wildlife densities, population

distributions and similar examples thereby compounding the difficulties of managing wildlife in a responsible, science-driven manner.

False Information – Protection of Public Lands

Throughout the I-713 campaign the proponents repeatedly – and forcibly - argued in forums, with the press and elsewhere that the initiative in no way would prevent public agencies from engaging in responsible wildlife management. The initiative bans outright the use of traps for any reason or purpose by any agency of government on public lands regardless of the need or urgency.

False information -- the use of poisons in Washington State

The Pro-I-713 campaign repeatedly defended a ban on two specific poisons within the initiative as critical to their ban on trapping in Washington State (and elsewhere in the nation). The Pro-713 campaign repeatedly refused to address the truthful fact that one of the poisons they claim their initiative banned was already illegal for any use in the state and the other poison “banned” could only legally be used by the federal government or Tribes under highly controlled, strictly regulated circumstances. The opponents to the initiative argued that the “poisons ban” existed within the initiative for the sole purpose of positioning their argument as “critical to the environment.” This observation was supported to a degree by copies of documents distributed to environmental groups wherein the bulk of the argument’s presented in favor of the initiative focused on the use of poisons with only marginal attention to the true intent of the initiative.

Television ad’s depicting trapping practices illegal in Washington state

Every major newspaper in Washington State in the final few days of the I-713 campaign soundly debunked the initial Pro-713 campaign television advertisements as false and misleading, denounced the Pro-713 advertisements for depicting trapping practices illegal in the state of Washington and rebuked the Pro-713 campaign advertisements as inappropriately inflammatory. Some stations flatly refused to run their advertisements (one in Seattle and many in Eastern Washington) because they reached the conclusion the advertisements were grossly misleading or for the reason the advertisements in use depicted images deemed unsuitable for public viewing.

Research completed in late 2003 determined that a video image used in the initial Pro-713 TV advertisement of a coyote struggling in a trap – of a type only legal for use in water and illegally chained to the ground and a tree stump -- was video imagery staged by the same organization in Canada that produced the faked “cat in a trap” photograph disclosed by the Olympian in the I-713 signature gathering phase and in their early campaign efforts after certification of the initiative for the ballot. Immediately following the investigative report by the Olympian all traces of the “cat in a trap” photograph disappeared from their campaign literature.

Canadian regulatory resources documented that use of the coyote in a trap video footage had been attempted by anti-trapping advocates in Canada about six years prior to passage of I-713 and officials in Massachusetts, California, Colorado and elsewhere reported that the same (or similar imagery) had been used in anti-trapping campaigns in their states.

Assertions of WDFW Illegal practices and misrepresentations

Miss Wathne repeatedly made false public statements in debates and before editorial boards implying that WDFW openly opposed I-713. The department issued a single document (a frequently asked question profile) that responsibly related the practical and legal impacts of I-713 if it were to be passed into law. It was, and continues to be, absurd for Miss Wathne (nd the Pro-713 proponents who now continue their efforts since Ms. Wathne has left the state) to make such assertions. Such documents, when compiled by state agencies, are subjected to an internal legal review to ensure compliance with the law and for accuracy prior to release and no agency of state

government would be willing to expose themselves for the potential legal liabilities that would result from the kind of behavior on the part of the agency claimed by the anti-trapping proponents.

Moles are not harvested for their fur

Prior to passage of I-713 there were two fur buyers active in Washington State who regularly purchased mole fur's from trappers for resale in high fashion apparel markets (primarily for use as trim) and for the manufacture of flies by fly fishers.

Public Health – bubonic plague & rabies monitoring programs

Miss Wathne repeatedly asserted throughout the 713 campaign (with the media and in public forums) that I-713 contained all of the necessary protections required to continue important public health-related monitoring programs for bubonic plague, rabies and similar examples – activities historically conducted by trappers throughout Washington State on a voluntary basis. Permits to allow trapping for the purposes of securing the necessary carcasses of species known to carry bubonic plague, rabies and other animal-borne pathogens cannot be issued under the provisions of I-713 and these types of monitoring programs no longer exist in Washington State.

Assertions that I-713 makes allowances for nuisance animals by allowing the issuance of permits to control predatory and/or nuisance wildlife

Pro-713 proponents have repeatedly conveyed a message that I-713 contains a permit process whereby property owners and home owners can easily obtain permits to control predatory and nuisance wildlife. The reality is that multiple limiting provisions of I-713 must be met to qualify for a permit make it very difficult to obtain permits and particularly so for regulated regimes to control nuisance wildlife proactively. Permits can only be obtained after proving that all non-lethal means to control predatory and/or nuisance wildlife have been exhausted. By then, the damage has been done and the predator or nuisance animal has moved on to other areas.

Sample Media Quotes

“Where they said I helped prepare the statement, that isn't true.”

Kurt Beardslee; Tacoma News Tribune; October 25, 2000

Wathne said common sense vanishes whenever the mole and gopher issue arises. I 713 is aimed at wildlife and fur trapping, not at home pests, she said. No one will banish common rodent traps.

Howard Buck, Columbian staff writer; The Columbian; October 24, 2000

In this state, the trap depicted in the ad can only be used submerged in water, said Ed Owens, the chair of the anti-initiative campaign. During the June signature drive to qualify the initiative for the ballot, petitions showed a picture taken in Canada of a cat caught in a trap being used in a way that already is illegal in this state.

John Dodge, environmental reporter; The Olympian; October 24, 2000

A new television advertisement backing an anti-trapping initiative on November's ballot shows gruesome scenes of animals caught in traps. But the scenes were not taken in Washington, and the traps shown may already be illegal in the state.

The ad also shows quick images of a coyote and fox caught in leg-hold traps and a beaver caught in a Conibear. The ad ends with a longer image of a terrified coyote caught in what is apparently a large Conibear trap.

Owens said some of the trapping shown in the ad isn't legal in Washington. He got a copy of the ad and studied the leg-hold traps. It appears that they are neither laminated nor padded, he said. Nor are their jaws offset.

Trapping rules in Washington state require offset jaws, padding or lamination for most leg-hold traps, said Tom Keegan, upland game and fur-bearer section manager for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. The purpose is to reduce the gripping power of the trap.

During the June signature drive to qualify the initiative for the ballot, petitions showed a picture taken in Canada of a cat caught in a trap being used in a way that already is illegal in this state.

State regulations do not allow use of large Conibear traps on land, said Keegan, who has not seen the ad. They are allowed under water and are typically used to trap beaver.

Scott Sunde, reporter, Seattle Post-Intelligencer; October 24, 2000

One question raised by the initiative: Would mole traps homeowners use be prohibited? Owens and a state Department of Fish and Wildlife fact sheet on the initiative said "yes", because they are body-gripping traps.

Wathne said "no". She said the initiative is directed at traps used for commercial and recreational purposes.

John Dodge, environmental reporter; The Olympian; October 22, 2000

Initiative backers say I-713 wouldn't cover widely used mole traps, even though they resemble the prohibited "body-gripping" traps. That's because a section of the initiative specifically targets trapping for "recreation or commerce," leaving out homeowners just trying to get rid of a mole, Wathne said.

The state Wildlife Department, which oversees trapping, says the mole traps would be covered by the initiative.

Warren Cornwall, Herald Writer; Everett Herald; October 15, 2000

I-713 sponsor Wathne says the initiative would not prohibit taking moles and gophers with body-gripping traps.

Bob Mottram, staff writer; Tacoma News Tribune; October 14, 2000

Wathne maintains the initiative won't apply to gopher and mole traps.

Scott Sunde, reporter; Seattle Post-Intelligencer; October 4, 2000

The photograph printed on copies of Initiative 713 shows a cat with its paw caught in a leg-hold trap. It's an emotionally arresting image to lure supporters.

Ford (WDFW Sgt.) could not be reached to comment, but in a letter to Owens, he wrote that it appears to be a No.4 Victor trap lacking an offset, or gap between the teeth. Such a trap would be illegal to use on dry land without special equipment, Ford's undated letter to Owens said. "Clearly the photograph would suggest an illegal use of this trap and certainly not a practice we consider common," Ford wrote.

Brad Shannon; The Olympian; June 13, 2000

"It doesn't ban trapping of moles, gophers, mice or rats - animals not trapped for fur," Wathne and supporters wrote in the state voters' guide.

The Associated Press; Olympia; November 1, 2000

The initiative specifically exempts mouse and rat traps. It does not mention the lethal traps used on moles or gophers, or to control the population of marmots in downtown Spokane.

Wathne said trapping for those animals would continue - and has in other states with trapping bans - since their pelts have no commercial value. But the state Department of Fish and Wildlife says rats and mice are the only animals unaffected by the initiative.

Dan Hansen; staff writer; Spokesman-Review; November 1, 2000

I-713 sponsor Wathne says the initiative would not prohibit taking moles and gophers with body-gripping traps.

Bob Mottram, staff writer; Tacoma News Tribune; October 14, 2000

"For Western Washington residents, the immediate impact of I-713 will be to ban mole and gopher trapping", wrote Terry Whitworth of Tacoma in a letter to the editor.

No so, responded Lisa Wathne, the coordinator of Yes! On I-713.

"By claiming that I-713 will ban mole traps, Terry Whitworth is dangling the latest red herring from the opponents of I-713," she wrote in response. "I encourage Washington voters to ignore this hysteria."

Peter Callaghan; The Tacoma News Tribune; October 12, 2000

Ms. Wathne's claim's that it is a common occurrence for the School of Veterinary Medicine at WSU to receive eagles, owls and other endangered avian species that have been caught in traps for treatment is blatantly false. Dr. Erik Stauber advises that only four endangered avian species caught in traps have been submitted to the veterinary hospital in the last 10 years, and none of them were from traps set by licensed trappers. Two golden eagles were from the Colville Indian Reservation and were from traps set by exposed bait. A great-horned owl was caught in a squirrel trap set in summer by a farmer. There is no history in our records relative to bald eagles or any other endangered avian species. Our record for the fourth bird indicates it was a hawk but the specific specie is not indicated.

Dr. William Foreyt; School of Veterinary Medicine, WSU; October 19, 2000

The perhaps well-intentioned but naïve and misdirected backers of Initiative 713 that would outlaw use of certain body-gripping traps claim it wouldn't apply to traps used by countless home owners to control nuisance moles in their back yards.

Editorial; The Chronicle (Centralia/Chehalis, WA); November 1, 2000

First, there's the whole debate over mole and gopher traps. Would homeowners who try to rid their lawns of unsightly mole hills be subject to arrest should this initiative pass? Proponents say no way.

Editorial; The Olympian; October 26, 2000