

## MEXICAN WOLF ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Final Summary Notes for July 8-9, 2004

Location: USFS office, 3005 East Camino del Bosque, Silver City, New Mexico 88023  
Time: NM Time: 0800 – 1700 on July 8, and 0800 – 1200 on July 9  
Host: New Mexico Department of Game and Fish  
Participants: AMOC Lead Agencies: AGFD – Terry B. Johnson (Chair), Deb O’Neill, Bill Van Pelt, and Dan Groebner; NMDGF – Chuck Hayes, Lisa Kirkpatrick, and Nick Smith; USDA APHIS WS – Dave Bergman, Michael Pacheco, Keel Price, and Stewart Breck; USDA FS – Wally Murphy; and USFWS – Colleen Buchanan, Susan MacMullin, James Ashburner, Larry Bell, Delivan Roper, and John Oakleaf.

AMWG Signatory Cooperators: Greenlee County AZ – not present; Navajo County AZ – not present; and NM Department of Agriculture – Bud Starnes.

AMWG Non-signatory Participants: Catron County NM – Alex Thal (CACO); Cochise County AZ – not present; Graham County AZ – not present; Sierra County NM – Adam Polley (SICO); and SCAT – Steve Titla.

Note: some of the participants were not present for the entire meeting.

### July 8

#### A. Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, and Agenda Review

Terry Johnson called the meeting to order at 0810 local time. After a brief welcome and introductions, and explanations for absentees, the previous Ground Rules were reaffirmed.

Two newspaper articles were reviewed; one was an editorial piece written by **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** and the other was about the lawsuit and injunction, on which Colleen elaborated. Colleen said the USFWS has until the end of August to respond to the plaintiffs. The trial likely will begin after that.

The agenda was reviewed, and because some people were unable to attend today’s meeting, but will be here on Friday, the agenda was changed so these people could participate in appropriate agenda items. Additions to the agenda included: hybridization and confidentiality issues, Duane’s comments regarding genetics, depredation compensation issue and subgroup, and the September 1 meeting. The MOU discussion will be discussed after lunch.

B. Review of Action Items from January 2004 AMOC and AMWG Meetings

The agenda for this meeting was largely drawn from the Action Items from the April 2004 AMOC and AMWG meetings. If an Action Item was not included in the agenda, attendees were asked to bring it to the group's attention.

C. APHIS/WS Depredation Study Update

During the spring roundup, there were 2-3 missing calves. They are continuing to tag calves in the study, and are having tags refurbished.

There have not been any new kills and there is not much evidence of wolves in the area, or any predators depredating cattle. There is only one field person, so it is difficult to keep up with fieldwork.

No one from the Recovery Team's Technical Subgroup returned comment on the study proposal. However, Stewart did get input from scientists from Italy, **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION**, and two others. They all provided good comments. Everyone said the broad idea of the manner in which we graze cattle in response to depredation was a good idea. However, they were concerned about sample sizes (mortalities). They did not think we would be able to attribute depredations to certain grazing patterns. These comments would change the way the study would be conducted. The question is whether we should continue the study with the small sample size. There are options available for how to continue.

**Question:** Do you have baseline of calf mortality? Do you have an idea of calf crop?

**Response:** This is their 3<sup>rd</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> season on this land. We can compare to the first few seasons. They had one season when they lost many calves, but they cannot say if it was wolves or not. Therefore, we have some baseline, but it is not great.

**Question:** Any info on predation from other than wolves? **Response:** Not reliable data.

**Question:** Isn't it important to see if nothing is going on? **Response:** Yes, but the first objective is looking at the different grazing regimes. One regime is aggregating cattle by taking cattle from different allotments and grazing them together.

We want feedback. We may submit the proposal to cattle growers. Perhaps it could be submitted to New Mexico Range Improvement Task Force. We would like a third party involved, especially since this could affect the cattle industry.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

Since the last meeting, SCAT has not had effective communication with FWS. The federal government caused the problem, now they should fix it.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

AGFD – We need to ensure good collaboration, agreement on scientific practices, and adequate funding. We must all communicate effectively. We need answers that are greater than at a single permittee level. **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.** AGFD has contributed \$125K so far and committed to another \$200K over the next two years. We need more cooperation so the study can be scientifically credible.

**Question:** Are alternative grazing strategies alternatives to compensation? **Response:** No, that is not what is meant.

Aggregated grazing could cause problems socially with having community allotments.

SICO – NM cattle growers are concerned about communication. We need the livestock industry involved, because if the study is conducted on the reservation, it will spill over. The study is not clear. We need to know and understand the methodologies. Any mortality is significant to the industry. The more wolves put in the wild, the more mortalities we will have. Sierra County gets money for every head out there, and now the County is receiving significantly less money.

Statistical significance is different from significant to individuals or the industry. These issues are very important. However, if the process keeps getting changed, it will not help study.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

AGFD - Talk with Stuart about this because we are hearing the \$40k goes to the depredation study.

NMDA – I strongly recommend bringing in range aids – PhD's and NM State University. Besides the drought, cattle and permittee numbers are being reduced. The Taylor Grazing Act comes into play. Money goes back to the county to help with roads, etc. This money has been reduced by 50%. The rancher feels it directly, but everyone will feel it indirectly through roads, bridges, noxious weeds. The ramifications are substantial.

The average age of ranchers is 60. We are going to lose the ranching industry, just as we lost timber.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

AGFD - We have a sense of the history, but not the future. That is why this study is important. Would Stewart articulate what needs to be done to move forward?

WS – The project is mired in politics, which is not the way to do research. Objectives will not be met, statistically speaking, relating to alternative grazing practices. Many questions are coming up.

**Question:** Is this area representative of the entire area? **Response:** Not representative. May be too much variation across the landscape for any place to be representative.

Perhaps we need to do this study in other areas and put GPS collars on wolves.

WS – I can write up a list of what can be done, but the group could come up with a clear statement that may be better. I am concerned about not meeting expectations. Our original idea was to change grazing practices this fall. We have 1 season without wolves. Now that we have wolves, we are going to change grazing practices. What will that tell us?

CACO - It will be good study, but we need baseline data. Let's build a database on depredation and get the depredation committee to look at it and make recommendations to get at the objective and get funding. Let's get together a subcommittee so we can bring it back to the group. How do we mitigate and get relief?

**Question:** Is there a problem with detection rates? **Response:** No. Winter was tough, and we may have missed a few, but we are doing well.

**Question:** What about IFT's ability to detect wolf kills? **Response:** Ranchers are doing a good job of turning over what they find. There just is not enough wolf activity.

USFS – We are finding that the allotment the study is on is not sufficient and representative of the entire area. Because the permittees were vocal, we put the study there. This was a pilot study.

AGFD can and will support a move to another area if necessary. Gila National Forest has a widely varied grazing strategy. It is a ready-made study. If we need to expand, let's do it. But we also can't just bail out on the current rancher partner without discussion beforehand.

**Question:** There is no one grazing regime on the Gila? **Response:** No.

**Question:** Is there one place that you would pick that would be representative?  
**Response:** No.

If we do this, we can never get a sample large enough for what we need.

NMDA – Should not conduct study by changing a rancher's grazing regime. You have to look at what regimes exist and do the study from that. These strategies are successful, so you should look at what is working, especially while we are in a drought.

WS – These are great landscape level questions. However, we wanted to do an intensive study, and then switch grazing. It is still an interesting question regardless of socioeconomic question. If you are looking at entire area and all grazing regimes, you are talking millions of dollars.

NMDA – The ranchers want to know what studies are going on. People are aware of ramifications. What are we proposing? Type? Who? Time? We need to get together and agree.

USFS – We need to clarify where to monitor and where to research. What do we want?

**Question:** Can Stewart come up with recommendations to subcommittee and approach it that way? Address both approaches (e.g., changing regimes and using existing regimes).

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

It is difficult to encourage funding for a depredation study if the wolves are going to be removed when they show up. You cannot do the study that way.  
We need a game plan for more than 3 months at a time.

The depredation compensation subcommittee members are: Alex T., Bud S., Susan M., Dave B., Stewart B., Deb O., Adam P., John O., and Wally M. Dave will approach Harold N. and Frank Hayes to see if they would like to participate. This committee will also discuss the research questions associated with the depredation study. They will develop clear objectives.

AGFD needs to know recommendations by 31 October for our fiscal year purposes.

**Action item:** The depredation subcommittee will have recommendations by 1 September. They will look at the broader landscape picture. Wally will provide map with grazing regimes for the Gila, **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION** and Stewart will give us results from the pilot study. The group will redefine objectives with where the study is going and recommendations.

NMSU will be involved as appropriate.

C. Summary Notes

We only received comments from Dave and Colleen for AMOC notes only. Is the change acceptable to Dave, Colleen, and everyone?

MOU signatories present agreed by consensus that the draft notes from April's AMOC meeting are final and can be distributed to AMOC meeting governmental cooperators and participants. Again, AMOC notes are for AMOC use only, and are not intended for public distribution.

Chuck had a question about something he said on page 6, and was told by members present that they remembered the statement.

NMDGF wanted CBD's opposition to releasing wolves born in captivity made clear on page 13. NMDGF thinks it is important to record what people say and hold them accountable when it is spoken in a public forum. Chuck will write a sentence and get it to Terry this afternoon. Terry will insert and finalize notes.

MOU signatories present agreed by consensus that the draft notes from April's AMWG meeting will be final after the correction made above. After the correction is made, the AMWG note can be distributed the next afternoon at the AMWG meeting.

We would like names associated with the comments and questions during the AMWG meetings. We must all help ensure that members of the public state their name before commenting or asking a question. Their name and the responders name will be inserted in the AMWG notes from here forward.

D. Law Enforcement Action Items from April 2004

AGFD reminded its law enforcement personnel that courtesy and sensitivity is important. We used to use blue cards to gauge our customer service, but because the responses tended to be uniformly satisfactory and highly complimentary, card use was suspended. Our approval ratings were about 97%. Every time our officers contact the public, they must file a landowner contact report. If bad comments are reported, we do investigate to see if there was misconduct. Jon Cooley (Region 1 Supervisor) talked extensively with law enforcement, and they think there is no problem and all contact has been great.

NMDGF reminded law enforcement personnel to be courteous and sensitivity was important.

USFWS sent a memo to its law enforcement personnel stressing sensitivity and leaving business cards.

AGFD and FWS have not been able to get a hold of **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** regarding the reward poster.

The remaining topics under this item will be deferred until tomorrow, when the USFWS law enforcement personnel will be present.

E. Protocol/SOP Discussion Including Wolf Releases and Public Meeting Update

Comments at the public meeting were largely against releases. Some people suggested Maness Peak or Fish Bench, and others opposed those sites.

**Question:** Does the court case allow for a release in AZ this year? **Response:** Yes, legally this can occur.

The proximity of the post office was brought up as a concern, so the actual Long Cienega release site was moved a bit by IFT based on public comments.

Terry passed out the release recommendation draft document. The AGFD Director will make a decision based on the recommendation submitted to him. This draft was reviewed by lead agencies in early May. There have been several drafts so far. We will defer this to tomorrow morning so we can review the document before commenting. This document will not be shared with the public. It is internal only. The track changes in the document are Jon Cooley's.

USFS - a map would be great, since it is internal. John described where the four sites are. Dan will bring in a map this afternoon so people can look at it.

There have been extensive conversations at the technical level. What we need now is a discussion at AMOC level so Terry can take a recommendation to Duane.

We have not provided guidance in a protocol on how to select sites. There is an SOP in draft form right now, but it is pretty far along.

Terry handed out the protocol list. Dale thought all protocols should have been completed by now, but most have not been completed. Dale said he will reassess priorities. However, AMOC needs to decide where to start and where to go. We need a road map that we can consistently follow to develop protocols. The public needs to know that adaptive management is value added.

**Question:** What is the time frame for release protocol to be finished? **Response:** Susan MacMullin and Bryan Arroyo reviewed it once and sent it back. Now, it is back with Susan.

Dale needs to resolve whether the approval process description is accurate, and if it involves AMOC. SOP 2, "Approval of Standard Operating Procedures," does not specify to go through AMOC. It goes thru IFT members and they are responsible to take it to their AMOC member. With this method, we are missing USFS, counties, and others that are part of AMOC. SOP 2 needs to be changed then to include more AMOC members.

**Comment:** If all protocols go to AMOC, we are looking at 10 months for each protocol before they are approved. **Response:** No. Most should be completed within 3 months, and the others within 6 months at worst.

AMOC does not need to know everything. Sometimes it only involves IFT. SOP 2 allows for another step to go to AMOC if we want.

The counties are concerned that they are not included, and would like the opportunity not to respond.

Terry handed out structural diagram to remind all how we are supposed to work together.

To make progress on this, a subgroup will be assigned to this issue and they will make the decision if the protocols are/aren't recovery related. The subgroup will not make decisions, just recommendations to AMOC. The subgroup will not wait until quarterly meetings to make recommendations, but will do so in between. The members of the subgroup are Terry J., John O., Adam P., Chuck H., Colleen B., and John C. They will decide which protocols are solid and which need work. Titla made a motion to accept this. Initial discussion will occur at the 1530 break.

Hector Ruedas and Kay Gale said the public was very happy with the opportunity to comment on the proposed release. They had constructive comments about what was occurring on the ground. This demonstrates that counties can play an important role. They are the government closest to the people.

F. Annual Work Plan, Winter Study, and IFT Budget for 2004

The annual work plan has not been worked on at all. This will be covered tomorrow. We will discuss budget then also. We will add these discussions to the role and function statement discussion.

Comments were never received back on winter study (the study was supposed to be reviewed as a budget issue, but the budget information never came forth). We need to know if we are doing the winter study or not. Everyone should review it tonight and be prepared to talk about it tomorrow.

USFWS did get its FY04 allocation, but it was greatly reduced. The wolf budget was \$863k last year, and will be about \$565k this year.

G. Update on Wolf Mortalities and Investigations

An uncollared male wolf released last year was hit by a vehicle and killed. This is the third human-caused mortality this year.

A non-wolf predator killed a female that had skin dermatitis and was in poor health prior to being killed. She may have been compromised because of skin condition.

Wolf 574 appears to have skin problem/mange from a distance (WS). WMAT thought there was an injury on the eye; there appears to be no fur around the eye. It looks scraggly and may just have a summer coat.

To date there have been 43 mortalities: 20 shot (including 1 authorized lethal take); 8 hit by car; 8 other (2 dehydration; 2 predation); 5 disease (3 parvo (from wild), 2 distemper; all captivity); and 2 unknown.

The lethal take order for 574 is the third order, but only one wolf has been taken to date. Two, if 574 is killed. The public is not hearing this. They are hearing that there are three dead wolves. The final press releases have not been clear on this.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION REDACTION.**

**Question:** Do ranchers have property on both sides? **Response:** Some do, but there is not a high percentage back and forth. Hunters do cross frequently.

H. Other

Recovery Coordinator: Position is open for three more weeks. Carter Niemeyer will be in the position and visiting the area from 7/11-7/31 on special detail. He is interested in applying, and will be at the Recovery Team meeting next week.

Recovery Team: Adam objects to a group of biologists discussing human dimensions aspects of wolf recovery. The recovery team was explained as biologists covering four issues such as: which wolf, recovery range, significant portion of range, and recovery role

(if any) of Mexico. Adam still believes that other groups should be represented; the team should be interdisciplinary, not only biologists.

Hybridization and confidentiality: USFWS says **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** heard a rumor that pups of 574 were hybrid, and DNA tests proved 574 sired the pups. The pups were only 4 lbs when they should have been 10 – 12 lbs. One pup had a stripe down its head. Conversations occurred at the IFT level of what the pups were, but the hybrid speculation (which proved wrong) leaked somehow. Everyone must be very careful about saying things. There is some concern over volunteers/interns coming through and having access to information, especially preliminary information. Some are from Defenders and some are from USFWS. The field team must stress to them that confidentiality is paramount and that information is deliberative until it is released. The IFT is not trying to keep secrets; they are just protecting information until it is released.

September 1 meeting: Duane Shroufe, Bruce Thompson, and Dale Hall have called a meeting to talk with IFT and AMOC about wolf issues. Some discussion topics will include: role and function, protocols, and collaborative cooperation. During their initial conversation, 574 and genetics were discussed. Dale said, granted conservation diversity needs to be maintained, but as soon as a wolf is released, a wolf is a wolf and 10j wolves are expendable. This will be talked about and questions will be answered on 1 September. This meeting is an exploration opportunity and will facilitate to open up doors impeding discussion and collaboration. Some questions will be provided to them in advance so they can be consistent with their answers. John Caid will be approached also as being a key member. We expect 25-35 participants.

**Action Item:** Dave Bergman will reserve the conference room at the Wildlife Services Phoenix office for the September 1 meeting.

#### I. Status of the Interagency MOU and Possible Additional Signatories

Several agencies have signed the MOU and changes to the MOU cannot be made without everyone signing again. However, there is a provision that others can enter into the MOU, summarizing their stipulations. All other signatories do not have to follow stipulations, but they do have to agree to allow the new signatories to use them.

The stipulations handed out by Alex are for Sierra and Catron Counties. Both Counties are comfortable with this document being made public. Sierra County will sign the MOU with this addendum. Catron submitted this as being what they want, but they cannot say if it will be signed for sure. AMOC will revisit this tomorrow after we all have had a chance to review stipulations.

The Sierra County Commission will hear the MOU on July 15, and hopefully approve signing on.

Catron County will hear the MOU on July 22, and hopefully approve signing on.

J. The Five-Year Review

The socioeconomic portion of the review went through USFWS D.C. The “statement of work” needs to go back to the D.C. office so it can go out for bid and contract.

We are now looking at an extended timeline for the review. Because of the contract, we cannot meet the time frames we established at the last meeting. The final report for the socioeconomic portion will be submitted 1 May 2005. Can we push back our deadlines to meet this? Our initial final deadline was 1/31 so we could present at the AMWG meeting in February. We need a mechanism in place to decide how/who is going to write the sections.

The socioeconomic portion is integral to the review, so we should adjust our deadlines to fit the contract. It would not be a benefit to present the other portion of the report first.

We timed the last schedule around everything. On 8 December, NMDGF has to give a presentation to their commission, so the most information they can get, the better. We will restructure all of our dates to fit the contract dates. Terry will tinker with time frames and dates tonight and come back tomorrow with recommendations.

The entire package will go to the Recovery Team and stakeholders for review.

We have to stress that the review is for the wolf reintroduction project, not the recovery program.

Although we are meeting on September 1, the October meeting is necessary to discuss the 2005 annual work plan. Meeting twice will be hard on NMDGF resources. We will stay with meeting in Springerville in October.

The five-year review will be called the five-year review. We need to keep the same name because it has been referenced in other documents.

We will distribute the review on our listserv and post it on our website. SICO suggested using CDs and distributing them to libraries or thru the counties.

The administrative component was not assigned to anyone. How do we assign this? A phone survey was done for this for the 3-year review. Bruce Thompson called agency

representatives and summarized responses. Ty Gray, AGFD's human dimensions expert, can tackle number 1 and see what Bruce did/didn't do. Terry will tackle number 2.

**Action Item: We will discuss this at the October meeting.**

Should we keep Cynthia responsible for number 10?

**Action Item: Colleen will call Cynthia and discuss her responsibilities for the review.**

K. Expectations of AMWG Meeting

**NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** requested from USFS a full analysis of carcass information. They want a demographic assessment of wolves feeding on livestock. The demographic assessment will tell us if we have viable population. We do not because it is sustained by releases; it is not a closed population. We know based on a demographic analysis, this population would not survive. It is supposed to be self-sustaining eventually, but the plan does not say it is supposed to be in the first 5 years.

Mexican wolf trends in the EIS – should the figure be shown to the AMWG tomorrow? AGFD is uncomfortable with the presentation going that way. We just need to say what field team is doing. Even though they are absolute numbers, there is still controversy over how we count them. Sometimes we want a sprinkling of analysis in our presentations, but generally we should wait for annual report to do it.

**NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** is likely to bring up that our numbers are not very high. **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** constantly brings this up, and we want to show that we are at and below numbers and mortalities, respectively. The figure represents what is in the annual reports – real numbers. The annual reports outline how population estimates are made. There were different levels of effort counting pups, but we are now consistent with how we count pups. The figure was going to be included because question comes up constantly.

We adjourned for the day at 1530.

July 9, 2004

A. Items Deferred/Continued from Yesterday

AMWG Meeting Topics

Depredation study – Stuart gave update on what he was going to present to the public. He will present the results of the study only. Budget will not be addressed unless asked.

Grazing on USFS land was brought up in Hon-doh and Adam would appreciate not getting into this.

AMWG – made change in notes reflecting **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** comment.

#### MOU

SCAT asked about burden of proof for depredation kills in the County stipulations for the MOU. USFWS explained the procedure that is followed.

**Question:** Is there a method that the counties would not be opposed to reintroduction?

**Response:** Yes. There are certain things that can be done to mitigate the impact of reintroduction.

**Question:** Are all counties going to sign under these stipulations? **Response:** AZ counties may look at this. Greenlee and Navajo have already signed. Right now, this only pertains to Catron and Sierra. This attachment will not change any commitments of those that have signed the MOU. Steve thinks that it is good that people can put divergent opinion in the MOU and he was told the MOU was purposefully structured that way.

Members acknowledged the submittal of stipulations. USFS made a motion to accept them, and WS seconded. All were in favor.

Both Alex and Adam thanked Terry for his dedication and helping the counties.

#### Protocol Subgroup

The group agreed to focus efforts on SOP 2. Two levels need to be considered – protocols that need Regional Director approval, and those that need AMOC approval. We are interested in streamlining and working at the lowest possible level, keeping in mind that protocols have to be approved by someone, somehow. Between now and 1 September, SOP 2 will be reviewed and revised. We will work through the rest of them after we are finished with SOP 2. Protocols will not be sent out for “review,” just for consideration in how they relate to SOP 2.

We need to get money spent in local communities and it needs to be reflected in the SOPs.

**Action Item:** Oakleaf will send all SOPs to Terry. Terry will burn all to CDs and send to AMOC.

#### Wolf Release Proposal

AGFD needs comments back for recommendations to Duane. What are the strengths and weaknesses?

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

USFS thought it was well done, despite not having a map. WS agreed – it was a big improvement over the first draft.

A scored matrix was suggested, but it was decided that it would not be value added.

A suggestion was made to include an appendix with public meeting notes. Dan G. explained it was a conscious decision not to include them because the entire meeting was not captured wholly.

**Action Item:** Dan G will email Terry the meeting notes, and he will get them out to everyone in AMOC.

SICO had two concerns. One is ensuring identification of release sites, in conjunction with USFS, that are not high-risk areas for fire. He also heard that drought relates to reproduction failure in wolves and does not think it is in the best interest of USFWS to pursue at this time. He was not sure where the study was done. Dan G. said there are studies that show predators thrive when there are bad environmental conditions. Adam explained the study he was referring to looked at reproduction, not prey base. It showed a direct relationship between drought and wolf reproduction. He thought wolves should be released in areas not seriously affected by drought.

**Action Item:** IFT will research this topic and present it at the next AMOC meeting.

The genetic section needs to have further explanation over expendable animals on the ground (10j) vs. maintaining genetic diversity.

**Question:** Are we trying to maintain lineages in wolves like the Apache trout?

**Response:** No, we can't. Stocked lineages of trout are limited as to where they can go and how distinct each stream-reach subpopulation is genetically. Once a wolf has been released, it goes where it wants to go and can breed with any other wolf. Also, we are not recovering at the lineage level; we are recovering the Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of the gray wolf. Thus, although we are trying to conserve at the species level in the DPS, we are still trying to maintain or even enhance genetic diversity through selective release of wolves chosen to represent certain lineages or genetic background. But, once they hit the ground, the 10j is in effect and the released animals legally become non-essential. We will continue this discussion at the Recovery Team meeting.

SCAT would like a map of release sites and entire recovery area in the release proposal. However, instead of a map, the group decided to include the general location of release sites in the matrix. Since this will become a public document, general terms will be used.

SCAT would also like place cards with names at the next meeting.

**Action Item:** Terry will ensure everyone has place cards at the next AMOC meeting.

#### Inviting Congressional Staff

Should we open up AMOC meetings to Congressional staff to provide them with more information? The group thought it was a good idea. There is interest already; Renzi's staff routinely makes it to AMWG meetings.

Since AMOC is functioning, it might be good for them to see. It could encourage them to ask questions. It is also important for them to see how we work together and demonstrate that we are not at each other's throats. The invitation should be extended to both states at the federal level. We can open it up to state legislators also. But we cannot open it up to nongovernmental entities.

The group will extend invitations through the counties; Sierra and Catron counties in NM, and Greenlee and Navajo in AZ. Terry should be cc:'d on the invitation letters, and he will distribute the letters to the rest of the group.

A question arose if the invitations should stress that they are invited to "attend and listen" and not participate. Adam mentioned that legally, the invitation had to be put that way for open meetings. Terry said this was not an open meeting, so the invitations can ask them to "attend." The group agreed. Most staff just listen anyway. The more open we leave the invitation, the more they are likely to attend.

Some wondered if a "sexy" agenda item would be necessary for them to come. Sierra County believes they will attend because it is a wolf meeting, and that issue is important enough.

The invitation should ask if they would like to receive agenda and encourage them to sign up to the electronic listserv.

They can be invited to any and all meetings except for the 1 September meeting. The election is close, so they probably will not show up for awhile.

#### Five-Year Review

The new dates that Terry handed out were acceptable. The sentence covering electronic distribution was fine too. We will send hard copies, if requested.

Some significant changes in the timeline: The 60 day public comment period was changed to 60 days with the availability of a 30 day extension (want to avoid public giving comment over the holidays). The new due date will be 15 February, with a possible extension to 15 March. The Recovery Team meeting dates are January 21-22. The July AMOC/AMWG meetings were changed to June. The 31 October and 30 April dates are based around the socioeconomic contract.

NMDGF would like drafts available for their commission meeting on 8 December. Can the contractor change due date to 4 December?

**Action Item:** Colleen will follow through with successful contractor to see if they can change to the 4 December date.

Extensive discussions took place on dates and times for the AMWG meetings in January. See end of the summary notes for the final dates and locations.

B. Annual Work Plan and Budget

Wally will be co-lead on this item because Susan has not been able to make progress.

**Action Item:** A draft annual work plan will be sent to AMOC by 31 July.

USFWS had \$870K available last year for the wolf project, but only \$530K for this year. This covers support for John and Dan (not salaries) and field operations, **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION**. There is no money to support NM or AZ, mule packers, flights, and WS. There is \$50K set aside for socioeconomic contract, but D.C. may pay for that.

We do not know how we will pay for flights, winter study, depredation, and monitoring.

**Action Item:** Susan will put together a request through Dale to D.C. requesting more money.

We are in a serious financial situation. NMDGF wonders if there was an important message accompanying the cuts. USFWS does not believe so. All money for recovery is going to grants for states and tribes (SWG).

The coordinator position will still be filled because their base budget covers all salaries.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

AZ is covered, but we need to take care of others as well. AGFD will not pull money from other projects to cover for the Mexican wolf project again. All of the other projects are suffering. AGFD is paying for all flights this year over AZ, NM, and the tribal lands. Last year AGFD contributed \$140k, and this year it is \$402k so AMOC/AMWG commitments can be kept. This does not include the money spent on the depredation study. AGFD is already carrying a \$43k deficit from FY04 from flights. Everyone needs to step up and look at the commitment we made in the MOU to seek funding. We have to advocate for collective funding.

USFWS needs cooperators to go to D.C. to talk with Steve Williams and Congress. The group needs to show them we need more money.

Every penny of section 6 is going to funding for the Mexican wolf. NMDGF is getting some of this money through LIP and SWG, but that is an entirely different set of responsibilities.

USFS wants a subcommittee to meet in July to go over numbers and brainstorm on what we need and how we can get it. The meeting will be in Albuquerque after the Recovery Team on Friday. Members will be Terry, Susan, Lisa, Wally, and Dave. John Caid and someone from SCAT need to be on the subcommittee also.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

AGFD just wanted to know the thought process behind the funding. The intention was not to take the tribes' allocations.

C. Law Enforcement

**LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION REDACTION.**

Involving the public in some sort of "community watch" was not well received by AMOC. AMOC does not support the general public doing this. If someone sees something, they can call the Operation Game Thief number.

Lion patrols are going on in both states September through December. As long as there are 175 permits or more in an area, they will have law enforcement covering it.

Mexican wolves are protected by state law in NM and AZ.

AGFD has receivers that we can loan; all have not been allocated yet.

**Action Item:** Dan G. needs to get Terry an allocation list.

The brochure for FWS was funded, but the AGFD brochure was not printed. This will be done this FY.

NM does not want anything to do with the reward poster. **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** has not done anything on this yet. Colleen is the AMOC contact for **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION**.

D. Role and Function Statements

The document handed out goes through needs that were identified at the last meeting. All of this is budget dependent and based on the annual work plan.

This topic will be focused on at the 1 September meeting.

**Action Item:** Comments to John by 31 July. John will incorporate comments and return document to AMOC by 24 August.

The communication is very open between the IFT and USFS. The person in the position described in number 12 would be to keep all district rangers informed, but would not be a biologist on the IFT. It would improve communication to permittees through the district rangers. The position would be funded by USFS. USFS has helped greatly, but it will be better to have one person assigned to this.

CACO would like to review the job description to ensure that the position will not just be another layer the permittees have to go through. The position should be positive, not regulatory. It was explained that all job descriptions are automated.

This person would not take over the responsibility of informing permittees, just the responsibility of coordinating with all district rangers.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

The position outlined in number 11 needs to be shaped by all agencies. The word choice was purposely chosen because people will think of the LIP program when they see it.

E. Other Business

574

Wildlife Services has not been able to do anything; **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

AGFD still recommends lethal take. If 574 is on AZ land, and there is a lethal take order from Dale, AZ will kill it.

FWS asked if AZ will still kill the wolf even though it is genetically valuable, and it is not depredating. AZGF responded that they would. It is a question of compliance with the protocol, and keeping our word.

The wolf has not been able to be trapped, so it must be killed. It has to be removed permanently one way or another. The genetic issue should have been resolved before the animal was put out as a 10j animal.

A suggestion was made that the protocol should be revisited to allow time for a break if a wolf cannot be trapped, and it stops depredating.

AGFD has an obligation to live up to the protocol, so the wolf must be taken. AGFD recognizes the genetic issue. If protocols do not make sense, they need to be changed, but they cannot be changed while dealing with a problem. Dale said take is going to be ordered. There is no room to make another decision. Susan will brief Dale again and let their concerns be known. He still may make the same decision, but they have to be heard.

Decisions need to be streamlined to be made as close to depredations as possible. Decisions should not be made months after the fact.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

IFT has not found any other kills or misbehaving from 574, but there have not been many locations.

F. AMWG Meeting

The group went over that afternoon's agenda to see if there were any more concerns. None were noted.

G. Local Government Participation in Recovery Team

Hector Ruedas was invited to join, but he declined. The cattle growers will have two more people on the stakeholder group because Utah and Texas do not attend.

County participation needs to increase. Sierra County commission will not appoint a member to represent all the counties. The counties are not a homogeneous group. Sierra County will participate as much as they can.

Ideas of participants were: Jan Porter from Catron County, Ron Henderson and Henry Torres from Grant County, and Mark Herrington from Graham County.

H. Winter Kill Study

Not much discussion on this topic. One month of pilot data have been collected. We need to comment on it during the work plan discussions.

I. Meeting Dates and Locations:

AMOC

October 14	0800-1700	Springerville AZ
October 15	0800-1200	Springerville AZ
January 27	1330-1700	Glenwood NM
January 28	1330-1700	Alpine AZ
April 14	0800-1700	San Carlos AZ
April 15	0800-1200	San Carlos AZ
June 16	0800-1700	Reserve NM
June 17	0800-1200	Reserve NM

AMWG

October 15	1330-1700	Springerville AZ
January 27	1800-2100	Glenwood NM
January 28	1800-2100	Alpine AZ
April 15	1330-1700	San Carlos AZ
June 17	1330-1700	Reserve NM

The meeting adjourned at 1142.