

Public Debriefing Concerning the Response, Rehabilitation and Release of Pilot Whales in the Florida Keys November 4, 2003- Marathon Government Center

I. Purpose of the Debriefing Meeting

The purpose of the meeting was to conduct a debriefing among volunteers, businesses, government agencies (federal, state, county), and Stranding Network members to discuss the response, rehabilitation and release of the pilot whales that stranded near the Content Keys on April 18, 2003. The meeting was open to the public. A professional facilitator helped the group identify the following: what went well, what needs improvement and what are specific steps for future mass strandings in the Keys.

More than fifty (50) stakeholders participated, including representatives from NOAA Fisheries, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS), Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Law Enforcement, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, County government, Marine Mammal Conservancy, Florida Keys Marine Mammal Rescue Team, Marine Animal Rescue Society, Marine Research Consultants, veterinarians, volunteers, media and private citizens, with the majority of attendees representing the volunteer/private citizen sector.

II. Meeting Process

The specific objectives of this meeting were to: (1) debrief and evaluate the response, rehabilitation and release of pilot whales, (2) receive input from stakeholders and the public on ways to improve for the future, (3) enhance relationships with partners and stakeholders for this program, (4) address public questions and comments, (4) identify specific actions to improve. To encourage as much public participation as possible, smaller randomly selected breakout groups were formed to discuss two aspects of each phase “what went well?” and “what could be improved?” After the small group discussions, the large group reconvened, reviewed/discussed what went well, what could be improved, clarified points of confusion and then participated in a large group discussion about what specific actions could be implemented in the future. This process was repeated for each phase of response, rehabilitation and release. A separate flip chart was available for all participants to write questions, which were answered by the end of the meeting.

This format provided an excellent vehicle for clarifying misinformation among volunteers and the public. Although a time for public comment was provided, the group agreed that this process has such a high level of participation that those whom originally wanted to speak during public comment, felt they had been heard and that their issues were addressed. Hence, there was no public comment because everyone withdrew his or her request to speak. The facilitator, Kristy Ellenberg, did an extraordinary job at

managing conflict, keeping conversations focused on issues, preventing personal attacks, and keeping the meeting on schedule.

III. Meeting Summary

The debriefing process generated considerable constructive feedback concerning the response, rehabilitation and release of the pilot whales. It also identified many items that went well, in addition to those areas that could be improved. Interestingly, many items appeared on both the “what went well” list and the “area for improvement” list. For example, during response, communication was identified as something that went well, and as an area for improvement. For the rehabilitation phase, coordination of volunteer shifts went well and also needed improvement, and for release, tagging was mentioned in both categories. Three overarching themes surfaced in all three categories for improvement: (1) communication, (2) chain of command, and (3) coordination. Actions were identified in all of these areas for future improvement. The summaries below highlight some of the main issues discussed during the meeting. A more comprehensive list of discussed topics is provided in the “Summary of Flip Charts” section. The “Summary of Flip Charts” represents an exact copy of flip charts generated during the meeting.

A. Response

In general, the flip charts reflected that the first response and notification process worked well and resulted in a quick response with tremendous volunteer, community and agency support. Resources (e.g. barge, crane, planes, equipment) were also on-site and available. Challenges during the response included getting appropriate vessels on scene (which was difficult due to the shallow water), communication, an unclear chain of command, and confusion surrounding whether or not a veterinarian was needed on site. While there was a lot of equipment on site, given the scope of the stranding, (e.g. 28 whales spread out over a large, remote area) rescuers still needed more equipment.

There was a lot of discussion about the chain of command and who was in charge during the response. The NOAA Fisheries stranding coordinator explained that an on-site coordinator was identified and was also a first responder. The on-site coordinator further clarified that coordination roles were divided between one person on a boat, who was communicating with land bases and vessels about off-site activities, and another person who was in charge of in-water activities with the whales and volunteers. It was further clarified that depending on future situations, this may or may not be a NOAA fisheries employee, as LOA holders can also serve in this capacity. Suggestions were made to clarify who is in charge and to improve communications by having the on-site leader riding with the highest-ranking FWCC Law Enforcement officer and wearing marked clothing. Marked clothing should be used to identify not only the on-site coordinator, but also experienced rescuers that have leadership roles. A representative from FWCC stressed that their officers have state of the art communication equipment, and are always willing to help bring coordination and enhanced communication to this type of situation.

NOAA Fisheries acknowledged that the FWCC was under-utilized and agreed that more communication between the two agencies will help prepare for future events.

Many questions arose about the role of the veterinarian for triage during a mass stranding and whether or not a veterinarian is needed on-site, as well as the sense that response was delayed due to the late arrival of a veterinarian. Since no local vets were available (the mass stranding occurred on Easter holiday weekend), a veterinarian from Miami was called to assist. NOAA fisheries clarified that it is preferable to have an on-site veterinarian when determining disposition of animals, although in a situation when this is not available, LOA responders can assist with making these determinations. The group also discussed that in the case of this stranding, when it became clear that the vet was delayed due to traffic, the response moved forward without her. The group also agreed that it would be helpful to generate a list of “on-call” veterinarians to ensure that vets are always available for a quick response. Suggestions further included training of USCG and FWCC enforcement personnel to better assist with these events.

B. Rehabilitation

During the rehabilitation effort there was tremendous community support including volunteer support, food, water, monies, and many other resources. Veterinarians from the local community and other parts of Florida also played a key role. Education, outreach and public relations were successful and resulted in excellent media coverage (e.g. Television, radio and print media). This massive volunteer coordination resulted in the successful rehabilitation of 5 out of 7 rescued whales, including a young (< 1 yr) calf.

While volunteer support and coordination was substantial, several areas were identified for improvement during rehabilitation:

- Provide more detailed orientations for volunteers.
- Provide more training of volunteers and staff in the areas of husbandry, APHIS standards, behavior and record keeping.
- Increase debriefings between shifts.
- Better supervision by establishing a clearer chain of command and communication among leaders of the two rehabilitation groups (FKMMRT and MMC).
- Establish protocols that clarify quarantine and sanitation procedures.
- Address public access (to whales) issues.

A lot of discussion concerned record-keeping responsibilities of rehabilitation groups. Some volunteers commented that due to the demands of caring for five whales, there was no time for keeping records, and the whales themselves were a higher priority. Furthermore, it was difficult to find individuals who would reliably record information since most individuals preferred to have direct contact with the animals and turnover rate for volunteers was high. All of the veterinarians at the debriefing stressed how crucial record keeping is to the animals' health. Records help veterinarians know how to adjust medications, show patterns and trends in health, and are an essential part of standard husbandry practices. Record keeping not only benefits the health of recovering animals,

but also has the potential to better guide future pilot whale stranding responses, and contributes to increased scientific knowledge.

Several action items were identified to address record keeping:

- Designate a record-keeper during rehabilitation, either one person per shift or a paid contractor if possible.
- Provide incentive to volunteers for record keeping.
- Stress the importance of record keeping during all training.
- Designate a data coordinator.
- Include the topic of record keeping during volunteer orientation.
- Design standardized, easy to use (waterproof) forms for recording data.

C. Release

Cooperation, teamwork, community resources, veterinary support, logistics, and media coverage went well, resulting in a near “as humanly possible” simultaneous release of the five whales. Overall crowd control was effective, except for some confusion surrounding two volunteer vessels that were mistakenly kept a distance >200 yards away from the release site. The importance of having a central communications person was stressed and could be improved by ensuring that the “traffic” on the radio is limited or by identifying more than one channel for communication. In addition, enhancing communication among boat captains by requiring attendance at a “captain’s” meeting or providing written briefing notes will also help in the future. The transport of whales went well and the tracking was immediate thus yielding significant scientific information.

Concerns were expressed about the appropriateness of transport “wet boxes” versus a sea-pen release, as well as the configuration of the whales on the release boats. Different individuals presented various rationales about the benefits and limitations of each method. There was some confusion about whether or not Dr. Aleta Hohn from NOAA Fisheries in Beaufort provided the satellite tags. NOAA Fisheries confirmed that Dr. Hohn provided the tags for the release. Furthermore, questions arose about why the tags could not have been placed on the whales prior to the release day. Experts with Marine Research Consultants and others explained that there are many issues if tags are placed on the animals days before the release (e.g. the whales may try to rub off the tags while in a confined area and the risk of infection is higher). MMC along with NOAA Fisheries also addressed the rumor that all of the whales were not released simultaneously. In fact the release occurred within 30 seconds, and despite claims that NOAA Fisheries “held back” No. 7, MMC clarified that NOAA Fisheries staff was instrumental in a quick release of No. 7.

Although logistics involving the actual release went well, post-release logistics could’ve been improved by ensuring that tracking equipment and people got to their respective vessels more quickly, providing better communication systems during the tracking (e.g. satellite phone), and by providing recapture supplies on both tracking vessels. There were also some issues with the duty cycle of the tags.

There was discussion about whether or not all of the whales were together after the release. Several people clarified this. The satellite “hits” as well as observations from the tracking team indicated that on August 10th at 6:55pm, all animals were heading NE towards the Florida Current and all five were together, with No. 3 approx. ½ mile from the other four. On the afternoon of August 11th, the whales began going in different directions. On August 12th, Jeff Foster reported that No. 7 appeared to be in close proximity to No. 3. Whales No. 4 and 6 were 36 miles from shore and much further northeast than No. 3 and No. 7. Several days later, whale No. 3 was reported in the Gulf of Mexico whereas No. 7 stayed near the Atlantic coast and eventually headed north toward Vero Beach.

Lastly, there was discussion about the role of Marine Research Consultants and the need for contracting outside experts. Some participants felt that there was plenty of local expertise and asked why locals were not “contracted.” NOAA Fisheries clarified that there was a need for expertise in terms of tagging and tracking the whales that did not exist in the local community, and that locals were paired with these experts for further training. Other comments included that bringing in experts helps rescuers/rehabilitators in the Keys overall, because it provides an opportunity for training that may not otherwise be available, or that otherwise would be prohibitively expensive.

IV. Action Items and Next Steps

The majority of recommended actions were related to improving communication among rescue groups, volunteers, law enforcement officials, and the public. Overall, holding regular meetings, trainings, building relationships and improving technology (e.g. satellite phones) were suggested. It was also emphasized that in the process of implementing these action items, everyone should strive to “keep things simple.” The need for more training was mentioned repeatedly throughout the debriefing, and included providing Incident Command Training to Keys groups, providing training for local veterinarians, coordinating training between the LOA groups (specifically on standards of care and behavior) and training for USCG and enforcement agencies.

Overall action items are summarized below. Due to the constraints on time, the large group was not able to distill these actions into more specific details. However, it was agreed that a collaborative process in the Keys to develop a “mass stranding protocol” similar to the Cape Cod Stranding Network, would help to address these actions in further detail (i.e. identifying who is responsible for implementing various actions in what time frame). NOAA Fisheries SEFSC will begin facilitating this process in 2004 and will host multiple meetings between various groups (e.g. LOA groups, government agencies, veterinarians). The end product will be a notebook of protocols that will serve as a valuable resource and reference for future mass stranding events.

A. Response Action Items

- Establish a list of “on-call” vets

- Provide t-shirts, armbands and/or hats for identifying key personnel during a mass stranding event. This will ensure that everyone knows who's in charge and who has experience.
- Provide "first responder" kits that include instructions, contact information and guidelines, as well as essentials such as sun protection for humans and animals.
- Ensure that the on-site coordinator work with the highest ranked FWCC/Law Enforcement officer on-site.
- Have NOAA Fisheries provide training and education for USCG and other enforcement agencies in the Keys.

B. Rehabilitation Action Items

- Improve Record Keeping:
 - Designate a Record-Keeper and/or Data Coordinator during rehabilitation phase. If possible, this should be a paid position. At a minimum, identify one person per shift who is responsible for record keeping.
 - Place an importance on record keeping during all trainings and orientations. Review record-keeping protocols during training and orientation.
 - Provide incentives for volunteers to keep records.
 - Develop standardized, user-friendly forms for record keeping.
- Provide more training for volunteers and LOA groups in the areas of (1) standards of care, (2) APHIS standards, and (3) animal behavior.
- Improve communication on-site between organizations
 - Designate a shift leader
 - Conduct daily briefings with volunteers either via meeting or written on a dry erase board.
- Evaluate how much access is allowed among staff, volunteers and the public, including access to the rehabilitation site, and direct access to animals.
- Identify ways to establish better on-site security
- Develop protocols on topics such as public access and quarantine procedures. For example, public access should be supervised, easy and friendly, while considering regulatory issues.

C. Release Action Items

- Ensure that during the release there is a central communication coordinator
- Provide more VHF radios and a satellite phone to improve communication.
- Provide written briefing notes to all captains the day of the release
- Require attendance of all participating captains to the captain's meeting
- Debrief (specific to the release process) immediately after the release.
- Improve tagging by having available pre-made, ready to go tags. Also ensure that there are extra RTF receivers. While there was also a suggestion for using a "dummy" tag to put on animals one week prior to

the release and then replacing them with a live tags, there was considerable discussion among tagging experts and veterinarians as to whether or not this would be the most effective strategy.

IV. Action Items and Next Steps

The majority of recommended actions were related to improving communication among rescue groups, volunteers, law enforcement officials, and the public. Overall, holding regular meetings, trainings, building relationships and improving technology (e.g. Satellite phones) were suggested. It was also emphasized that in the process of implementing these action items, that everyone should strive to “keep things simple.” The need for more training was mentioned repeatedly throughout the debriefing, and included providing Incident Command Training to Keys groups, providing training for local veterinarians, coordinating training between the LOA groups (specifically on standards of care and behavior) and training for USCG and enforcement agencies.

Overall action items are summarized below. Due to the constraints on time, the large group was not able to distill these actions into more specific details. However, it was agreed that a collaborative process in the Keys to develop a “mass stranding protocol” similar to the Cape Cod Stranding Network, would help to address these actions in further detail (i.e. identifying who is responsible for implementing various actions in what time frame). NOAA Fisheries SEFSC will begin facilitating this process in 2004 and will host multiple meetings between various groups (e.g. LOA groups, government agencies, veterinarians). The end product will be a notebook of protocols that will serve as a valuable resource and reference for future mass stranding events.

D. Response Action Items

- Establish a list of “on-call” vets
- Provide t-shirts, armbands and/or hats for identifying key personnel during a mass stranding event. This will ensure that everyone knows who’s in charge and who has experience.
- Provide “first responder” kits that include instructions, contact information and guidelines, as well as essentials such as sun protection for humans and animals.
- Ensure that the on-site coordinator work with the highest ranked FWCC/Law Enforcement officer on-site.
- Have NOAA Fisheries provide training and education for USCG and other enforcement agencies in the Keys.

E. Rehabilitation Action Items

- Improve Record Keeping:
 - Designate a Record-Keeper and/or Data Coordinator during rehabilitation phase. If possible, this should be a paid position. At a minimum, identify one person per shift who is responsible for record keeping.

- Place an importance on record keeping during all trainings and orientations. Review record-keeping protocols during training and orientation.
- Provide incentives for volunteers to keep records.
- Develop standardized, user-friendly forms for record keeping.
- Provide more training for volunteers and LOA groups in the areas of (1) standards of care, (2) APHIS standards, and (3) animal behavior.
- Improve communication on-site between organizations
 - Designate a shift leader
 - Conduct daily briefings with volunteers either via meeting or written on a dry erase board.
- Evaluate how much access is allowed among staff, volunteers and the public, including access to the rehabilitation site, and direct access to animals.
- Identify ways to establish better on-site security
- Develop protocols on topics such as public access and quarantine procedures. For example, public access should be supervised, easy and friendly, while considering regulatory issues.

F. Release Action Items

- Ensure that during the release there is a central communication coordinator
- Provide more VHF radios and a satellite phone to improve communication.
- Provide written briefing notes to all captains the day of the release
- Require attendance of all participating captains to the captain's meeting
- Debrief (specific to the release process) immediately after the release.
- Improve tagging by having available pre-made, ready to go tags. Also ensure that there are extra RTF receivers. While there was also a suggestion for using a "dummy" tag to put on animals one week prior to the release and then replacing them with a live tags, there was considerable discussion among tagging experts and veterinarians as to whether or not this would be the most effective strategy.

V. Summary of Flip Charts

The flip charts generated from the debriefing are summarized below (as written on the flip charts).

A. Response to pilot whale mass stranding on April 18th, 2003

1. What went well during the response?

*** Flip chart summary from Group A**

- Early communication went very well- notification process

- Team OCEAN and USCG
- US1 Radio's Bill Becker critical for getting volunteers and crane/barge on-site
- First response stranding kits there and ready to go
- Good response from trained volunteers
- Signage at initial rehabilitation site made the site easy to find
- Boat transport to and from difficult site- managed well under circumstances
- First response went well
- Enforcement
- Rescued seven whales
- Good radio coverage
- Volunteers were amazing – followed direction
- Good public response
- Crane on-site

* Flip chart summary from Group B

- Initial response- first 24 hours
- Coast Guard response, including FWCC, FKNMS, Fire Dept.
- Communication on scene from trained to non-trained volunteers
- Setting up camp
- Resource availability at the spur of the moment- barge, cranes, planes, equipment
- Community response (strike zone charters, spirit towing, fantasy Dan, US1 radio)
- Numbered identification of whales
- On-site peer-to-peer training
- Community support
- Pooled resources from multiple groups
- Media response
- Response of other federal agencies

2. What are areas for improvement to mass stranding responses in the future?

* Flip chart Summary from Group A

- Coordination and logistics (have on-call vets)
- Crowd/vessel “control” (too many boats/movement/noise)
- Getting volunteers on-site after 5:00pm
- Visually identifying key personnel
- Not enough boat access to transport to site (meaning it was too shallow for large enough vessels to transport animals).
- Chain of command not clear
- First response
- Vet delay

- Communication- land to site, site to land
- Lack of dedicated rehab site
- Coordination/communication
- Lack of trained volunteers/equipment availability
- Carcass disposal

* Flip chart Summary from Group B

- Rotation schedule for in-water rescuers- insist upon this
- Communication
- Decision-making authority/on-site coordinator and interaction with designees
- Delayed actions because of off site authority
- Need for stranding related equipment on enforcement boat
- Separation of No. 7 and mother
- Medical response
- Logistics

3. What are some actions that could be implemented in the future?

a. Response Actions

- Have on-call vets
- Provide t-shirts, flags, armbands or hats for identifying key personnel
- Provide first responder kits with instructions/guidelines e.g. Sun protection
- Provide training and education for USCG/enforcement

b. Communication Actions

- Who has ultimate authority? LOA/NMFS
- Technology
 - Satellite phones, Nextel, VHF need to be available to stranding
- Simplify system
- Use law enforcement to communicate
 - On-shore dispatch and offshore
- Communicate with vet
- List of trained vets compiled and distributed

B. Rehabilitation of Pilot Whales on Big Pine Key

1. What went well during the rehabilitation of pilot whales?

* Flip Chart Summary from Group A

- Vet cooperation
- Volunteer coordination
- Volunteer orientation
- Patience and understanding of all staff

- Media coverage
- Community resources
- Availability of support
- Site
- On-site training on more behavioral information
- Resources
- Local vets and offsite
- Shift coordination
- Community support/businesses/Navy
- Educational opportunity for community
- Media coverage/National Geo

* Flip chart Summary from Group B

- Successfully rehabilitated five whales
- Trained nursing calf to eat fish
- Lots of volunteers trained/coordination
- Community support- food, water, money
- Identified new rehab site- cleaned up and utilized unused space
- Public relations with community
- Pooled resources between multiple organizations
- NMFS paid for some things
- Lots of veterinary support
- Nationwide support
- Orientation of volunteers
- Good cooperation and support among volunteers and staff
- Outreach and education of public
 - Protocols
 - Quarantine
 - Equipment
- Crowd control and public access
- Record-keeping/training

2. What are areas for improvement?

* Flip chart Summary from Group A

- Address water quality if using the same site for future strandings
- More specific sanitation protocol
- Need more training
- Need more timely documentation of all data- medical record keeping
- Need designated staff on-duty at night
- Record keeping training/chain of command
- Clarify chain of command for volunteer duties and procedures
- Leader agree on actions and policies
- Clarify shift leaders

- More communication between leaders and volunteers
- Less politics
- Better communication and coordination between leaders
- Feedings were confusing for whales, people and for record keeping
- Need training
- Communication between organizations- volunteers need to know who is in charge- chain of command- keep consistent
- Sanitation

* Summary of Flip chart B

- Supervision- chain of command within LOA
- Basic training needs improvement
- Shift to shift briefing- more communication
- Data collection (1 person responsible daily)
- Unnecessary people in the water/PR and rewards
- Need better on-site updates daily for visitors and volunteers
- More detailed orientations needed for volunteers
- Public access too close to water/animals
 - Better monitoring
 - Watch
 - Remote camera?
- Need consistent behavioral conditioning/training of volunteers
- Equipment such as stretchers and poles were inadequate
- Poor water quality
- Presence of pets and wildlife access

3. Actions to improve rehabilitation in the future

- Designated record-keeper
 - One person per shift
 - Paid staff/contractor if possible
 - Incentive for volunteers for record-keeping
- Place importance on record-keeping during all training
- Identify a data coordinator
- Set up easy forms with essential, basic, consistent information
- Include record-keeping training in orientation
- Conduct record keeping on a computer- easier to share info.
- Improve on-site security
- Develop Protocols on public access and quarantine- Public access should be supervised, easy, friendly- LOA support. Also need to consider regulatory issues.
- Training
 - Standards of care
 - APHIS
 - Behavioral issues
- Improve site now for future events

- Evaluate access, handling and personnel

C. Release of pilot whales off of the Florida Keys

1. What went well during the release?

*** Flip chart Summary from Group A**

- Cooperation among organizations
- Community resources
- Actual release went well (mechanics)
- Transport
- Capture
- Tagging
- Media control
- Crowd control
- Tracking/vessels
- Coordination between organizations on-site
- Pre-prep for release went well
- No. 3 release was excellent
- Transport dealt with No. 2 and No. 6 very well
- Tagging process went well
- All tags worked
- Plentiful vet support
- Team work- coordinated and efficient- all equipment worked
- Donated gear from organizations

*** Flip chart summary from Group B**

- Five whales were released back to habitat
- Logistics from leaving site to release- personnel and vessels
- Media coverage
- Consideration of volunteers time and effort
- Post-release debriefing
- Close to simultaneous as humanly possible
- No injuries to whales or humans
- Pool footage/media
- Unauthorized boats kept away
- Communication between all
- Vet care and attention on transport
- Tracking was immediate
- Learned a lot from tracking
- Tracking went well given challenges
- Crowd control the day of release was good
- Collection of long term movements
- Spectator control and media updates

- Speed and smoothness of actual release – well under one minute start to finish
- Great public education

2. What are some areas for improvement for future releases?

* Flip chart Summary from Group A

- Communication
- Pre-release planning (method)
- Enforcement
- Delays in decision-making
- Paperwork delays
- Lack of concrete protocol (medical)
- Coordination on release day
- Post release coordination
 - Equipment
 - Tracking
- Volunteer viewing release
- Tags: improve to make smaller
- Reduce number of boats
- Authority/decision/delay on release
- Communication about Jeff's team and purpose

* Flip chart summary from Group B

- Release plan- communication of specifics
- Post release coordination
- Closer to release for volunteers
- Tags
- Specific logistics
- Ship to shore communication between tracking team and land
- Immediate debriefing on post release
- Distribute correct information to reduce misconceptions
- Better transfer of staff to tracking vessels
- Who was in charge after Jeff arrived?
- 7's release day
- 7's whereabouts after release
- Boxes vs.? Alternative to boxes
- 7's recapture- supplies only on one vessel- was not full redundancy
- Tag transmitting issues- not properly programmed- Aleta's role?

3. What are some actions to improve future releases?

General Comments:

- Always have a designated, central communication coordinator

- Improve ship to shore communication by improving access to technology (e.g. satellite phones).
- Have more VHF radios charged, have back ups and have them ready to go
- Require attendance of participating captains at the captains meeting.
- Provide briefing notes to captains on day of release
- Hold the release debriefing as close to possible after the actual release- Always debrief after each separate event.

Actions for improving communication:

- Between and within organizations
 - Designated shift leader
- Daily briefing with volunteers
 - Written and oral
 - Dry-erase board
 - Live/active website updates, including “supplies needed.”
- Assign a public relations person to give accurate information
- Improve communication between multiple organizations on decision making by holding regular meetings
- Build relationships between the local groups

Authority

- Regional coordination and on-site coordination
- On-site coordinator works with highest ranked FWCC/LE officer
- Have a way to identify key personnel, so everyone knows who’s in charge and who has experience

Coordination

- On-site training
- Build relationships with land and water agencies and law enforcement
- Incident command training
- Train more vets
- Coordination of LOA trainings between multiple groups

Tagging

- Investigate more humane ways to tag
- Have available pre-made ready to go tags
- Have available extra RTF receivers
- Use a dummy tag and place on animal one week prior to- and then replace with live tag day before release

Procedure/Planning

- Keep things simple

Questions and Responses

A separate flip chart was provided for participants to write any questions that resulted from small group discussions, or individual questions. Below are the questions as written by participants on the flip charts and the responses to those questions.

Q: Why were there two meetings?

A: NOAA Fisheries had a meeting with LOA holders (FKMMRT and MMC) prior to the public debriefing to discuss topics specific to the LOA's. This meeting had a very narrow focus and different objectives than the larger public debriefing. Given the scope of public involvement, it was critical to provide an opportunity in the second meeting to hear from everyone concerning the pilot whale response, rehabilitation and release and provide a forum for open communication between the public, agencies and LOA groups.

Q: Who responds to the next stranding?

A: As always, when there is a stranding the protocol is to call FWCC who then notifies the stranding coordinator, who then notifies the LOA organization or Designee that is in closest proximity to the stranding.

Q: Why weren't animals contained overnight?

Q: How could we have rescued more animals?

Q: Were there resources offered by Jeff Foster's group that weren't available before?

NOTE: when the facilitator began to approach the last three questions, participants stated they felt their questions had been addressed during small and large group discussions, and that there was no need to address the questions again.

Participants in the Debriefing Workshop concerning the mass stranding of pilot whales in the Florida Keys

Name	Affiliation
Bob Favarato	citizen/volunteer
Diane Favarato	citizen/volunteer
Fiona Wilmot	FKNMS
Robert Keeley	FKNMS
Jan Blackman	MMC/FKNMS
Russ Rector	Dolphin Freedom Foundation
Cherie Jenkins	Duke University
Kim Robertson	Private
Sean Meehan	NOAA
Steve Hemenway	NOAA OLE
John Hackney	MMC
Debbie Arnold	MMC
Yuko Yamamoto	MMC
Greg Schorr	MRC
Martin Firestone	MMC
Avis Lois	MMC
Robert Lingenfelser	MMC
Corliss Rupp	MMC
Jean Ward	MMC/FKMMRT
Karen E. Conway	MMC
MJ Taylor	MMC
Robert Smith	Volunteer
Valerie Smith	Volunteer
Denise Jackson	FKMMRT
Stacy Marlow	MMC
Wayne Mech	FKMMRT
Mary Stella	DRC
Becky Arnold	FKMMRT
Kim McDowell	Volunteer
Doug Mader	Vet
Pamela Sweeney	MARS
Julie Zaias	MARS
Anne McCarthy	FKNMS
Jim Bohnsack	NOAA Fisheries
Will Conley	Volunteer
Brian K. O'Neill	FKNMS
Jacalyn S. Del Vecchio	Volunteer
Melanie Howey	Volunteer
Cheva Heck	FKNMS
Mary Gregarro	Volunteer
Patricia Kuhn	Volunteer
Andrea Vargas	MARS

DRAFT 12/01

Jeannie Evans	MARS
Lynn Stine	MMC/MARS
Corky Trimbur	Volunteer
David Dipre	FWCC
Charle Manire	Vet/Mote Marine Lab
Phyllis Mc?	Volunteer
Jeff Foster	MRC
George Neugent	County Commission
Laura Engleby	NOAA Fisheries
Jenny Litz	NOAA Fisheries
Blair Mase	NOAA Fisheries