

1 PI-CA-10-0361-I

2 Interview of Jeffrey Gleason

3 October 26th, 2011

4 Eric May: It is October 26th, 2011. This is Special Agent Eric  
5 May with the Department of Interior, Office of Inspector General,  
6 accompanied by --

7 John Meskel: Special Agent John Meskel.

8 Eric May: And --

9 Jeffrey Gleason: Dr. Jeffrey S. Gleason, wildlife biologist.

10 Eric May: And the -- Mr. Ruch?

11 Jeffrey Ruch: Ruch.

12 Eric May: Ruch. I'm sorry.

13 And on the other end of the line, can you identify your guys,  
14 yourself.

15 Jeffrey Ruch: Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility.

16 We have Jeff Ruch.

17 Katherine Douglas: And Katherine Douglas.

18 Paula Dinerstein: And Paula Dinerstein.

19 Eric May: Okay. And you are all representing Mr. Gleason,  
20 correct?

21 Jeffrey Ruch: Right.

22 Eric May: Okay. It is now nine o'clock.

23 Do you have questions, Mr. Ruch?

24 Jeffrey Ruch: We do. Your interview notice stated that the,  
25 quote, "Department of Justice has declined criminal prosecution  
26 regarding matters we will discuss in this interview."

1 Eric May: That's correct.

2 Jeffrey Ruch: We want to know whether Dr. Gleason was named as a  
3 subject of this criminal referral by your office. Was he a named  
4 subject?

5 Eric May: He was.

6 Jeffrey Ruch: All right. And are there matters subject to this  
7 interview going to be contained within the referral to the Department  
8 of Justice, as your notice implied, or are you going to cover matters  
9 in addition to the Department of Justice referral?

10 Eric May: Same matters as this -- the same stuff that we told  
11 you during the last interview.

12 Jeffrey Ruch: Okay. Your notice also states that we, quote,  
13 "Intend to discuss actions taken in your official capacity as an  
14 ecologist that include the representation of your official work."

15 Eric May: Yes.

16 Jeffrey Ruch: As we understand it, the Polar Biology paper was  
17 not an official or an assigned duty for the authors, and the paper  
18 concludes with a disclaimer. They are speaking of individuals and not  
19 in any official capacity.

20 Therefore, the questions that you're going to ask about the peer-  
21 reviewed article outside of the scope of the interview notice and if  
22 not, how to they relate to his official work or official capacity?

23 Eric May: His official work during his observations during the  
24 BUF study.

25 Jeffrey Ruch: And not the paper?

26 Eric May: No. We're going to be asking about the paper as well.

1 Jeffrey Ruch: But do you consider the paper official work or  
2 official capacity?

3 Eric May: Yes.

4 Jeffrey Ruch: And can you explain why that that's so, give that,  
5 from our reading it is not, and it clearly states in the paper itself  
6 that it's not.

7 Eric May: Mr. Ruch, I think, as far as the questions today, that  
8 that -- that's probably not an issue that's pertinent at the moment.  
9 We'd like to ask the questions that we have. The legal issues that I  
10 think you're getting at would probably be best-addressed in a separate  
11 forum or a separate setting.

12 Jeffrey Ruch: And what form would that be?

13 Eric May: If there were further actions taken.

14 Jeffrey Ruch: All right. The interview notice appears to allude  
15 its scope to "Integrity and representation," of a scientific  
16 publication.

17 As we read the Department of Interior manual on Scientific and  
18 Scholarly Activities, Part 305, Chapter 3, it sets forth the exclusive  
19 means for reporting, reviewing and resolving all allegations of  
20 scholarly misconduct, which include the quality and accuracy of  
21 published scientific research.

22 As we read the rule, the jurisdiction of the Inspector General in  
23 this area is limited to, "Cases of fraud, waste and abuse." And so, I  
24 guess what we want to know is: Is this interview being conducted in  
25 collaboration with the Departmental Scientific Integrity Officer, as  
26 provided by the rules?

1 Hello.

2 Eric May: I think the way we're going to answer that is we are  
3 conducting an investigation under our authority as the IG. Beyond  
4 that, we're not going to comment right now.

5 We have a number of question we would like to address today. I  
6 think the rest of these things will be worked out in a matter of time.

7 Jeffrey Ruch: Well, then, can you explain why this isn't a  
8 violation of the departmental rules? We don't want our client to be  
9 acting in violation of the departmental rules. So, can you help us  
10 out here?

11 Eric May: I can assure you that he won't be acting in violation  
12 of the department rules by participating in this interview today.

13 Jeffrey Ruch: And why is that?

14 Eric May: He is asked to cooperate with an investigation by the  
15 Office of the Inspector General. We are operating under our authority  
16 and there's no issue that I see with him cooperating with us and  
17 participating in this interview today.

18 Jeffrey Ruch: What about the issue we just raised, because this  
19 is outside the scope -- the IG is not immune from the rules of the  
20 Department of Interior. I guess we want to know why this is in  
21 concert with those rules. It's a simple request.

22 Eric May: We're operating under the same authority that we had  
23 during the previous interviews that we conducted.

24 Jeffrey Ruch: That doesn't answer the question.

25 Eric May: If you have -- I'm not going to answer that question.  
26 If you have any further inquiries you can make it with my department.

1 Jeffrey Ruch: All right. And then the final question we have  
2 is: Since, as we understand it, you're looking at the quality of  
3 peer-reviewed scientific scholarship, and scientific activities by  
4 Ph.D. researchers, do any of the IG personnel involved with this  
5 investigation have any scientific training or background which  
6 qualifies them to competently assess the quality of this work and, if  
7 so, what are those qualifications?

8 Eric May: We're qualified investigators and we're conducting an  
9 investigation under the same authority that we did the previous  
10 interviews.

11 If you have any further inquiries you can make it with my agency.

12 Jeffrey Ruch: (Overspeaking) question is millions of people  
13 involved in this inquiry have scientific training or background which  
14 qualifies them to competently assess peer-reviewed scientific  
15 publications? Is it yes or no?

16 John Meskel: I think it's really not pertinent to what we're  
17 looking at today.

18 Jeffrey Ruch: Well, it actually is.

19 John Meskel: Well, Mr. Ruch, we respectfully disagree. We  
20 conduct our business all the time in looking at matters that occur  
21 before the department or are relevant to the department, occur by the  
22 department employees. This is one example of those.

23 Jeffrey Ruch: I guess we're trying to figure out at what level  
24 do we need to gear the information. Is it something you can  
25 understand the information when it's presented in a technical way or  
26 does it have to be, in essence, dumbed down?

1 John Meskel: No. I think we'll address that as we go through  
2 it.

3 Jeffrey Ruch: Well, actually, no. I'm going to insist that you  
4 tell us right now because that will affect the way the questions are  
5 answered. So, do you or anyone else involved in this investigation  
6 have scientific training or background?

7 John Meskel: We can advise --

8 Jeffrey Ruch: It's a yes or no.

9 John Meskel: -- advise him to address the questions in a  
10 technical way, if that's the way he feels is appropriate to address  
11 the question.

12 If we don't understand or we'd like some clarification, we will  
13 ask.

14 Jeffrey Ruch: And with respect to my question --

15 John Meskel: I'm not going to address that right now.

16 Jeffrey Ruch: Will you address it at all?

17 John Meskel: We may at some future point. The department or our  
18 organization may choose to respond to you in that light and the  
19 concerns that you have. But, right now, today, the focus is on the  
20 questions that we have for this interview. Not about the process, and  
21 we're -- your questions or concerns about the authority.

22 Jeffrey Ruch: All right.

23 John Meskel: It's a discussion for a separate time and place,  
24 sir.

25 Jeffrey Ruch: Actually, we disagree, but since you are going to  
26 refuse to discuss it, I suppose we should get this over with so this

1 investigation doesn't go on for another 18 months.

2 John Meskel: Is that it?

3 Jeffrey Ruch: Shall we proceed?

4 John Meskel: Yes.

5 Eric May: Yes, please. Any more questions?

6 Jeffrey Ruch: No. And I think Dr. Gleason has something he'd  
7 like to supplement the record with.

8 Jeffrey Gleason: If that's okay.

9 Eric May: Sure.

10 Jeffrey Gleason: I would like to preface this second interview  
11 by clearing some of my -- clarifying some of my answers from the first  
12 interview.

13 During the first interview, Agent May asserted that the  
14 extrapolation calculations in the Polar Biology paper were mistaken,  
15 and I quote, "I had my folks who are experts in numbers and  
16 statistics, and they found that there was an error in the  
17 extrapolation methodology that suggests that the survival rate of the  
18 polar bears in 2004 was 57 percent as opposed to the 25 percent  
19 reported in the manuscript. That's quite a difference in terms of 25  
20 percent is very -- wow, that's huge."

21 I would like to state for the record, under no circumstances do I  
22 think we made a mistake in these calculations. I should have  
23 corrected Agent May's incorrect assertion at the time. Not only are  
24 the calculations in the paper correct, but in the five years it has  
25 been in wide circulation, we have not been contacted by the editor of  
26 the journal to publish an erratum. And, to our knowledge, the journal

1 has not been contacted in this regards by any scientist in the world.

2 In the case of the straightforward calculations or extrapolations  
3 in this paper, no mistakes were made. None of the scientific peer  
4 reviewers from the journal noted any mistakes in the calculation, nor  
5 did the editor, a total of four independent scientific reviews.

6 In addition, when you said -- and I quote, "I had my folks who  
7 are experts in numbers and statistics, and they found that there was  
8 an error in the extrapolation methodology," I should have asked you to  
9 tell me precisely what the perceived error was so I could explain to  
10 you why you were the one mistaken.

11 During the first interview, Agents May and Meskel asked questions  
12 specific to the four drowned polar bears regarding an email between  
13 myself and Dr. Monnett regarding three versus four polar bears.

14 During the first interview I was trying to answer questions based  
15 on memory without reviewing either my field notebook or the published  
16 paper prior to the interview. That being said, let me be clear. We  
17 saw four dead polar bears, all in September 2004, floating in the  
18 Beaufort Sea during aerial surveys.

19 Only three dead polar bears that were observed were on transect,  
20 while the fourth dead polar bear was observed either on connect or on  
21 search.

22 I provided the dates, event numbers and descriptions for each of  
23 the dead polar bear sightings for my field notebook below. Obviously,  
24 the dates from my field notebook matched the dates provided in Table 2  
25 of the published paper.

26 14 September 2004, entry number 120, "Polar bear dead. Possibly



1 entangled." After circling the animal a number of times it actually  
2 appeared to be internal organs hanging down below the animal.

3 16 September 2004, entry number 23, "Dead polar bear. Did not  
4 circle to confirm."

5 18 September 2004, entry number 131, "Dead polar bear."

6 22 September, entry 122, "Dead polar bear floating with glaucous  
7 gulls perched on top."

8 There should be no further question about the actual sightings of  
9 four dead polar bears.

10 Point number three. Agents May and Meskel extensively questioned  
11 the validity of the photographs. Obviously, given the poor resolution  
12 and quality of these photographs, they certainly weren't created or  
13 otherwise manufactured in a photo shop or some other software used to  
14 create and manipulate images.

15 I did unsuccessfully attempt to improve the quality of the image,  
16 but didn't create them. Moreover, the photographs were not included  
17 in the Polar Biology paper and should have no relevance to it.

18 Finally, Agent May states, and I quote, "So, as an observer, you  
19 didn't need any specific experience or qualification to observe the  
20 bowhead whale migration?"

21 Apparently there's some question as to my experience and/or  
22 education relevant to conducting aerial wildlife surveys. Let me  
23 reiterate, I have three degrees, a Bachelor of Science in Wildlife  
24 Fishery Science from South Dakota State, a Master of Science in  
25 Wildlife management from the same university, and a Ph.D. in zoology  
26 from the University of Western Ontario.

1 In addition to my education, I have published 17 peer-reviewed  
2 papers, including three on polar bears and an additional nine peer-  
3 edited or scientific reports. As well, I have authored or co-authored  
4 34 papers or posters presented at various professional scientific  
5 meetings, including three on polar bears.

6 Do I consider myself qualified to have participated in the survey  
7 program? Certainly.

8 Eric May: Okay. Anything else before we begin?

9 (No response.)

10 Eric May: All right. Mr. Gleason, can you -- you went over the  
11 dates of your observations. Okay. When you made those observations,  
12 how did you -- can you explain to me how you documented or recorded  
13 those observations?

14 Jeffrey Gleason: There's -- on the wildlife survey typically  
15 there are sort of two protocols. Typically, it's either some sort of  
16 computer program which was this case, and/or a field notebook as a  
17 backup reference.

18 In this case the field notebook was used to document specifics  
19 about each observation, which could not be included in the database.

20 Eric May: And when you mean the database, the BWASP database,  
21 the software?

22 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

23 Eric May: And meaning the recorder -- when you call it an  
24 observation of a bowhead whale, the data recorder would document it in  
25 the software program?

26 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

1 Eric May: And so are you -- let me -- are you stating that BWASP  
2 data software did not allow you to document the polar bear  
3 observations?

4 Jeffrey Gleason: It allowed us to document that we observed a  
5 polar bear.

6 Eric May: Okay.

7 Jeffrey Gleason: I'm not sure the database at that time allowed  
8 us to enter whether or not those individuals were dead.

9 Eric May: Okay.

10 Jeffrey Gleason: If it did, it was an oversight on the data  
11 recorder, if it's not in the database. So, it could potentially be  
12 two possibilities. Either dead was not an option in the program at  
13 the time, or the recorder simply failed to record it at the time it  
14 was observed. Those are two possible scenarios.

15 Eric May: Okay.

16 Jeffrey Gleason: And therefore, that's why field notebooks were  
17 also provided information.

18 Eric May: Okay.

19 Jeffrey Gleason: And I think if you look through the information  
20 provided in the field notebooks that I think you received photocopies  
21 of, there's -- for each sighting that's listed there's specific  
22 information.

23 Eric May: No, and I've seen those -- I've seen the notebooks.

24 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

25 Eric May: Dr. Monnett's. I've seen them of the four  
26 observations. And the reason I'm asking is because I'm trying to

1 clear up what Dr. Monnett said during his two interviews and what you  
2 told me on the first interview, and that's what I'm trying to clear  
3 up.

4 On the first interview Dr. Monnett said, "When dead polar bears  
5 were observed during BWASP flights in September '04, the observers did  
6 not have the ability to document these sightings using an existing  
7 BWASP software program. We were forced to write in our journal  
8 notebooks these types of observations," which is what you just  
9 indicated.

10 Jeffrey Gleason: I would say it would be one of the two options  
11 or possible scenarios.

12 Eric May: Yes.

13 Jeffrey Gleason: Either it was an option or available in the  
14 software, and it simply didn't get recorded, or it was not an option  
15 for recording --

16 Eric May: Okay.

17 Jeffrey Gleason: -- that individual's dead.

18 Eric May: Because the first interview you told me, quote -- and  
19 I'm just trying to -- "When an observer sighted a bowhead whale and/or  
20 other mammal, the observer would call out the sighting to the data  
21 recorder who would then hit "enter" on the laptop.

22 "The access software database would then initiate and the data  
23 recorded would immediately enter the specific geospatial information  
24 of the sighting. This information could include species, size of the  
25 species, number of species, single, behavior, feeding, swimming,  
26 approximate distance from the aircraft and transect line, weather

1 variables and so forth.

2 "The observers and the data recorder would also document other  
3 mammal sightings such as polar bears, bearded seals, walruses, ringed  
4 seals," -- so that's the -- so you're indicating back then you don't  
5 recall exactly what were the circumstances when you were documenting?

6 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't recall --

7 Eric May: Okay.

8 Jeffrey Gleason: -- specifics to each of those, whether or not  
9 the recorder actually recorded the behavior as "dead," or, even if  
10 that was available. I'm not sure.

11 Eric May: Okay. No, that's -- and I know -- I understand it's  
12 been a long time since. Let's go over -- during the last interview  
13 you indicated that you and Dr. Monnett conducted a research of over 30  
14 years of archived records and concluded that no dead polar bear  
15 carcasses were ever seen or documented floated in open water before.

16 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

17 Eric May: Okay. After the observations and you two decided to -  
18 - to prepare a paper to document your observations, can you tell me --  
19 explain that process a little bit more in terms of gathering this  
20 information. What archived records were you looking at?

21 Jeffrey Gleason: We were using the database.

22 Eric May: The BWASP database.

23 Jeffrey Gleason: And also the -- I don't recall specifics. I  
24 think there was some conversation with Steve Treasey (phonetic) the  
25 program manager prior to that, in reference to dead polar bears. Now,  
26 I can't be for sure, but I believe that is the case.

1 Eric May: Okay.

2 Jeffrey Gleason: And obviously, these sorts of sightings would  
3 be pretty memorable and would probably be recorded somewhere, whether  
4 it was in the database specifically or in a field notebook associated  
5 with, or in the annual reports, the BWASP reports.

6 Eric May: Yes. And the dates, the specific dates were from 1987  
7 to 2003, I believe, what the manuscript stated, right?

8 Jeffrey Gleason: That's correct.

9 Eric May: My question -- and this is -- you just indicated and  
10 explained how the BWASP software program didn't allow you to document  
11 dead polar bears, so I'm just --

12 Jeffrey Ruch: No, he didn't.

13 Jeffrey Gleason: No.

14 Jeffrey Ruch: He said he didn't remember.

15 Eric May: Well, no, he doesn't remember, but at the time, maybe  
16 the BWASP data didn't allow you to record --

17 Jeffrey Ruch: You're putting words in his mouth.

18 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't recall --

19 Eric May: Well, no. Explain to me, because that's what I --

20 Jeffrey Gleason: It could be -- it could be one or the other  
21 option.

22 Eric May: One or the other.

23 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

24 Eric May: But had -- did -- was the BWASP data software ever  
25 changed to allow you to record a dead mammal or a dead polar bear?

26 Jeffrey Gleason: Again, I don't recall if -- if we changed the

1 database after that point in time. I believe there was some  
2 discussion internally about modifying the database to allow more  
3 specific details about species other than bowhead whales.

4 The survey, itself, and the database were really designed  
5 specifically to address fairly straightforward questions about bowhead  
6 whale migrations and the migration axes.

7 But, I think after 2004, after these observations there were --  
8 Chuck -- Dr. Monnett and I discussed making some changes and working  
9 with the contract folks to try and get some modifications to the  
10 program that would allow more detail.

11 And again, I can't recall if there was a comment, tab, drop-down  
12 tab or something that would allow additional information. I'm not  
13 sure.

14 Eric May: But my understanding -- what you -- the BWASP data  
15 software, and because of its ability, that's why you had a secondary  
16 way to record or document --

17 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

18 Eric May: -- which is the note -- notebook.

19 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

20 Eric May: So when you went back and looked at all this archived  
21 information --

22 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

23 Eric May: -- did you use the BWASP database?

24 Jeffrey Gleason: Primarily. Primary source of information.

25 Eric May: But maybe the observers didn't have the ability to  
26 document it in the BWASP data of the dead polar bears. And that's my

1 question: How could you make that statement when -- did you look at  
2 the notebooks of those observers during that period of time as well?

3 Jeffrey Gleason: I think -- I don't recall the specifics as far  
4 as -- we used the database, certainly, but we may have included  
5 conversations with Steve Treasey, who had been there for an extended  
6 period of time prior to my arrival in Alaska, as well as the annual  
7 reports --

8 John Meskel: The BWASP study?

9 Jeffrey Gleason: Right. And I believe there -- in each of the  
10 annual reports there is very specific -- fairly specific information  
11 about sightings. For each of the marine mammal groups, I believe each  
12 species, there's sort of a separate section with each of these annual  
13 reports, I believe. It's been a while since I reviewed those.

14 Jeffrey Gleason: And the reason I'm asking these questions,  
15 because during the second interview of Dr. Monnett he indicated, and  
16 I'll quote, "It turned out that Jeff Gleason had done an extensive  
17 analysis of the database and had looked for drowned polar bears, and  
18 it turns out that we could log them.

19 "On the flight when we were seeing the bears, for some reason,  
20 both Jeff and I were of the impression that the BWASP database did not  
21 accommodate drowned polar bears. I think what happened was, was that  
22 the recorder was that was there, for some reason, told us that it  
23 couldn't.

24 "That's why we made those detailed observations in our notebooks.  
25 Ultimately, we relied on the database, but we also spoke to Steve  
26 Treasey," like you mentioned.



1 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

2 Eric May: So that's my question about the earlier versions of  
3 the BWASP database. Is that true, based on what Dr. Monnett just  
4 indicated in his second interview with me?

5 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't -- I don't have access to the program,  
6 itself, the access database. I have versions of the files, the Excel  
7 spreadsheet that you can basically access.

8 Eric May: Okay.

9 Jeffrey Gleason: And, you know, transfer that file out. But I  
10 don't remember the specifics relative to that question. That seems  
11 like a reasonable scenario. As I stated, it's potentially one of two  
12 situations.

13 Either it wasn't an option available within the framework of the  
14 program, or it was available and it simply -- we failed to record it.  
15 The data recorder failed to enter these individuals as dead at the  
16 time.

17 Eric May: So the statement in the -- I'm just -- one, I'm trying  
18 to get clear on -- did you go back and -- where did he get the  
19 statement that the BWASP database could log the drowned polar bears or  
20 dead polar bears?

21 Jeffrey Ruch: I think that wasn't his statement. His statement  
22 has been repeatedly he doesn't recall.

23 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't recall the specifics.

24 Eric May: Okay. So, Dr. Monnett was --

25 Jeffrey Gleason: That seems like a reasonable -- a reasonable  
26 statement --

1 Eric May: Okay.

2 Jeffrey Gleason: -- for the record, but I don't recall the  
3 specifics of whether or not the program at the time, allowed for that.  
4 It may have been, but it -- I believe it's one of two situations.

5 Eric May: Okay.

6 John Meskel: Can you help me understand something, then, sir?  
7 If you went back and you reviewed the data for all those years for  
8 that specific purpose, but you, even to this date, aren't sure whether  
9 the program was set up to allow that, how do you then come to the  
10 conclusions that you did?

11 Jeffrey Gleason: Well, I haven't --

12 Jeffrey Ruch: Can you be more specific? Which conclusion are  
13 you talking about?

14 John Meskel: About -- about the --

15 Jeffrey Ruch: Which specific conclusion are you talking about?

16 John Meskel: About the observation regarding the number of  
17 drowned or dead polar bears that were observed in the past.

18 Jeffrey Ruch: Could you be more specific, which specific  
19 observations are you talking about?

20 John Meskel: The statement made in the abstract about not -- "No  
21 polar bear carcasses were observed from 1987 to 2003."

22 Jeffrey Gleason: As I stated previously, we also used other  
23 sources of information, including BWASP annual reports, the scientific  
24 literature and I believe conversations with Steve Treasey, the program  
25 manager over that period of time.

26 Eric May: And he was the team leader of the BWASP?

1 Jeffrey Gleason: He was -- he was in charge of the BWASP survey,  
2 yes.

3 John Meskel: Did I understand correctly that the database was  
4 the primary source of the --

5 Jeffrey Gleason: It would have been the primary source of  
6 information.

7 John Meskel: Okay.

8 Jeffrey Gleason: But, like I said, we also used literature, the  
9 BWASP annual reports, and we had, I think, versions or copies of those  
10 dating back to those years, spanning those years, as well as phone  
11 conversations and discussions with Dr. Treasey.

12 John Meskel: In reviewing the database, though, you're not sure  
13 whether that particular data, about whether they were observed --  
14 drowned polar bears was even captured or could be captured in the  
15 database?

16 Jeffrey Gleason: I -- I can't really comment on whether the  
17 version we had was the same as the version that was used in 1987. I  
18 don't know -- there's no way for me to know if it's the same version.

19 As I stated earlier, I believe, if there were previously-observed  
20 drowned polar bears, and I think Steve Treasey has provided some  
21 information on that, that they would have been captured somewhere. So  
22 --

23 John Meskel: And where would that have been?

24 Jeffrey Gleason: As I mentioned previously, Steve Treasey would  
25 have either documented those -- that information in field notebooks  
26 and/or the BWASP annual reports.

1           John Meskel:  So, if I'm understanding you right, those are sort  
2 of the summary level, the annual review of the data that was  
3 collected.  But, if the data wasn't collected, to begin with, then  
4 would it necessarily be noted in a summary?

5           Jeffrey Gleason:  Again, as a backup measure to the program  
6 itself, it's standard operating procedures in most surveys to use a  
7 field notebook or handwritten notes for these very cases where the  
8 database doesn't allow for you to capture specific information  
9 relative to a sighting.

10          As I stated, I didn't -- I don't know if the version we were  
11 using in 2004 had the same -- the program, itself, whether it was the  
12 same as used in 1987.  Like -- there's no way for me to know that.

13          Eric May:  Anything else?

14          (No response.)

15          Eric May:  Okay.  Were you and Dr. Monnett the first individuals  
16 to have observed dead polar bear during the BWASP study?

17          Jeffrey Gleason:  I believe that's the case, yes, given our --  
18 like I said, you know, previous discussions up to this point on this  
19 topic, they would have -- should have been and would have been  
20 captured either in field notebooks and then put into each of the  
21 annual reports.

22          So, that information was available.  Now, whether or not it was  
23 not captured in the database, that's a separate issue and it's sort of  
24 -- how can I put this -- inappropriate after the fact to go into a  
25 database and add information.

26          And I don't recall specifically whether or not we thought --

1 whether or not we thought about, you know, as Dr. Monnett had  
2 previously sort of discussed the -- sort of the situation, whether or  
3 not we thought about, you know, going in after the fact when we were  
4 on the ground, and having had some time to think about it, whether or  
5 not we thought about going in and doing that after the fact.

6 I don't recall specifics, but obviously, if -- if that  
7 information is missing, then we didn't do that. We felt it was  
8 inappropriate to do that, so -- and these are, I think, sort of larger  
9 issues relative to survey methodology and sort of this transfer of  
10 information through time. And these are -- these are, you know, those  
11 sorts of things.

12 Eric May: Understood.

13 Jeffrey Gleason: And the sort of development of a program is a  
14 work-in-progress. Like I said, I don't know if the program is the  
15 same. I believe strongly that if there were ever dead polar bears  
16 observed during this survey, they would have either been published or  
17 they would have been in a field notebook or, more importantly, they  
18 would have made the annual reports and be documented there.

19 Eric May: And the reason I'm asking these questions is because  
20 we conducted interviews of other BWASP observers and we were told that  
21 they observed dead polar bears prior to yours and Dr. Monnett's dead  
22 polar bear observations.

23 So, that's what I'm trying to clear up and find out what's the  
24 best way to find documentation or a record of these polar bear  
25 observations.

26 And I was told by the observers that they recalled calling back

1 out to the data recorder and, you know, saying, "Dead polar bear," as  
2 one of their observations. So, did -- any comment on that? Have you  
3 ever heard of other observations being made, other than yours?

4 Jeffrey Gleason: Other than -- of dead polar bears?

5 Eric May: Prior to yours.

6 Jeffrey Gleason: Certainly not.

7 Eric May: I have in front of me -- does that look familiar?  
8 It's the -- the BWASP data recordings for the specific dates --

9 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

10 Eric May: -- and others?

11 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

12 Eric May: Now, this is September 6th, 2004 that I'm showing Mr.  
13 Gleason. All right. You're a Ph.D. now, right?

14 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

15 Eric May: So, Dr. Gleason?

16 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

17 Eric May: On this entry number 204 --

18 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

19 Eric May: -- which is September 6th --

20 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

21 Eric May: -- a couple of weeks before your initial observation -  
22 -

23 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

24 Eric May: Right?

25 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

26 Eric May: -- it says, "Species, polar bear; behavior, swim;

1 habitat, open water."

2 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

3 Eric May: So, can you interpret, by looking at that, any more  
4 information just from reading that about that polar bear observation?

5 Jeffrey Gleason: Obviously the bear was swimming.

6 Eric May: Right.

7 Jeffrey Gleason: The behavior was entered as "swim." There's  
8 about -- let's see. There are about 14 specific pieces of information  
9 relative to that sighting, and provides information on ice coverage,  
10 sea state, habitat, aircraft response, visibility, right and left, ice  
11 type, no ice. So, in this case a behavior was recorded for this  
12 entry.

13 Eric May: Right. And now, I'm showing Dr. Gleason a table of  
14 codes, and does this look familiar?

15 Jeffrey Gleason: It does.

16 Eric May: Do you know how old that form is, by chance, when they  
17 started using that for the data recordings?

18 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't know when this was -- I don't know if  
19 this is the exact same one as that was used in 2004. I remember  
20 pasting, cutting this out and putting it in my field notebook.

21 Eric May: Okay.

22 Jeffrey Gleason: As a sort of reminder.

23 Eric May: Okay. Yes, and for the individuals on the other end  
24 of the line it's -- like "behavior," and they have different codes. S  
25 for swim. M for --

26 Jeffrey Gleason: Mill.

1 Eric May: -- mill. X for dead. U for -- So, I was jus trying  
2 to clarify. So, if September 6th, '04 had the ability to document a  
3 polar bear sighting -- obviously it does because it says "swim."

4 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

5 Eric May: And then if you look, you know, other days, it says  
6 "Swim, run" --

7 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

8 Eric May: -- "rest."

9 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

10 Eric May: But there is no indication of, you know, X for dead or  
11 "dead."

12 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

13 Eric May: So did --- at the time of your observations was this  
14 in place?

15 Jeffrey Gleason: I believe that is the case.

16 Eric May: Okay.

17 Jeffrey Gleason: This is dated '04. It appears that, as I think  
18 Dr. Monnett stated, after the fact, we recognized that "dead" was an  
19 option under "behavior," and it was --just failed to get recorded by  
20 the data recorder. And why that happened I'm not sure.

21 So, it is -- I mean, it was or is one of the two options I  
22 provided earlier. And I think in this case, based on this, given the  
23 dates of this information, that it was available but failed to get  
24 recorded in the database.

25 Eric May: Another record is September 11th. Remember, I had --  
26 I had other observers tell me that they made dead polar bear



1 observations prior to yours, and one specific in September, during  
2 that same flight of -- string of flights that you made, and here's  
3 September 11th.

4 And I need your help interpreting this because it says, for the  
5 other end, "Species, polar bear. Aircraft response. No. Total  
6 number -- polar bears probably. One." How can you determine whether  
7 or not the status of this polar bear in that entry -- and it's entry  
8 number five.

9 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes, that's -- that's interesting. 9/4, 9/6.

10 Eric May: Especially with like the codes. If they could put  
11 "swim" in there, why couldn't they put "dead"?

12 Jeffrey Gleason: I have no --

13 Eric May: No. Okay.

14 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't understand -- I don't understand in  
15 this case, that the dates between these two observations is five days,  
16 but in the latter entry there's no place for "behavior." And whether  
17 or not -- I think what has happened here is because behavior was not  
18 entered, it doesn't actually show up in this.

19 Eric May: So -- okay. That's on September 11th. I just have a  
20 few more.

21 Jeffrey Gleason: I would suggest that if you don't enter  
22 information in any of these -- I mean, there's multiple opportunities  
23 to enter, you know, 14 -- there might be more columns of information  
24 that you could have entered data into, but if you don't enter it, it  
25 doesn't show up on the printout.

26 Eric May: Okay.

1 Jeffrey Gleason: So it gets missed.

2 Eric May: Well, here -- I'm going to have you look real quick  
3 through September 16th and September 18th, the two other days that you  
4 -- you guys made observation, and I think you took -- you were there  
5 on the 16th, weren't you?

6 Jeffrey Gleason: I'd have to look at my field notebook.

7 Eric May: I know you were there on the 14th, weren't you?

8 Jeffrey Gleason: I think I was there -- I don't have my field  
9 notebook handy.

10 Eric May: The 14th was the first time you observed a dead polar  
11 bear, and that's -- that's those photos, correct?

12 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct. Well, I don't know the dates of the  
13 photos.

14 Eric May: Of the photos. Well, but the photo is just of the one  
15 polar bear?

16 Jeffrey Gleason: One, possibly two. I think the photos -- if  
17 you look at the photos closely, I think there are two photos with one  
18 that looks like it has an intestine.

19 Eric May: Right.

20 Jeffrey Gleason: And then there might be another photo that  
21 doesn't show that, so that was one of -- one of the other polar bears  
22 that we observed.

23 Eric May: And we're not questioning the photos. We're just  
24 trying to document -- find out the documentation of the polar bear  
25 sightings. So, if you look through there, Dr. Gleason, on the 14th,  
26 September 14th, 2004, and you indicated the actual entry number.

1 Jeffrey Gleason: "Behavior" was not recorded.

2 Eric May: Is that the entry number you mentioned at the  
3 beginning of the --

4 Jeffrey Gleason: Entry number 120 on 9/14, one o'clock, 1:02:46  
5 p.m. "Behavior" was not recorded. "No ice, total number, one."

6 Eric May: Yes.

7 Jeffrey Gleason: Ice coverage, zero.

8 Eric May: So this is your polar bear observation?

9 Jeffrey Gleason: It has --

10 Eric May: You believe?

11 Jeffrey Gleason: It matches the entry and the date.

12 Eric May: And the reason I was -- I was just wondering why it  
13 didn't say "Behavior." That's the -- but everything else, like "rest,  
14 swim, run," and I just didn't understand why "dead" wasn't documented.

15 Jeffrey Gleason: Again, that's sort of --

16 Eric May: And that's consistent with all of the other dates,  
17 too, so in time we don't need to go through all the --

18 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't know who the data recorder was at that  
19 -- for those flights. But, for whatever reason, that specific piece  
20 of information was not recorded.

21 Jeffrey Ruch: Most people don't think of death as a behavior.

22 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

23 Jeffrey Ruch: They think of it as a status.

24 Jeffrey Gleason: I mean, I can't explain why it wasn't recorded,  
25 because I wasn't the data recorder. But apparently there was a  
26 decision made by the data recorder, and there may have been a lack of

1 conversation between the observers to record that information. So --

2 Eric May: It was the same data recorder, as well, for my review  
3 of it.

4 Jeffrey Gleason: Right. So I guess because also that we had it  
5 recorded in our data books with the entry number and the time and the  
6 flight and all that information.

7 Eric May: Right. And I confirmed that.

8 Jeffrey Gleason: We could cross-reference that.

9 Eric May: Yes.

10 Jeffrey Gleason: So --

11 Eric May: Well, no, the dates -- the dates were --

12 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

13 Eric May: -- it's just the actual documentation in the record of  
14 --

15 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

16 Eric May: -- of the polar bear being dead. That's what we're  
17 trying to find out.

18 Jeffrey Gleason: I understand. And I think Chucks's  
19 recollections is probably sort of the way it happened. I don't know  
20 the specifics as far as whether we went into the database and -- we  
21 didn't do anything after the fact, obviously, or those codes would be  
22 in there after the fact.

23 Eric May: Okay.

24 Jeffrey Gleason: But, again, as I mentioned, you sort of make  
25 that decision given a database when you're collecting the data whether  
26 or not to go in after the fact. And typically, if you want to sort of

1 avoid that -- now, if you can make changes to the program before the  
2 next field season and implement additional information columns, that's  
3 more appropriate than actually going in after the fact. So, I -- yes.

4 Eric May: And let me go back to the observer, BWASP observers  
5 who indicated that they -- they saw dead polar bears. Obviously, you  
6 didn't recall that. If that was the case, Dr. Gleason, and they  
7 observed it, would that have made any difference in the significance  
8 of your manuscript, the manuscript of --

9 Jeffrey Ruch: Could you be more specific? For example, what --  
10 were they saying that they observed dead polar bears in open water  
11 following a storm?

12 Eric May: No, they -- they -- well, they made these observations  
13 the first week -- the first two weeks of September 2004, which was  
14 prior to the major storm. And I'm just questioning -- or asking,  
15 would that have made -- if there were observations of dead polar bears  
16 prior to the storm, would it have made a significant impact on the  
17 results of your manuscript?

18 Jeffrey Ruch: To be clear, you're talking about prior  
19 observations that took place in September 2004?

20 Jeffrey Gleason: Same month, same year.

21 Jeffrey Ruch: Not prior to that?

22 Eric May: Well, prior -- prior to Dr. Monnett and Dr. Gleason's  
23 first observations.

24 Jeffrey Ruch: Right. But not prior to September 2004 --

25 Eric May: No.

26 Jeffrey Ruch: -- so that's 2003, 2002, et cetera?

1 Eric May: That's correct.

2 Jeffrey Ruch: So, which is days before their observations,  
3 you're saying?

4 Eric May: Well, yes. One was the first week of September and --  
5 because yours, the first one was September 14th.

6 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

7 Eric May: And I was just wondering, would it have made a big --  
8 a difference.

9 Jeffrey Gleason: Without having specific information relative --  
10 relevant to each of those sightings, it's hard to really interpret  
11 that information. If those were, you know, floating well offshore and  
12 having some information on sea ice distance and that sort of thing,  
13 you know, it's really hard to think about it exactly as far as what  
14 the relevance would be.

15 The fact that those observations occurred in the same month and  
16 the same year provides some additional support of the overall paper.  
17 But, as far as -- like I said, I -- without having specific  
18 information relative to each of those sightings, it's hard to -- for -  
19 -

20 Eric May: Right. No, I understand.

21 Do you have anything, John?

22 (No response.)

23 Eric May: All right.

24 Jeffrey Gleason: It's interesting that those were somehow not  
25 relayed to anyone.

26 Eric May: Right. And what I was told is that they called them

1 out to the data recorder and didn't -- I mean, they didn't -- just an  
2 observation to them. They didn't --

3 Jeffrey Gleason: They didn't see the relevance or they --

4 Eric May: Right. And it was only one. It wasn't as many as you  
5 guys saw, the four, so --

6 Jeffrey Ruch: Are you saying there's no paper trail on these  
7 prior observations?

8 Eric May: Well, no. What I'm saying is that they called out to  
9 the data recorder and, you know, indicated that they saw a dead polar  
10 bear, but -- for instance on the September 11th one, there was an  
11 observation of a polar bear, the same characteristics as your  
12 observation. It didn't say "Swim, dead or rest," --

13 Jeffrey Gleason: No behavior was recorded.

14 Eric May: No behavior was recorded, but there were those  
15 sightings, or those recordings or entries in prior -- September 14th -  
16 -

17 Jeffrey Gleason: Same month. Same month.

18 Eric May: Right. So, that's why I was asking you, can you  
19 identify, based on this entry, that polar bear observation, that polar  
20 bear was dead?

21 Jeffrey Gleason: Given the information on that printout?

22 Eric May: Well, no -- right. But you already said -- you  
23 already explained that.

24 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

25 Eric May: And there's no behavior --

26 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

1 Eric May: -- so -- or acts or anything -- any codes to indicate  
2 that that polar bear was dead.

3 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

4 Eric May: But that's consistent with all the other polar bear  
5 observations. But there was one -- there was a couple of entries  
6 prior to your initial observation, which is why I wanted to get your  
7 help as to -- can you tell me whether or not there's a way to  
8 determine that this polar bear was dead, based on this entry?

9 Jeffrey Gleason: Not based on the entry information.

10 Eric May: Okay.

11 John Meskel: All right. Just so I can try to put this together,  
12 and help me if I'm misunderstanding something. When you were on these  
13 flights and you observed the -- what you believe to be dead polar  
14 bears, you felt that that was significant. You documented that in  
15 your --

16 Jeffrey Gleason: Field notebook.

17 John Meskel: -- field notebook, and there were four sightings  
18 that you documented.

19 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

20 John Meskel: You knew that that was significant. It caused, if  
21 I understand you guys, to look at this issue, go back and review the  
22 records from this study that was targeted, not towards polar bears,  
23 but towards the bowhead whales --

24 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

25 John Meskel: -- and review all of the data to see if there were  
26 prior sightings of dead polar bears noted.



1 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

2 John Meskel: But you reviewed -- the primary source of  
3 information was the database itself.

4 Jeffrey Gleason: Primary.

5 John Meskel: And even for the sightings that you did note in  
6 looking at the database, there's no recording that we see, or if I  
7 understand right that you see, that says whether they were dead?

8 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

9 John Meskel: And you reviewed the 30 years -- or is that the  
10 correct number, is that 30 years?

11 Jeffrey Gleason: '87 to 2003, yes.

12 John Meskel: -- the prior years' sightings, to determine if  
13 there were other sightings, but it appears from the information that  
14 was actually recorded in the database that that wouldn't necessarily  
15 be captured there?

16 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes. Like I mentioned previously, there's no  
17 way for me to know the framework and capabilities of the BWASP access  
18 database from '87, and whether or not it was the same exact structural  
19 framework, the program itself.

20 Auxiliary information which would include field notebooks,  
21 discussions with the previous BWASP manager, Steve Treasey, and the  
22 BWASP annual reports, there was no information that would lead us to  
23 suggest that there were ever any dead polar bears sighted.

24 And the fact that apparently there were just prior to our  
25 observations, is this the first time that I know of, that I've heard  
26 about this.

1 John Meskel: Okay.

2 Jeffrey Gleason: And I work there and was intimately involved  
3 with the program. There was no discussions of that or they would have  
4 been included in the paper.

5 John Meskel: Well, given all that, do you think it is a  
6 possibility that there were polar bears, dead polar bears observed in  
7 prior years that you might not have found out about?

8 Jeffrey Gleason: Is it a possibility?

9 Jeffrey Ruch: How can he answer that question?

10 John Meskel: I'm asking for an opinion.

11 Jeffrey Ruch: I thought this was supposed to be a factual  
12 investigation.

13 Jeffrey Gleason: It would -- I would have to speculate on that.  
14 I -- I'm not comfortable speculating about that -- those prior years'  
15 information.

16 John Meskel: Okay.

17 Jeffrey Gleason: Like I said, I don't know the framework of the  
18 program and its capabilities -- the capabilities of the database  
19 itself prior to that time.

20 John Meskel: Yes.

21 Jeffrey Gleason: I was there from '04 through '06 and was fairly  
22 familiar with the program at the time. Now, that being said, again,  
23 the observations of the four dead polar bears we saw did not make the  
24 output of the database, the program.

25 John Meskel: I'm sorry. Could you clarify that?

26 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes. They didn't -- the behaviors were not

1 recorded.

2 John Meskel: Okay.

3 Jeffrey Gleason: As we previously discussed. And why that  
4 happened is -- is unclear. There are, you know, again, probably two  
5 scenarios where that might occur. The data recorder simply failed to  
6 record that information or the observers, myself or Dr. Monnett failed  
7 to relay that information and it's importance to the data recorder,  
8 and therefore, it simply did not get recorded.

9 John Meskel: I guess one other question would be something that  
10 I think -- well, I'm not sure who said it, but someone else alluded to  
11 it here, that if they were dead then there might not have been a  
12 behavior, per se, to record.

13 The X in the table that we're looking at suggested to us that  
14 there might have been a way to record that they were dead, but is it  
15 possible that the behavior wasn't recorded because there was no  
16 behavior, per se?

17 Jeffrey Gleason: Certainly that is a --

18 John Meskel: You saw no movement, no activity. Is that a  
19 possible explanation?

20 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes, I suppose that's possible.

21 John Meskel: Okay. So what it boils down to is, I think, if --  
22 if we're hearing you right, we don't know why it wasn't recorded. We  
23 can agree that we see the entries in the database. For certain  
24 entries we see that there was no behavior recorded.

25 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

26 John Meskel: For other entries we see that there was behavior

1 reported, like they were swimming.

2 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

3 John Meskel: And for the ones where there was no behavior  
4 recorded, we're not sure why it doesn't say "dead," or the X symbol.

5 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct. Right.

6 John Meskel: But I think you also noted that the way the  
7 database printout works is you think if there was nothing entered in  
8 that field for like the behavior, that that field wouldn't show up  
9 when you print it out, which is --

10 Jeffrey Gleason: That is -- that is my interpretation of the  
11 output. I guess --

12 John Meskel: And that's what I think we're seeing on the ones  
13 where --

14 Jeffrey Gleason: If there's a lack of information --

15 John Meskel: -- there's not a behavior, that doesn't --

16 Jeffrey Gleason: -- in the output from the database, I think  
17 that is because there was simply no information entered for a specific  
18 -- whether it's habitat or behavior or ice conditions. If it's blank  
19 on the output that suggests that information simply wasn't entered  
20 into the database at the time of the observation or at the time it was  
21 entered.

22 John Meskel: Okay.

23 Jeffrey Gleason: And to clarify the -- when you are on the  
24 aircraft and you observe something, and it could simply be a change in  
25 sea ice conditions, as soon as you hit "enter" in that program it  
26 provides a geospatial reference point on a map, for instance.

1 John Meskel: Yes.

2 Jeffrey Gleason: And then it allows you to enter various  
3 information, pieces of information which you can see in the output.

4 John Meskel: Okay.

5 Eric May: When you were writing your draft manuscript, I read  
6 all the drafts that you guys did throughout the period of time, and  
7 this is an observation. I noticed in the abstract section you had --  
8 several of the drafts, you indicated -- you stated the limitations of  
9 the study and your observations.

10 And I'll quote, "Differences in observations -- observer  
11 abilities to discriminate polar bears from waves, snow and ice,  
12 coupled with among and within the year variations and survey effort,  
13 ice conditions and local weather patterns also probably influenced  
14 both total number and spatial distribution of polar bear sightings."

15 Do you remember that?

16 Jeffrey Gleason: I --

17 Eric May: It's a long time ago, and there's like four or five  
18 draft manuscripts, but towards -- you know, this was deleted, of the  
19 importance, and I bring this up because, do you -- I have a memo here  
20 --

21 John Meskel: Do you want to let him answer that question,  
22 whether remembered it?

23 Eric May: Okay.

24 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't recall the specific verbiage.  
25 Certainly that could have been in one of the earlier drafts.

26 Eric May: But it's the limitations is what --

1 Jeffrey Gleason: Acknowledging the limits of the data or the  
2 information, the observations.

3 Eric May: Now --

4 Jeffrey Gleason: And that's pretty standard verbiage when you're  
5 publishing a survey. I think, in some of my follow-up -- two of my  
6 follow-up papers, there's probably a statement very similar to that  
7 somewhere in the document.

8 Eric May: And it's important --

9 Jeffrey Gleason: Recognizing the limitations.

10 Eric May: Limitations.

11 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

12 Eric May: And what I wanted to show you --

13 Jeffrey Gleason: Wildlife surveys are challenging for a number  
14 of reasons.

15 Eric May: Do you remember -- I have a memo from -- you wrote to  
16 the chief of the environmental assessment section, sometime in 2010,  
17 because the dates reflect that. There's no specific date, but it --

18 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

19 Eric May: And in here -- and I just want you -- it's real quick,  
20 quote, "Another point is that using BWASP data for a detailed analysis  
21 does not reflect the actual number of whales associated with each  
22 sighting and the sightings tend to represent a potentially biased  
23 underestimate, a sample of the potential number of whales sighted."

24 And then you go on to say, "One must be careful about using, and  
25 more importantly, presenting and interpreting data in such a crude  
26 manner, as the data, themselves, may be misrepresented and/or

1 misinterpreted," and you go on to say, "You need to provide the  
2 caveats of the survey, the analysis and presentation of the data up  
3 front."

4 And my question, over the sequence of drafts this limitation was  
5 not part of the final manuscript.

6 Jeffrey Ruch: You're comparing apples and oranges. That memo is  
7 about use of the data for purposes of a study.

8 Eric May: I'm --

9 Jeffrey Ruch: But it's not a study.

10 Eric May: I'm talking about --

11 Jeffrey Ruch: It's an observational --

12 Eric May: -- Dr. Gleason's state of mind of the importance of  
13 providing all the information. Is that correct?

14 Jeffrey Ruch: Is that a state of mind question?

15 Eric May: Is that correct? Do you agree with the statement you  
16 made to the chief, that it's important to provide all of the  
17 information up-front so --

18 Jeffrey Gleason: I think it's important to acknowledge the  
19 potential limitations and the pitfalls associated with any survey  
20 data.

21 Eric May: And that's what -- that's my point.

22 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

23 Eric May: It's not -- I don't want it to be read too much into -  
24 - I just wanted your frame of mind as to how important it is to -- to  
25 provide the information.

26 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

1 Eric May: Okay. And I'm just curious. This limitation is like  
2 almost three paragraphs. It wasn't included in the manuscript. Was  
3 not providing the limitations important in your manuscript, of your  
4 observations?

5 Jeffrey Gleason: You'd think -- and I can't recall exactly  
6 throughout the various iterations and drafts during the review process  
7 this was removed. And I don't know why, whether that was the internal  
8 review, the friendly review or the scientific peer review from the  
9 journal.

10 There are basically three levels of review for this document.

11 Eric May: Yes.

12 Jeffrey Gleason: And the internal review agency, my supervisor  
13 at the time, Dr. Cleve Cowles, was one of the reviewers, internal  
14 agency reviewers. The regional supervisor, Paul Stang was an internal  
15 reviewer and, as well, the director, John Gall (phonetic).

16 Now, the next step was the friendly review. And the friendly  
17 review, I think, included -- and I think we covered that in the  
18 acknowledgements, who the reviewers were.

19 Eric May: Yes.

20 Jeffrey Gleason: And, of course, the scientific peer review from  
21 the journal were anonymous reviewers. I don't know at what stage  
22 those statements, that information was removed from the paper. So,  
23 I'm just not certain --

24 Eric May: Okay.

25 Jeffrey Gleason: -- as to why or who recommended removal of  
26 that.



1 Eric May: Yes, I mean, there's a lot of people that conducted  
2 the review of it.

3 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

4 Eric May: Another example is -- during my first interview with  
5 you you said, "We believe that the windstorm caused severe adverse  
6 swimming conditions and that the polar bears drowned as a result."  
7 Simple statement.

8 Jeffrey Gleason: Presumably.

9 Eric May: Presumably.

10 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

11 Eric May: Right. And then Dr. Monnett responded much the same  
12 in his responses to the blind peer reviewers of Polar Biology, and I  
13 ask, were you able to respond -- or review those peer reviews?

14 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't know what my -- I don't recall my level  
15 of involvement with the three scientific peer reviews or peer  
16 reviewers assigned by Polar Biology. I don't recall -- and the  
17 reviewers typically have a form -- or a format that they follow, and  
18 between the authors, the editor of a journal and the reviewers, there  
19 is often some back-and-forth, you know, trying to figure out what --  
20 which comments exactly or specifically need to be dealt with, and  
21 there's a lot of back-and-forth during that process until which time  
22 the editor and the reviewers are okay with the final product. And,  
23 like I said, I don't recall the process exactly.

24 Eric May: Okay. Dr. Monnett responded to a peer reviewer  
25 critique after he criticized that the manuscript emphasized too much  
26 on suggesting that the polar bears died because of loss of sea ice.

1 Dr. Monnett, quote, stated, "He suggests that more plausible  
2 explanations for the deaths, including the scenario that bears were  
3 caught offshore by a storm. This, in fact, is what we believe to be  
4 the case. That is, during calm weather, many bears swam toward ice  
5 that was unusually distant. A storm developed and bears died. End of  
6 story."

7 And that was his response, pretty much the same thing you  
8 indicated just a moment ago -- during my first interview with you.  
9 Again, my question is: In reading all these draft manuscripts, the  
10 storm, at the beginning was -- you had almost a page or two discussing  
11 the storm and the relationship with you -- what you believe the cause  
12 of death of the polar bears.

13 I mean, we're talking two, three pages, and it's mentioned  
14 throughout the manuscript --

15 Jeffrey Ruch: Excuse me. How is the draft of the scientific  
16 peer-reviewed paper within the jurisdiction of the Inspector General?

17 Eric May: And then so, at the final -- I'm not going to answer  
18 that.

19 At the final published manuscript, the first reference of the  
20 storm is on page four. Was there a --

21 Jeffrey Ruch: Are you guys editors now? What's the matter with  
22 you?

23 Eric May: What's your opinion? What's your thoughts on that?

24 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't -- I don't recall the specific  
25 decisionmaking process to get from the first draft to the final  
26 printed copy of the manuscript.

1 Eric May: Okay.

2 Jeffrey Gleason: There's a lot of iterations, both co-authors --  
3 it might have been during the internal review process. It may have  
4 been during the second level, friendly review process, or the editor  
5 and/or the peer reviewers may have asked us to remove a lot of that  
6 information. Like I don't recall specifics relative to that.

7 Eric May: Okay. And then lastly, the same peer reviewer from  
8 Polar Biology stated in one of his critiques, quote, "This should be"  
9 -- talking about the manuscript -- "This should be revised to give a  
10 better flow. While the observations, themselves, are important, I  
11 strongly caution the authors about extrapolation and suggesting that a  
12 number of bears probably drowned. The data do not support it."

13 Okay. Dr. Monnett responds, -- all right. Dr. Monnett responds,  
14 "Reviewer asserts that the circumstances surrounding the deaths are  
15 unknown. We acknowledge that and there are no witnesses -- there were  
16 no witnesses. However, the circumstances are compelling and the  
17 conclusion seems rather obvious. Lots of bears were swimming far  
18 offshore, a storm and high winds developed and subsequently bears were  
19 seen floating dead.

20 "This conclusion seems especially compelling, given the fact that  
21 the area has been regularly and thoroughly surveyed each September for  
22 nearly three decades by MMS and other companies and agencies and few  
23 swimming and no dead bears have been seen."

24 He goes on to say, "We believe that our conclusion that many of  
25 the swimming bears probably drowned as a result of rough seas was  
26 understated. We didn't say 30, as the ratio suggests, but

1 deliberately chose to be understated because of the potential  
2 importance of these data to NGO's involved in the debate about the  
3 climate change and associated fund-raising."

4 Do you recall seeing that statement?

5 Jeffrey Gleason: (No verbal response.)

6 Eric May: In your opinion, what did Dr. Monnett mean --

7 John Meskel: Can you answer verbally, sir.

8 Jeffrey Gleason: I'm sorry.

9 Eric May: Oh, I'm sorry.

10 Jeffrey Gleason: I have no recollection of that particular  
11 statement in response to one of the reviewers.

12 Eric May: Okay.

13 Jeffrey Gleason: Like I said, typically, if you're a co-author  
14 on a paper it is the primary author's -- typically the primary  
15 author's responsibility to address comments received from reviewers  
16 via the journal.

17 There may be opportunity for divvying out the task load if there  
18 are a lot of revisions, as we call them, to a manuscript. For  
19 instance, if you have to reanalyze the data. A specific individual  
20 might be -- have specific skill sets, so they would -- the primary  
21 author might divvy out questions related to that piece of information  
22 to that individual.

23 But, in this case, I don't recall my overall involvement with  
24 addressing the peer review comments.

25 Eric May: Okay.

26 John Meskel: Do you remember anything about it?

1 Jeffrey Gleason: Other than I had -- I had some level of  
2 involvement but, again, the primary author has the primary  
3 responsibility to deal with these. I may have gotten a copy of Dr.  
4 Monnett's comments to the reviewers. I don't recall my level of  
5 involvement with that process.

6 John Meskel: Okay.

7 Eric May: In your opinion, what did Dr. Monnett mean when he  
8 made the statement about deliberately understating the numbers for  
9 NGO's involved in the debate about the climate change and the  
10 associated --

11 Jeffrey Ruch: How would Dr. Gleason know what Dr. Monnett meant?  
12 The question needs to be directed to Dr. Monnett, and you have and he  
13 --

14 Eric May: Dr. Gleason's an author of this manuscript that Dr.  
15 Monnett was responding about the content.

16 Jeffrey Ruch: What's in his colleague's mind, is this another  
17 frame of mind question?

18 Eric May: Do you want to answer that question?

19 Jeffrey Gleason: It isn't clear to me what -- what the -- how to  
20 interpret that sort of response to that question. I don't have a  
21 frame of reference, to be honest, to actually respond in a reasonable  
22 manner. I -- I don't know. I simply don't.

23 Eric May: Okay. Is there a difference between the term "global  
24 warming" and "climate change"?

25 Jeffrey Gleason: I believe there is a difference in the  
26 interpretation. I think, in -- from a scientific perspective we talk

1 about "climate change," whereas the media and others tend to go down  
2 the "global warming" path, and I think it's interpretation.

3 Climate change -- obviously the climate simply changes all the  
4 time. The "climate change" is, I think, more of a scientific frame of  
5 reference whereas, again, "global warming" is more of a media or --  
6 it's much different.

7 Eric May: But using the term "global warming," do you -- it's  
8 not derogatory?

9 Jeffrey Gleason: No. But it --

10 Jeffrey Ruch: Derogatory to the climate?

11 Jeffrey Gleason: I think, in my opinion, it suggests a  
12 particular point of view, a strong point of view one way versus  
13 "climate change" is, I would say, more objective in the connotation  
14 associated with each of those terms. I think "global warming" has the  
15 connotation or agenda, whereas climate change is more relevant to  
16 discussions of science and data.

17 Eric May: And my last question to you, during the Paul Stang,  
18 Cleve Cowles --

19 Jeffrey Gleason: Cowles, yes.

20 Eric May: -- and John Gall --

21 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

22 Eric May: They reviewed the manuscript. Do you recall any  
23 discussion about the numbers and the ratios with them?

24 Jeffrey Gleason: It's been a long time since -- obviously, since  
25 this paper came about. I think there was a meeting, if I recall  
26 correctly, sometime after the marine mammal conference and the Marine

1 Mammal Conference in San Diego, California, was in December of 2005.

2 I believe soon thereafter a Wall Street Journal article came out.

3 There was a meeting with myself, Paul Stang, Cleve Cowles and John  
4 Gall sometime in that time frame there, almost immediately thereafter.

5 I don't recall --

6 Jeffrey Ruch: But that was after the paper came out.

7 Jeffrey Gleason: That was after the poster came out. And the  
8 poster, I think, as I previously stated in my first interview, seemed  
9 to create more of a stir than the paper. And the poster was reviewed  
10 internally and signed off on, but I think there was -- the media  
11 picked up on the poster at the Marine Mammal Conference.

12 I wasn't there. I wasn't present at the Marine Mammal  
13 Conference. Dr. Monnett was presenting that -- that poster. But,  
14 yes, there was a meeting, and there were discussions about the  
15 extrapolations.

16 Now, I think in the paper we talk about -- in the extrapolations  
17 we cite, "Only a small total number of bears was seen on roughly,  
18 approximately 14,000 kilometers of transects surveyed in 2004, thus  
19 limiting our ability to provide accurate estimates of polar bear  
20 mortality and associated confidence in (inaudible.)

21 And this sort of gets out one of the points you were making about  
22 acknowledging limitations of the data. And we do that, and that's  
23 page 685 in the first main paragraph where we talk about these  
24 extrapolations, and we cite -- it says, "See McDonald, et al., 1999  
25 and Evans, et al., 2003."

26 And both of those papers refer about survey methodology and

1 further limitations and constraints, given -- given the survey  
2 methodology. So we -- I think there are a couple of -- I think there  
3 are other places where there's some acknowledgement of the data  
4 limitations.

5 So -- but yes, I do -- there was a meeting -- to get back to your  
6 question. There was a meeting to discuss these numbers and, again,  
7 this extrapolation and the ratio estimators we used are pretty  
8 straightforward in that -- and I don't know if we've cited it in this  
9 paper or not. Let's see.

10 There are a couple other related papers that talk about this sort  
11 of extrapolation, and it is -- when it comes to surveys it is a fairly  
12 standard -- or standardized approach. You consider the width or the  
13 strip width of the transect, how far you can see either side.

14 Eric May: Right.

15 Jeffrey Gleason: And then, from that, given the number of  
16 individuals you observed, you can sort of extrapolate. And that's the  
17 ratio estimator that we provided.

18 Eric May: Because three of the observations were made on the one  
19 transect --

20 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

21 Eric May: -- and that's why there's three plus one?

22 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

23 Eric May: Okay. But there was no discussion with your  
24 supervisors about deliberately understating numbers for a specific  
25 purpose?

26 Jeffrey Gleason: No, not that I'm aware of. I mean, I don't



1 think there is a -- I think John had the biggest -- John Gall had the  
2 biggest heartburn over the extrapolations. Cleve recognized the  
3 limitations of the data. I mean, he's a scientist. And John Gall and  
4 Paul were, you know, administrators.

5 So, I provided -- I think if you went back through the emails, I  
6 provided both Paul and John an email that had specific points about  
7 numbers relative to -- and I think as relative to the poster which  
8 later a lot of the data from the poster ended up in the paper.

9 So, I think if you went back through -- and I don't have that  
10 information handy, but I think if you went back through the email  
11 records you would find that I clearly laid out what the numbers sort  
12 of mean relative to the overall interpretation.

13 Eric May: But understating numbers for the purpose of fund-  
14 raising, is that good science?

15 Jeffrey Gleason: Well, we -- let me -- again, let me be clear.  
16 As a wildlife biologist for this agency, when I was in Alaska and here  
17 as well, I do not receive funding to do independent research.

18 Jeffrey Ruch: Right.

19 Jeffrey Gleason: Period. The funding, as you are probably  
20 aware, we do work closely with outside entities to conduct research in  
21 that there's an internal funding process that gets ranked regionally  
22 against other potential studies for funding, and it gets ranked  
23 nationally among the offices within the agency to conduct research.

24 This was outside that framework, and we have not received -- we  
25 did not receive funding to do this sort of study independently. It  
26 was under the umbrella of the BWASP annual survey. And we have not

1 received any financial dispensation from any NGO's.

2 We have not been contacted by Al Gore or anybody related to the  
3 movie, "The Inconvenient Truth." This was simply observations of dead  
4 polar bears. And at that point in time, given the data, the  
5 information we had in-hand at that time, we had no information to  
6 suggest that there were ever any drowned polar bears observed.

7 John Meskel: All right. I wanted to transition to another  
8 topic. If you remember the last time we met with you here and we  
9 interviewed you, I believe you referred to the fact that you had some  
10 documentation during the interview and after we wrapped up the formal  
11 interview you agreed to get that for us, and you did.

12 There was a lot of documents, if I remember right in that. One  
13 of them was this sheet. Do you recall seeing that, or do you know  
14 what that is?

15 Jeffrey Gleason: 2/14/06. (Reading silently from document.)

16 Yes. It's basically a -- some sort of cover sheet relative to  
17 either the poster or the paper. I'm not certain, and it -- to be  
18 clear, we did, during my time in Alaska, we prepared two separate  
19 posters.

20 One was to the Marine Mammal Conference in San Diego in December  
21 of '05, I believe. The second was the Wildlife Society meeting in  
22 Anchorage, Alaska, which occurred -- the actual meeting was in  
23 September of 2006, I believe.

24 Now, I'm not sure this cover that is a scanned -- or a photocopy,  
25 I'm not sure, whether this is in reference to one of the posters or  
26 the paper.

1 John Meskel: Okay.

2 Jeffrey Gleason: Because there's -- it's not a -- I mean, it's  
3 not attached to a specific document. And, like I said, there were at  
4 least those two posters and the one paper. And since that time I've  
5 co-authored or authored two other polar bear papers after the fact.

6 But specifically, I don't know -- I'm not sure whose handwriting  
7 that is. It may be Cleve's and, like I said, I'm not certain which  
8 sort of -- which one of the posters or the paper this one goes to.

9 John Meskel: Okay.

10 Jeffrey Gleason: And certainly, as a follow-up, we -- we could  
11 have addressed these issues before it actually went to the public. I  
12 think you should have additional information. I don't know whether  
13 this was loose or whether it was associated with one of those  
14 documents.

15 That form, that 1382, or whatever it is, this should have been --  
16 I think originally either stapled to or paper-clipped to, or  
17 something, of one of those forms, and that should -- it will tell you  
18 which document this is in reference to.

19 John Meskel: Right. And I believe --

20 Jeffrey Gleason: I'm not certain which one it is but, yes.

21 John Meskel: Well, let's just talk about this a little bit. So  
22 it appears to be some type of a routing slip or a cover slip--

23 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

24 John Meskel: -- that went on --

25 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

26 John Meskel: -- one of these papers that were submitted. What

1 is the date on it?

2 Jeffrey Gleason: 2/14/06.

3 John Meskel: Okay. And these series of initials here, can you  
4 tell us who these people were that signed off on it?

5 Jeffrey Gleason: RD is the regional director. John Gall is  
6 initialled. PAO, I'm not -- PIO, I'm -- let's see. I'm not sure who  
7 those initials are.

8 John Meskel: But the offices of the PAO and PIO signed off?

9 Jeffrey Gleason: They initialled it.

10 John Meskel: Or it appears to be --

11 Jeffrey Gleason: Correct.

12 John Meskel: -- they initialled it?

13 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

14 John Meskel: All right. And the RSLE?

15 Jeffrey Gleason: Regional supervisor of leasing and environment,  
16 which would have been Paul Stang.

17 John Meskel: Okay. Right. And could you read off the comments  
18 for us there?

19 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes, certainly. Comment one, "See my comments  
20 on sea ice. Statement is not supported in the abstract."

21 General point number two, a general comment, "Are there enough  
22 data to make these statements? Was survey protocol the same through  
23 all" -- excuse me -- "26 years? This translates into approximately 12  
24 sightings per year."

25 Point three, "We will also need to see the poster when in draft.

26 Point four, "Paul, to avoid confusion, please mark supervisors

1 rather than RD box."

2 Presumably this was in reference to the abstract I submitted for  
3 the Wildlife Society meeting that was held in Anchorage, Alaska in  
4 September of 2006. I'm -- given the time line. So, it should be  
5 relative to that poster.

6 John Meskel: Okay.

7 Jeffrey Gleason: Yes.

8 John Meskel: Do you know if there were any written responses  
9 made to these questions or comments?

10 Jeffrey Gleason: I can -- I can certainly look in my files about  
11 drafts, the various iterations of the abstracts and, like I said, I  
12 think you guys received a copy of the form which was later signed,  
13 specific to this poster.

14 John Meskel: Okay.

15 Jeffrey Gleason: You guys should have --

16 John Meskel: And that would be the official approval form?

17 Jeffrey Gleason: Right. Correct.

18 John Meskel: Yes.

19 Jeffrey Gleason: The official approval form. And again, I think  
20 it's MMS 1328 or 1382 or -- it's a specific form, and I think I  
21 provided each one of those for each of the posters and the paper the  
22 last time you guys were here.

23 John Meskel: Yes.

24 Jeffrey Gleason: But I -- whether or not I have every iteration  
25 of the abstract, I'm not sure. I know there -- and I think that  
26 actually this poster, I believe, is on the agency website. So -- but,

1 again, this was -- this was not a publication, so there was no outside  
2 peer review process.

3 The process here was basically my supervisor, the co-authors, and  
4 I think Cleve Cowles, my supervisor at the time was co-author on this  
5 poster, the regional supervisor, Paul Stang, and John Gall. And there  
6 -- the public affairs may have reviewed it, you know, that sort of  
7 thing, but --

8 John Meskel: Yes.

9 Jeffrey Gleason: -- it wouldn't have went outside to through a  
10 peer review process.

11 That being said, it gets peer-edited, and actually gets selected  
12 by the program committee for that conference. So, they could have  
13 rejected it if they felt it wasn't -- you know, it didn't meet the  
14 criteria, it wasn't worthy, et cetera. And sometimes they may submit  
15 edits to the abstract back so you can get that taken care of.

16 But, I don't know if I have all the records of iterations of the  
17 abstract. I've got -- obviously, I have the final version of the  
18 poster and I think I provided a copy of that as well the last time.

19 John Meskel: Right.

20 Jeffrey Gleason: But I think this is in reference to the poster,  
21 given the date.

22 John Meskel: Okay. Could you respond to that comment that he  
23 made there, the question on number two?

24 Jeffrey Gleason: "Are there enough data to make these  
25 statements?" I don't know what "these statements" are in reference  
26 to. Again, I think if -- and again, it's been so long and I -- we

1 worked on a number of these in various iterations. There may have  
2 been -- the meeting that I was talking about, I believe, was  
3 associated with the Marine Mammal Conference poster, but there may  
4 have been an additional meeting or an email to address these very  
5 issues about the numbers.

6 John Meskel: Okay.

7 Jeffrey Gleason: And I may have a copy of that. You guys  
8 probably already have that somewhere, but it will tell -- it addresses  
9 these concerns.

10 John Meskel: Okay. All right. Do you remember, after our last  
11 interview, getting those documents?

12 Jeffrey Gleason: I do.

13 John Meskel: And us asking for copies of certain ones, including  
14 this one?

15 Jeffrey Gleason: I do.

16 John Meskel: If I recall correctly, I asked you to copy a number  
17 of documents, including this one. You went and copied them, came back  
18 and provided us the documents.

19 Jeffrey Gleason: Right.

20 John Meskel: This particular page was not in the ones that you  
21 gave us back as -- with the copies. Do you remember what happened in  
22 regard to that particular cover sheet?

23 Jeffrey Gleason: I think I later found it. I remember -- there  
24 was some --

25 John Meskel: All right. Let me help you out here. Then, let me  
26 just ask you, after I tell you what we recall or we think we recall,

1 get your response to that, all right, try to simplify it.

2 From our recollection, you went to the copy machine. You made  
3 copies. You came back. You gave us the copies. I thumbed through  
4 them quickly, did not see this particular sheet, which I had observed  
5 before and thought it looked like it might be relevant.

6 I asked you about it. It wasn't in the copies. It didn't appear  
7 to be in the originals anymore, either. Do you remember that?

8 Jeffrey Gleason: I do.

9 John Meskel: Okay. Do you remember what you said about it at  
10 the time, if anything, what had happened to it?

11 Jeffrey Gleason: I don't recall my particular explanation. If  
12 you're inferring intent to deceive, I will emphatically state that is  
13 not the case.

14 John Meskel: Okay.

15 Jeffrey Gleason: I believe sometime later I was able to produce  
16 that copy. Now --

17 Jeffrey Ruch: And to be clear, are we talking about this 2/14/06  
18 routing slip?

19 Jeffrey Gleason: No. Well, yes, that's what we're referring to.

20 Jeffrey Ruch: Routing slips?

21 Jeffrey Gleason: I was, at the time, attempting to package  
22 materials after the first interview, specific to each one of the  
23 posters and the paper, the actual sign-off form, as well as all the  
24 drafts, as well as this was attached to -- I believe it's the poster.

25 It was like paper-clipped to it, and when I -- I don't know what  
26 happened, whether it got lost in the shuffle of all that paperwork or



1 ended up falling under the photocopier, but I was having a hard time  
2 producing this little -- and it was basically a slip of paper. It  
3 shows the edges of this document when I -- when it's been reproduced.

4 But there absolutely, emphatically, was no intent to deceive the  
5 agents in this investigation. I provided them with a significant  
6 amount of information during the first interview, upon the request. I  
7 had virtually all the forms, the sign-off forms, originals, and as  
8 well, and follow-up emails.

9 I provided Special Agent May with contact information for a  
10 number of individuals as well as about 20 links to various  
11 publications, sort of addressing the overall hypotheses, so to speak,  
12 about the potential effects of changing climate on ringed seals, polar  
13 bears and other species.

14 Obviously, that doesn't fit this sort of line of rationale that I  
15 may have been intentionally deceiving the agents. That was simply not  
16 the case. So, if --

17 Jeffrey Ruch: Is that where the agents are going?

18 Jeffrey Gleason: If that is the angle, that is not the case.

19 John Meskel: Okay. From what I recall, we -- after we looked at  
20 this, didn't see this. You and I went back to the copy machine and we  
21 looked for the page there. It wasn't on the copy machine. It wasn't  
22 on the floor. We looked in the trash can, I think, there, couldn't  
23 find it.

24 And you went, I believe, elsewhere to try to see if you could  
25 find it, and if I remember right, Agent May actually found the slip in  
26 a trash can outside of the coffee machine. Do you know how it got

1 there and what happened there?

2 Jeffrey Gleason: This was, again, I was -- I think this might  
3 have been attached via paper clip or stapled. So I had a pile of  
4 documents that I was feeding sort of independently through and this  
5 little piece of paper may have ended up in that location.

6 There was no intent. I did not place a cover slip in the garbage  
7 to deceive the agents at the time. Absolutely did not do that.

8 John Meskel: Okay. In retrospect is there anything here that  
9 you wouldn't be comfortable with us seeing or --

10 Jeffrey Gleason: Absolutely not.

11 John Meskel: -- do you think there's any issue with --

12 Jeffrey Gleason: No. Absolutely not.

13 John Meskel: Okay.

14 Jeffrey Gleason: As I stated earlier about this cover slip,  
15 there are some points that the reviewer has about -- I assume the  
16 abstract. You know, he has some general questions about the poster in  
17 itself, and it might have been an early draft.

18 I don't recall, but I'm fairly certain that each one of these  
19 points was addressed between the time of this document, which was  
20 February 14th, '06, and the time the -- again, I assume this is  
21 related to that poster that was presented in September of 2006.

22 I can't be certain because of the overlap of the December '05, I  
23 think the call for papers for the TWS meeting in Anchorage, probably  
24 January, February or March, for the September meeting, well in  
25 advance.

26 So, I'm not certain which this belongs to. But I'm fairly

1 positive that it's the TWS poster, and this was probably a very early  
2 version. And I'm fairly certain that if you go back through the email  
3 records, I probably formally responded in an email with Cleve, Paul,  
4 John and probably Dr. Monnett, relative to these comments and the  
5 numbers and what they mean.

6 And I think you guys have a copy of that poster and --

7 John Meskel: We do.

8 Jeffrey Gleason: -- it's still provided, I think, on their  
9 website. I don't -- I don't think there's any -- there were no dead  
10 polar bears, I don't believe, discussed in that -- in that second  
11 poster. It was more about change in sea ice information and  
12 distribution of polar bears over the term of the survey.

13 John Meskel: Okay.

14 Jeffrey Gleason: So it -- it's sort of a different -- different  
15 issue than -- compared to the previous poster and the papers about the  
16 dead polar bears and the wind event. This is about sort of changing  
17 distribution -- changes in the sea ice as well as change in  
18 distribution over time of polar bears, both inshore, offshore, east or  
19 west.

20 John Meskel: Do you know whose handwriting this is, who these  
21 comments were written by?

22 Jeffrey Gleason: I -- I can't be certain. Those may have been  
23 Cleve's comments, but I -- I can't be certain because it says, "Please  
24 return to Chief, ESS." This may -- from ESS, so presumably -- and I'm  
25 assuming here that these comments were from my supervisor, Dr. Cleve  
26 Cowles. It's been a while since I've seen his handwriting, so --

1 John Meskel: Okay.

2 Jeffrey Gleason: -- but I'm pretty certain.

3 John Meskel: All right. Where he asks here, "Was the survey  
4 protocol the same through the 26 years?" and in parentheses,  
5 "(especially as regards to polar bears)."

6 Do you know what protocol, in particular, he might be referring  
7 to?

8 Jeffrey Gleason: I'm not sure what protocol, how to define  
9 "protocol" in this case. I think he's talking about the survey  
10 itself, but -- and whether or not there was some sort of difference in  
11 emphasis, deemphasis on that sort of thing.

12 John Meskel: Yes.

13 Jeffrey Gleason: I have no -- I wasn't associated with the  
14 survey in the early years.

15 John Meskel: Okay.

16 Jeffrey Gleason: I know -- I mean, the survey itself, the BWASP  
17 software was designed specifically to collect information about  
18 bowhead whales. That being said, given the duration of the survey and  
19 the spatial extent of the survey, it also provides some pretty decent  
20 information about other species.

21 Now, that being said, again, interpretation of the data, there  
22 has to be some -- you know, recognition that, you know, the number of  
23 ringed seals or spotted seals, for example, a detection probability.  
24 And I -- I think I touched on much of that in the first interview,  
25 differences in detection probability given sea states.

26 And so I -- he's sort of broadly touched on some points here that

1 I think were probably addressed in the poster.

2 John Meskel: Okay.

3 Jeffrey Gleason: And there -- again, sort of broad survey-  
4 related issues.

5 John Meskel: But you don't recall how it wound up in the trash?

6 Jeffrey Gleason: No, sir.

7 John Meskel: All right.

8 Jeffrey Gleason: There was no intent on my part to deceive the  
9 agents relative to this document.

10 John Meskel: Okay.

11 Jeffrey Ruch: And we know this was in the trash because of Agent  
12 May, is that correct?

13 Eric May: That's correct.

14 Jeffrey Ruch: Thank you.

15 Eric May: Why don't I --

16 Jeffrey Ruch: That's the basis of the criminal referral on Dr.  
17 Gleason?

18 Eric May: One last email I want to go over with you.

19 Jeffrey Ruch: Misplaced routing slip?

20 Eric May: No. This is the --

21 Jeffrey Ruch: A poster that doesn't have anything to do with the  
22 paper?

23 Eric May: It's from Dr. Monnett to you, and Dr. Monnett --to  
24 you. In the email it's dated October 25th, 2005, and it says, "Give  
25 me a break." But it started the chain from WWF, World Wildlife  
26 Foundation, or Federation.

1 And it's from Julia Woolford (phonetic) from that organization,  
2 and she forwarded this -- or she wrote this to Dr. Ian Stirling, and  
3 then forwarded it to Dr. Monnett who ultimately forwarded it to you.

4 And the start of the email says, "Dear Ian and (inaudible). Once  
5 again, sorry to bother you for more information at short notice. The  
6 interest from WWFUK in fund-raising for Arctic conservation has  
7 increased and we have been inundated with copy which needs clearance  
8 for possible fund-raising activities.

9 "One treatment that they seem keen on is the idea of more polar  
10 bears drowning as a result of climate change and melting ice. They  
11 sent me the attached note. I'd seen this press coverage, but didn't  
12 pay it too much attention as I assumed that it was probably not  
13 scientifically verifiable.

14 "However, it looks like we need a view on this so we could avoid  
15 any potentially ill-advised fund-raising attempts by colleagues. The  
16 other treatment they are considering revolves more simply around polar  
17 bears disappearing before the end of the century as a result of  
18 disappearing sea ice.

19 "What they want to know is what is likely to happen to the bears.  
20 Will they simply become extinct, will they interbreed with brown  
21 bears? What might happen? Will be a regional extinction," -- et  
22 cetera.

23 So, Dr. Ian wrote to Dr. Monnett, "Hi, Chuck. Nice to see you in  
24 (inaudible) the other day briefly. The enclosed is self-explanatory.  
25 It looks pretty sensational. List it to me, but since you are the  
26 only one with real information on this, would you mind giving a brief

1 assessment to Woolford."

2 And then Dr. Monnett forwarded to you and Dr. Monnett says, "Give  
3 me a break." Do you recall receiving this email, by chance?

4 Jeffrey Gleason: I've -- obviously, I did receive it. I don't  
5 recall receiving it and I obviously, with Dr. Monnett's response, he  
6 probably didn't either respond to it. I don't imagine that he would  
7 have responded to it, either.

8 I don't know that as a fact, but I can't imagine that, given his  
9 response there, "Give me a break," that he would have responded. You  
10 know, I -- in the first interview I had mentioned that about the time  
11 the first poster came out, it became -- it got to the point where we  
12 could not, as scientists, contact scientists or biologists in the  
13 sister agencies.

14 So, it got sort of weird. We were told, "You will not talk about  
15 polar bears, sea ice, climate change or any of those issues to  
16 anybody." And that included other scientists and other agencies. At  
17 the same time, obviously we had requests for information, those sorts  
18 of requests, you know.

19 But it was sort of a weird time to be a biologist/scientist in  
20 the agency at the time, and it was one of the reasons, probably the  
21 primary reason that I left the agency up there because of this sort  
22 of, "You will not" -- which was a little disconcerting, given what was  
23 going on.

24 But, yes -- so, I -- I probably received multiple forwards that  
25 Chuck would get regarding the requests, and I -- obviously I wouldn't  
26 have responded to the request outside of Chuck. I mean, Dr. Monnett.

1 Sorry.

2 So, -- and "Give me a break," pretty much, I think, solidifies  
3 his opinion of that request as well.

4 John Meskel: Do you have anything?

5 Eric May: Would you be willing to take a polygraph of anything  
6 we talked about today, the routing slip, information you told me?

7 Jeffrey Ruch: Why don't we talk about that and get back to you.  
8 We'll take a polygraph if Agent May will. How's that?

9 Eric May: Fine.

10 All right. That concludes our interview.

11 Jeffrey Ruch: Just wait a second here. Now, we've been through  
12 several hours of this. There's been a criminal referral made by your  
13 office against Dr. Gleason and I guess I demand to know what was the  
14 basis of the criminal referral.

15 Eric May: And my answer is the same as I told you at the  
16 beginning of the interview.

17 Jeffrey Ruch: Which is? I didn't ask you at the beginning of  
18 the interview.

19 Eric May: You asked about the interview and the authority of  
20 what -- what we're talking about and the --

21 Jeffrey Ruch: No. I --

22 Eric May: -- we did at the first two or three --

23 Jeffrey Ruch: Are you refusing to say what the basis of the  
24 criminal referral was? Because it is completely unclear from now,  
25 almost five hours of questioning where in the hell you're going with  
26 this.



1 Eric May: And my answer will be the same as I told you before.

2 Jeffrey Ruch: Okay. Now, this has been going on since March  
3 2010, this investigation. Are you still in the early phase of the  
4 investigation? Are you at the mid-point? Are you about to wrap this  
5 up?

6 Eric May: I'm not at liberty to tell you.

7 Jeffrey Ruch: All right. Is there any additional material you  
8 want from Dr. Gleason?

9 Eric May: No. Anything else?

10 Jeffrey Ruch: No. That's it.

11 Eric May: Okay. It's 10:45, and this interview is concluded.

12 (Whereupon, the interview was concluded at 10:45 a.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

C E R T I F I C A T E

MATTER: Interview of Jeffrey Gleason

DATE: 10-26-11

I hereby certify that the attached transcription of pages 1 to 65 inclusive are to the best of my belief and ability a true, accurate, and complete record of the above referenced proceedings as contained on the provided audio recording.

*Neal R Gross*

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701