

## **Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Work Group Final Summary Notes for Meeting of July 9, 2004**

Location - Bayard Community Center, 290 Hurley Avenue, Bayard, New Mexico

Attendees (not all Attendees signed in legibly) - Tim Edwards, Lynn Edwards, Sarah Wheeler, Jeff Dolphin, Norm Wheeler, Peter Segulia, Deirdre Wolf, Martin Curtan, Bonnie Curtan, Larry Sullivan, Kathy Sullivan, Darry Dolan, Robert Murillo, Rosy Murillo, Santo Murillo, Donna Stevens, Jo Gauer, Sue Sefscik, and Linda Metz (private citizens); Mary Ann Baruch (People for USA); Jean Ossorio, Jon McDonald, and Jim Stertz (Southwest Environmental Center – SWEC); Jene Moseley and J. Waugh (Sierra Club); Scotty Johnson (Defenders of Wildlife – Defenders); Helen Francis (SW Biodiversity); Michael Robinson (Center for Biological Diversity – CBD); Steve Titla (San Carlos Apache Tribe – SCAT); Alex Thal (Catron County); Adam Polley (Sierra County); Shawna Nelson, Deb O’Neill, Dan Groebner, Bill Van Pelt, and Terry Johnson (Arizona Game and Fish Department – AGFD); Chuck Hayes, Lisa Kirkpatrick, and Nick Smith (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish – NMDGF); John Oakleaf, James Ashburner, Delivan Roper, and Susan MacMullin (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – USFWS); Bud Starnes (New Mexico Department of Agriculture – NMDA); Wally Murphy (U.S. Forest Service – USFS); David Bergman, Stewart Breck, and Michael Pacheco (USDA APHIS Wildlife Services – WS).

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

Terry B. Johnson, Chair (AGFD), called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. He thanked all present for attending.

Attendees briefly introduced themselves. Then the ground rules were affirmed as the same as for previous meetings: minimize side-bar conversations; show respect for disparate opinions; raise hands for recognition; one person speaks at a time; question-and-answer format; and participants should direct questions to the panel. A new rule added requiring anyone speaking to state their name before asking questions or providing comments; this will become part of the summary notes.

Please recognize that these summary notes are not minutes, and comments and questions will not be summarized word for word.

### Review of Action Items from April 2004 Meeting

Attendees were informed that Action Items from the previous AMWG meeting were turned into Agenda Items for this meeting. The “Other Business” agenda item includes time for topics that were missed, and new items that attendees want to add.

1. Posting annual Interagency Field team (IFT) reports on the AGFD website. This item has been completed; the reports are now available.

**Action Item:** USFWS Mexican Wolf Recovery Program reports will also be put on the AGFD website – Due 7/31/04.

2. Reward poster. Concern was expressed in the April 2004 AMWG Meeting that the agencies' reward poster did not reflect funds (ca. \$35,000) that had been committed by various nongovernmental organizations, and the phone numbers on the poster needed to be updated. Colleen Buchanan was supposed to work with Craig Miller (Defenders) and law enforcement agents from USFWS, NMDGF, and AGFD to resolve this. Terry Johnson and Chuck Hayes were supposed to advise their agency's law enforcement agents that Colleen would contact them about this. Chuck and Terry completed their part, but Colleen has yet to hear from Craig.

**Action Item:** Scotty Johnson will ask Craig Miller to contact Colleen by July 23.

3. Information flow matrix. This matrix outlines whom to contact in each cooperating agency when wolf events of interest and importance occur. This matrix was finalized in May, and has been successfully used once. This should make information flow better, and ensure it is timely.
4. USFWS Region 2 Director's response regarding wolf control decisions (i.e. Will every decision be documented in writing, and will only the Regional Director make decisions regarding control?).

Susan MacMullin – Regional Director Dale Hall and Colleen Buchanan spoke about this. Susan thinks Dale said he does not want to be bound to a commitment to document every decision, or for him to make every decision (delegation is important). But, regardless of who makes Mexican wolf decisions, he is ultimately responsible and accountable. Susan will double-check Dale's final decision, since Colleen was handling this and she is not present today to verify it.

Michael Robinson – Why does USFWS not want to have decisions in writing and document the cause? CBD is willing to develop a form.

Susan MacMullin – USFWS usually issues a press release on important actions, so people will know about the decision. I am willing to take it back to Dale, but this is the best answer I can offer today.

Scotty Johnson – Memos that lead up to the decision could be cut and pasted into a memo. That would be easy.

Michael – Susan, you said that in most cases there is an advisory to the press. This is not true. The Cibola pack is going to be killed, and nothing was released except by CBD. You need to be forthright.

Marty Curtan – Whose decision is this? Can we get his number?

Susan MacMullin – It is the Regional Director's decision. Again, I will take this back to him and get clarification.

Terry Johnson – Let's get the decision in the next seven days so we can get it in the notes.

Donna Stevens – I support Michael getting it out to public and asking USFWS to be transparent.

Jean Ossorio – A press release does not equate to an official document.

Dan Groebner – All actions taken in this project have been approved in (authorized by) an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the 10(j) rule, or a management plan, so actions do not need approval on a case-by-case basis.

Michael Robinson – I am not suggesting redundancy to the process. I just want to know why a decision has been made to take a wolf out of the wild.

Darry Dolan – What are the conditions that led to the destruction of the Cibola pack?

Terry Johnson – We will talk about this later in the agenda, with the IFT update.

Jason Lapinsky – We (ranchers and guides) want same type of documentation for every action the USFWS makes in favor of the wolf.

**Action Item:** USFWS will get a response from Dale Hall by 16 July so it can be included in these notes. This item will be brought to the next AMWG meeting for closure. [Note: as of August 31, when these notes were being finalized, no USFWS decision had been relayed to Johnson.]

### Interagency MOU

The referenced Interagency MOU for the AZ-NM reintroduction project is available on the AGFD website at: [http://www.azgfd.com/w\\_c/wolf\\_reintroduction.shtml](http://www.azgfd.com/w_c/wolf_reintroduction.shtml), which has a link to the USFWS Mexican wolf recovery page.

MOU signatories to date include:

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Work Group  
July 9, 2004, Final Summary Notes  
Page 4 of 18

Lead Agencies - Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD)  
New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF)  
White Mountain Apache Tribe (WMAT)  
USDA APHIS Wildlife Services (WS)  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)  
U.S. Forest Service (USFS)

AMWG Cooperators - Greenlee County, Navajo County, and New Mexico Department of Agriculture (NMDA).

All AMOC Lead Agencies have signed the MOU.

AMWG participants that have not signed on as Cooperators are - Graham and Cochise Counties have not signed, but are considering participating.

Catron and Sierra Counties will be considering signing the MOU at their County Commission meetings in July. They have created an addendum to the MOU that AMOC has accepted. No other signatory is obligated to the addendum.

San Carlos Apache Tribe is participating in AMOC meetings, but has not decided whether to sign the MOU.

Any government agency at the county level or above is eligible to sign the MOU. New Cooperators can be added as described on pages 12-13 in the MOU.

#### Interagency Field Team (IFT) 2004 Annual Work Plan and Budget

The IFT is made up of the Lead Agencies and includes personnel from AGFD, NMDGF, WMAT, WS, USFWS, the Turner Endangered Species Fund, and a seasonal intern funded by Defenders.

Budgeting and Work Plan development for 2005 are far behind schedule, because USFWS just received its budget in May for the federal Fiscal Year starting last October, and is just at the point where it can make allocations to the wolf project. The Lead Agencies will meet next Friday in Albuquerque to discuss the Work Plan. We want to have a draft plan by July 31 and a final by August 31.

USFWS had \$870,000 for wolf work last year, but only has \$530,000 to allocate this year. This covers support (but not salaries) for John Oakleaf and Dan Stark, IFT field operations, \$140,000 for WMAT (wolf staff), and \$40,000 for SCAT (to begin managing). There is no money to help support NMDGF or AGFD, mule packers for releases or captures, monitoring flights, or WS. The budget projections do not look any better for future years. In fact, they look worse.

WS has \$150,000 to be split between IFT operations in AZ and NM.

NMDGF has the authority to spend money for one IFT FTE (Nick Smith), by matching federal funds in a 3:1 ratio (federal:state). However, it now appears that the \$60,000 that was supposed to come from USFWS for this position will not be available.

AGFD has spent about \$110,000-300,000 per year (including federal matching funds) through June 30, 2004, for IFT work. However, in FY05 (beginning July 1, 2004), AGFD is not receiving anything from USFWS, so AGFD is committing \$442,000 to the project. This will include federal matching funds from sources other than the USFWS wolf budget. To accomplish this, AGFD is taking funds from other bird, fish, mammal, and herp projects. The AGFD contribution to the WS depredation study (\$100,000 per year) is funded separately.

Scotty Johnson – Defenders’ annual allocation to WMAT to hire community herder who will track wolves and cows is \$112,000 through the Farm Bill EQIP program. Possibly we could help fund other wolf work.

Terry Johnson – NMDGF could use \$25,000 right now.

Scotty Johnson – I will look into it.

Jason Lapinsky – The USFWS allocation does not include salaries?

Susan MacMullin – Salaries for USFWS employees are taken out of base funds, not the \$530,000.

Jason Lapinsky – How many USFWS employees are working full time on wolves?

Susan MacMullin – Reintroduction: two; recovery: one.

Terry Johnson – Remember that wolf reintroduction and wolf recovery are different. We are only speaking of reintroduction budgets now.

Jason Lapinsky – Are the other agencies excluding salaries from their dollar figures?

Terry Johnson – AGFD’s figure includes salaries for all FTEs directly involved in the reintroduction work: the AGFD IFT leader, outreach, and two technicians. These funds, plus the costs of staff like myself who are not in the IFT, are reflected in the agency summary that we produce periodically.

**Action Item:** Terry will provide an update of the agency expenditures summary within the next 30 days.

Sue Sefscik – What is the difference between recovery and reintroduction?

Terry Johnson – Recovery refers to the range-wide conservation (recovery) effort, which is supposed to occur under and be guided by a Recovery Plan written by or for a Recovery Team. The Recovery Plan is supposed to be updated every five years. In this case, reintroduction refers to the reintroduction effort in western NM and eastern AZ that is guided by an Adaptive Management Oversight Committee and this Adaptive Management Work Group. Reintroduction is supposed to help accomplish recovery. However, the Recovery Plan guiding our reintroduction project was signed in 1983, and does not provide much specific guidance. That will improve when the plan is revised, a process that is underway right now through a Recovery Team.

Jason Lapinsky – What about NMDGF – Why doesn't NMDGF have money?

Chuck Hayes – Our 25% State match of the \$80,000 total is available, but we need USFWS matching money to fully fund the position.

Jason Lapinsky – Where does the NMDGF money come from?

Chuck Hayes – Primarily the State's General Fund.

Terry Johnson – AGFD gets its State IFT money primarily from Lottery (Heritage) Funds, and we match it with a variety of federal funds.

Scotty Johnson – The USFWS budget is down almost 50% -- please explain.

Susan MacMullin – The Region 2 endangered species program budget has been shorted for the past two years. The money is simply not there. Congress is not appropriating it, and Washington is not reallocating to compensate for the shortfall.

Terry Johnson – The Congressional appropriators guiding the USFWS budget are not mainly from the Southwest. They typically fund programs for the states they come from. It is politics.

Michael Robinson – Is USFWS funding WS out of the \$530,000, too?

Susan MacMullin – In the past, we typically funded both of the states, WS, and the two tribes (WMAT and SCAT) from our wolf budget. This year we are only funding the tribes.

Michael Robinson – How much of the \$530,000 is going to wolf control?

Susan MacMullin – About 30 to 50 percent goes to the IFT, which is also responsible for wolf control.

Michael Robinson – So \$160,000 to \$250,000 goes for control?

Susan MacMullin – No, that is not right.

Terry Johnson: I think the language here is a problem. I think Michael is talking about wolf control in a depredation-response sense, and Susan is talking about overall wolf management, including monitoring, etc. Let's try to be more precise.

Jean Ossorio – How much are we going to have this year for the IFT?

Terry Johnson – We will not know until perhaps the end of July.

Jean Ossorio – How much did we have last year?

Terry Johnson – The expenditures summary will answer that, in terms of what each agency spent.

Jason Lapinsky – AGFD is spending how much this year?

Terry Johnson – \$442,000 for this Fiscal Year, which began 1 July.

Jason Lapinsky – Explain the discrepancy between NMDGF and AGFD.

Chuck Hayes – There are many differences. AGFD has dedicated funds to the project and NMDGF does not. Overall, NMGFD is a smaller agency, has a smaller budget, and is a smaller state.

Terry Johnson – In September 2002, the Arizona Game and Fish Commission (AGFC) thought the wolf program problems could best be improved if we (the states) became more directly involved in a leadership capacity. AGFD has backed that commitment up with increased allocation of funds. The other agencies are apparently not able to contribute as much financially right now. AGFD can, so that's what we are doing. We get our State monies from the AZ Lottery and Indian gaming in AZ. However, we also shut down some fish, bird, mammal, and herp projects so we could redirect those funds to the wolf project this Fiscal Year. That was our choice. It was not forced on us by anyone, nor were we constrained by our Legislature from doing it. Our legislature does not get involved in our budget the way NM's does.

Jason Lapinsky – AGFD is paying a large portion of the budget to put wolves in NM.

Terry Johnson – AGFD is currently underwriting a disproportionate amount of the IFT costs to achieve the goals of the AZ-NM reintroduction project, address the problems identified by the Game Commissions of the two states in 2002, and help achieve recovery so the wolf can be delisted. How long we are willing or able to sustain this kind of budget is unclear. We are

approaching it one year at a time. The alternative was to leave wolves unmanaged, and not address legitimate public concerns. We did and do not think those alternatives were/are acceptable or appropriate.

Jason Lapinsky – AZ money is affecting people in NM.

Terry – Congress made a budget cutback decision for USFWS, but we must still manage wolves on the ground. AGFD is contributing funding to address these issues, including depredation relief, regardless of where the problems occur. The project is supposed to be a team effort, and we are committed to that approach.

Scotty Johnson – It is a top down decision. Money coming in reduces conflicts. NM residents should contact their legislators to get money for NMDGF.

Larry Sullivan – The rules are different in AZ and NM. The way the programs work is in the MOU. The government has decided to implement rules and laws that someone else has made.

Scotty Johnson – The rules are being made by U.S. citizens. Many attempts have been made to weaken the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but citizens will not allow it.

Terry Johnson – Citizens enacted our Heritage (Lottery) Fund by about a 74% vote. Since then, there have been 28 or so legislative attempts to redirect the funds from wildlife, but Heritage opponents have never been able to get it done.

Darry Dolan – The citizens of NM would like to thank AGFD for expending funds to the benefit of New Mexicans.

#### Other Business

1. Sharon Morgan read a letter from Nancy Kaminski thanking everyone who helped post signs in the National Forests to reduce the likelihood of accidental killing of wolves.
2. Status of Mexican Wolf Recovery Coordinator vacancy. The internal (USFWS) opening closed last week, but it will be open externally for three more weeks. It will be at least 1½ months before a selection is made and offered. Hopefully, the position will begin by the start of the next federal Fiscal Year, October 2004.
3. Update on wolf mortalities in 2003 and 2004. There were 13 field mortalities in 2003 and three in 2004. The last mortality was an uncollared yearling male (released in 2003) that was hit by a car on 19 May in Springerville.

To date, there have been 43 mortalities: 20 shot (including one authorized lethal take); eight hit by car; eight other causes (e.g. two dehydration; two predation); five disease (three parvo, two distemper; all in captivity); and two unknown.

Michael Robinson – The three disease mortalities were pups. The vet was not able to control the disease.

4. Update on animal husbandry/depredation study.

Stewart Breck: The study is in east-central Arizona. As previously stated, the specific location cannot be disclosed.

The primary objective of the study is to see if alternative grazing strategies reduce depredation. We are also collecting baseline information on all kills, by other predators as well as wolves. This first year was the pilot year to see if the objective could be met. The sample sizes are small, so we will not have statistical power to say if altering grazing regimes will affect depredation. Now, we need to decide if we should continue the study, and how. It may not be possible to answer the basic question we are asking in these circumstances.

We got comments back from experts asked to review the study proposal. Everyone said the broad idea of evaluating the manner in which we graze cattle in response to depredation was a good idea. However, they were concerned about the small sample size, as are we.

During the spring roundup, there were two to three missing calves. Project personnel are continuing to tag calves, and are having tags refurbished. There have not been any new kills and there is not much evidence of wolves in the area, or of any other predators depredating cattle. There is only one field person on the study, so it is difficult to keep up with the fieldwork.

We are tagging second calf crop. About 250 calves, 70 heifers, and 30 cows are tagged. Eight radio-tagged calves died (five lion, one wolf, two nonpredator) and 12 untagged died. Five were nonpredator-related and seven are unknown, but are still being investigated.

The pilot year will not provide us with information on alternative grazing, but we are getting good predator interaction data.

A companion study may take place on San Carlos Apache Reservation (SCAR) if a grant request comes through.

Darry Dolan – What is the difference between this study and the one on SCAR?

Stewart Breck – They are pretty much the same. Our desire is to ensure that the results of both studies can be compared, so they need to be very similar in approach even though the grazing systems differ.

Susan MacMullin – The decision on the tribal grant is in the USFWS D.C. office.

Darry Dolan – What is SCAT's interest?

Susan MacMullin – What kind of predation rates there are. There is no real data available now.

Stewart Breck – It will be an interesting comparison between different systems.

Darry Dolan – Are you trying to decide whether to continue because of population size?

Stewart Breck – The sample size will not be adequate to answer the question. We do not want to give false expectations.

Joanne Edwards – What will an alternative grazing strategy look like?

Stewart Breck – It was an idea of Frank Hayes (USFS) to use aggregate grazing, a community herd approach. You take cattle from several allotments and run them together.

Joanne Edwards – So, it is an increase in numbers?

Stewart Breck – Yes, but there are reservations from the agriculture community. We want to identify if aggregation will reduce predation.

Joanne Edwards – Can we read up on this?

Stewart Breck – Yes. See me for some reading suggestions.

Sharon Morgan – There is 3% livestock death due to predation. It should be up to individual to decide what husbandry practices to use.

Stewart Breck – We are trying to find non-lethal methods, but we are limited in the area in which we can work.

Deirdre Wolf – Feral dogs were our problem. Is anyone looking at them?

Stewart Breck – Not in this study.

Deirdre Wolf – Whitewater and Apache are crawling with wild dogs. Whole herds of sheep are slaughtered.

Scotty Johnson – WMAT monitors wolves and herds with GPS. They keep them as far apart as possible by moving cows. There are other benefits also – riparian areas are improving. We need to get USFWS support to add expertise. We would be able to develop a better picture. Where is the tribal grant timeline?

Susan MacMullin – Collaborating is the best approach, and USFWS would love to meet and discuss this. Grants are being awarded now. The grant cycle starts in the spring, so it is too late for this year.

Scotty Johnson – We will try next year for an Apache grant?

Mary Ann Baruch – Any results/conclusions from the study?

Stewart Breck – Not yet.

Mary Ann Baruch – We want to know how it is going.

Stewart Breck – I am happy to give updates, but we have to wait until the study is over to draw conclusions.

Darry Dolan – What are the reservations of the agriculture community?

Stewart Breck – There are economics tied to the allotments and concern over loss of allotments. We do not know if herding is practical. Some people do not get along with their neighbors. Cattle are different. The USFS district ranger put a lot of thought into this.

Darry Dolan – Is there a recommendation to monitor herds?

Stewart Breck – No.

Darry Dolan – Is the formation of larger herds in the study?

Stewart Breck – It is up to the individual ranchers to decide that. Manipulating how they run cattle may not be part of the study because of small sample sizes, but we may be able to compare differences between places.

Michael Robinson – I would like a copy of the study proposal. I requested it 14 months ago and have not gotten it. When can we get it?

Stewart Breck – I can get it in two weeks, 23 July.

Terry Johnson – Let's clarify that. The proposal itself is not available, as we have stated previously. It includes information that specifically identifies the host ranch, and releasing that would be a violation of confidence and for WS a violation of a court order. I will send out a modified version of the study to everyone, as soon as Stewart provides me with one.

**Action Item:** Terry will send out a modified version of the study proposal to everyone who is signed up on the electronic subscription list for wolf updates.

Norm Wheeler – Are the seven untagged mortalities predator-related?

Stewart Breck – We do not know yet.

Norm Wheeler – That is a 7% mortality rate, not 3%.

Stewart Breck – We are looking at the total, not just the percent mortality of the tagged.

Norm Wheeler – What is important is what causes the deaths. There are increased deaths due to predators - 7% were due to wolves.

Stewart Breck – That is not how we use the data.

Norm Wheeler – We do not care about 250 alive – we care about the deaths.

Stewart Breck – I hesitate playing with figures this way. You cannot interpret them before the end of the study.

Terry Johnson – There has to be a feasibility assessment for the first year to see if we can actually gather the data we want through this approach, and to see if it would be worthwhile to fund a long-term study. The methods are still changing and evolving. We cannot make inferences this early. This is a major concern. Premature conclusions and decisions don't help anyone.

Scotty Johnson – Mad cow disease will be an issue for livestock producers nationwide, and we are incorporating into the WMAT husbandry study. Producers may be required by USDA to tag 10% of the herd. There will be funding available for this. This problem will overtake predators very quickly.

Michael Robinson – If you terminate the current study, will you write up the results and disseminate them?

Stewart Breck – That is up to AMOC.

Terry Johnson – AGFD would want to make the results available to the public, as long as there are no confidentiality problems and as long as the appropriate caveats are noted (e.g. sample size limitations). If there were meaningful results, we would want to see them published.

Dave Bergman – I want to remind people of FOIA. We (WS) will not circumvent it, but we have to review information before it goes to public. We also cannot release information on cooperators because of an injunction.

Joanne Edwards – You said there were four objectives, with the primary one being alternative grazing practices. You thought it was Frank Hayes that came up with herd aggregation. Where else can I read about this, besides your study proposal.

Dave Bergman – The **Quivera Coalition** promotes alternative grazing.

Joanne Edwards – Is this what you are looking at in your study?

Stewart Breck – Aggregating has never been tried in the Southwest. The idea is not even in the literature extensively. It is new.

Terry Johnson – The question is, “Can we establish a depredation baseline by which to measure improvements?” That is where we are with study – will it answer that question?

Joanne Edwards – How do you establish a baseline?

Terry Johnson – The baseline referred to here is the predation rate before wolves entered the picture. To know what impacts wolves are having, you must know what the lions, coyotes, and bears are doing.

Stewart Breck – Joanne, please come talk to me after this meeting.

Nick Smith – Frank Hayes has an idea of preventative management.

Darry Dolan – Is there something about large herds that frustrates predators?

Stewart Breck – Yes. We are reevaluating right now. We cannot address this primary objective based on the first year.

Jason Lapinsky – The USFS has been moving away from large concentrations of livestock. There are banking issues.

Terry Johnson – We are seeing the problems now.

Adam Polley – Your concerns over banking will be discussed.

Scotty Johnson – We (Defenders) are in the formative stages of a proposal. There is a proactive carnivore trust at the national level for wolves. It gives producers who have good ideas some support money. I have forms to pass out. This is cutting edge.

Jason Lapinsky – Comparing tribal lands to USFS lands is comparing apples and oranges.

Scotty Johnson – Identifying the cause of death will be required by USDA soon.

5. Five-year review. There are three parts, one of which will be contracted out by USFWS. The socio-economic contract has extended deadlines for both other parts.

**Action Item:** On 4 December, the draft Five-Year Review will be sent to AMWG and stakeholder groups. There will be a 60-day comment period. The final report will be completed by 31 August, 2005.

The 10(j) requires a five-year review. We are rescheduling future AMWG meetings so we can talk about the review. The public comment period will be December 4 through February 15. **See the end of this document for meeting times and places.**

Michael Robinson – What is the purpose of public comment?

Terry Johnson – To ensure opportunities for all interests to be expressed, and to incorporate into and/or address the comments in the review.

Michael Robinson – Will this be like meetings for the three-year review?

Terry Johnson – We are not anticipating having open houses, like the three-year review did.

Michael Robinson – On what basis were the locations chosen?

Terry Johnson – They will all be within or very close to the reintroduction area, and are based on rotation between the states and the north and south. We do not know if we will have additional meetings or not.

Michael Robinson – I would like Silver City to be included in the public hearing schedules.

6. Development of role and function statements.

Terry Johnson: We have made a first attempt at the descriptions, and they are now being reviewed. Comments are due from the agencies by July 31. We hope to bring final descriptions to the October AMWG meeting.

Jason Lapinsky – Will we have any time to review them before the meeting?

Terry Johnson – We will get them out in advance; the budget and annual work plan drafts will be out, too.

**Action Item:** Send out role and function statements, and budget and annual work plan drafts through self-subscription news service two weeks prior to October AMWG meeting.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson – Please get your email addresses to Deb O’Neill. However, the self-subscription news service for wolf updates is your responsibility to sign up for. Please visit our website at: <http://www.azgfd.com/eservices/subscribe.shtml> to sign up for this service.

7. Other Items

a. Scotty Johnson – I want to give you some information on Defenders’ Carnivore Conservation Fund. There have been complaints about getting depredation compensation payments out on time. There is a backlog. Here is the process: the depredation incident is confirmed through WS, and then a letter goes to the cattle producer. It is up to the producer to contact Defenders, if they want to be reimbursed. Some do not want to be compensated. I would like the group to come up with suggestions on how to streamline the process.

Dave Bergman – WS will provide the fact sheet from Defenders with the investigation results when they are submitted to the livestock producer. That’s as far as we can go in informing people about the compensation program.

Scotty Johnson – How long will it take to get a report to the producer?

Dave Bergman – It takes about one to two weeks.

**Action Item:** WS will insert Defenders information into their mailing of results to livestock producers.

### Field Report from Interagency Field Team

John Oakleaf gave update of what the IFT has been doing. They are locating undocumented pups, and are trying to determine denning activity.

The Luna pack is denning, and two other packs are likely denning. Wolf 798 is also likely denning. The Hon-Dah pack lost its alpha female, but the IFT has seen uncollared wolves with the alpha male. The San Francisco pack is showing denning patterns. Wolf 796 has produced at least one pup.

The release in AZ scheduled for later this month will be in Long Cienega. The IFT conducted a local meeting in the Blue to take public comments. AMOC reviewed the proposal and made recommendations to AGFD. Four sites were identified initially, and Long Cienega was chosen. The AGFD Director made the final decision, based on consideration of the written proposal and all the comment received from the agencies and the public. Several concerns were noted for each proposed site, but the bottom line is that releases are essential to making progress toward recovery and delisting.

There is a lethal take order out for 574.

The IFT is attempting to collar 796's pup.

Darry Dolan – This is a confirmed pup?

John Oakleaf – Yes.

The IFT is trying to trap and get out more collars. They are targeting females now, and pups when they get older.

Mary Ann Baruch – What is the ratio of collared to uncollared wolves?

John Oakleaf – It is in the 2003 annual report. I do not have the numbers right now. There are approximately 20 collared out of 55 wolves.

Jean Ossorio – You always have estimates of numbers of uncollared wolves. Do you have a protocol for how you get from raw figures to numbers of animals? If so, can we have the information so we can evaluate how this is done? I am uncomfortable with how you estimate it.

John Oakleaf – The 2003 report outlines how we do it. It is based on observations by the IFT.

Jean Ossorio – I see in your notes there are five uncollared.

John Oakleaf – We have not estimated uncollared wolves for 2004 yet.

Terry Johnson – Will the numbers for the end of 2004 be based on only 2004, or on previous years, too?

John Oakleaf – 2004 only. These are minimum numbers.

Jean Ossorio – How do you know you are not counting uncollared wolves twice or more?

John Oakleaf – We are basing it on pack dynamics. Identifying collared wolves with uncollared individuals.

Linda Netz – Were the pups going to be released, too?

John Oakleaf – The pups died. The second group was picked up on SCAR for depredation reasons.

Darry Dolan – Do you have a sense of uncollared animals that are related to collared?

John Oakleaf – There is a high dispersal in winter. The uncollared ratio goes up when they have pups.

Darry Dolan – You should include this in the field notes. It is interesting.

John Oakleaf – We do. We track it through time.

Linda Netz – We have 15 collared, and when you take out 574 and others, we will be down to 13 collared? Are you happy with these numbers?

John Oakleaf – As you move through a successful program, you have to collar animals out there. Trapping is one way to get more collars out instead of just releasing.

Darry Dolan – When was the last initial release?

John Oakleaf – Last year.

Jean Ossorio – I counted the number of pups that were around last year, and that number was close to the number of mortalities. If you assume all pups lived, then we are not gaining anything. We are probably at a net loss.

John Oakleaf – When we get to the end of 2004, it will be reflected, if that is the case. I do not think it will be.

Nick Smith – 796 will be eligible for re-release.

Michael Robinson – USFWS just prevailed, along with Defenders and CBD, in a case that denied an injunction to remove wolves from the wild and terminate the reintroduction project.

Schedule and Locations of 2004/2005 AMWG Meetings

October 15	1:30-5:00 p.m.	Springerville, AZ
January 26	6:00-9:00 p.m.	Truth or Consequences, NM
January 27	6:00-9:00 p.m.	Glenwood, NM
January 28	6:00-9:00 p.m.	Alpine, AZ
January 29	6:00-9:00 p.m.	Phoenix, AZ
April 15	1:30-5:00 p.m.	San Carlos, AZ
June 17	1:30-5:00 p.m.	Reserve, NM

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.