

MEXICAN WOLF ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
Final Summary Notes for April 22-23, 2008  
Note: This is not a Public Document

Location: Manor House Restaurant, across the street from Quality Inn & Suites, 420 East Highway 70, Safford, Arizona 85546; Phone 928.428.3200; Fax 928.428.3288

Date/Time: April 22, 2008: 0900 – 1700 (AZ Time)  
April 23, 2008: 0900 – 1500 (AZ Time)

Host: Arizona Game and Fish Department

Participants: AGFD: Terry B. Johnson (AMOC Chair), Dave Cagle, Mike Godwin, Mike Sumner, Jon Cooley; EACOC: Larry Stevenson; GRAHCO: Terry Cooper; GRECO: Hector Ruedas, Kay Gale; NAVCO: Jerry Brownlow; NMDA: Bud Starnes; NMDGF: Matt Wunder, Renae Held, Ken Mills, Ellen Heilhecker, Leon Redman; SCAT: Steve Titla; USDA-APHIS WS: Dave Bergman, Chris Carrillo; USFS: Cathy Taylor; USFWS: John Oakleaf; WMAT: Cynthia Dale

### **April 22, 2008**

#### 1. Welcome, opening comments, and ground rules

Terry Johnson opened the meeting at 0900 with a welcome to all, and introductions around the table. Terry gave an update on John Morgart (USFWS), who is on indefinite leave due to illness. While Morgart is gone, John Oakleaf will represent USFWS in AMOC, in addition to holding down Oakleaf's IFT responsibilities. Maggie Dwire will handle many of Morgart's daily Recovery Coordinator office responsibilities. Wally Murphy will back up Oakleaf and Dwire, and will represent USFWS tomorrow in AMOC on a couple of important issues.

Johnson reminded all that AMOC is a collaborative enterprise. When there are conflicting agendas or positions among agencies, we strive to find common ground. This can only work if each agency brings its issues to the table, so we can deal with them forthrightly. This also requires each of us to participate in the discussions, and provide constructive alternatives for others to consider. When we have action items to handle or issues to consider, each AMOC representative and surrogate is responsible for keeping themselves up to date and for commenting in a timely manner. Silence has been considered consent, but lately it seems that sometimes no comment is provided yet the decision made by others is not supported.

#### 2. Agenda review, additional discussion points, and special announcements

Terry Johnson noted that Wally Murphy and John Slown would be arriving late this afternoon, so NEPA/EIS discussion will be deferred until they arrive. Also, as requested by several cooperators, the AMOC Chair issue will be addressed in tomorrow's session.

Johnson also noted that as of April 1 AGFD has made the transition to a new Director, Larry Voyles, who is fully committed to the 1996 FEIS, 1997 ROD, 1998 10j, and the 2003 MOU and to AMOC as a partnership enterprise. Voyles wants to maintain our collective credibility

by adhering to the SOPs and other positions and processes adopted by AMOC and vetted through public process.

3. Discussion of Summary Notes from Previous AMOC and/or AMWG Meeting(s)

Terry Johnson noted that only Greenlee County provided comment on the January 2008 AMOC and AMWG Summary Notes. Terry made the changes requested, and Bruce Sitko (AGFD) posted the AMWG Summary Notes on the website. Terry reminded all that AMOC Summary Notes are not public information, so they will not be posted on the website. Steve Titla asked whether Action Items from the January meeting had been completed. Terry advised that AMOC will look at the Action Items during this meeting; some have been completed and some will be addressed today or tomorrow. Terry asked everyone to look at the Summary Notes and identify during the meeting today or tomorrow any Action Items about which they have questions or concerns.

4. Miscellaneous items:

a. AMOC and AMWG meeting dates for 2008 and 2009

AMOC/AMWG meetings traditionally rotate within the reintroduction area, between Arizona and New Mexico and north and south. This week's meetings were supposed to be in Reserve NM, but the only facility there did not respond to inquiries about availability. So, the meeting was moved to Safford, the closest place in which facilities available on April 22-23. Terry thanked several cooperators for help in trying to locate facilities in several towns in AZ and NM.

The next AMOC and AMWG meetings (July) are scheduled for Clifton AZ, followed by (October) Glenwood NM.

At this time, all AMOC Lead Agency Directors except Benjamin Tuggle (USFWS) are slated to be at the July meeting or to have a surrogate present who is authorized to act on their behalf. This is crucial, because several important issues seem unlikely to be resolved before that meeting. Director Tuggle's surrogate will likely be Brian Millsap or Wally Murphy. Directors who come in early for the July 31 Directors session can opt to attend the July 30 AMOC-IFT session and/or that evening's AMWG meeting.

At this time, it appears that all six Directors will attend the December AMOC meeting (Directors Summit), in Phoenix AZ.

2008-2009 Schedule: Terry Johnson asked whether an Arizona meeting needs to be changed to NM to compensate for this week's meeting in Safford, AZ. No one responded, so the schedule was left as is.

Steve Titla asked whether the timing of AMWG meetings (i.e. midweek evening sessions) or the location affects public attendance. Terry Johnson replied that a variety of meeting times have been tried over the years, and there has been no demonstrable effect on attendance. He also said that no single meeting location serves all people in the reintroduction area equally. Steve would like to see more of a focus on getting info out to the public on wolf processes. He said a study is needed on public participation in the AMWG meetings, dates, and location to determine when there is the most public participation. Location may be restricting people from attending. Terry said that AMOC has discussed this issue several times, but it is always worth more consideration.

**Action Item:** At the July 2008 AMOC meeting, we will look closely at means by which to increase public participation in AMWG meetings.

Terry Johnson noted that in addition to AMWG meetings, the public can use *ES Updates* to become informed about the Reintroduction Project and AMOC actions. Also, each agency's PIOs can help get word out about AMWG meetings and the Project. AMOC representatives and surrogates should all be assisting with outreach in their agency, and through their own agency's news outlets. Cynthia Dale noted that WMAT uses monthly radio program to get information out about AMWG public meetings, and publishes information in local newspapers.

Terry Johnson again asked whether anyone is interested in changing upcoming meeting locations from AZ to NM. Again, no one responded. Steve Titla noted that San Carlos offered to host the April 2008 meeting, since scheduling had been difficult in Reserve, and will be happy to host the April 2009 meetings. Matt Wunder asked why the December Directors Summits are scheduled for Phoenix. Is it just to show off the new AGFD headquarters? Terry replied that in the past these winter meetings have been scheduled for Phoenix so the Directors can have dove or quail hunting opportunities in conjunction with the meeting. Also, December weather tends to be favorable in Phoenix, whereas other sites can be affected by snow closures of highways or airports. The December AMOC-Directors meetings can be outside the Recovery Area because public AMWG meetings are not held with them. Still, Terry advised that if AMOC wants to change the December location, now is the time to do that. John Oakleaf asked whether anyone was interested in having the AMWG portion rotate in the future. All attendees indicated they are comfortable staying with the proposed 2008 and 2009 schedule.

**Action Item:** Matt Wunder will nail down specific locations (meeting rooms) for the 2008 and 2009 AMOC and AMWG meetings in Glenwood, Silver City, and Truth or Consequences NM. AMOC meeting rooms must be large enough for 30 participants. AMWG meeting rooms must be large enough for 75 participants.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will disseminate another email to AMOC with the 2008 and 2009 meeting dates and locations.

b. *ES Updates*: encouraging sign-ups

Terry Johnson encouraged cooperators to steer the public toward the *ES Updates* and the AGFD and USFWS wolf websites for information on the Reintroduction Project. He also advocated urging employees within the cooperating agencies to sign up.

c. Update on WMAT Tribal Council actions

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

d. Lead Agency staff changes and temporary duty assignments

AGFD: Mike Sumner is still acting IFTL; Colby Gardner is starting back part-time on the IFT; and via Cecilia Schmidt will be working on the IFT on a Temporary Duty Assignment until June. USFWS: Dan Stark's position was filled by hiring Ann Marie Houser, who will start work in August. In addition, USFWS hired a 60-day hire, an existing USFWS volunteer who was going to leave. Another USFWS volunteer will come on in July and one started last month. The Assistant Recovery Coordinator position has been advertised. USFWS is also trying to fill Melissa Wolf's vacated position with Ted Turner's MW Management Facility in NM as a USFWS employee. NMDGF: Ken Mills started in early March as IFTL. A 180-day temp will be hired in early May. USFS: is still working on providing an IFT member; the position is in Washington DC for classification, prior to advertising it. WS: stands at 1.25 FTEs of the 4.0 authorized, and due to budget constraints will remain at that level indefinitely.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

e. Clarification Memo for SOP 5.0 (Initial Releases)

All comment on SOP 5.0 from the public comment period that ended March 15 was provided to AMOC before today's meeting. There was not much comment. Terry Johnson: does any agency want to propose a change to the Clarification Memo as a result of considering the public comment? Response: no -- unanimous.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will finalize the Clarification Memo, and provide a copy to all cooperators for final editorial proofing. If no errors are noted, Terry will disseminate the final (approved) version to AMOC, have Bruce Sitko post a copy, and advise the public via an *ES Update* that the Clarification Memo is now in effect.

f. Clarification Memo for SOP 6.0 (Translocations)

Prior to today's meeting, all comment on SOP 6.0 from the public comment period that ended March 15 was provided to AMOC. There was not much comment. Terry Johnson: does any agency wished to propose a change to the Clarification memo as a result of considering the public comment? Response: no -- unanimous.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will finalize the Clarification Memo, and provide a copy to all cooperators for final editorial proofing. If no errors are noted, Terry will disseminate the final (approved) version to AMOC, have Bruce Sitko post a copy, and advise the public via an *ES Update* that the Clarification Memo is now in effect.

g. Clarification Memo for SOP 11.0 (Depredation Investigations)

This SOP has not been through public review, but all Directors have agreed with its current content and form. Terry Johnson: after considering the internal comment on the Clarification Memo, does any agency want to bring up any discussion now, or can we open this up for public comment? WS still has concerns about waiting 12 hours for USFWS to make a co-investigation decision or to get to reported depredation site. WS voiced the same concerns before, but would like to see what the public says. Terry Johnson: WS does not have to wait at least 12 hours for USFWS. As the Clarification Memo now stands, if WS believes the depredation investigation will be detrimentally affected by waiting for USFWS, they can proceed without USFWS. This concern was addressed in revision of Item #3 of the memo after the last Directors' Conference Call. Dave Bergman: then WS is OK with the Clarification Memo as written, and recommends moving forward with public review. Hector Ruedas: the AZ counties still oppose any changes in SOP 11.0, but agree that we should move forward with public review. Steve Titla: SCAT has a concern about the clarity of the memos; they might be confusing to the public. He would like to see us format #3 like #2 (a, b, c.). All other agencies indicated they are OK with the memo as written. Terry Johnson: AMOC could move forward with the public comment period, and use that as an opportunity to reconsider whether clarity could be improved by modifying the memo as Steve Titla has suggested. In the past, some of the public has expressed a preference for bulleted text as opposed to paragraph structure, while others have indicated the reverse preference.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will finalize the draft Clarification Memo for public comment, and provide a copy to all cooperators for final editorial proofing. If no errors are noted, Terry will disseminate the final draft version to AMOC, have Bruce Sitko post a copy, and advise the public via an *ES Update* that the draft Clarification Memo is open for public comment for 30 days.

h. Clarification Memo for SOP 13.0 (Wolf Control)

Terry Johnson: this Clarification Memo has not been through public review, but all Directors and AMOC have reviewed it several times. This is not a consensus document in every aspect; on some aspects acceptance was achieved but not concurrence. Terry: after considering the internal comment on the Clarification Memo, does any agency want to bring up any discussion now, or can we open this up for a public comment period? WMAT: OK as is. USFWS: small typos in #3 and in # 5 "T" Recovery Coordinator instead of "The....," but otherwise OK. NMDGF: will let it go to public comment, but may have questions after it goes to public comment.

Terry Johnson: if we don't vet NMDGF's comments before the public comment period, we will have to have another public comment period and that would be a waste of time and money. It also matters whether the issues are minor or major. John Oakleaf: AMOC will need to address the public comment regardless of whether NMDGF has issues. Terry Johnson: yes, but we will only need to address the public's concerns. If we bring up new issues that we did not vet with the public, but which we knew about before the public comment period, that's not acceptable.

WMAT, WS, USFS, NMDA, and the counties would all like to deal with any issues before we go forward. Steve Titla: an option would be to move forward with incorporating public comments to existing issues and open up another public comment period subsequently if needed. He is concerned about protecting the public's rights. On the other hand, how prepared will we be? Steve wants to balance the strategies. Terry Johnson: AGFD would be OK with NMDGF's request if NMDGF needed public comment in order to determine what their stand will be on whatever issue(s) they have. But, if they already know what their issues are, we should consider them now and make changes before requesting public comment. We should not waste the public's time or our own.

Terry Johnson: what are NMDGF's issues, and are they Director Thompson's issues or someone else's? Matt Wunder: the issues are mine, not Director Thompson's. # 3 is the area that I am having difficulty with; the way it is worded "MUST submit its final written..." This seems to imply that a Removal Order MUST follow a 3<sup>rd</sup> incident. Terry Johnson suggested alternative wording "within 36 hours... that will trigger discussion of a Removal Order." Bud Starnes said that is a major change and the NM Cattle Growers would not support it. Bud believes it is the most contentious change possible. Terry Johnson then recommended another alternative to consider: "Must submit his written recommendation to the AMOC chair on removal..." Again, there was widespread agreement that any change from the last wording the Directors saw would be problematic. Terry said in his opinion the NMDGF concern is not a new issue, any changes at this time will likely lack consensus, and he recommends moving the memo forward to the public and sorting it out afterward. WMAT, WS, USFS, the Counties, and NMDA would all rather not change SOP 13.0, but they are OK with going forward with public review. SCAT: would rather that NMDGF had not brought this issue up at the last minute; wants there to be a Removal Order after one depredation incident; also worried that more discussion will be lengthy. Terry Johnson: 9a addresses this, and it specifically opens the window that NMDGF wanted: that at three depredations there will be a discussion about a Removal Order. Doesn't this sufficiently clarify the guidance such that no further change in #3 is needed? Moreover, NMDGF might not believe that a third depredation should trigger a Removal Order, but AGFD still believes that the agencies committed to three depredations triggering a Removal Order and that's where we still stand. Johnson noted that we have tried to cover the preferences of four jurisdictional agencies with one document, and that virtually ensures differences in interpretation and application. All other agencies are OK with moving forward with the public comment period.

NMDGF will bring in any additional comments of its own after the public comment period, and AMOC (and/or the Directors, if necessary) will determine what to do about them.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will finalize the draft Clarification Memo for public comment, and provide a copy to all cooperators for final editorial proofing. If no errors are noted, Terry will disseminate the final draft version to AMOC, have Bruce Sitko post a copy, and advise the public via an *ES Update* that the draft Clarification Memo is open for public comment for 30 days.

i. Draft SOP 25.0: Media Access

Cathy Taylor clarified that SOP 25.0 is not linked to the Special Use Permit process, as the USFS is dealing with outfitter guides. The public comment period for SOP 25.0 ended on March 15. Terry Johnson asked if there any comments. Counties: no. USFS: looks good; it is clear; one change suggested - documenting activities on Apache and Gila -- if that were changed to “on national forests within the project area” it would take care of any possible future changes in the 10-j rule. WS: want to see a loop to come back to either AMOC or the cooperating agencies so they can inform their own PIOs on the USFS decision. Perhaps we could insert something between #6 and #7, or as a new # 6. WS wants to make sure that all PIOs know about decisions on the SPU requests so they are not approached by the public without knowledge of the decision. NMDA: OK. NMDGF: do we need to address public comments concerning Special Use Permits? What triggers this process?

Terry Johnson: let’s make sure we don’t think or imply that AMOC has the authority to issue or even comment on a SUP. It’s a USFS decision on who gets or does not get a SUP. Matt Wunder: do we or USFS need to have more guidelines about who needs a SUP; example, a student recently wanting access to the Project. Terry Johnson: we are wrestling with the distinction that the Project may or may not choose to cooperate with an individual, regardless of whether they meet USFS SUP requirements. USFS has CFR criteria (regulations) for SUPs, and USFS approves or denies SUP applications. If we referenced their guidelines in this SOP, and they changed their regulations, we would need to change the SOP also. Let’s not get into that loop.

Cathy Taylor: the SUP is a USFS document and decision. In the proposed changes to outfitter guide permits, USFS has tried to remove differences in the application process for commercial vs. educational groups. Also, they often provide a SUP for research.

Terry Johnson: the thrust of SOP 25.0 is to get enough information for AMOC to make a decision on whether or not we can provide Project resources to a media project. Some of the public comment indicated they thought we were telling them they can or cannot do something on public lands, when all we are doing is saying that we reserve the right to allocate or not to allocate Project resources to support their

activity. We need to clarify this. Matt Wunder: agreed that we should address this in the background; we don't want to be painted as limiting access to the Project, as long as they're not impacting wolves. Terry Johnson agreed about impacts on wolves, but again reminded everyone that IFT resources are limited. He suggested revisiting Matt's comments tomorrow to give Matt more time to think about specific wording changes that he might recommend.

USFWS: In #2, delete "establish a clear and beneficial public purpose." In reference to the **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** comments, this adds subjectivity to the process. All agencies are OK with deleting this sentence.

John Oakleaf asked about Section 7 consultation. Cathy Taylor said that if there is a potential effect, yes, USFS would conduct a Section 7 consultation.

In #10, "To ensure the highest accuracy possible the permitted media can choose to have the appropriate ITF leader...staff review narration...release." Delete last line. John Oakleaf: the public said this sounds like a censorship. Matt Wunder suggested the comment is more pertinent to #9. Dave Cagle said it's better to make that offer, so there is a smaller chance of misinformation going out. Cynthia Dale: the last sentence covers our ability to coordinate efforts. Terry Johnson: we could strike the first sentence; soften the second sentence to include recording, documentation, etc.; add #6; and include Section 7 consultation if applicable. WMAT: OK with those changes. SCAT: no comment.

Matt Wunder suggested another change: Page 1, paragraph 2 reads "The project strives when possible..." Suggest changing to "Project strives to provide as much media access as possible to Project staff facilities and operations, when consistent with the Project's primary obligation..." Page 2, #2 reads "sufficient detail about the proposed project..." Suggest changing to "sufficient detail about the requested access to assess impacts on wolves and project activities." B. change "permitted" to "accommodated." #4 second line, add "and USFS (if on forest land)." #5 change "incident commander" to "liaison." #9, third line: "coordinate with" instead of "strictly follow;" but sentence will be reworked already so ignore this. All agencies are OK with these changes.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will finalize the Clarification Memo, and provide a copy to all cooperators for final editorial proofing. If no errors are noted, Terry will disseminate the final (approved) version to AMOC, have Bruce Sitko post a copy, and advise the public via an *ES Update* that the Clarification Memo is now in effect.

j. Draft SOP 27.0: Monitoring the Mexican Wolf Population

Terry Johnson said most of the few public comments about this draft SOP were about breeding pairs, and asked if the agencies were OK with the draft as written. Counties: yes. USFS: yes. WS: yes. NMDA: yes. NMDGF: yes. WMAT: yes. USFWS:

recommended adding (per **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** comment) to the objectives “measuring progress toward the reintroduction objective of establishing a viable, self-sustaining population of at least 100 wolves in the BRWRA.” Terry Johnson: the FEIS and the MOU say we will strive for a population of at least 100 wolves in the Recovery Area, but does either document commit us to establishing a self-sustaining, viable population? AGFD’s premise has always been, and the Recovery Team in 2004-05 seemed to agree, that a Blue Range wolf population would, of ecological necessity, be a component of a metapopulation and not capable of standing alone. Thus, he recommends not inserting “viable and self sustaining” because those objectives are not achievable within the current Recovery Area under the current 10j rule. Bud Starnes: the USFWS letter to **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** correctly says that projections are nothing more than a hypothesis. He believes this also applies to the 100 wolves and doesn’t believe that we can sustain 100 wolves in the current area. Terry Johnson suggested it would also be better to leave out the number, which is subject to change, and just say “measuring progress toward achieving approved population objectives for the Reintroduction Project. Bud Starnes: I’m okay with this change. All other attendees also agreed.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will modify the SOP to add an objective: “Measuring progress towards achieving approved population objectives for the Reintroduction Project.” Terry will then finalize the Clarification Memo, and provide a copy to all cooperators for final editorial proofing. If no errors are noted, Terry will disseminate the final (approved) version to AMOC, have Bruce Sitko post a copy, and advise the public via an *ES Update* that the Clarification Memo is now in effect.

k. NEPA Scoping Meetings progress report

Terry Johnson: John Slown will be here later and will give a brief presentation at the AMWG meeting. In his absence, Johnson gave a short summary of what the talk would be: D.J. Case & Associates provided Slown a very preliminary draft report of their scoping analysis on April 4. The report was based on a total of 13,598 comments received during the public scoping period, which ended on December 31, 2007. Hard copy comments were broken down into issues by manual reading and characterization. Issues were identified from the emailed letters by using a scanning software program and a series of key words. Some hard copy letters were transcribed electronically and then submitted to scanning process to verify that manual and electronic "reading" of comments resulted in very similar outcomes. The draft report divided the issues identified into "Areas of Concern," with some repetition. An updated draft report will be submitted to USFWS on April 30, and should contain 24 identified issues, several with two or three sub-issues. These issues statements will assist in identifying the issues to be addressed by the EIS.

Wally Murphy commented on Cooperating Agency (CA) status. 22 counties in AZ and NM requested CA status. USFWS asked them all to respond to letter of conditions to say whether or not they accepted them. Seven counties agreed and the

others are looking into draft Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance. The USFWS solicitor said the CEQ alternative is not appropriate. So, USFWS is looking into other options to accommodate, if possible, the dissenting counties, all of which are in NM. The question is whether USFWS can sustain two processes, since other counties have already signed on. Also, some counties (NM) were opposed to AMOC voting on their status -- the MOU addendum crafted for the NEPA process calls for AMOC to take action on the status of agency cooperators. USFWS will provide AMOC with a packet on county participation, including process information, so AMOC can address the requests. Terry Johnson: remember, once we start the NEPA process, AMOC will have separate meetings for NEPA work, in addition to our quarterly meetings for Reintroduction Project business. Under the MOU Addendum, the AMOC Chair runs both sets of meetings, as well as AMWG meetings.

Bud Starnes asked whether USFWS will call the counties in to work on the unresolved process issues. Wally Murphy replied that USFWS plans to have a coordination meeting to talk about its expectations and process.

Cathy Taylor asked what the NEPA process expectations are for USFS. Wally Murphy said that USFWS asked for assistance from USFS at the beginning, and were told no USFS resources beyond the AMOC representative and surrogate would be available. Cathy Taylor said the difference may be between running the process (USFS will not do that) and participating in the process (USFS will do that). Wally asked for clarification regarding what USFS will and will not do.

**Action Item:** Cathy Taylor will look into what, if any, additional resources are or will be available from USFS for participation in NEPA process.

1. Initial releases and translocations for 2008 and 2009

Translocations

Home Creek: a final (Directors) decision on this proposed action in April was deferred because the female of the mated pair (F1028 and M1008) did not become pregnant in captivity prior to the proposed April translocation date. Given that unexpected development, the IFT contacted captive management facilities to see if other pups could be released. A pair of adults at Wolf Haven in Washington is available. Because they have bred in the past, they are excess to the captive population. The IFT also discussed an initial release of 839 and 1036 in AZ, in combination with translocation of F1028 and M1008 to an available site in NM. Terry Johnson asked if today's draft package offloads some information from the overall translocation/initial release package the IFT previously provided. Oakleaf: yes.

John Oakleaf said when the IFT learned that F1028 was not pregnant, it made more sense to delay the translocation until June, when there are more elk calves on the ground. However, the **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION**. Terry Johnson

asked where this information is in today's translocation documents. John Oakleaf said it has not been integrated yet, and that considering an initial release in AZ and a translocation in NM changes the whole discussion. Terry Johnson said that when he learned that F1028 was not pregnant, he asked Oakleaf to ensure that the IFT continued discussion with the AZ permittees to evaluate all possibilities for translocation in Home Creek, and not to convert to an initial release. Oakleaf said he felt that in that discussion he and Terry talked about releases, and that Terry wanted a translocation but it didn't matter where it happened. Terry disagreed and restated that he had wanted further discussion with the permittees to see what their concerns were about translocation, without the complication of switching to an initial release.

Terry Johnson then reiterated questions posed in January about the translocation package, which was crafted in September 2007. He was concerned that information from a December public meeting was not included in the translocation package, nor was information on IFT follow-up on questions and concerns posed by the Directors in December 2007. When new relevant information is generated, our documents must be revised to integrate it. Neither AMOC nor the Directors should need to read multiple documents when reviewing a single proposed action. The IFT and AMOC also need to be sensitive to phrasing in our documents, and what information is included in the notes from meetings. Terry expressed concern that the IFT's summary of the December 2007 public meeting on the proposed Home Creek translocation including a member of the public's caustic and irrelevant personal characterization of the NMDGF Director. Such comments should never be included in AMOC, AMWG, or other Project-related meeting summaries. Only information that is germane to the issues under consideration, and the decisions that need to be made, should be included. Every one of us owns a responsibility to help ensure this by carefully editing all drafts, and providing timely, appropriate editorial recommendations.

Terry asked if the Directors would be able to determine from today's package, without benefit of someone explaining it, why the IFT's first recommendation for the translocation is now NM, not AZ. Answer: they could not, because all the relevant information for the AZ and NM sites is not in the document. In addition to the information noted above, the allotment owner information on timing of grazing at each site should be included, as should the IFT assessment of pros and cons for each site. Also, NMDGF would like to analyze the likelihood that translocated adult wolves might not stay in the same place (i.e. the translocation site), because the female is not pregnant.

Terry Johnson then asked if NM would need to hold a public meeting if the translocation were proposed for NM. Matt Wunder replied that, while discussing the translocation with Bruce Thompson, he did not get a feeling of a strong need for a public meeting. Terry said that is not definitive; we need definitive answers before we move a recommendation forward to the Directors.

Renaë Held mentioned that if NMDGF needs to hire **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** for packing (mule) support, for financial reasons (i.e. end of fiscal year) June would be better for a translocation. If a NM translocation is delayed to after July 1, NMDGF might have to do an RFP for wilderness packing.

**Action Item:** Matt Wunder will look into the need for a public meeting in NM on the possible translocation, and advise AMOC and the IFT of the decision.

**Action Item:** the IFT will revise the F1028/M1008 translocation proposal to include all pertinent information and address all concerns identified in the December, January, and April AMOC meetings.

**Action Item:** By May 9, the IFT will provide a revised translocation proposal for Terry Johnson to distribute to AMOC for discussion with their Directors and for AMOC conference call discussion on May 20, at 1:30 pm AZ Time (2:30 pm NM Time). After the call, AMOC representatives will consult with their Directors to determine how to proceed.

Terry Johnson then noted another phrasing concern re: IFT documents. As has been noted before, the IFT sometimes uses phrases that lead to misperceptions about the roles, functions, and authorities of the IFT vs. AMOC vs. the Directors. For example: in some of the documents discussed today, a statement is including referring to “the IFT’s population goal.” The IFT does not have population goals; the Project does, and AMOC shapes them with IFT input and Director approval or concurrence. IFT authors need to be more sensitive to these kinds of wording issues.

**Action Item:** AMOC conference call scheduled for May 20, 1:30 pm AZ Time, 2:30 pm NM Time. Terry Johnson will disseminate logistical information for the call, as AGFD has changed its vendor support for conference calls since our last one.

### Initial Releases

John Oakleaf said the IFT is proposing two initial releases in AZ, one at Engineer Springs and one at Campbell Blue. Both would add unrepresented genetics to the wild population.

For Engineer Springs, a pair of wolves is available from the Wolf Haven pre-release facility (the Cienega and Hog's Neck packs came from Wolf Haven). The adults, 752 and 958, have yearlings (including a female) and an unknown number of pups in the den. Engineer Springs has been used before, and livestock conflicts have occurred. However, grazing is further away from Engineer Springs this year than in previous years. Dave Cagle asked if there are unauthorized cattle in the area. Cathy Taylor said they could be considered lawfully present, because a wildfire burned fences that previously contained them.

**Action Item:** Cathy Taylor will look into whether these cattle are lawfully present.

The second initial release the IFT is recommending is of F1039 and M836 at Campbell Blue AZ, in late fall 2008. Cattle will be off that area by October 1. F1039 has wild experience (but only three legs), but M836 does not.

The ensuing discussion identified several issues with the IFT proposal package. The package is not clear on when and how public meetings would be held. Also, at the Greenlee County Cattle Growers' meeting in March, IFT representatives stated, in response to a question, that no initial releases were planned for this year. When that statement was made, the representatives were not aware that in December 2007 the Lead Agency Directors had asked AMOC and the IFT to be more aggressive in developing recommendations for translocations and initial releases, to help grow the wild population. In view of the December guidance, and despite the IFT statement to the Cattle Growers, Kay Gale said she told people at that meeting to be prepared for both translocations and initial releases. Even so, some of the people at that meeting will probably remember only that the IFT said no releases were planned for this year, and some of them will probably have interpreted "not planned" as meaning "will not occur." This will create another distrust issue.

Dave Bergman said his Director will ask how much dialogue happened with the allotment owner about the conversion to initial release. Also, do we put more effort into a translocation than an initial release? Terry Johnson is concerned that the short time frame proposed by the IFT would create a public perception that an affirmative decision is predetermined. Kay Gale asked how many of the 17 approved initial release sites have been used. John Oakleaf said seven have not been used. Hector Ruedas said that if they are not used, they should be removed. Ken Mills said that could leave us open to criticism: why aren't we using them? Cathy Taylor and Renae Held said that sites can change in various characteristics over time, and asked how difficult it would be to put sites back on the list after they have been removed.

Dave Bergman asked if any of these sites were vetted with the District Ranger. Could there be sites that the District Ranger thinks are better, in terms of their management process? John Oakleaf said those contacts have not been made, since this has just gone to AMOC.

Terry Johnson said AMOC has asked IFT in the past to give recommendations about what sites need to be dropped and to be aggressive on adding sites. Terry suggested the IFT talk with USFS about how their management practices will affect site suitability. John Oakleaf said the IFT has the allotment information for 2008 and ungulate information is updated from AGFD and NMDGF. Terry asked about grazing practices. Oakleaf said they are included in the allotment plans.

Kay Gale said there are places in the recovery area that just won't work for releasing wolves and 52 (the 2007 EOY Minimum Count) might be the magic number (carrying capacity) for resident wolves. Hector Ruedas said that places have been used for the past several years, without success, yet we are still using them and they still have problems. Terry Johnson asked if the IFT has analyzed sites that have consistently supported wolves and how they relate to the initial release and translocation criteria. The answer was no. Terry also asked if wolves are occupying any sites that are not on our lists of approved sites. **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

Terry Johnson asked NMDGF to comment on the initial release issues. Matt Wunder said initial releases are an AZ concern and whatever is good for the wolves is OK with NMDGF. He would like to see wolves released where they will have the best success. USFWS will also defer to AGFD on a decision. Terry Johnson said that it is fundamental to the AMOC process that all Lead Agencies and cooperators provide substantive input on issues, so everyone can have the benefit of all the available information and opinion. Terry reminded all that the Directors asked for a more comprehensive initial release/translocation package for 2008 and 2009, so they would not have to consider one proposed action at a time, yet we are continuing down the one-proposal-at-a-time path. Terry said he could not ask the AGFD Director to support an initial release in June, because we have not done due diligence and the public notice would be too short. He would like to see a more complete package from the IFT before making recommendations to Directors, and he wants the Directors to have both the short term and (per their December request) the overall proposals.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**

Terry Johnson suggested considering testing an initial release of an adult pair with pups in September.

**Action Item:** AMOC members return comment to the IFT on the current draft proposals by close-of-business on May 2.

**Action Item:** By close-of-business on May 9, the IFT will provide AMOC with revised proposals.

**Action Item:** On May 20, at 1:30 pm AZ Time, AMOC will convene via conference call to discuss the re-crafted proposals and determine whether to move a recommendation or recommendations forward to the Directors. (Note: this would push an initial release, if one is recommended by AMOC and approved by the Directors, back by at least a week, but the IFT is OK with that timeline.)

**Action Item:** After this week's AMOC meeting, John Oakleaf will send soft copy of the translocation proposal to AMOC.

m. Range Rider concept

Terry Johnson asked if NM is willing to take on administrative responsibilities for a range rider program in NM. Matt Wunder said it is, but NMDGF will not be looking to other agencies or nongovernmental organizations for funding.

Cynthia Dale said the Defenders of Wildlife range rider program has worked well for WMAT in the past.

Terry said that AGFD is not willing to take on a range rider responsibility at this time, due to concerns regarding procurement, liability, and Internal Revenue Service issues. The IRS issues revolve around the distinction between contractors and employees, and AGFD's perceptions about the need for close oversight of contracted range riders. Due to a statewide hiring freeze, AGFD is not in a position to hire range riders. Given these concerns, AGFD would prefer that interested ranchers and NGOs negotiate with each directly, with AMOC providing guidelines for range rider interaction with wolves and perhaps permits for LTLP use.

**Action Item:** Matt Wunder will get NMDGF's range rider proposal information together in order to talk about it during the AMOC conference call on May 20.

n. Wolf-elk population model for New Mexico

PowerPoint presentation by RJ Kirkpatrick and Stewart Liley (both of NMDGF). RJ said the NMDGF model is a tool for people to get their head around what is happening with wolves/elk within a given year, and a tool to evaluate resources for wolves. NMDGF wanted to keep it simple because of the wide audience targeted. They gave a demonstration of the model, starting with an estimated elk and wolf population and adding in variables that affect elk numbers. Kirkpatrick stressed that some (unknown) proportion of the elk mortality is compensatory. After running the model, they found that the observed cow-to-calf ratio was better and the population estimate was higher than estimated.

Jon Cooley asked how rates of elk predation are determined. Response: elk per wolf per month, but it is still questionable data – elk/wolf/month and is it compensatory or additive? How do you know how many wolves we have, how early does a pup turn into an elk eater, etc. Bud Starnes asked what the predation is excluding wolves. Response: in model, they have let the number range; also, it is variable for different sexes and ages. Bud asked if other predator rates should be higher and felt poaching should be at 10%. RJ said that if this were the case you would expect to see an effect in numbers observed from fall flights. Bud also asked NMDGF to add a line about cow predation and run it alongside the elk model, and asked if NMDGF should include mandatory check stations data to determine body condition.

RJ said that NMDGF is working to incorporate AZ into the model, but more work needs to be done before any results can be shared. Cynthia thinks WMAT would be interested in cooperating with NMDGF on the model.

Stewart Liley said NMDGF has tried to cover areas where they knew that wolves had territories in the past. John Oakleaf, one of the tools is if any of your estimates are grossly off, you should see it in the model output.

Terry Johnson asked if RJ et al. looked at the FEIS definition of “unacceptable impacts to big game,” which will come into play when adapting the current 10j standard of 35% permissible detrimental effect. Someone commented that the Rocky Mountains wolf project changed their definition, but Terry said their wolf population was clearly on the road to recovery, so their take of wolves was easier to justify.

Terry asked if NMDGF is at a point where it can say that wolves are not decimating elk populations. Response: yes. Terry pointed out that he and others had predicted prior to 1998 that post-release hunters and guides would become concerned about loss of elk, when in fact what would happen is wolves would change the distribution and activity patterns of elk but guides and hunters would continue to use their traditional hunting methods, thus leading to such misperceptions. WMAT just confirmed that this past year (in fact, they found elk have increased on FAIR since wolf reintroduction), and their guides and hunters are adjusting.

Lastly, Bud Starnes asked if it would be possible to take livestock predation out and see how it affects the model. No response was recorded.

AMOC conclusion: AMOC is fine with RJ presenting just a NM model at the AMWG meeting tonight. Hopefully, in a year or so the presentation can be expanded to include AZ and perhaps FAIR.

## 5. IFT Update

### a. Outreach activities

John Oakleaf gave a brief summary of outreach activities for the 1st quarter of 2008: January AMWG meeting, 14 non-agency attendees; February 27, Maggie Dwire made a presentation to 25 Sierra Club members at the Sevilleta Wolf Management Facility; March 7, Mike Godwin and Mike Sumner presented an update to Greenlee County Cattle Growers and the Upper Eagle Creek and Blue River Watershed Associations; March 17-18, Ken Mills, Renae Held, and LuAnn Tafoya took ~15 middle school students on a wolf tour -- the students had won an art and essay contest through the Southwest Environmental Center; and March 19, John Oakleaf and Mike Sumner met with Rick DaValos (USFS) and a permittee regarding translocation at Home Creek.

i. Integration of 2007 EOYC information into Project Status Summary

The IFT integrated the EOYC information but did not forward the revised Summary to AMOC.

**Action Item:** After this week's AMOC meeting, John Oakleaf will forward the Summary to Terry Johnson for dissemination to AMOC and posting on the website.

ii. Reprinting of brochures, posters, etc.

In November, AMOC approved the Project brochure for reprinting, but Elizabeth Slown, Dave Cagle, and Terry Johnson subsequently found errors in it before it was printed. Elizabeth and Terry are now collaborating on a re-write.

iii. Presentations

See above.

iv. Website maintenance and development

Bruce Sitko (AGFD) and an unnamed USFWS employee continue to do a fine job maintaining the respective Project websites.

v. Annual Reports: Reintroduction Project and Recovery Program for 2007

Reintroduction Project Annual Report

WMAT: Page 2, paragraph 1, second to last sentence: insert probable (but Terry noted that it doesn't trigger a management action). Page 4, population estimation: are they "trail camera sets" or "traps?" Traps is the terminology used (per the scientific literature), but for clarity with our audience it should be changed to remote cameras. Page 4, paragraph 3: helicopter counting "alive" wolves

confusing, although the next sentence puts it into perspective. Page 5, top of page: fax monthly project updates... do we mail also? We only fax copies. post hard copies, and post copies on the website. Page 6: how is the Durango Pack covered? Response: it is summarized in the table; we should make it more obvious.

USFS: confused on releases vs. translocations. Wording needs to be tightened; add the word "initial" to release. Page 3: wording confusing concerning radio collared wolves and home ranges. Page 5, Outreach: add the wallet card and the October wildlife fair. Results: Locations of wolves on FAIR and SCAR are not included, but in the middle of the third paragraph we talk about radio tagging animals. Cynthia said WMAT is OK with that. Page 5, last sentence: add "including the pups that are available for re- release." Please describe the difference between hard and soft release in the methods. Wolf Depredation: a summary table would be useful. Discussion: San Mateo and Hawk's Nest were new pairings, not packs. Extrapolating into depredations/100 wolves. Suggest number of depredations/61. Project Management: prefer to see more aggressive numbers for minimum population count and minimum breeding pair objectives.

USFWS: Management Actions, Page 8: 26 should be 28 and 10 should be 8. Page 10: Bluestem is not wild-born. Lofer was not successful (but Cynthia then gave an update: recent observations affirm that Lofer has four wolves and might have been a breeding pair in 2007). Page 11: add initial releases as a possible mechanism for increase in numbers. Add a section for cause-specific mortality rates. On Table 2, two wolves (1041 and 1048) were left off.

AGFD: Page 7: the projected number of depredations was higher "than" vs. "that." Management Actions: add fladry, with no additional depredations. Header says 2006; should be 2007. Please add the AMWG meeting participant numbers to the outreach text.

USDA WS: depredation poisoning – clarify that we suspect plants are causative; we don't people to think it's due to pesticides.

GRECO: suggest adding county lines to the maps, if possible. Response: John Oakleaf said the formatting would be difficult – too much information on a small map. Hector then suggested just adding a county map by itself, for reference and clarification.

#### Recovery Program Annual Report

Work on this report has been initiated, but the report cannot be completed until the Reintroduction Project Annual Report is completed.

- b. Quarterly report on depredation and nuisance incidents and responses

John Oakleaf gave a short summary of depredations; 12 were reported, but not all were wolf related. See handout for details.

Dave Bergman said a reported Chino Valley depredation was missing from the IFT report. IFT said it will add, but Bergman said it was just mentioned to indicate that many of the reports received and investigated are not Mexican wolves.

John Oakleaf said a depredation occurred at the **LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION REDACTION**.

c. Other IFT activities and issues

AMOC-IFT discussion of April 7, 2008 depredation in New Mexico (Middle Fork Pack): the IFT could not come to consensus on assigning this incident. Terry Johnson noted that in some cases AMOC and the IFT are abiding by draft (interim) Clarification Memos and sometimes we are not. Terry said that for this incident AMOC must have the Jurisdictional IFTL report referenced in the SOP 11.0 Clarification Memo. Ken Mills said it exists, but he did not bring copies. However, the only information from that report that was not included in the depredation summary that John Oakleaf provided today is the times and dates on which Mills spoke to people. Terry Johnson asked if USFWS did a law enforcement investigation. Oakleaf said no, because he was not available at the time. Terry asked whether John had identified a surrogate to act on his behalf in his absence. Response: no.

**Action Item:** USFWS needs to have a backup (surrogate) available for John Oakleaf at the field level, whether permanently or on a case-by-case basis.

Terry Johnson asked if Ken Mills had any problems completing the JIFTL form, since this was the first time it was used. Ken said no; he wasn't able to reach everyone immediately, but eventually he did.

Terry said the IFT disagreement was rightfully taken to AMOC, but he believes that assigning a depredation incident is an IFT obligation. AMOC has no information that the IFT does not have, and it is one more step removed from the field. AMOC can hear the issue and give recommendations, but ultimately the Jurisdictional IFTL should make the call. John Oakleaf said that under #8 in SOP 11.0, he thinks the decision is AMOC's, and if AMOC can't agree it goes to the directors. Terry noted that this dichotomy was discussed in the Directors Summit in December, but the Directors failed to give guidance after Terry gave his perspective and Bruce Thompson gave his. Terry lamented that we need to be better about polling for decisions when viewpoints are expressed, especially conflicting viewpoints. However, given what the current draft of SOP 11.0 says, Terry agreed that AMOC should make the call on this incident.

Ken Mills gave a brief description of the depredation incident, as stated in the handout given to AMOC. The only change needed in the handout is to change “30 yards” to “30 feet.”

Bud Starnes said that we should bring the rancher in front of us to tell his side of the story, since we were not on site. He thinks we are impugning the word of the rancher (whose opinion about the number of wolves involved differed from the IFT’s). Ken Mills said he didn’t intend to impugn the rancher, but the information gathered suggested there may not have been six wolves. Bud replied that perhaps two people need to ask questions of the rancher, so they could compare their information and reduce the confusion.

Terry Johnson noted that the NMDGF recommendation assumed that a subsequent depredation would establish culpability for the first. He does not believe that another depredation would necessarily identify a pattern; two points establish a line, but they do not establish a trend or a pattern. Ken Mills said he was taking into consideration that in NM they have had a record of habitual depredations.

Mike Godwin asked if we had clarified whether or not it was a body size issue or an issue of other identification issues on the wolf pup vs. coyote issue. Ken said it may be other identification issues, but the rancher did say other animals, the size of coyotes (smaller than wolves), were present. Dave Cagle asked if the rancher said how close they were to each other. Ken said the rancher said they were not all in exactly same area, but they were in the general area of the kill. John Oakleaf said he has seen coyotes with wolves in the past.

Bud Starnes said that NM’s decision to wait to assign depredations suggests they are trying to change the protocol. We already give wolves two chances before we remove them. Cathy Taylor asked if in January there were two collared adults and three uncollared yearling animals. John Oakleaf: F1115, a yearling, was also collared (during the End-of-Year Count). Also, Cathy asked if assigning the incident to the pack meant that all five wolves in the pack would be included. John Oakleaf: yes. Cathy asked if Ken Mills could live with all five wolves being assigned an incident. Ken said it is a question of the burden of proof; if 861 was not located near the site, should she be implicated? Ken was also looking for guidance as to when we would be OK assigning incidents to an entire pack.

Dave Cagle asked what the canine pattern was for the alphas and the yearlings. Ken said at this time of year pups would have adult teeth and the sizes would be the same. John Oakleaf said there is more of a difference between male and female; why not assign the incident only to the animals that were known to be there. Ken said we are bringing this up more for discussion about how to deal with uncollared animals. Cynthia asked if there were enough distinct measurement differences to determine individual animals. John Oakleaf said that canine spreads are not definitive enough to distinguish between individuals. Ken said that, based on bite marks, two animals

might have been involved. Also, the carcass was 50% consumed and the investigators were unable to determine the weight. This is the first depredation incident for this pack; with recent removal of other packs, Middle Fork might be investigating areas that are wolf free. Terry asked whether WS was the only Project agency at the scene of the investigation. Dave Bergman: WS investigated the report and confirmed it as a wolf depredation.

Cathy Taylor asked if the IFT agreed there was a depredation by at least two members of the pack. Ken Mills said he was comfortable with two members of pack being assigned a depredation. Ken said 50% of the carcass was eaten, which was more than a single wolf would consume, but coyotes were also present. Dave Cagle asked if the weekly monitoring flights had found the pack members nearby. Ken said the observer thought they were in close proximity, but the airplane was flying high.

John Oakleaf said, "If three animals were in the area, and multiple animals were involved, why not assign the incident to the entire pack?" Cynthia said we had the same issue with the Paradise Pack in AZ, and in that case we moved strikes from the pack to a single animal (which was not a member of the pack) at a later time, when we had better information indicating only that one wolf had been depredating. Ken said we have also had cases in the past where pack members received more strikes at a later time.

Matt Wunder asked, given all information, what are the most probable (culpable) wolves? Ken Mills said location is the best information. One wolf to pull out is 861, since she was only seen south of the site, about 1.5 miles. John Oakleaf said that distance is not a long distance to a wolf. Wally Murphy said this disagreement shows that if we can ever get it done, co-investigation is a good idea.

Dave Bergman said he had spoken with his staff and their opinion was the entire pack was involved. Cynthia Dale said she knows the IFT had looked at this extensively, and therefore she has to side with their recommendation of striking the entire pack. Ellen said that if five wolves were involved, why was the entire carcass not consumed? Ken said the kill was made that night (10-12 hours earlier), therefore it would have been possible for them to consume entire animal. However, they also killed an elk and consumed most of it. Ken said that in Canada, when he was using GPS to look at deer depredation like Dan Stark was doing down here, he did see wolves consume an entire animal in a short period of time.

Counties: the majority recommendation should hold.

Terry Johnson said he does not see how we can assign the incident to the entire pack, when two members were elsewhere, and he does not believe we can rely on a subsequent depredation act to inform us as to which animal was culpable in the prior incident.

Terry Johnson called for a vote on assigning the April 7 incident to the three collared wolves in the Middle Fork Pack (AM871, AF861, and F1115). USFS: yes. USDA WS: the entire pack, but WS can live with assigning it only to the three collared animals. NMDA: entire pack. Counties: entire pack. NMDGF: yes, assuming that if more information becomes available we can revisit the decision. USFWS: yes. WMAT: yes. AGFD: yes.

**Action Item:** John Oakleaf will send the IFT summary to Terry Johnson to incorporate the AMOC decision.

6. Evening AMWG Meeting: AMOC and Cooperator presence and participation

All cooperating agencies indicated they would be present in the evening AMWG session.

Terry Johnson asked whether AMOC should reconvene at 0900 the next day, as scheduled, or at 0800 in hopes of finishing early. Some participants indicated that starting at 0800 would be a hardship, because they were not staying in Safford. All parties then agreed to stick with the 0900 start-up time.

7. Adjournment for the day (April 22)

Terry Johnson adjourned today's AMOC session at ca. 1700.

**April 23, 2008**

8. Continue discussion from previous day (April 22)

AMOC reconvened at 0900. Agenda items pending from the previous day were completed, and the discussion was integrated into the appropriate section above.

9. Miscellaneous items:

a. USFS MW Guide and Outfitter Special Use (SUP) Guidelines

Cathy Taylor (USFS) said that she got some feedback from a SUP person while developing these guidelines. For the proposed time (seasonal) restrictions, there are legal issues. Any restrictions must tie into the 10j or the CFR, and USFS believes that these draft guidelines are actually draft restrictions. Cathy said there were questions about #8, prey remains: is the 250 yards arbitrary, or based on science/observations? John Oakleaf said it was based on observations. USFS recommends that if a report must be submitted, we should provide a standardized format that is very brief. USFS also asked if AMOC would be using the information gathered to revise the proposed restrictions. Otherwise, why gather it?

Mike Godwin (AGFD) suggested that for the purposes section we move from a negative to a positive connotation. He offered suggestions, but said we can wordsmith it further. Delete #4 entirely. In #1, facilitate an increase of the public's understanding and support for the Mexican Wolf Reintroduction Project. In #2, use the IFT time available for talks and group contacts in the best possible way. In #3, ensure that activities have minimal negative impacts on wolves. Convey the importance of these issues, when it can't be enforced. For the report, he believes that most questions could be addressed when the application process is completed.

John Oakleaf suggested that the 250 yards wording could be linked to the harassment language in the rule.

Terry Johnson asked if this is a USFS document or an AMOC document. Cathy said that it is a USFS document, but USFS is looking for AMOC feedback.

Leon Redman (NMDGF): we are talking about a SUP, a yearly operating plan, and a trip plan all together. If you're adapting a yearly operating plan, they can go back to that for reference. He suggested going to the Law Enforcement and Special Use Permit people, who already have these kinds of guidelines available.

Cynthia Dale believes that one week notice would not be enough. She wants to see language added to have confirmation a week ahead of time.

Terry Johnson said he appreciates all the work that Cathy and others have done, but he has some discomfort with this entire subject. The owner of the SUP process is USFS. Having AMOC review permit applications or establish restrictions for permits or guidelines for applying for permits would not be appropriate or legal. AMOC can only recommend; USFS must do all the regulatory work. Whatever USFS decides to include from our discussions is up to them.

Cynthia Dale suggested that they don't add dogs into the situation.

Matt Wunder said he understands there are issues with the breeding season, but that is also the key tourist season. He can see them doing tours as long as they're not harming the wolves.

Terry Johnson has the same concern as Matt, but perhaps for different reasons. Closures around den sites were the only closures addressed in the 1996 FEIS and 1997 Record of Decision. Terry does not believe that recreational activities (including ecotours, etc.) are a problem for wolves here, and this proposal might lead to more closures in the future, without the appropriate NEPA process. That would be contrary to what we have assured the public from the outset, via the FEIS.

Kay Gale said that if this is a USFS document then the paragraph about AMOC should be taken out. Dave Bergman and Terry Johnson agreed.

**Action Item:** Cathy Taylor will take this discussion and the draft “guidelines” to the upcoming coordination meeting between the Apache-Sitgreaves and Gila staff. She will let AMOC know what is decided.

b. IFT recommendation regarding temporary holding facility

Terry Johnson said that, consistent with previous AMOC discussion, he had asked the IFT to look into options for holding wolves temporarily and to bring forward a proposal for AMOC to consider. He emphasized there is no intention of holding wolves indefinitely in such a facility. Cynthia Dale said it would be a good idea to have areas where each agency could hold wolves under their purview. **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION**. Dave Cagle said there is a disadvantage to the AGFD Sipe Wildlife Management Area; wildlife managers may have an increased work load. Terry said AMOC needs to focus on the need for a facility or facilities, possible locations, what resources would be required to create it or them, and what the costs (financial and otherwise) would be. Workload increases and other “costs” would have to be addressed by the appropriate Director or Directors.

Cathy Taylor said USFS has concerns about placing a facility on the Alpine administrative site. USFS has been told in the past not to do this for other agencies in other situations, but in this situation USFS is a signatory partner. The USFS concern is for the ability to protect the wolves that are being held.

Wally Murphy doesn’t see the sense in hauling wolves for long distances. He believes that any proposed site will have the same security and resource issues.

Terry Johnson said there are risks if we go with a private volunteer or a contracted caretaker; they can get overly involved (emotionally) with the final disposition of the wolf. Terry said we should look to USFWS for funding and resources, because the need for such facilities stems directly from some of the changes that USFWS required in the draft SOP 13.0 Clarification Memo.

Wally Murphy said it doesn’t matter where the facility is; someone will have to be there to watch over it. **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION**.

**TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION**.

**Action Item:** Cynthia Dale will work with IFT to add information about the FAIR into the recommendation for a temporary holding facility, by May 6.

Mike Godwin asked what kind of staff and resources we would need to implement such a proposal. Cathy Taylor and Wally Murphy wanted to add to the proposal a recommendation for a more permanent facility.

Various ideas were mentioned, including: double fencing, a kennel type system with a privacy fence, and the need for a structure with no public visibility.

Terry Johnson said there are two major questions for AMOC to discuss with their Director: 1) Do you agree that temporary holding facility is needed? 2) Are you OK with certain criteria for construction of this type of facility. There is no sense in the IFT spending time developing a detailed proposal, if no Director is willing to fund or house it.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will get a revised draft of the concept-level holding facility proposal from the IFT and send it to the Lead Agency Representatives. The Lead Agency Representatives will be responsible for updating their Director, before the May 20 AMOC conference call, so we can discuss this further on the call.

c. Mexican Wolf Conservation Assessment

The USFWS has just initiated, through a contract, a Mexican Wolf Conservation Assessment to capture (compile) the biological information that has been developed since the FEIS and the Reintroduction Project's 5-Year Review. It will include all the published and raw information gathered or generated by the Recovery Team that was operating in 2004-05. No new research will be conducted, and no recovery strategies of objectives will be identified. It is a synthesis and compilation effort, not a planning effort. USFWS will try to have a public comment period on a draft assessment in the Federal Register this Fall. USFWS also intends to do outreach about the assessment. USFWS has asked AGFD to give a "heads up" to the state wildlife agencies in UT, TX, CO, and OK, since the current understanding of historical range includes those states. Again, this will be a synthesis of information, and a USFWS document, not an AMOC document. An added benefit is that it will be helpful in the NEPA process and in any recovery planning effort that occurs on down the road, at any level.

d. 2008 and 2009 Project budget, IFT priorities, FTE needs, agency commitments

Discussion began by focusing on the 10-12 points listed in Director Bruce Thompson's email of xxx. Cynthia said that John Caid supports the table staying the way it was. Terry Johnson asked if anyone else had any deletions to suggest. Cathy Taylor said she has had discussions with Don DeLorenzo and he asked how important the intensive winter monitoring in March is. John Oakleaf said that we dropped it this year due to budget considerations and flight limitations, that (based on Dan Stark's thesis results it would be better accomplished with GPS collars. This would make available 0.14 FTEs. Ken Mills said that GPS studies have shown that using flights alone yields inaccurate results.

Dave Bergman would strike the management of captive facility category and absorb those FTEs into other categories. All agencies agreed.

# 20 is not eligible for deletion, since it's continuing (scat surveys).

Dave Bergman asked if we have started the LTL program. Response: no, and it might not get off the ground this year. Also, we have evaluated any release sites.

**Action Item:** the IFT will modify the work plan to incorporate the deletion and changes stated at the meeting.

Depredation response: Matt Wunder stated that NM is trying to get away from depredation centric response and move toward proactive approaches, for example affected stakeholder agreements. Terry Johnson stated that Director Thompson's characterization of this issue is inaccurate. Although all other Lead Agencies agree with stepping up proactive measures (AGFD started stakeholder agreements 2 years ago. As noted previously in AMOC meetings), none of them wants to diminish response to depredations. Only NMGFD is advocating decreasing commitment to "depredation centric response," and the other agencies see that as an abrogation of a fundamental Project commitment to the parties affected by wolf depredation. AGFD, USFS, USFWS, WS, and WMAT agreed that Terry's assessment is correct.

Cynthia Dale stressed that we must use the available FTEs to fulfill our responsibilities. John Oakleaf mentioned that USFWS FTEs do not take into consideration the added need for SOP adherence that comes with clarifications of SOPs 5, 6, 11, and 13. Matt Wunder said that conversely, a reduction in the number of wolves (from 2006 to 2007, per EOY Counts) is also an issue to consider for 2008, and calls into questions the need to increase the depredation response. Terry Johnson replied that AGFD does not consider the decrease in the 2007 EOYC to be significant, especially given the uncertainty of how many uncollared wolves might exist. Also, the need for depredation response is triggered by individual events, and not averaged across the population. Some packs and some individuals just cause more trouble than others.

WS says that they are continuing to pull time from non-wolf programs so they can do the required wolf work.

Cathy Taylor suggests keeping the FTEs as they are now, and moving forward.

All agencies, except NMDGF, believe that depredation response should be increased.

Cynthia Dale said that WMAT should be the one to make decisions on how many people they need for FAIR work. All the activities identified in the Work Plan are needed to fulfill their requirements from the Tribal Council, etc.

Terry said the 152% Bruce Thompson references for depredation response increase, and which seems to be a primary NMDGF concern, might be inflated since WS is approved for 4.0 FTEs for wolf work but is only funded for 1.25. Part of what NMDGF perceives as “increase” is actually just WS asking for their full FTE allocation, so they don’t need to pull staff from other areas. WS has been carrying this shortfall for several years.

Terry asked Matt if Bruce understands that most of the increase is from this deficit, or is he more concerned about his own agency’s request for more FTEs. Matt Wunder replied that he thinks Bruce understands the WS issue, but is not sure.

Mike Godwin said he doesn’t think that Bruce understands the purpose of the tables: Table 1 is a projection of staff needed, Table 2 is an assessment of what is available without bringing in agency employees other than the IFT. There is work being done by non-IFT employees and it is not counted, many staff members (not in AGFD) are also going over on hours. This is a gap between what is needed and what is available.

Matt asked if we have a breakdown on what is preventative vs. responsive? John Oakleaf said no, but Wildlife Services is strictly responding to depredation with the shortfall they have.

Terry said that we need to have the Directors in the room for this discussion and we won’t make progress until that happens.

Radio collaring – Terry Johnson asked if we have a difference of opinion among the Lead Agencies on the need to radio-collar wolves. Thompson’s email indicates that we do. Project SOP states that every wolf handled should be collared and at least one member of each pack should be collared. Those SOPs were approved by all the Lead Agencies, yet NMDGF is now questioning the collaring effort. Matt Wunder stated that 72% of the wolves are collared or associated with collared animals, and he believes this is a high number. Matt asked if it really takes 1.25 people per year to handle collaring needs, as the tables indicate.

Cynthia Dale said that WMAT Tribal Council wants as many wolves collared as possible (preferably every wolf), but at least half of each pack and WMAT is already short in FTEs to deal with this. John Oakleaf stressed that the more wolves collared the more info we have. Cynthia said the wolves that we have the most trouble with are uncollared dispersers. Cathy Taylor mentioned that if we don't have several animals in each pack collared it becomes more difficult to make depredation assignments. Dave Bergman said we need to have information about locations so we can conduct other management actions without jeopardizing Mexican wolves.

Terry Johnson asked if the IFT anticipates being able to maintain that percentage of collaring if we reduce the number of FTEs. John Oakleaf said it is always a struggle to keep that number up. Matt Wunder asked if we actually need to have one FTE set aside completely, not considering WMAT. If so, would we consider that? John Oakleaf said some events require more than one person, and collaring is not done every day. Also, USFWS always sends one or more "Albuquerque" volunteers to help with collaring, and they are not factored into the tables.

Terry Johnson asked if we want to take the table completely out of the Work Plan. John Oakleaf suggests leaving it in and continuing the FTE discussion. Wally Murphy said this kind of issue should not go to the Directors; it should stay at the AMOC level. Cathy Taylor reminded him that this issue came to AMOC from the Directors. Terry said Bruce Thompson indicated earlier in an email to AMOC and the Directors that his staff would be empowered to address these issues at this meeting. Terry thinks a face to face discussion among Directors is needed, but the Directors haven't had time, so they deferred it to us. Obviously, we are not going to resolve anything today.

Terry Johnson said he thinks the Annual Work Plan does not hinge on the unresolved table. Could we finalize the Work Plan without the table? USFS – let's extend that part of the discussion for half an hour, to discuss what FTEs are available, and see if we can reach agreement. The discussion ensued, but resolution was not reached.

Terry expressed concern that he has heard through the IFT that NMDGF does not intend to provide support (money or planes) for fixed-wing weekly monitoring next year (i.e. after June 30, 2008). Is that true? If it is, then AGFD flight resources might need to be focused on AZ entirely (including WMAT and SCAT, per routine).

**Action Item:** NMDGF will look into availability of its resources for the coming Fiscal Year, by the May 20 conference call.

**Action Item:** By May 9, each Lead Agency will respond (by email) to Terry Johnson concerning the 12 work plan concerns sent by Bruce Thompson. We can discuss them further on the May 20 AMOC conference call.

- e. AZA request for permanent removal and lethal take moratorium

This item was not discussed.

- f. Selection of AMOC Chair

Terry Johnson said the basic process for selecting the AMOC Chair is described in the 2003 MOU: the Chair must be the Lead Agency Representative from AGFD, NMDGF, or WMAT, and the Chair is appointed (or renewed) every two years. Terry was appointed Chair in 2003 by acclamation, and renewed as Chair in 2005 (again by acclamation). On both occasions, before accepting the role Terry asked NMDGF and WMAT whether they wanted to be Chair, and on both occasions they said no. The Chair was not discussed in the October 2007 or January 2008 AMOC meetings.

In January 2008, John Morgart was approached by **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION**, who suggested it was “time for a change” in the AMOC Chair and it was NMDGF’s turn. Morgart inferred that **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** would work through NM to pursue this. Morgart advised Terry Johnson of the discussion, and he and Terry agreed to let things run their course and see what **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** would do. Neither John nor Terry knew whether by “NM” **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** meant the NM Governor’s Office or NMDGF. **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** is thought to have good access to the Governor’s Office, i.e. the Governor’s policy advisor for wildlife issues.

On April 12, NMDGF Director Bruce Thompson sent an email to the Lead Agency Directors stating that NM Governor Richardson and the NM Game Commission had directed the NMDGF to take on a leadership role in AMOC, and consequently NMDGF was looking forward to the other AMOC agencies supporting a 5-6 month transition to NMDGF as AMOC Chair. Thompson indicated he had discussed this with USFWS Regional Director Tuggle and AGFD Director Shroufe in March, and both had agreed to the change. Thompson also suggested that Terry Johnson welcomed the change. In a second email, to AGFD Director Voyles, Thompson suggested the change might be good for Terry, in light of his health issues.

Terry Johnson: AGFD and Terry would indeed be happy to relinquish the Chair, if that is what AMOC and the Cooperators as a body want, if the change were made through proper process, and if the new Chair were appropriately committed to the partnership and supported by his or her agency sufficiently to handle the job. However, Terry said he did not request that he be replaced as Chair and he does not believe his health is an issue with regard to handling AMOC responsibilities. Terry said that for the past 3-4 years he has asked NMDGF to take on more administrative responsibility in AMOC and the IFT, and to more fully meet its field and financial obligations in the Project. Other AMOC representatives have repeatedly expressed much the same desire.

Terry said that Director Thompson's email precipitated concerns among the Lead Agencies and Cooperators, especially about "behind the scenes discussions" among a subset of Directors. Several cooperators have spoken with him about this. As he sees it, the process issue is separate from the question of who is or should be AMOC Chair. Terry then offered a couple of comments about the process, basically reiterating what he had said in his April 15 email to AMOC in response to Director Thompson's April 12 email.

Cathy Taylor said USFS thinks there has been an issue with leaving WMAT out of the Director discussions.

Cynthia Dale provided a written statement and said that WMAT Director John Caid was not included in the March Director discussions referenced by Director Thompson. One of Thompson's email comments was that the AMOC Chair is a State purview (AGFD or NMDGF), and WMAT asserts this is not the way it is in the MOU. WMAT is the equal of AGFD and NMDGF under the MOU. WMAT believes there was a disregard for process and professional courtesy in how this was handled. Also, WMAT doesn't know how the NM Governor or the NM Game Commission can give permission for moving forward with this change without consulting other agencies. Apparently, Director Thompson assumed the other AMOC members want the change and that if there were a change it would automatically go to NMDGF and it must stay in the State realm. Why did NMDGF discuss this with AGFD and USFWS but not WMAT? Why didn't USFWS direct NMDGF to AMOC, when Thompson first approached them?

Cathy Taylor said Director Thompson might have misinterpreted statements from AGFD and USFWS and he should look to the spirit of the MOU for guidance.

Cynthia Dale stated that WMAT adds a large area (FAIR) to the wolf program and has signed agreements to work with USFWS and the other AMOC agencies. They expect the same respect as other agencies and WMAT will not support a transition to a NMDGF Chair. WMAT is very happy with the work Terry has done for the program. They believe if something isn't broken it shouldn't be fixed, and Director Thompson was correct in yielding to AMOC (i.e. agreeing with Terry's April 15 email regarding process) and that the AMOC process should go forward.

Hector Ruedas said the counties were upset by involvement of the Governor in NM. They feel the Governor can't proclaim this, only AMOC can. GRECO agrees with WMAT's comments, and believes NMDGF is out of line. GRECO is willing to sit at the table because they want the wolves properly managed. The counties support continuing with Terry Johnson as AMOC chair, even though they don't have a vote.

Kay Gale asked why a request from an outside party is being given that much consideration. Terry Johnson said that he doesn't know that Thompson's request was

related in any way to **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** comments to Morgart. In mentioning **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION** earlier, Terry was just trying to make sure that (in Morgart's absence today) all the information was on the table.

Terry Cooper of Graham County said that he appreciates Terry's chairmanship and institutional knowledge and doesn't want to see any changes.

Cathy Taylor said the way this issue was put forward was awkward; we need to follow process. She agrees that Terry has done a tremendous job, but has wondered why there has not been a change considered before. She suggests that we retain Terry and rather than AGFD being the alternate that another agency step in. She also suggests that we postpone a vote to allow more information to be gathered. If we do change leadership, would another agency be able to give as much time to the position as Terry does? USFS believes that each agency interested in becoming Chair should submit proposals on what they would be able to provide.

Jerry Brownlow said Navajo County thinks we should have an open discussion, but feels that NM didn't follow process and it was handled wrong. They didn't show respect to other agencies. NAVCO supports what WMAT said; WMAT should have been involved in the process. NAVCO supports Terry Johnson as Chair, but maybe this should be put on a future agenda item.

Wally Murphy said USFWS Regional Director Tuggle felt the NM actions happened outside the MOU process, and does not support a change in Chair at this time. USFWS wants to be sure the Chair has the time and financial support the position requires. Anyone interested in becoming Chair should have a 1-year shadow assignment with Terry Johnson. Cynthia Dale asked if Director Tuggle suggested that this issue go to AMOC when Director Thompson approached him. Wally didn't know.

Dave Bergman said the WS Director is concerned that the issue was brought up outside the MOU. WS is extremely pleased with the work Terry Johnson is doing and feels that we don't have anyone else with the institutional knowledge that Terry brings to this decision. WS wants Terry to continue as Chair.

Steve Titla of SCAT invoked "The Apache Way" (i.e. cutting through the smoke) and moved to have Terry serve as Chair indefinitely. Steve feels he's very objective and reasonable and doesn't feel that anyone else can fill the position.

Bud Starnes of NMDA said he hasn't seen any evidence that anyone else is qualified, ready, or has the support to take over the AMOC chair. He doesn't feel that NMDGF has the time or money to support the position, as they have proven in the past. Also, he said the Governor doesn't have the authority in this topic.

Hector Ruedas said that if NM wants to run the program, why don't we split up the program and have NM work on their own.

Terry Johnson said the AGFD position is and always has been that collaboration will serve us better than independent action by each agency. The Chair's duty is to reflect the will of the group as whole, not just of their own agency. He said he has continually imposed on the AGFD AMOC Surrogate to help with his work as Chair, and thank goodness Bill Van Pelt and now Dave Cagle have been willing to do so. Having a shadow or vice Chair from WMAT or NMDGF could lessen the workload on the AGFD AMOC Surrogate. However, Terry said he understands that all AMOC representatives have many obligations other than the wolf; none of us is entirely dedicated to AMOC duties. So, the question is whether anyone has the time and other resources necessary to serve as AMOC Chair, because this is a "time intensive" group for a Chair to serve. Terry said again that he asked in 2003 and 2005 if NMDGF wanted to be Chair, and Lisa Kirkpatrick and Chuck Hayes said absolutely not.

Regardless of who is AMOC Chair, Terry Johnson said he believes that the events of August – December brought to light the fact that the layer of administrative support for the AMOC Chair is too thin. Shadowing or a vice or surrogate Chair might serve us all well. Terry also stressed that there would be difficulties in a shadow or Vice Chair process, as the workload is high, the need for timely communication is huge, and a shadow or Vice Chair must be just as well informed and just as involved in all AMOC issues as the Chair is. It's not just a matter of showing up for meetings.

Terry Johnson said he does not believe this issue can or even should be resolved at this meeting. There are too many unasked questions that probably cannot be answered today. But, before we even try to get into them, we need to remember that AMOC has always tried to achieve consensus, and outside the meeting room we have not identified any dissenting voices. We leave our discussions in the room, and carry forward decisions as AMOC decisions that are supported (or at least accepted) by all.

Terry said that, based on comment today and over the past week or so, the AMOC agencies seem to want to know several things: Is NMDGF committed to the AMOC partnership, i.e. the MOU? Why does NM want to become Chair now? Does NMDGF have and is it willing to commit the resources required to function as Chair? Who would NMDGF put forth as Chair? Terry said AGFD Director Voyles believes that credibility is everything to AGFD, since it has little regulatory authority, and in AMOC credibility means living up to the commitments we have made as a body.

Terry Johnson said he would like to see an open discussion of the issues and options today. However, Hector Ruedas said he wants to cut the discussion and put the issue on the table today. Terry then asked NMDGF to speak.

Matt Wunder said he appreciates all the comments – NMDGF doesn't believe there is a problem with Terry; that's not why they want a change. Essentially, the process hit

the fan when the leadership statement was made by the Governor. The Governor provides guidance for the agency, but NMDGF was not made aware of the Governor's wishes previous to the statement. He believes the statement said that the Governor wanted NMDGF to explore the process of looking into changing the Chair. Matt said NMDGF Director Thompson told him that he didn't have discussions with the Governor about the process in detail, just that they wanted to explore/start the process. Thompson said his April 12 email was notification that this is something that NM is interested in doing. Several AMOC representatives questioned that, since the April 12 email did not ask AMOC to initiate the process. Terry Johnson affirmed that Director Thompson's email didn't go to AMOC. It went to the Lead Agency Directors, NM staff, and Terry, all of whom interpreted it to be notification of a decision by three Directors, one of whom (Shroufe, AGFD) retired on March 31.

Cathy Taylor then read the April 12 email aloud: it says that NM is now in a position to take over the AMOC Chair and asks the other agencies for their support and cooperation. That is a decision, not a request. The email makes reference to direction from the NM Governor, but maybe it was not crafted correctly. Director Thompson needs to be more careful with his words.

Cynthia Dale again said WMAT takes offense at the State realm wording of the April 12 email. WMAT feels they deserve an apology. Also, Thompson's email to Voyles apparently said that Thompson's lack of discussion with Voyles was an oversight, but NMDGF didn't bother to contact the WMAT Director either. Until NMDGF can show more respect for the process or they have the capacity to do the job that Terry Johnson is doing, WMAT won't back it.

Motion on the floor: Terry Johnson explained that Steve Titla's original motion (i.e. Terry Johnson serve as indefinite AMOC Chair) was out of order, because the 2003 MOU sets a 2-year limit for the Chair, subject to renewal. Titla then moved that Terry Johnson remain as AMOC Chair for 2 years. Hector Ruedas seconded. Counties – yes. SCAT – yes. NMDA – yes. USFS – no; wants to explore shadowing before voting on Chair. WS – yes. USFWS – no, same reason as USFS. WMAT – yes. NMDGF – no. AGFD – yes; but open to shadowing if the agencies want that. Terry Johnson said that we failed to achieve Lead Agency consensus, so the motion fails.

Terry Johnson asked whether NM or WMAT wanted to serve in a shadow or Vice Chair capacity; perhaps we could resolve that issue, and then tackle the Chair issue. Instead, Cynthia Dale suggested a continuing resolution that Terry remain Chair for 2 years, while we explore whether there is an agency that has the resources required for the Vice Chair, with resolution by the scheduled May 20 AMOC conference call. USFS seconded. Counties – yes. USFS - yes. WS – yes. NMDGF – no. USFWS – yes. SCAT – no; wants Terry to remain Chair with no Vice Chair. AGFD – yes. Terry said that we failed to achieve Lead Agency consensus, so the motion fails.

Motion made by Hector Ruedas and seconded by Terry Cooper that Terry Johnson stay on as AMOC Chair. All said yes, except NMDGF. Terry Johnson said that we failed to achieve Lead Agency consensus, so the motion fails.

Terry Johnson asked what NMDGF wants. Matt Wunder replied by nominating NMDGF (an unnamed individual) as AMOC Chair. The motion died for lack of a second. Terry then asked Matt whether there were any circumstances under which NMDGF would support Terry as Chair. Matt said no. Terry said that, in light of NMDGF's position, the issue should be referred to the Directors. All parties agreed. Terry then asked if all present were OK with him running this meeting. All said yes.

**Action Item:** Terry Johnson will refer the Chair issue to the Directors.

After a short break, Terry Johnson asked for a motion regarding an Acting Chair while AMOC awaits Directors resolution of the Chair issue. Hector Ruedas moved that Terry Johnson be named temporary Chair, until the issue of Chair/Vice Chair is resolved. Terry Cooper seconded the motion. All parties voted in favor of the motion.

g. Other items deferred

No agenda items were deferred.

10. Other business

Terry Johnson asked Renae Held to send him the draft notes by Thursday April 30, and to have them integrated into the AMOC Agenda format. Renae agreed. Terry then said that any agenda items not addressed through closure will be moved to the next AMOC meeting.

11. Adjournment

Terry Johnson adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.