ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT
HERITAGE DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Animal Abstract **Element Code:** AMAJAD1032
Data Sensitivity: No

CLASSIFICATION, NOMENCLATURE, DESCRIPTION, RANGE

NAME: *Canis lupus baileyi*
COMMON NAME: Mexican Gray Wolf, Lobo
SYNONYMS: *Canis nubilus baileyi, C. lycoan baileyi*
FAMILY: Canidae

AUTHOR, PLACE OF PUBLICATION: Nelson and Goldman (*C. nubilus baileyi*), J. Mamm., 10:165. May 9, 1929.

TYPE LOCALITY: Colonia Garcia, 6,700 ft., Chihuahua, Mexico. July 10, 1899.

TYPE SPECIMEN: USNM 98312, skin and skull of adult male, collected by E.W. Nelson and E.A Goldman. Original number 13895.

TAXONOMIC UNIQUENESS: 1 of 2 subspecies of Gray wolf in Arizona, 1 of 5 subspecies in North America. Southern-most occurring and most endangered subspecies of gray wolf in North America.

DESCRIPTION: *Canis lupus baileyi* is the smallest and most genetically distinct of the five subspecies of gray wolf that once inhabited most of North America. Males are larger than females; the nose pad is 1 1/4" (33 mm) wide, height 26-38" (66-97 cm); length 4' 3" to 5' 6" (130-165 cm); tail is 13 3/4" - 17" (35-42.5 cm); hind foot 8 5/8"-12 1/4" (22-31 cm); weight 70-100 lbs (31.1-86 kg) (50-90 lbs per USFWS 1995). This is a small sized wolf both externally and cranially; they have a broad zygomatic arch, short thick muzzle, deep chest cavity, thick neck and forequarters, and a downward slope from shoulder to hindquarters. Their head and feet are large in proportion to the body, and their long legs look almost frail compared to their bodies. The color can range from most common grizzled gray to shades of black, brown, and buff; throat and area between forelegs whitish; has a long bushy tail with a black tip.

AIDS TO IDENTIFICATION: *C. l. baileyi* is smaller externally and cranially than *C. l. youngi* (intermountain Gray Wolf); the coyote (*C. latrans*) is smaller with a smaller nose pad, and it holds its tail downward whereas *baileyi* holds its tail straight out, and a domestic dog's (*C. familiaris*) tail curves upward. It is one half the size of an arctic wolf; it is more narrow chested than a domestic dog; it looks like a shaggy German Shepard but has predominantly longer forefeet and legs.

draft

ILLUSTRATIONS: B & W photo (Johnson, 1990: 18).
Map (Busch, 1995: 172)
Color photo (Groebner, 2000:18-20).
Color photos (Johnson, 1992: 2)

TOTAL RANGE: Historically in Southeastern Arizona, New Mexico and West Texas, south through much of northern and central Mexico. Recently reintroduced to Arizona and New Mexico. A small remnant population might remain in Mexico.

RANGE WITHIN ARIZONA: Historically in Southeastern corner of the Apache National Forest in Arizona, bordering New Mexico Gila National Forest, in Greenlee and Apache Counties. Had not been seen in the wild since 1970, until recent reintroductions in Apache County, Arizona.

SPECIES BIOLOGY AND POPULATION TRENDS

BIOLOGY: The Mexican Gray Wolf is a social animal that lives in packs of 2-15, but typically 4-7. The strongest male and strongest female are the leaders (alpha). The male and female hierarchy: Alpha male is dominant over the entire pack, followed by the alpha female, then the beta male and beta female, and last the omega male and omega female. A wolf's social status can be determined as early as thirteen days old. Dominant behavior is an open mouth with bared teeth, hair raised along its back and its ears erect and pointed forward. Different packs tend to try and avoid each other. Each pack can travel over hundreds of miles, but their home range is unknown. Wolves howl most commonly during breeding season in late fall and early winter, but may howl any time of year. Howling is an important means of communication, letting pack members know the location of other pack members; as do scent posts marked by urination (Hoffmeister 1986). The way the wolf stands can say something to another wolf. Body gestures are very important in this way. Their sense of smell is over a hundred times greater than a human being. Almost half of a wolf's time is spent sleeping and the rest is spent hunting and rearing its young.

They are mainly nocturnal, hunting along runways and hunting beats that follow stream beds, washes, old game trails, and old roads. Both parents forage for food to feed the young. When the food is taken at a great distance from the den, the parents will fill themselves and regurgitate the food at the dens for the young. When young are about 3 months of age, they and the parents leave the den, and may begin to traverse established runways on hunting beats. (Hoffmeister 1986 *in* BISON 2000).

Pathogens to which wolves might be exposed in the wild include canine parvo virus, canine distemper, infectious canine hepatitis, leptospirosis and rabies. These pathogens do exist in canids, in areas of dense human population. Neither canine hepatitis nor leptospirosis is a concern in the southwest. The protocol for Mexican wolves released into recovery areas, is to vaccinate them for rabies, parvo virus, distemper, hepatitis and leptospirosis while in

draft

captivity. Wild-born wolves would only be trapped and vaccinated in cases of serious outbreaks of a given disease. (Groebner 1995).

REPRODUCTION: Both the male and female are sexually mature by the age of 2 years (breeding occurs between 2-3 years of age). Only the dominant male and female mate and rear offspring; pairs usually mate for life. They breed once a year from December to March, when the female goes into estrus for 3-5 days. Pups numbering 4-8 are born from March to May after a gestation period of 63 days. The young are born blind, deaf, and completely helpless. Young are tended by both parents, although the entire pack helps in raising the pups. Dens are made under rock ledges, off the slopes of canyon walls or hills, with good visibility of surrounding area. Some offspring remain with the pack, while others disperse as they mature, probably in winter (December).

FOOD HABITS: They feed primarily on large mammals including elk, deer, javelina, and occasionally pronghorn, and bighorn sheep. Also may take, to a lesser degree, rabbits, hares, wild turkeys and small rodents (Groebner 1995), and have been known to occasionally take cattle. They can go for weeks without food, and will gorge on kill when it is plentiful.

HABITAT: A significant vegetation type is probably not important for wolf survival. As long as the habitat is adequate to support sufficient prey populations, such as elk and deer, and human-induced mortality is controlled, the wolf should survive. Ungulate populations are most productive in ecosystems that contain a variety of forest successional stages. (Groebner 1995). Historically: montane woodlands in the southwestern U.S. and central and northern Mexico, and throughout southeastern Arizona in Upper Sonoran woodlands and grasslands; avoided desert areas (BISON 2000).

The Arizona reintroduction area consists of rugged topography, with steep canyons and high ridges, that are bisected by the Mogollon Rim. The most common vegetation types of the Blue Range area are petran montane and Great Basin conifer forests, plains and Great Basin grasslands, Madrean evergreen woodland, and semidesert grasslands. (Groebner 1995).

ELEVATION: Above 3,000 to 12,000 ft. (915 - 3660 m), or lower if they are in transit. Above 3,500 ft (1068 m) in Mexico.

PLANT COMMUNITY: In the Arizona recovery area, petran montane forests occur at higher elevations, and are comprised of ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), aspen (*Populus* spp.) and fir (*Abies* spp.). Great Basin forests are characterized by pinyon-juniper stands, at slightly lower elevations. Madrean evergreen woodlands also occur below the pine forests, and are dominated by evergreen oaks, pinyon, and juniper. Grasslands occur between 3,600-7,500 feet, and consist of native and nonnative grasses, with mesquite (*Prosopis*), juniper, and forbs in areas where fire suppression and grazing are common. (Groebner 1995).

Upper reaches of riparian areas within the recovery zones support plant communities of narrowleaf cottonwood (*Populus angustifolia*), willows (*Salix* spp.), alders (*Alnus* spp.),

draft

maples (*Acer* spp.), and red osier dogwood (*Cornus stolonifera*). Lower elevations are dominated by Fremont cottonwood (*P. fremonti*), sycamore *(Platanus wrightii*), walnut (*Juglans major*), boxelder (*Acer negundo*), ash (*Fraxinus* spp.), and hackberry (*Celtis* spp.). (Groebner 1995).

POPULATION TRENDS: At one time, they were extirpated from Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. Recovery efforts began more than 20 years ago with the establishment of a fledgling captive breeding program. They were recently re-introduced to Arizona (1998 and 1999) and New Mexico (2000) as experimental non-essential populations. Released animals are captive-reared wolves that are 'genetic surplus,' meaning their genes are already well represented by relatives in the captive population. A small wild population may persist in Mexico.

SPECIES PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT STATUS: LE (USDI, FWS 1967)

STATE STATUS: WC (AGFD, WSCA in prep)
[Endangered, AGFD, TNW 1988]

OTHER STATUS: Group 1, species level (NNDRW, NESL 2005)
[Group 1, species level (NNDFW, NESL 2000)]
P, determined endangered in Mexico (MFESL 1994)

MANAGEMENT FACTORS: Recovery of this species, will require sound management that addresses the following areas: livestock industry, ranchers, prey base, habitat capabilities, multiple use conflicts, public education.

PROTECTIVE MEASURES TAKEN: Captive breeding program at 19 cooperating facilities in the U. S. and 5 facilities in Mexico.

SUGGESTED PROJECTS: Public education; additional field surveys to evaluate possible future reintroduction sites.

LAND MANAGEMENT/OWNERSHIP: USFS (Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest), and private in the Arizona recovery zone.

SOURCES OF FURTHER INFORMATION

REFERENCES:

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 1988. Threatened Native Wildlife in Arizona. Arizona Game & Fish Dept., Phoenix. p. 23.

Arizona Game and Fish Department. In prep. Wildlife of special concern in Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department Publication. Phoenix, Arizona. 32 pp.

draft

Arritt, S. 1999. Born to be wild? The Mexican Wolf returns. Partners Conserving Endangered Species. Vol. 4, Nos. ½. pp. 10-20.

Bailey, V. 1971. Mammals of Southwest United States (with special reference to New Mexico). Dover Publications, Inc., New York. p. 303.

Bednarz, Dr. J. C. 1988. The Mexican Wolf: Biology, History, and Prospects for Reestablishment in New Mexico. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. pp. 1-70.

Biota Information System of New Mexico. 2000. BISON Species Account 050866: Mexican Gray Wolf (*Canis lupus baileyi*). New Mexico Game & Fish, http://www.fw.vt.edu/fishex/nmex_main/species/050866.htm. pp. 1-25.

Brown, D. E. 1984. The Wolf in the Southwest: The Making of an Endangered Species. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Brown, W. 1998. "El Lobo Returns." International Wolf: A Publication of the International Wolf Center. Ely, MN. Vol. 4. No. 4. p. 3-7.

Burbank, J. C. 1990. Vanishing Lobo: The Mexican Wolf and the Southwest. Johnson Publishing Co., Boulder.

Busch, R. H. 1995. The Wolf Almanac. Lyonst Buford Publishers, New York.

Cockrum, E. L. 1960. The Recent Mammals of Arizona: Their Taxonomy and Distribution. University of Arizona Press, Tucson. p. 218.

Gish, D. M. Date unknown. A historical look at the Mexican Gray Wolf (*Canis lupus baileyi*) in early Arizona Territory and since Statehood, a review of available documentation and personal records.

Groebner, D. 2000. The irony of reintroducing Mexican wolves in the southwest. Wildlife Views, Arizona Game and Fish Department. pp. 18-23.

Groebner, D. J., A. L. Girmendonk, and T. B. Johnson. 1995. A proposed cooperative reintroduction plan for the Mexican Wolf in Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix. Tech. Rep. 56. pp. 1-135.

Hoffmeister, D. F. 1986. Mammals of Arizona. University of Arizona Press, Tucson. p. 468.

Johnson, T. B. 1990. "Non Game Field Notes: Mexican Wolf." Wildlife Views, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix. p. 18.

Johnson, T. B. 1992. Just how big & bad is the wolf. Wildlife Views, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix. pp. 2-3.

Johnson, T. B., D. C. Noel, and L. Z. Ward. 1992. Summary of Information on Four Potential Mexican Wolf Reintroduction Areas in Arizona. Draft Report. Arizona Game and Fish Dept.,Phoenix. pp. 1-87.

Mech, L. D. 1970. The Wolf: The Ecology and Behavior of an Endangered Species. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Mexican Federal Endangered Species List. 1994. Secretaria de Desarollo Social, NORMA Oficial Mexicana NOM-059-ECOL-1994.

Mexican Wolf Recovery Team. 1982. Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan.

McBride, R. T. 1980. The Mexican Wolf (*C. l. baileyi*), A Historical Review and Observations on its status and distribution. USDI, Fish and Wildlife Endangered Species Report 8, Albuquerque, NM.

NatureServe. 2000. Comprehensive Report Species: Canis lupus baileyi. http://www.tnc.org. pp. 1-7.

draft

Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife Department. 2000. Navajo Endangered Species List.

Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife Department. 2005. Navajo Endangered Species List. P. 2.

Nunley, G. L. 1977. The Mexican Gray Wolf in New Mexico. USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service Report, Albuquerque, NM.

Parsons, D. R. 1996. "Mexican Gray Wolf Recovery Case Study." New Mexico's Natural Heritage: Biological Diversity in the Land of Enchantment. Vol. 36. p. 101-123.

Poole, A. J., and V. S. Schantz. 1942. Catalog of the type specimens of mammals in the United States National Museum, including the biological surveys collection. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington. Smithsonian Institute, U. S. Nat. Mus. Bulletin 178, p. 44.

Steinhart, P. 1995. The Company of Wolves. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, New York.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1967. 32 FR 4001.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1982. Endangered Species of Arizona and New Mexico. Albuquerque, NM. Region 2. p. 3.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994. The Mexican Wolf: Natural History and Recovery Efforts. Albuquerque, NM.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1995. Reintroduction of the Mexican Wolf within its Historic Range in the Southwestern United States: Draft Environmental Impact Statement. USFWS, Region 2, Albuquerque.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of the Mexican Gray Wolf in Arizona and New Mexico, Final Rule Final Rule. Federal Register 63(7):1752-1772.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service, Southwest Region Ecological Services. 1999. Mexican Gray Wolf FAQ's.

MAJOR KNOWLEDGEABLE INDIVIDUALS:

Dan Groebner, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Pinetop.

Terry B. Johnson, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Exterminated from essentially all of range through trapping and poisoning. Habitat is shrinking from human encroachment. (NatureServe 2000).

Most wolves that were (and are) reintroduced to Arizona and New Mexico, come from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service captive wolf management facility at Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge in New Mexico. Cooperators in the captive propagation program include Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum and the Phoenix Zoo.

Per Arritt (1999), "The expected home range per wolf pack is about 250 square miles, and wolves will not share home ranges. After this year, we will have used most appropriate release sites in the 1,000 square-mile primary recovery zone in Arizona, which means we are running out of space for releasing wolves. A formal amendment to the plan would be required to open more remote areas for releases." **Note:** after this article was printed, they began releasing wolves in New Mexico.

draft

To the user of this abstract: you may use the entire abstract or any part of it. We do request, however, that if you make use of this abstract in plans, reports, publications, etc. that you credit the Arizona Game and Fish Department. Please use the following citation:

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 20XX **(= year of last revision as indicated at end of abstract)**. X...X **(= taxon of animal or plant)**. Unpublished abstract compiled and edited by the Heritage Data Management System, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ. X pp.

draft