

From: [Davis, Edward D](#)
To: [Oakleaf, John](#); [Piper, Cyrenea B](#)
Cc: [Dwire, Maggie](#); [Young, Don, DGF](#); [Greenleaf, Allison R](#); [Riso, Nicholas, DGF](#); [McGee, Brady](#); [Ordonez, Vicente -FS](#)
Subject: RE: Catron County MOU
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 5:42:26 PM
Attachments: [2019 FINAL MOU SIGNED.pdf](#)

Hey,

I brought this up during the FWS Wolf Management meeting today, so it should be on FWS wolf leadership's minds. I'll put some comments on John's email below. Speaking for myself, we need harder/firmer/better answers to the questions Cyrenea puts below and for some I just put. I'm getting the feeling that we will keep doing what we're doing. But that doesn't work. People are frustrated on all sides, so we can't keep doing what we're doing. Some expectations need to be clearly communicated (in writing) with Catron county/Jess so there isn't as much gray area. What we do in Catron county, should, and hopefully will be mirrored into the other counties. If Jess gets something, let's start getting the contacts together so all the counties get what Catron gets? A consistent, fair, and documented (in writing) approach will help our reputation, while unequal data sharing will only hurt us. Maybe SOP 26 can outline this for the field team?

These are not meant to be complaints, but more challenges on how the IFT can improve over time. We have to adapt as we get more and more wolves. Less gray area, more consistency/uniformity, and lowering expectations across the board is my suggestion as a good starting place. This is an opportunity to start the conversation with Catron County.

Thanks,
Ed

From: Oakleaf, John <john_oakleaf@fws.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 9:42 AM
To: Piper, Cyrenea B <cyrenea_piper@fws.gov>
Cc: Dwire, Maggie <maggie_dwire@fws.gov>; Young, Don, DGF <don.young@state.nm.us>; Greenleaf, Allison R <allison_greenleaf@fws.gov>; Davis, Edward D <edward_davis@fws.gov>; Riso, Nicholas, DGF <Nicholas.riso@state.nm.us>; McGee, Brady <brady_mcgee@fws.gov>; Ordonez, Vicente -FS <vicente.ordonez@usda.gov>
Subject: Re: Catron County MOU

Cyrenea,

I think this is a question best answered by Brady since it has to do with the MOU, but I will do my best to describe my recommendation (interim guidance) on this topic prior to Brady responding. I read through the MOU have attached it for people to look at.

1. The MOU does not specifically state what will/will not be shared. Lead Agencies (AZGFD, BLM, NPS, NMDGF, WMAT, USFS, USFWS, WS) are in a different status than cooperating agencies (counties), but the MOU doesn't specify the status at a field level,

but does state that: "Counties and EACO will: 1) enhance communication **We have been out of the loop on Jess's personal sighting/nuisance reports through time. Will those be offered over to us now (in totality)?** with other interested parties and the public to keep them informed on the Mexican Wolf Recovery Program; 2) provide logistical and other support as necessary for the Mexican Wolf Recovery Program **I have no idea what this means? What logistics will Catron County (or all county signatories) be helping us with? Investigations should be going to WS-NM, so that doesn't count in my opinion ;** 3) coordinate impact assessments and mitigation measures **This is a huge problem. What is Catron county, or any county signatories doing for mitigation measures? I argue that they do not do this. This would give them some investment, and would certainly help IFT relationships if they helped** that may occur from reintroduction and management of the Mexican wolf, on health, safety, and welfare of the Counties and their residents."

2. The IFT consist of Lead Agency employees whose primary duties involve onthe-ground management of Mexican wolf. **As discussed in other conversations, BLM and NPS have not been directly involved in wolf management to my knowledge (different issue I realize). "Getting our house in order" comes to mind. Can we work towards getting the Lead Agencies functioning smoothly first? If that isn't in place, we're just passing confusion down to the cooperating agencies, and it is showing...**
3. So Jess is not a member of the IFT but is hired to work on list above and we should assist with that in particular enhancing communication and mitigation measures. **Again, what mitigation measures are happening? This could be a huge help honestly, if the counties were more engaged in animal husbandry practices for example? That would be very helpful! Or, when Jess gets "nuisance" sightings. If he could help educate his county's residence about what "nuisance" is, that also could help us!**
4. Along those lines, Jess also does depredation co-investigations at the request of landowners. He is generally the first call that they make. **Why is this? I'm blunt, so I'll just say it; he has influence over the investigation and a producer is more likely to have an investigation confirmed if he is there. I think there is a general push to say that Jess being there is a good thing, it helps as a conduit for information/coordination? It is not, and needs to be addressed at some point. Producers should be instructed, and reemphasized to call WS-NM in NM. That is already a mixed message; one that we could help fix?**
5. We have shared tools with Jess (receivers, locations (after depredations, hazing, etc.). And should continue to do so in the spirit of cooperation and mitigation measures. **I continue to question the mitigation measures. What is Jess doing with his receiver that helps the producer? He does not haze. If this is our direction, Cyrenea's questions below need answered. Another big one is who will coordinate and lead this effort (updating receivers, etc...)? Does that fall on NMGFD? FWS? A shared approach? In the past, this has landed solely on the Alpine crew.**
6. So my suggestion is that we periodically update Jess with frequencies, generally this has

been done once a year and includes all wolves in New Mexico and wolves that are close in Arizona. We could do this twice a year but the helicopter season and trapping season when we add collars are pretty close together. Who is “we”? Who handles coordination/communication at the other county levels? I’m assuming John, maybe Brady? Would/should that same approach be had here? Maybe Grant/Sierra county want receivers? Who updates them?

7. We should share locations after the fact rather than prior to investigations so as to not bias investigations. I think that general information is fine (e.g., Mangas territory or whatever), but specifics on a spot (e.g., there is a cluster at the location of the depredation) should not be shared prior to the investigation. We can share following the investigation. This would make sense to be NMGFD since it is related to depredations? Should this happen on every one? That takes time/effort. My thought is we send out the “depredation report” that is created on AGOL? No doubt they will pop up and be used against us for how we make assignments.
8. We should share what animals we are assigning depredations to as soon as we know so that Jess can complete his investigation report. Communication is 2-way. I think this is a great spot to lean on Catron county or Jess about the other sighting/nuisance reports he takes. Maybe educate him, or ask him to start explaining what “nuisance” behavior is? Start doing something to benefit the situation, instead of only advocating against wolves in the county.
9. If there is a nuisance situation, we should share all information with Jess. To what end? Will he come out and help us haze at night, etc... This is the continual struggle (my opinion) is that we get very little out of Jess, yet put a lot of effort in. Others will likely disagree with me, but the overall net gain of all the work we do with Jess literally only backfires and makes Catron county more anti-wolf. They are literally one of our biggest hurdles to wolf recovery and I will say they do not have a true interest in helping mitigate conflict or coexisting with wolves.
10. You can always direct Jess to talk to me if he has any questions or needs further clarification. I did talk to him about the reason behind our recent struggles with the transition in WS personnel. He seemed to understand. He often calls around looking for someone to answer him or give him information. It is because some give him what he wants, and others don’t. As Cyrenea mentioned below, the IFT decided several things over a year ago in regards to communicating with Jess, yet he still got a R1000 receiver and still gets the flightsheet from WS-NM. Again, I think we need to get our house in order. Too many inconsistencies to be successful with Catron County at the moment (my opinion) and way too confusing to create an equal and fair data dissemination strategies for all county MOU signers.

Again, These are my recommendations and interim guidance. Brady will have to weigh in on a final version of this, but I think this is consistent with the MOU (see attached).

Cheers,

John

John Oakleaf
Mexican Wolf Field Projects Coordinator
2105 Osuna NE, Albuquerque, NM
(928)245-1910 (Work Cell)

From: Piper, Cyrenea B <cyrenea_piper@fws.gov>
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:15 PM
To: Oakleaf, John <john_oakleaf@fws.gov>
Cc: Dwire, Maggie <maggie_dwired@fws.gov>; Young, Don, DGF <don_young@state.nm.us>;
Greenleaf, Allison R <allison_greenleaf@fws.gov>; Davis, Edward D <edward_davis@fws.gov>; Riso,
Nicholas, DGF <Nicholas.riso@state.nm.us>; McGee, Brady <brady_mcghee@fws.gov>; Ordonez,
Vicente -FS <vicente.ordonez@usda.gov>
Subject: Catron County MOU

John,

Per recent emails and communication with Jess Carey it is clear he is unhappy with the project. In his email he states certain expectations from us because of Catron County being on the MOU. Can you clarify what we as the FWS are required to share with Catron Country per the MOU? I think we as a team need to have a clear understanding about this and then decide on a plan going forward on how we share data with Jess. For example, do we share the flightsheet with Jess? Can we set a schedule where an IFTL sends him updated flightsheets? What is the expectation in regards to sharing depredation assignments? How does NMGFD want to share this information since they are the lead on depredations? Finally, when do we share and when do we not share location data with Jess? We have agreed in the past not to share location data prior to an investigation because it has swayed determinations in the past, but can we put that in writing somewhere?

Thanks,
Cyrenea

Cyrenea Piper
Mexican Wolf Recovery Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
PO Box 856 Alpine, AZ 85920
Cyrenea_piper@fws.gov
928-215-1130