



Investigative Report of Failure to Disclose Employment at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Date Posted to Web: June 7, 2016

This is a version of the report prepared for public release.

SYNOPSIS

In March 2014, this office gained information from a DOI-OIG investigation that Stephen M. Barton, Chief, Administration and Information Management, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration (WSFR), served as treasurer for the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) from around 2004 to early 2014, while also serving as a FWS employee between September 2007 to the present. The same investigation revealed that FWS had awarded WAFWA around \$3 million in grants and cooperative agreements.

The OIG sought to determine whether Barton properly disclosed any income he received from WAFWA, the extent of his involvement with WAFWA, and whether his involvement with WAFWA had created any conflicts of interest with his FWS position.

This investigation determined that Barton signed an employment agreement, effective August 2007, to serve as a treasurer for WAFWA through July 2014. In December 2010, Barton signed a Request for Ethics Approval to Engage in Outside Work Form, in which he stated he was receiving no salary or compensation from his WAFWA position and that he was working around 10 hours per week for WAFWA.

This investigation determined that Barton received income from WAFWA each year between 2008 and 2014, with the largest amount being \$109,242.74 in 2013. Records revealed that Barton did not disclose his WAFWA position or salary in any of the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) financial disclosure reports that he submitted to FWS in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015. According to WAFWA records, Barton was paid a total of \$377,363.18 between 2008 and 2014.

This investigation determined that Barton acted as the subject matter expert on audit requirements at WAFWA, that he was involved in developing a WAFWA request for proposal for audit services, that he was involved with discussing a waiver of an audit requirement for WAFWA while in his FWS position, and that he was ultimately responsible in his FWS position for corrective action in response to audit findings related to WAFWA.

During our investigation, we also reviewed Barton's travel records which indicated that, between fiscal years 2011 and 2015, Barton had over 100 flights at Government expense to or from Boise, ID, where he resided with his spouse even though he was assigned to the Washington, DC area. FWS travel voucher documents and data indicated that the total cost to the Government for all of the vouchers that included Barton's Idaho travel was approximately \$96,087. A comparison of FWS travel records and FWS payroll records revealed several instances during 2014 in which Barton was in Boise on the weekend and received per diem while not working any hours for FWS.

During his interview, Barton admitted to using a Government office phone, cellular phone, and email account, along with Government office space, to perform WAFWA business. He admitted to receiving payment from WAFWA for FWS work while attending WAFWA conferences, and to signing Federal grant applications on behalf of WAFWA using the name of another WAFWA officer. He also admitted that his FWS job and WAFWA job had sometimes merged together. Barton also explained that since 2008 or 2009, he traveled home to Boise, Idaho, for weekends

per a verbal agreement he had with Hannibal Bolton, Assistant Director, FWS-WSFR.

BACKGROUND

Relevant Federal Laws

- 18 U.S. Code § 205: Activities of officers and employees in claims against and other matters affecting the Government.
- 18 U.S. Code § 209: It is a violation to receive any salary, or any contribution to or supplementation of salary, as compensation for his services as an officer or employee of the executive branch of the U.S. Government, from any source other than the Government of the United States.
- 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a): It is a violation of law to knowingly and willfully conceal or cover up a material fact, or to make false statements, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the Government.

Relevant Federal Regulations

- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.101(b)(8): “Employees shall act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual.”
- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.101(b)(9): “Employees shall protect and conserve Federal property and shall not use it for other than authorized activities.”
- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.101(b)(10): “Employees shall not engage in outside employment or activities, including seeking or negotiating for employment, that conflict with official Government duties and responsibilities.”
- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.101(b)(14): “Employees shall endeavor to avoid any actions creating the appearance that they are violating the law or the ethical standards set forth in” the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch.
- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502(a): “Where an employee knows ... that a person with whom he has a covered relationship is ... a party to [a particular] matter, and where the employee determines that the circumstances would cause a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts to question his impartiality in the matter, the employee should not participate in the matter unless he has ... received authorization.” An employee has a “covered relationship” with “[a]ny person for whom the employee has, within the last year, served as officer, director, trustee, general partner, agent, attorney, consultant, contractor or employee.” 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502(b)(1)(iv).
- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.702: “An employee shall not use his public office for his own private gain, ... or for the private gain of friends, relatives, or persons with whom the employee is affiliated in a nongovernmental capacity, including nonprofit organizations of which

the employee is an officer or member.”

- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.702(a): “An employee shall not use or permit the use of his Government position or title or any authority associated with his public office in a manner that is intended to coerce or induce another person, including a subordinate, to provide any benefit, financial or otherwise, to himself or to friends, relatives, or persons with whom the employee is affiliated in a nongovernmental capacity.”
- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.704(a): “An employee has a duty to protect and conserve Government property and shall not use such property, or allow its use, for other than authorized purposes.”
- 5 C.F.R. § 2635.705: “[A]n employee shall use official time in an honest effort to perform official duties.”

Prior Investigation – Interview of Barton

During an interview related to an earlier DOI-OIG investigation, Barton recollected that WAFWA’s executive secretary, a longtime personal associate of his, invited him to join WAFWA on a part-time basis. Barton said his role as WAFWA treasurer began in 2004, and that his workload gradually increased to a full-time position. Barton said he submitted his resignation to WAFWA around January 2014.

When asked if he had misused Government time and resources while working for WAFWA, Barton indicated that he had not. He claimed he had never worked for WAFWA during his scheduled FWS work hours. He remembered he once made a mistake of signing a document on behalf of WAFWA that resulted in a reprimand by the FWS Ethics Office.

In discussing the event involving the FWS Ethics Office, Barton recalled how he had signed a grant modification with FWS on behalf of WAFWA. Shortly afterwards, an FWS ethics official called Barton questioning his involvement, which culminated in him pledging to never endorse agreements for WAFWA.

Barton estimated he earned approximately \$50,000 a year during the 10-year period he worked for WAFWA. He disclosed that his hourly wage was \$50 per hour.

When asked if he reported any of the aforementioned earnings or compensation as required in the annual filing of the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) Form 450, he acknowledged he had not thought of reporting the WAFWA earnings. Barton conceded that he did not have a good reason for not reporting the WAFWA earnings to FWS.

Prior Investigation – Interview of WAFWA executive secretary and WAFWA finance official

During an interview related to the same earlier DOI-OIG investigation related to a separate issue, the WAFWA executive secretary estimated that Barton earned about \$70 per hour working for WAFWA.

The executive secretary expressed that WAFWA had sought to create a full time Chief Financial Officer (CFO) position for Barton. The executive secretary indicated WAFWA had assumed that Barton would accept a CFO position with WAFWA and leave FWS to work at WAFWA fulltime.

The executive secretary explained that the WAFWA committee produced a job package, which Barton rejected for several reasons including the salary offered. When asked the main reason Barton turned down WAFWA's job package, the executive secretary explained that Barton's request was much higher than the committee had offered.

The WAFWA treasurer/CFO and executive secretary indicated that they questioned Barton's work, especially the budget and financial reports that he conducted. The finance official asserted that Barton's hiring practices were questionable because he hired two people he had formerly worked with at the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. He also hired his daughter, who according to the finance official had no accounting experience. The finance official disclosed that she had been planning to terminate Barton's daughter from WAFWA due to the organization restructuring and her lack of required work experience.

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

This office gained information from a DOI-OIG investigation that Stephen M. Barton, Chief, Administration and Information Management, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration (WSFR), served as treasurer for the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) from around 2004 to early 2014, while also serving as a FWS employee. Barton entered Federal service in September, 2007.

Barton Neglected to Disclose Income Received from WAFWA

Records collected during a separate DOI-OIG investigation revealed a December 2010 memo from Barton to Hannibal Bolton, Assistant Director, FWS-WSFR, in which Barton acknowledged that serving as the treasurer of WAFWA potentially presented an actual or an appearance of a conflict of interest in accordance with 18 U.S.C. 208.

A subsequent December 2010 memo from Bolton to Barton summarized concerns related to Barton's position with WAFWA. In a DOI Request for Ethics Approval to Engage in Outside Work or Activity form, dated December 10, 2010, Barton certified the following:

- No salary or compensation from WAFWA.
- Around 10 hours per week of work for WAFWA.
- If there is a significant change in the nature or extent of my outside work or activity, or in my official duties with DOI, I will submit a revised request for approval to engage in outside work or activity.

A review of Office of Government Ethics (OGE) records submitted by Barton in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 revealed that Barton had not listed the WAFWA treasurer as an outside position and had not reported WAFWA as a source of outside income.

When questioned during his interview as to why he had neglected to report his WAFWA income on Office of Government Ethics (OGE) Form 450s for several years, Barton said it had been a situation in which he “didn’t have time.” Barton explained that, when it came time to report the income, he didn’t think about it because he had been far behind on other things.

When asked why he had not reported any outside income from WAFWA on his Request for Ethics Approval to Engage in Outside Work form, Barton said at the time it had been so “minor” and had seemed to be “insignificant.”

Barton Received Income from WAFWA Between 2008 and 2014

We served an OIG subpoena to WAFWA requesting various records, including all records related to either direct or indirect payments and/or gifts to Barton. In response, WAFWA provided the following:

- A document that appeared to be titled, Stephen Barton, 1099 pmts for professional svcs. The document revealed the following information.

Year	Total
2008	\$34,998.47
2009	\$41,966.74
2010	\$51,602.83
2011	\$56,361.48
2012	\$70,458.44
2013	\$109,242.74

- A document titled, Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statement 2014, which included the following information.

Employer
Western Association of Fish and
963 South Orchard St Suite D
Boise ID 83705

Employee
Stephen M Barton
[address]

Wages, tips, and other compensation
\$12,732.48

- A document titled, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, All transactions from all dates for Barton, Stephen M. The document listed transactions dated between January 12, 2007, and March 21, 2014.

In response to the subpoena, WAFWA also provided records related to invoices that had been

submitted to WAFWA by Barton. An analysis of these records, along with FWS payroll records, revealed that Barton reported working a total of between 80 and 108 hours per week during at least nine weeks in fiscal years 2012 and 2013:

<u>Week</u>	<u>WAFWA</u>	<u>FWS</u>
January 8, 2012:	27	58.5
July 15, 2012:	53.75	55
July 22, 2012:	48.25	36
September 30, 2012:	25.25	61.5
November 4, 2012:	24.75	67.25
August 4, 2013:	9.75	70.5
August 18, 2013:	46	55.5
September 1, 2013:	47.75	51
November 3, 2013:	50.75	53

When asked why he left WAFWA in 2014, Barton indicated that the work had been too much. Barton indicated that he had told WAFWA he would take a full-time job there if they paid him the same amount he had been making while working for FWS. Barton explained that WAFWA had said the amount he requested was more than they were willing to pay. Barton believed WAFWA had offered him \$135,000 per year and that he had been making \$155,000 working for FWS.

Use of Federal Property to Conduct WAFWA Business

In response to the subpoena, WAFWA also provided messages related to Barton, which were sent or received using an email account. The signature block of the sent messages often listed contact information, which generally included Barton's FWS office phone, mobile, and fax numbers.

When questioned during his interview as to why he had used his FWS office phone, FWS cellular phone, and FWS email account to conduct WAFWA business, Barton said he had done so "primarily out of convenience."

When asked why he had not instructed people to send messages to his Yahoo account instead of his FWS account, Barton said it had not seemed "material."

Barton explained that there had been times in which he had used his FWS office to conduct WAFWA business, such as participating in WAFWA conference calls. When asked how much time he would spend on WAFWA work while at his FWS office, Barton said it would vary between answering a quick question and being on a conference call. Barton explained that if someone related to WAFWA had called or sent an email, he would try to "turn it around" and be done with it.

Barton Signed WAFWA Grant Application Documents

In an email sent in June 2012, Barton issued instructions to WAFWA's executive secretary. In

the email, Barton wrote:

When dealing with grants (financial assistance) with the US Fish and Wildlife Service...I'd really appreciate it if, in the future, I "sign" documents using a signature "stamp" for [the executive secretary] or any other WAFWA officer, you do not include in emails that I "signed" the documents or had anything to do with their approval or submittal. Please keep that within the WAFWA family...

When questioned during his interview as to why he had signed FWS grant applications on behalf of WAFWA using the name of someone else, Barton said he had probably done so out of convenience.

Barton's Involvement in WAFWA's Audit Requirement under OMB Circular A-133

In response to the subpoena, WAFWA also provided messages sent or received by Barton's FWS email account. A review of the messages revealed an email sent in March 2012, in which Barton sent an attachment to WAFWA's grassland coordinator and a National Fish and Wildlife Foundation representative. The attachment was on WAFWA letterhead, which included Barton's name and position title of treasurer. In the letter, Barton wrote:

To Whom It May Concern...1. A-133 requirement. The Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies has not reached the \$500,000 federal funds threshold which requires an audit. 2. WAFWA has an Audit Committee, which reviews all accounting transactions, bank accounts and brokerage accounts throughout each year and conducts a final review at...each annual meeting.

On July 10, 2014, Barton sent an email to an FWS-WSFR division chief. In the message, which had a subject line of "WAFWA A-133 waiver request," Barton wrote:

Per our discussion yesterday, here's my explanation on how and why you can give WAFWA a waiver....The decision is yours, if you believe the circumstances warrant the waiver, the RD [Regional Director] (or you if that's in your delegated authority which [I] suspect it is) can approve their request.

OIG agents also obtained additional messages from FWS related to Barton's Government email account. The review revealed a July 23, 2014, email from Barton to a DOI attorney. The message, which had a subject line of "WAFWA exception request," included background information, applicable regulations, and related emails. In the message, Barton wrote:

Question: Can WSFR grant the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) a one-year exception from the audit requirement?...[an unknown party] requested input from DOI and the OIG. Both, as you would expect, said "No" to the waiver request.

During his interview, the division chief explained that he had asked Barton for feedback and said that Barton would have been considered the subject matter expert on this topic because of

Barton's official FWS duties.

When questioned as to whether it was weird when Barton's name came up when FWS was discussing an audit requirement related to WAFWA, the division chief indicated that he often wondered about the awkwardness of Barton serving as the WAFWA treasurer while being employed by FWS. The division chief indicated that audits were an aspect of the relationship between FWS and the grant recipients. He explained that dealing with the audit findings was not always pleasant, and that it would have been awkward to have "a foot in both worlds." The division chief indicated that he often thought of Barton's WAFWA position as a "strange relationship."

When asked if he had ever raised this concern to his chain of command, the division chief said yes, and explained that this took place during a verbal conversation. He indicated that everyone had been aware that Barton was the WAFWA treasurer and that more than one person had commented that it had to have been problematic.

The division chief indicated that FWS subsequently received audit results from WAFWA. He explained that, as had been expected, it had not been a very good audit.

When asked during his interview about WAFWA's requirement to have an A-133 audit done, Barton said he had advised the executive secretary that WAFWA needed such an audit shortly before leaving WAFWA. Barton explained that WAFWA had started doing a request for proposal (RFP) in preparation of hiring an audit firm. He said he had directed a WAFWA employee to draft the RFP.

When asked if he had sent the email to the division chief rendering advice and addressing regulations relating to the A-133 requirement and WAFWA, Barton answered in the affirmative.

Barton's Responsibility for Corrective Action Related to WAFWA Audit Findings

A review of WAFWA audit reports for 2012, 2013, and 2014, a time that Barton was the WAFWA treasurer, revealed that the audits identified a lack of segregation of duties, because the treasurer performed the recording, check signing, and approval of expenditures and depositing of funds. Additionally, the reports stated that there was no evidence of review of some of the expenditures.

Other findings of material weaknesses included that WAFWA had been late in its submission of data collection forms, and that WAFWA did not submit reports (*related to SF-425 and SF-PPR Reporting*) before the required deadlines. An audit report also identified account reconciliations and review as a material weakness, because multiple audit adjustments were necessary to correct the ending balances of certain accounts, and because account reconciliations and a detailed review were not performed in enough detail to ensure the accuracy of the ending balances.

In a September 2014 email from an FWS-WSFR administrator, wrote to Barton:

Recently, I received Single Audit reports that contain general findings – i.e., those that

cover multiple programs... We are currently approving/reviewing...for 2 reports...and WAFWA...In both situations, we are asking for more information to resolve the finding.

How do you want to deal with negotiating the corrective action?...

When questioned if his FWS job duties included taking corrective action in response to audit findings at grant recipient organizations such as WAFWA, Barton answered in the affirmative. He explained that the responsibility had fallen under an audit branch, which had fallen under him. Barton confirmed that he had been ultimately responsible.

Additional Use of Federal Property to Conduct WAFWA Business

The review of Barton's FWS email account also revealed around 100 additional email messages, sent or received between fiscal years 2012 and 2015, which reflected WAFWA related business.

In an October 2012 email, a grants management specialist at the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, wrote:

Attached is a copy of agreement 13-CO-11221632-007 for your review and signature....Once received in our office we will have the agreement signed on behalf of the U.S. Forest Service and return a fully executed scanned copy to your office for your records.

An attached document was titled, Collection Agreement between the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the USDA, Forest Service.

In a January 2013 email, Barton's FWS email address received a forwarded message from his WAFWA email address. The attached memo from the FWS administrative grants officer to Barton, had a subject line of Modification 0001 to Grant Award F12AP00799. In the memo, the administrative grants officer wrote:

A modification has been completed to your organization's Federal financial assistance award...The new total amount of funding is \$226,250.00 and an updated Scope of Work is attached.

In a July 16, 2013 email, Barton asked a Fish and Wildlife administrator a question related to WAFWA. Barton wrote:

Can you fill me in on the...FOI [Freedom of Information Act] request? Who requested, what and is it done?

On July 17, 2013, the administrator responded via email:

I've attached the request, but before we go any further, I want to let you know that [an unknown party] said in an email: "I have no plans to discuss with my supervisor since he is on the board." I was guessing that was you and wondered why a Federal employee

would be on the board of a States organization, but thought maybe it referred to the time frame requested (2008 – present) and that you may have had a role earlier.

On July 23, 2013, Barton forwarded the email and the attached document related to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to his personal email account.

While many of the WAFWA related email messages identified were received and not sent, the review did not reveal any instances between 2012 and 2015 in which Barton advised any of the senders to direct future messages to a private email address instead of a FWS email address.

Barton Received Salary from Both FWS and WAFWA for Attending WAFWA Conferences

An analysis of FWS travel records related to Barton and pages from a public WAFWA website¹ indicated that FWS paid Barton’s travel and lodging expenses related to several WAFWA conferences, including the following:

- 2011 Winter Meeting
- 2011 Summer Meeting
- 2012 Summer Meeting
- 2013 Winter Meeting
- 2013 Summer Meeting
- 2014 Winter Meeting

FWS payroll records revealed that Barton received regular pay, and sometimes earned compensatory time hours, during the date ranges associated with each WAFWA conference listed above. The payroll records did not reflect any leave taken by Barton during the date ranges of any of the conferences.

For example, records related to the 2012 WAFWA Summer Meeting in Hawaii, from July 20 to July 25, 2012, revealed that Barton reported the following hours to WAFWA and to FWS:

<u>Day</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>WAFWA</u>	<u>FWS</u>
Fri	July 20	8	8
Sat	July 21	15	8 (compensation time earned)
Sun	July 22	14	8 (compensation time earned)
Mon	July 23	12.75	8
Tue	July 24	12.5	8
Wed	July 25	9	8

During his interview, when asked if he had been paid by both FWS and WAFWA while attending the WAFWA conferences, Barton answered in the affirmative. When asked if WAFWA had paid him for the same work FWS had been paying him for while attending the WAFWA conferences, Barton said, “for part of the conference, yes.” When asked if this was the case at each WAFWA conference he had attended, Barton said, “yes.”

¹ <http://www.wafwa.org/>

When asked what a day's schedule would have been like when he worked 15 WAFWA hours and 8 FWS hours, Barton said the two jobs would have just been "merged together." When questioned how long such a schedule went on for, Barton explained that the schedule had gotten worse in 2012 and that it had become "impossible" in 2013.

Barton's FWS Travel to and from Boise, Idaho

A review of FWS travel records indicated that, between fiscal years 2011 and 2015, Barton had over 100 flights at Government expense to or from Boise, Idaho, where he resided with his spouse even though he was assigned to the Washington, DC area. FWS travel voucher documents and data indicated that the total cost to the Government for all of the vouchers that included Barton's Idaho travel was approximately \$96,087. A comparison of FWS travel records and FWS payroll records revealed several instances during 2014 in which Barton was in Boise on the weekend and received per diem while not working any hours for FWS.

During his interview, when questioned about his travel to Boise, Idaho, Barton explained that his wife was in Idaho. When asked if Hannibal Bolton, Assistant Director, FWS-WSFR, knew he had been traveling home to Boise for the weekends, Barton explained that he had asked Bolton if he could work from Boise, but Bolton had not approved of him working from there full-time. Barton indicated that Bolton had instead approved of him traveling home to Boise from time to time. When asked if the Government had paid for the flights to Boise, Barton said that most of the time the Government paid.

Barton said the agreement with Bolton had been in place since Bolton started around 2008 or 2009. When asked how often he teleworked from Boise, Barton explained that he teleworked most of the time to some degree, and that he probably had not claimed such time.

Additional Information

During his interview, Bolton explained that he had no knowledge of Barton receiving any compensation from WAFWA. When asked if Barton ever reported or mentioned receiving a salary from WAFWA, Bolton said no.

When asked if anyone ever questioned how Barton could attend WAFWA conferences as both a FWS employee and a WAFWA treasurer, Bolton said he thought nobody knew Barton held a position with WAFWA. Bolton indicated that he thought Barton resigned from WAFWA around the time in December 2010 when Barton submitted the form seeking approval to work for WAFWA.

Bolton indicated that Barton had an agreement in place to telework a couple of times per month from a home in Idaho. When asked if he approved Barton's time and attendance records and Barton's travel requests, Bolton answered in the affirmative.

During Barton's interview, when asked if it had been common knowledge at FWS that he had been working for WAFWA, Barton answered in the affirmative. When asked specifically if Bolton had known, Barton said, "yes." When asked how Bolton had known, Barton said they

would talk about it.

We questioned an FWS ethics official. During her interview, we asked if anyone within FWS thought it was a problem that Barton was serving as the treasurer for WAFWA while working for FWS. She said she thought the issues were more related to whether Barton was in compliance with an earlier approval he had received from Bolton to serve as the WAFWA treasurer.

She explained that a challenge they were faced with was that Bolton had provided an earlier approval to Barton to work for WAFWA. She said they were working off of information from the prior approval when the issue of Barton submitting a grant application came up.

When questioned if Barton or Bolton ever sought the advice of the FWS ethics office related to income Barton received from WAFWA, salary Barton received from both FWS and WAFWA to attend WAFWA conferences, salary negotiations Barton participated in when considering a post-employment position with WAFWA, or Barton's use of Government equipment and office space to perform WAFWA business, the ethics official said Barton and Bolton never came to her seeking guidance on such issues. She said she was not aware of Barton or Bolton seeking such guidance from the FWS ethics office, and she indicated that she probably would have heard something if Barton or Bolton had done so.

When asked if Bolton had been aware that Barton was serving as the WAFWA treasurer, she said that Bolton acknowledged the position when Bolton signed the related paperwork.

When questioned if the FWS ethics office ever responded to the fact that Barton was ultimately responsible for corrective action related to findings identified during audits of WAFWA, she indicated that such information was never brought to her attention.

After her interview, she provided a copy of a January 2009 agreement in which Bolton granted Barton approval to continue to work for WAFWA. She also provided a copy of a FWS financial assistance award document signed by Barton in January 2010.

SUBJECT

Stephen M. Barton
GS-15, Step 10,
Chief, Division of Administration and Information Management
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program

DISPOSITION

The U.S. Attorney's Offices for the Eastern District of Virginia and the District of Idaho declined this case for prosecution. We are providing this report to FWS for action deemed appropriate.