From: Terry Johnson
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2007 8:20 AM
To: AZ Terry B Johnson; FS Cathy A Taylor; FWS John Morgart; NM Renae Held; USDA-APHIS WS David L Bergman; WMAT Cynthia Dale; WMAT John Caid; AGFD Bill Van Pelt; AGFD Jon Cooley; FS Bobbi L Barrera; FWS John Oakleaf; USDA-APHIS WS Alan May; GRECO Hector Ruedas; GRECO Kay Gale; NACO JR DeSpain (Supv); NMDA Bud Starnes; NMDA Les Owen; SiCo Jan Carrejo
Cc: AGFD Shannon Barber-Meyer; NM Ellen Heilhecker; WMAT Krista Beazley; FWS Bernard Lujan; FWS Brian Millsap; FWS Bryan Arroyo; FWS Doug McKenna; FWS Elizabeth Slown PIO; FWS James Ashburner; FWS Jason Riley; FWS Jose Viramontes; FWS Steven L Spangle; FWS Victoria Fox PIO; FWS Wally J Murphy; USDA-APHIS WS Chris D Carrillo; AGFD Bruce Sitko; AGFD Dan Groebner; AGFD Dave Cagle; AGFD Eric Gardner
Subject: Mexican Wolf: Action Items and Background Information from July 23 Meeting in ABQ NM
Attachments: MW SOP 06.Wolf Translocations.Final.20050430.doc; MW SOP 05.Initial Wolf Releases.Final.20050430.doc; MW SOP 13.Control of Mexican Wolves.Final.20051010.doc; MW SOP 11.Depredation Response.Final.20050430.doc; MW AZ S6 Project -- Less Than Lethal.20070612.No TC.doc; Mx Wolf SOP 13.0 Review - Initial Suggestions from Bruce Thompson.htm

Hi!

Thanks again to all who were able to attend yesterday's meeting, and to USFWS for hosting the meeting. See you all on July 31, in Pinetop, for the next step in this process (discussion of possible changes in Reintroduction Project SOPs).

As soon as I send this message to you folks, I will forward it to the Lead Agency Directors. I own any inaccuracies in portraying our discussions from yesterday, because as noted yesterday there is not time for a review to achieve your concurrence with this summary. I apologize for that, but as we also noted yesterday this appears to be one of those "necessary time-critical" situations.

Assignments: General Information

In all comment documents, to help me with organizing the MANY comments I will receive, please retain the existing file name but insert your initials (personal or agency) in it as follows:

Original file name: MW SOP 05.Initial Wolf Releases.Final.20050430.doc
New file name: MW SOP 05.Initial Wolf Releases.Final.20050430.AGFD.doc

If individuals within an agency provide conflicting comments, I will go with the comment from the Lead Agency Representative. Or my own omniscient insights. LOL!

COB refers to Close-of-Business on the deadline day (i.e. 5 pm local time).

Submit all comment via Track Changes, accompanied by explanatory Comments inserted in the electronic copy as necessary.

Meet or beat the assigned deadline.

Assignments: Deadlines

1. AMOC Lead Agency Representatives and appropriate higher staff will immediately brief their Directors on the three foundational documents for the Reintroduction Project: November 2002 summary of AGFD, NMDGF, and USFWS discussions; October 2003 MOU; and diagram of relationships between and among recovery, adaptive management, and reintroduction activities. The purpose of these briefings is to address AMOC's concerns that not all Lead agency Directors are familiar with or have consciously bought into the basic approaches to this project to which their predecessors committed in forming AMOC. At the August 2007 Directors Summit, we must affirm that we are all on the same page in that regard, or the Directors must reach agreement on any necessary changes. AMOC believes we are not all on the same page right now, but we are definitely all trying to get there.

Note 1: Of particular importance is AMOC's relationship to external entities. AMOC was established as an operational arm of the Directors for managing the Reintroduction Project within the boundaries established by relevant laws, rules, and policies. The intent was for Commissions, Governors, Legislators, and Congressmen, etc. to work through the appropriate agency Director to influence AMOC, not to do so by direct contact. Vetting AMOC issues with outside entities before AMOC and the Directors have had an opportunity to address them is problematic.

Note 2: AMOC also agreed yesterday that other entities that have recently become more prominent players in the project (e.g. Governor staff, Commissioners, and also all agency PIOs) should be appropriately briefed on and familiar with the foundational documents in hopes of reducing the misinformation that is being conveyed about AMOC structure and function and the Reintroduction Project itself (as opposed to the USFWS recovery program, which is a separate but related enterprise).

2. Each Lead Agency Representative will discuss with their Director as soon as possible the list of "initial consideration issues" that Director Thompson provided in his email of July 13 (see attachment). No other Director provided written input to AMOC in response to Director Thompson's request, so clarification is needed on which of the issues are supported or not supported by other Directors. The issues listed in that email were an invaluable starting point for AMOC discussions yesterday, and MOC noted that some were already identified in the 5-Year Review Recommendations and some appear to be in conflict with guidance from other Directors or are infeasible within the constraints of resources (staffing and funding) presently allocated to the Reintroduction Project. At the latest, AMOC needs this clarification from each Director for discussion at its July 31 meeting with the IFTLs and Oakleaf (see Item 4, below).

3. By COB on July 27, each Lead Agency must provide comment to TBJ on SOPs 5.0 (initial releases), 6.0 (translocations), 11.0 (depredation response), and 13.0 (control). With regard to

SOP 13.0, comment on all three aspects may be provided within the existing SOP or comment on issuance of Permanent Removal Orders may be provided separately from the rest of SOP 13.0. In any event, in the next iteration of SOP 13.0 TBJ will split it into Sections A (nuisance), B (depredation), and C (Permanent Removal Orders).

4. On July 31, at 1000 AZ Time, AMOC and the three IFTLs and the AMOC-IFT Liaison will meet in Pinetop AZ to discuss possible changes in SOPs 5, 6, 11, and 13.

5. By August 17, AMOC will complete comment to TBJ on any proposed revisions in SOPs 5, 6, 11, and 13.

6. By August 20, TBJ will disseminate final PROPOSED revisions of SOP 5, 6, 11, and 13 to AMOC, Signatory Cooperators, and the Lead Agency Directors.

7. Between August 20 and August 27, AMOC Lead Agency Representatives and appropriate higher staff will brief their agency Director on all proposed changes in SOPs 5, 6, 11, and 13 so the Directors are prepared to make SEMIFINAL decisions regarding their concurrence on August 30 at the Summit. The drafts that come out of the Summit will be open for public comment through the AMWG public meeting scheduled for October 18. After it integrates the public comment appropriately, AMOC will schedule a final discussion with the Lead Agency Directors to obtain their concurrence on true final changes in this AMOC-approved SOP.

8. By COB on August 17, each Lead Agency must provide comment to TBJ on AGFD's proposed Less-Than-Lethal-Projectiles project. AGFD intends to move its proposal forward the following week, regardless of whether comment is received and regardless of whether NMDGF has completed its proposal.

9. By COB on August 17, each Lead Agency must provide accurate updated information to TBJ on agency expenditures for 2006, 2007, and 2008. Information must include amounts, and sufficient text to enable construction or revision of explanatory footnotes.

10. Ongoing: Updates on SOP 0.C (Key Contact Information) and AMOC Contact Information are due to TBJ immediately as changes on personnel and contact information occur.

11. No deadline assigned: SOP 3.0 Outreach: Jon Cooley will precipitate outcomes and update recommendations (if any) from the PIO meeting that occurred back in April (?), for which no outcomes have been supplied by those attending.

12. No deadline assigned but all IFT and AMOC members are directed to read all project SOPs and comply with them without exception.

13. No deadline assigned but the IFT is directed to ensure that its recommendations to AMOC on strikes include all relevant information and are formatted in compliance with the model provided in May 2007.

14. No deadline assigned but each Lead Agency Representative is to discuss with their Director prior to the August Summit the problems associated with understaffing in the IFT and at the Surrogate level, and problems associated with vacancies, intra-agency succession planning, and need for temporary duty assignments to provide at least survival mode IFT response capacity while vacancies are being filled and longer term solutions are sought.

15. No deadline assigned but John Morgart needs to provide Jan Porter Carrejo (Sierra County) with the information she requested in June regarding documentation needed to collect the offered rewards for wolf killings and what entities besides USFWS are providing reward monies. Note: I apologize for forgetting to cover this item at the end of yesterday's meeting, after initially saying I would do so.

16. No deadline assigned but the IFTLs and AMOC-IFT Liaison are directed to ensure that henceforth they submit AMOC information to the AMOC Chair so that he can review it for content and accuracy and then forward it to AMOC, Signatory Agencies, and Cooperators, as appropriate. Copies of such documents should not be distributed to other individuals by the IFTLs or Liaison until after the AMOC Chair has accepted the document for AMOC consideration (this is intended to minimize problems with multiple versions as have occurred in the past).

17. No deadline assigned but John Morgart will provide comment to TBJ on draft SOP 25 (media access).

18. No deadline assigned but John Morgart will keep AMOC apprised of activities pertaining to expected publication (August 4) of the Notice of Public Comment Period (and public meetings) for scoping the 10j rulemaking process.

19. No deadline assigned, but all Reintroduction Project personnel will work within their own agency to find solutions to email management issues (e.g. limits on In-Box contents that cause rejection of new incoming messages).

20. At some point in the distant future, or perhaps in the afterlife, we will all take a minute to reflect on the many good things that the Lead Agencies, Cooperators, Directors, AMOC, IFT, countless agency support staff, and the involved public have collectively accomplished thus far. It ain't all bad, and all of us are trying hard to make it all even better.

Areas of Concern Identified by AMOC Yesterday (fruit for AMOC Representative discussion with Directors from now through the August Summit) Note: these items are NOT priority ranked! (Profuse apologies if I failed to capture the essence of any comment offered when we listed or discussed these yesterday)

1. Inconsistent adherence to approved SOPs: among Directors, AMOC, and the IFT.
2. Inadequate staffing at the IFT level.
3. Inadequate funding for the IFT.
4. Director interaction in Reintroduction Project: uneven across agencies, mixed signals among agencies, recent problems with after-the-fact preferences,

guidance, or direction.

5. Some individuals have too many roles to play and/or too many functions to perform and too often people fail to recognize or acknowledge when they are or someone else is playing one assigned role as opposed to another. Need clear distinction between roles and functions of Directors, AMOC, and IFT. Assigning Directors or IFT members as AMOC Representatives or Surrogates exacerbates problems.

6. Employee turnover, inadequate within-agency succession planning for known future vacancies, and need for better intra-agency and inter-agency coaching, training, mentoring of new personnel.

7. Some AMOC Lead Agency Representatives are not empowered to represent their agency (Director). Lead Reps need more face time with Directors (and need to brief them better on the issues and POSSIBLE RANGE OF RESPONSES) so they can get better guidance that enables them to ADAPTIVELY MANAGE in AMOC discussions and conference calls when decisions need to be made. The objective is to find Lead Agency consensus on mutually acceptable common ground, not come forth with "my way is the only acceptable way" dictates, unless absolutely necessary. This can't be done efficiently or effectively by relaying messages to absent individuals to make decisions with which other absent individuals might then disagree. Possible alternative: Agency Directors meet or conference (Monthly? Weekly?) to make all decisions, and disband AMOC and AMWG.

8. Communication lapses (missed steps, late messages, and haste-makes-waste quickie messages that do not adequately convey complexities and nuances with appropriate codicils and contingencies).

9. Time frames: existing public commitment to immediate response on wolf problems but process time frames do not allow for all of the required let alone the desired within-agency heads-ups, approvals, information flow (internal and to public), etc.

10. NM events have brought higher-level politics into the project at unprecedented levels.

11. Obvious philosophical differences between agencies on wolf management and on empowerment of AMOC leading to inconsistencies in on-the-ground actions and delays in taking action.

12. NEPA Scoping and EIS Development: timeline, budget, and staff support.

13. Recovery Planning: when and how? Constant pressure from public to answer basic questions of wolf population and distribution goals for reintroduction project for recovery and for post-recovery management.

14. Action on the 37 5-Year Review Recommendations, aside from those wrapped up in 10j modification.

15. Need for proactive wolf management (interdiction and incentives: e.g. range-riders, allotment management and animal husbandry, analysis of wolf movements and cattle (losses/uses?)) which is currently constrained by lack of staffing and funding.

16. Providing dissenting comment after decisions have been made rather than before the comment deadline.

17. Cohesiveness of the Project Team (AMOC and IFT, and associated agency staff). Roles and functions of IFTLs not supported by all IFT members (e.g. allocation of IFT staff and other resources on daily and weekly basis).

18. Adding more layers of complexity in process and new processes might exacerbate existing problems rather than resolve them. Example: the more layers and iterations of concurrence needed, the more time is needed to make and

implement decisions, and the more likely it becomes that additional strikes will occur before a 3rd strike response is undertaken.

19. Lack of public (especially the affected parties, e.g. ranchers) understanding of the Reintroduction Project, how it relates to recovery, and goals, objectives, and timelines for both.

20. SOP 13.0: everyone wants change but there is not consensus on the direction or extent of change needed because the ultimate (extremist) agendas in play are fundamentally in conflict (no wolves killed to protect livestock interests; no wolf depredation is acceptable). Can mutually acceptable common ground be found?

21. USFS needs wolf and depredation information for NEPA coordination (on grazing issues) sufficient to withstand legal challenges.

22. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.

23. Confusion on agency/employee roles and functions pertaining to AMOC decisions.

24. Political landscape has changed substantially in the past few months. Much confusion over what needs to be done, what can be done, and who needs to do it by when and how. How will AMOC respond, and in what areas is AMOC empowered to respond? Substantial differences appear to be emerging among AMOC Lead Agencies as a result of individual rather than coordinated response. We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately (apologies to Ben Franklin for any misquoting herein).

Thx, Terry

****

Terry B. Johnson, Chair
Mexican Wolf AMOC/AMWG
Arizona Game and Fish Department
http://azgfd.gov
2221 West Greenway Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85023-4399
Tel 602.789.3707 Fax 602.789.3926
E-mail teebeej@azgfd.gov

****

Confidentiality Notice: This email, including all attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) within their agency. It may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unathorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited unless specifically provided for under the Arizona Public Records Law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message.