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HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS:  Good evening. On
behalf of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, I
welcome you to this public hearing regarding the
proposal to revise the Nonessential Experimental
Population Rule for the Mexican wolf and to seek comment
on the accompanying draft Environmental Impact
Statement.

My name is Lesley Travers. I will be your
hearing officer today. My company is Travers
Consulting, and I am not affiliated with U.S. Fish and
Wildlife Service, and I don't represent them. I
represent no point of view with respect to the proposal
that is the subject of this hearing.

My role is to conduct this hearing in an
orderly manner such that we receive your comments
accurately into the record. I would like to recognize a
number of people.

Crystal Diamond, Soil Water Conservation
District.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Jim Wood, Deming Soil
and Water board member.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Billy G. Garrett,
Sierra County commissioner.

Dr. Tuggle and Mrs. Barrett. They will provide opening
remarks, and Ms. Melbihess will give a brief PowerPoint
presentation that explains the proposal.

MR. TUGGLE: Good evening, everybody. My name
is Benjamin Tuggle. I'm the regional director for the
US Fish and Wildlife Service in the Southwest Region.
Our regional jurisdiction covers Texas, New Mexico,
Arizona and Oklahoma. I'm here tonight, along with
other service representatives, to give testimony and
receive comments for the proposal to revise the
nonessential experimental population of the Mexican gray
wolf, and also to solicit comments on the EIS, the
Environmental Impact Statement that's in the draft form.

The hearing tonight is the fourth of the many
hearings that we've had that we've scheduled here in the
Southwest to listen to your comments on the two proposed
rule revisions.

It is our intent that any final determination
resulting from the proposed changes to the Mexican wolf
Experimental Population Rule be as accurate and
effective as possible. And towards that end, we seek
the best scientific and commercial data available. We
will base our final decisions in part on the testimony
that we receive here tonight as well as written comments
that we receive.
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On behalf of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, I want to express my deepest appreciation to Sierra County, and particularly the town of Truth or Consequences, for allowing us to use this meeting room here at the Civic Center.

I also want to thank all of you for attending this meeting tonight. It is extremely important that we hear what you have to say. As we move forward with our efforts to recover Mexican wolves in Arizona and New Mexico, we will retain the experimental nonessential designation for this wild population of Mexican gray wolves, and we’re doing so in order to maximize the management flexibility that we have as we recover this species.

I want to turn the floor over now to Sherry Barrett, who is our wolf recovery coordinator for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. BARRETT: Thank you all for coming today. I appreciate all the people that also were here earlier this afternoon for the public information session, and my comments are going to be turned over to Tracy Melbihess, who will give the presentation.

MS. MELBIHES: Good evening, and again, thank you all very much for sharing your evening with us. My presentation should take about 20 minutes.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been engaged in the recovery of the Mexican wolf for going on four decades. This is the subspecies of the gray wolf that was extirpated in the US in the 1970s due to predator eradication efforts. And at that time, the last wolves in the wild were brought in to captivity at facilities in Mexico and the US, and the captive breeding program was established.

And the purpose of that breeding program was to save the Mexican wolf from extinction, but also to breed those wolves and their offspring over time, to eventually produce wolves that could be reintroduced into the wild.

In the mid-1970s, the Mexican wolves received the protections of the Endangered Species Act, and that stimulated our development of a recovery plan which we finalized in 1982.

So in 1998, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service began the reintroduction of the Mexican wolves to the wild in Arizona and New Mexico. More recently, Mexico has also started a reintroduction program.

Mexico has its own federal endangered species law and its own recovery plan for the Mexican wolf, and its own plans for reintroduction in the country of Mexico. The two reintroductions that are going on in the United States and Mexico are independent efforts that are occurring pursuant to the federal laws in both countries. So they are coordinated, but independent efforts.

So in 1998, when we initiated this reintroduction, we published our final rule. And that was a document that said, described the regulations we would use to manage this population. Where we would put wolves in the wild, how we would manage them on the ground, including potentially removing them.

So those are the highlights of that. The experimental population area is I-40 across Arizona into New Mexico, down to I-10. Within that designation was the Blue Range Wolf Recovery Area here (indicating), the Gila National Forest in New Mexico, and the Apache National Forest in Arizona.

Then within that Blue Range Wolf Recovery Area, we also designated the primary recovery zone and a secondary recovery zone. The primary recovery zone was where we would conduct the initial releases, which is taking the wolves from captivity and putting them in the wild, and they could then disperse into the secondary recovery area.

Wolves also currently, in addition to the Blue Range Wolf Recovery Area, inhabit the Fort Apache Indian Reservation. That’s through a separate memorandum of agreement with the White Mountain Apache Tribe. The wolves that are in this area, our regulations stated that they could not leave the area. So if they do, we capture them and bring them back.

So, 16 years later, in terms of the reintroduction, we have established a minimum population of about 83 wolves in the wild, as of our most recent year-end-of-the-year-population count. 83 wolves in about 14 packs.

And the management of wolves on the ground has developed into a partnership effort between a handful of agencies: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, Arizona Game and Fish, the Forest Service and Wildlife Services.

And collectively, we have all learned quite a bit about the reintroduction of the Mexican wolf from the biology of the wolves and what the population needs to be secure, to the impacts that the wolves can have on the land owners and the communities that are co-existing with the wolves, and also the clarity of our own regulations and the efficacy in trying to implement them.

And so, gathering all of that information, we initiated a scoping period back in 2007. And we held a
series of public meetings at that time to talk to the public and hear about their ideas and concerns related to our reintroduction. And last year, in 2013, we published a proposed rule. That proposed rule would essentially be our modifications to the regulations that we established in 1998. We also published a notice of intent to develop a draft Environmental Impact Statement. So, these are two separate documents that come together in a process. The rule provides the regulations, and the Environmental Impact Statement analyzes the impact of our proposed action. And so, from our public comment period, we received about 7,000 comments that we used to do a revision of that proposed rule. And along the way, the development of the draft EIS, we have been joined by about 27 cooperating agencies. And these were federal, state, county and tribal governments that joined us to develop a draft Environmental Impact Statement. And so, all of this information then is used to develop the rule and the draft Environmental Impact Statement that was published a few weeks ago at the end of July. So the purpose of our overall action is that we are trying to further the conservation of the Mexican wolf by improving the effectiveness of our reintroduction project. And there are several main components of our action. One is that we recognize we need to modify the boundaries of the re- -- of the experimental area where the wolves are. Second, we know that we need to modify some of the management regulations that govern where we put the wolves and how we manage them on the landscape. And then we also need a tool that we can use to manage wolves that may disperse outside of the experimental population area. And so the reasons for these three main components of our action, again, are several. One, is that we recognize certain things about the status of the population. And two of the most important things are we recognize that the population needs to grow larger. And that in growing larger, it will take up more space. Another thing that we recognize is that the genetic composition of the population in the wild is not as robust as it could be, and we need additional space to conduct initial releases. We also recognize that with Mexico's reintroduction program, there is a potential for wolves from Mexico to disperse across the border into the United States.

Some of the reintroduction sites in New Mexico are less than a hundred miles from the border, and that is a distance that is easily traveled by a wolf. And so, between these various actions to modify the geography and our management actions to address some of these changes that are occurring in the reintroduction, a couple of the big issues that came up during scoping that are related to our actions but they are outside of what we are trying to do right now, which is to improve the existing population. Comments related to recovery, recovery planning and the designation of essential or nonessential. So I want to talk about those briefly.

Recovery planning is something that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service does for most species that are listed under the Endangered Species Act, and it's our way to establish the big picture of what needs to happen to improve that species' status so that eventually that species can be delisted from the endangered species, from the list of endangered species, because those legal protections are not needed anymore. And so that is kind of the umbrella document that guides many of the activities that occur to conserve that species.

And so this action that we are currently taking is one of those actions that will occur under the recovery program for the species, but it is a subcomponent of the recovery program. And then the essential and nonessential status, these are designations that accompany the status of experimental in the Endangered Species Act. And an experimental population that is either essential or nonessential, both contribute to the conservation and recovery of a species, and in both designations we have management flexibility.

The difference between these designations is that from an essential population, when we've put those animals back into the wild, they are essential for the survival of that species. Meaning if they die, we're facing extinction.

So when we designated the experimental population area in 1998, we recognized that for the Mexican wolf, we do have the captive breeding program, several hundred wolves in about 52 facilities in the US and Mexico. So if the wolves in the wild died, we would be able to use the offspring in the captive population to put them back into the wild. So we made that designation of nonessential experimental, and we are maintaining that.

All right. So, here is alternative one. So in
a draft Environmental Impact Statement, we have a proposed action that mirrors what you see in the proposed rule. Then we also looked at two alternative ways to achieve our purpose and needs. We also analyzed the no action alternative. So alternative one here, again, between New Mexico and Arizona, the green and blue area is not any kind of designation. This is what we think, based on the scientific literature, is suitable habitat for the Mexican wolves. These are mountainous, forested areas with ungulate prey.

And so, we include those on the map so that you can see our best estimate of where wolves would go on a landscape. So this is an experimental population area that would range from I-40 all the way down to the international border, again, to expand the experimental population area so that wolves from Mexico could be managed as part of the experimental population area. This is a three-zone management scheme.

Management, or unit zone one, is in the orange highlighting there, and that's the current Blue Range Wolf Recovery Area for the Gila National Forest and the Apache National Forest. But it's expanded to also include the Magdalena, the Cibola, the Picuris National Forest and three ranger districts of the Tonto.

The reason for the expansion of this area, is that, as I mentioned earlier, the primary recovery zone in the Blue Range Wolf Recovery Area is relatively small and is relatively full. In other words, the wolves that we have released there now occupy that area, and we are unable to conduct additional releases.

And we recognize that in order to improve the genetic robustness of this population, we need to conduct more initial releases, so more of the wolves from captivity that have genetic material that is not currently represented in the wild need to be released. This will give us some flexibility and options as to where those releases could occur.

Then in zone two, encompasses most of the rest of that suitable habitat that you see. This is an area where wolves would be allowed to disperse into from Zone 1, and wolves do actually already inhabit Zone 2 there on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation. And so, they would be able to disperse throughout this area. Wolves could also disperse into Zone 3. This is eastern New Mexico and western New Mexico. As you can tell, there's not a lot of green and blue over here, so there's not a lot of suitable habitat, and therefore, if wolves disperse into that area and did not cause a problem, they would be allowed to stay. If they did cause nuisance, depredations, we would be quick to manage those situations.

Then in this alternative, it also includes this permit that we would essentially issue ourselves. It's a permit under the Endangered Species Act. That describes how we would manage the wolves that would potentially disperse outside of experimental population area. So anywhere here (indicating).

And in those cases, we do intend to capture those wolves and bring them back to the experimental population area. The rationale for that is that, again, we are trying to improve the genetic condition of the population as well as the size. And so as these wolves could potentially disperse very long distances out in the landscape, we want to bring them back in so that they have the potential to contribute to improving this core population that we've already established in the Blue Range Recovery Area.

Then our alternative one also includes some broadening of our existing take measures. Take is the ability to harm or harass or even kill a Mexican wolf. And so, those instances are spelled out in the rule. For example, right now, we have take provisions related to if a wolf is in the act of attacking livestock. And we're proposing on federal land right now, our current regulation specifies that in order to be able to take a wolf on federal land, a permit could be issued if there are six breeding pairs of Mexican wolves in the population.

We are proposing to eliminate that stipulation and instead offer those permits at our discretion; and instead offer those permits at our discretion; and is relatively full. In other words, the wolves that

In those cases, we do intend to capture those wolves and bring them back to the experimental population area. The rationale for that is that, again, we are trying to improve the genetic condition of the population as well as the size. And so as these wolves could potentially disperse very long distances out in the landscape, we want to bring them back in so that they have the potential to contribute to improving this core population that we've already established in the Blue Range Recovery Area.

Then our alternative one also includes some broadening of our existing take measures. Take is the ability to harm or harass or even kill a Mexican wolf. And so, those instances are spelled out in the rule. For example, right now, we have take provisions related to if a wolf is in the act of attacking livestock. And we're proposing on federal land right now, our current regulation specifies that in order to be able to take a wolf on federal land, a permit could be issued if there are six breeding pairs of Mexican wolves in the population.
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We do not think our proposed action would have the discretion to issue a removal action for someone that they are with. Alternative 3 also mimics alternative 1, except there may be localized herds where predation pressure could be heavier.

And then specific to ranching and livestock production, similarly, we do not think that our proposed action would impact the regional economic sector, but we understand that depredations can be significant for individual ranchers.

And then we do not find any other significant impacts in the other resource areas that we looked at. So as you know, and that's why you're here, we're in the middle of a public comment period. This will be over at the end of September, on the 23rd, and everything tonight that you say for testimony or that you offer either in the comment boxes will be included with our entire record. That also includes the opportunity to comment on the Internet and through the mail.

We use all of the comments received from all sources to finalize our Environmental Impact Statement and our rule. And so you should also have this information on the little agenda sheet and potentially the comment cards. It's also on the rule. And if you don't have it in any of those, grab one of us and we'll make sure that you get it. This is the address for electronic submission of comments as well as mail.

So our time line for this, we're right about in the middle right now, we're right past that. We do expect to, after the submission of comments, finalize these documents in January. And so again, we want to thank you very much for being here and for providing the testimony tonight, and we ask that you recognize what we're trying to do right now.

It is our mission to conserve and recover the Mexican wolf, and the proposed action is with that intention in mind. But we are trying to do it in a balanced way that shows responsiveness to the people who are impacted by Mexican wolves, specifically in nuisance and depredation situations. So thank you very much.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, Tracy, Sherry, and Dr. Tuggle. This is a public hearing.

Notice of this public hearing was published in the Federal Register on July 25, 2014, starting on Page 21.

Thank you very much for being here and for providing the testimony tonight, and we ask that you recognize what we're trying to do right now.
The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will accept comments and information on these proposals postmarked on or before September 23. You may submit written comments today. Written comments may also be submitted to the staff at the registration and information tables. They may be submitted electronically or mailed as a hard copy.

After review and consideration of your comments, and all of your information gathered during this and other previous comment periods, the Service will make a final determination. The purpose of this hearing is to receive your comments on the proposal and accompanying draft Environmental Impact Statement. Both oral and written comments on all aspects of the proposals are very important and will be carefully considered. Because of the importance of your comments, it is necessary that we follow certain procedures during this public hearing.

If you want to present oral comments at this hearing, please go to the registration tables outside of this auditorium and sign up. When you register, indicate the organization that you are representing in your comments today. With the exception of federal elected officials, tribal leaders, state Game & Fish agency directors, all oral comment, registration cards have been pulled, and will be drawn at random.

This process was implemented to encourage attendance at this afternoon's information meeting, and to provide for a fair process that allows us to receive oral testimony from as many different perspectives as possible within the allotted time frame. The following process is designed to maximize efficiency and provide speaking opportunities to as many participants as possible. Periodically, throughout the hearing, I will call groups of names for those registered to provide oral comments. When your name is called, please come forward and take a seat in the reserved section at the front of the auditorium near the microphones. When it is your turn, please begin your presentation by stating your full name, spell it for the record, and indicate if you represent an organization. If you are reading your comments, please take care to read them slowly enough for the court reporter to understand. Also, if possible, the reporter would appreciate a copy of the comments you read, and you can deposit them in the box near the microphone.

Please return to your original seats in the auditorium after you speak. This is an informal hearing, and therefore, you will not be questioned in connection with your comments. Your comments or questions are being recorded by the reporter to preserve them for the record. If you are called to speak and choose not to speak, or provide short remarks, you may not yield your time to another speaker.

Because the purpose of this hearing is to receive your comments, the Service will presume any questions are for the record. The Service's formal response to questions and issues raised during this comment period, including this hearing, will be published in the final rule and final Environmental Impact Statement. The Service will not respond to questions at this hearing. Please keep in mind that the reporter will not record any statements from the audience or any statements which are made to the audience. Comments must be made directly into the microphone facing the front of the room. I ask that you treat each speaker with respect and refrain from making comments from the audience.

Questions, comments, applause, jeers, demonstrations from the audience will not be allowed, and they take away precious time for others to speak. I appreciate everyone's cooperation in minimizing distractions.

Out of respect for speakers, I ask that you please refrain from photographing individuals as they present their comments. Videotaping is only done along the side aisles, and no cameras are allowed in the center aisle or in the front of the room, no video cameras.

In the interest of all who chose to provide verbal testimony and to prevent unreasonable disruption during this public hearing, we would like you to inform you that Dalene Hadnot of New Mexico Farm & Livestock Bureau and Angela Kocherga of Gannett Broadcasting will be video recording today's proceedings. If you wish to obtain contact information for either of them, please visit the registration desk.

Because of the number of people expected to speak, strict adherence to a two-minute time limit is necessary by all speakers. I will let you know when time is up, and I will call five-minute breaks as needed to allow the court reporter to rest. I will now call the first group of names.

David Richmond, Jan Thompson, Dan Lorimier, Senator Bill Soules, David Carbajal, Kerrie Romero, Oscar Sampson, John Saridan and Kyrstie Wear.
For all of my life, I spent a lot of time hiking, camping in the Gila Wilderness. I hope that sometime in my life I get to experience wolves and hear them in the wild. I look forward to hearing the other people speak. I can say that my constituents in my district, I have had numerous people contact me, that they want to make sure that we have a strong wolf presence in New Mexico. I have had no one in my district contact me with the other point of view. Thank you.

MR. SARIDAN: My name is John Saridan. I'm from T or C. My name is John Saridan. I'm from T or C. I represent myself. The U.S. Forest Service should eliminate boundaries for the wolves' movement. The U.S. Forest Service needs to quit stalling and complete a comprehensive recovery plan before changing the current rule. The U.S. Forest Service should not continue the fiction of designating Mexican gray wolves as an experimental nonessential population. This ignores science, logic and reality. They are essential.

Captive bred Mexican wolves need to be released immediately throughout the Blue Range Recovery Area to prevent the loss of valuable genetic diversity and speed recovery. That's all I have that say. Thank you.

MR. LORIMIER: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you. My name is Dan Lorimier, L-O-R-I-M-I-E-R. I'm a 40-year resident of Sierra County, and I'm the conservation coordinator for the Rio Grande chapter of the Sierra Club. I would not have to open our eyes and our hearts to eliminate the boundaries of the wolves' movements.

These lands belong to all of us. We can't ignore science, logic and reality. There are less than 83 Mexican gray wolves in the wild today. We need to act and educate and prevent extinction for one of the most divine, beautiful and valuable creatures of the land. We need to restore, rebalance the wild places and the wildlife of New Mexico and Arizona. Let's make the right choices to see a beautiful future. Let's welcome home the most endangered land mammal in North America, and not mistake.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. THOMPSON: Good evening, my name is Jan Thompson. I too am from Las Cruces, and I speak from my perspective as a science, logic and reality. They are essential. For all of my life, I spent a lot of time hiking, camping in the Gila Wilderness. I hope that sometime in my life I get to experience wolves and hear them in the wild. I look forward to hearing the other people speak. I can say that my constituents in my district, I have had numerous people contact me, that they want to make sure that we have a strong wolf presence in New Mexico. I have had no one in my district contact me with the other point of view. Thank you.

MR. SARIDAN: My name is John Saridan. I'm from T or C. My name is John Saridan. I'm from T or C. I represent myself. The U.S. Forest Service should eliminate boundaries for the wolves' movement. The U.S. Forest Service needs to quit stalling and complete a comprehensive recovery plan before changing the current rule. The U.S. Forest Service should not continue the fiction of designating Mexican gray wolves as an experimental nonessential population. This ignores science, logic and reality. They are essential.

Captive bred Mexican wolves need to be released immediately throughout the Blue Range Recovery Area to prevent the loss of valuable genetic diversity and speed recovery. That's all I have that say. Thank you.

MR. LORIMIER: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you. My name is Dan Lorimier, L-O-R-I-M-I-E-R. I'm a 40-year resident of Sierra County, and I'm the conservation coordinator for the Rio Grande chapter of the Sierra Club. I would
like to speak to you briefly about common sense.

Common sense tells us to use the tools available to us, to make the wisest and most comprehensive and long-reaching decisions. This is one of those decisions. I urge U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to use the concept of common sense while making this decision. I'm a strong advocate of the reintroduction of Mexican gray wolves in New Mexico.

Common sense tells us that this is a key element in the hierarchy of wildlife in New Mexico.

Thank you very much.

MR. SIMPSON: Hello, my name is Oscar Simpson.

I am a state chair of the New Mexico chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers. I'm a resident of New Mexico, life long resident of New Mexico.

I've hunted and fished all of my life here in New Mexico. I've seen a lot of changes and a lot of habitat changes. My organization and I consider the Mexican gray wolf a critical keystone species that needs to be fully protected, not in limited protection as you have now.

In the past 20-some-odd years of managing the Mexican gray wolves, you have had a lot of mistakes and deficiencies that, in my opinion, is overlooked.

You haven't really required the BLM and Forest Service and other federal agencies to really make sure that we got good quality habitat so the deer and the ungulates are prey species that the wolf can survive and have. In other words, we want healthy populations of deer, and what we consider the Mexican gray wolf would depredate on those.

If you have good healthy populations of deer and elk and other prey species, then you'll have minimal impact. I disagree strongly with the Game Department's ability to remove wolves on certain conditions. That to me reeks of politics, and whatever administration in there you won't see a lot of fluctuation, and based on what you've done on the other gray wolf species --

MR. LORIMIER: Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: I'm going to read ten more names while the next speaker comes up to the microphone. John Kucera, Sanford Schenmitz, Phil Cantas, Chad Smith, Charles Cummings, Jean Ossorio, Joel Alderete. I'm sorry, I'm killing names here. Cody Jackson and Crystal Diamond.

MR. RICHMAN: I'm David Richman, R-I-C-H-M-A-N, of which I've got a lot of problems with over the years.

I'm a retired professional biologist. I have worked primarily in applied ecology, insects as well as in other areas.

I am aware of the position held by top predators such as the wolf in the ecosystem's structure.

If we remove top predators, we often produce untended and often serious consequences, including overabundance of prey species such as deer, and the resulting starvation which has happened before in the Everglades.

Overutilization of plants by prey species, disaltering and affecting numerous species of both plants and animals, as in elk populations at Yellowstone. Increased or emergence of animal-borne diseases such as Lyme disease, transmitted by deer ticks in the northeast US.

These alterations of the ecosystem can be basically, in my opinion, you let the politics run this reintroduction and recovery plan. You've identified those as in this morning's brief summary.

We need to expand the recovery area beyond and include the Grand Canyon area. We need to allow -- you also need to introduce wolves in all of these areas so you can have the first population. The key to this thing, and the key to hunters especially is critical habitat for both ungulates and wolves. That is another deficiency that, in my opinion, is overlooked.

You haven't really required the BLM and Forest Service and other federal agencies to really make sure that we got good quality habitat so the deer and the ungulates are prey species that the wolf can survive and have. In other words, we want healthy populations of deer, and what we consider the Mexican gray wolf would depredate on those.

If you have good healthy populations of deer and elk and other prey species, then you'll have minimal impact. I disagree strongly with the Game Department's ability to remove wolves on certain conditions. That to me reeks of politics, and whatever administration in there you won't see a lot of fluctuation, and based on what you've done on the other gray wolf species --
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values, and Sierra County's most profitable industries,
area without bringing in fresh genetic material.
which are agriculture, hunting and tourism. I find the
fact that none of the alternatives or the Environmental
boundaries set would prevent the wolves from ever
coming into the Gila Wilderness back country annually. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. KUCERA: Hi, my name is John Kucera,
K-U-C-E-R-A. I'm from Las Cruces, New Mexico, and thank
you for being here tonight. And I was going to ask you
some of the things that I want to address, but before I do,
I want to be clear about what I think is one of the problems.

Our main concern is that this program is going
to turn into what the gray wolf debacle has turned into
in Montana, Wyoming and Idaho. During the
question-and-answer-session earlier, you defended the
draft EIS assumption, that the Mexican wolf will have a
minimum impact on ungulate herds, by stating that we
don't have the predator pressures that the states like
Wyoming and Montana do, but it seems that you neglected
to recognize that we do have predator pressures like the
mountain lion, black bear and coyote.

We have also environmental pressures from
prolonged drought and wildfires. We feel that not
enough consideration has been given to these pressures,
and Wildlife Services will to do to mitigate damages to
wildlife if it's found that over time the wolves have
more of an impact than the Fish and Wildlife Service
originally thought.

We would appreciate a continued effort to work
with the individuals who are living and operating within
wolf country and respect a genuine effort to listen to
the organizations who have people who spend upward of
nine months in the Gila Wilderness back country.

Our industry provides over 36 million in
nonresident tourist dollars, the majority of which go back directly
to the rural economies. We would first like to thank
the Fish and Wildlife Service for their efforts to keep
the Mexican wolf as a nonessential experimental
population, and also providing an avenue for management
in the event of a wolf attack on a hunting dog.
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We have also environmental pressures from
prolonged drought and wildfires. We feel that not
enough consideration has been given to these pressures,
and has not been approved for an expanded program. I see no feasibility
for it to be expanded. Thank you.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 38</th>
<th>Page 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. So without taking such measures and personal responsibility, including the removal of any livestock carcasses that may attract -- HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Sir, thank you, sir. Next speaker, please.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MS. OSSORIO: My name is Jean Ossorio, J-E-A-N, O-S-S-O-R-I-O. Sunday night, I spent my 375th night since 1998 camping in a tent in Mexican wolf home ranges. Currently, I must travel at least 150 miles in order to see Mexican wolves, hear packs howling in chorus, or find their tracks in mother snow. Soon, dispersing wolves may visit Dona Ana County where I live only two miles from the edge of the newly designated Organ Mountains Desert Peaks National Monument. The possibility of seeing or hearing the rare and iconic lobo will be an added attraction for monument visitors from around the country and the world. For me, the prospect of having Mexican wolves right in my own backyard is one I've looked forward to since I saw my first wild lobo in 1999. It is encouraging that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provides alternatives 1, 2 and 3 for connectivity with potential populations to the south, especially in the light of recent news of a wild born litter of pups in Sonora.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. reproduction of elk and deer and other wild big game species. So we hope that the area that the wolves can occupy, as proposed, is expanded, and we would be disappointed with the relatively slow increase in the wolf population. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Next speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MR. CUMMINGS: My name is Charles Cummings. Last name is C-U-M-M-I-N-G-S. I'm from Albuquerque. I'm grateful for the opportunity to be a part of this hearing. Thank you for hearing my voice and my opinion. First, I'd like to acknowledge Sherry Barrett, Maggie Dwyer and their team for their hard work in protecting Mexican gray wolves. Their dedication is inspiring and appreciated. I'm a native New Mexican. I speak in support of the reintroduction of the Mexican gray wolves in the Southwest. I am grateful the Mexican gray wolf has federal protection, but I advocate for more protection. Our government has sponsored a long lasting program of predator eradication. It's time for our government to take a stronger position on protecting a species that it has spent so much time and money trying to eliminate from the American landscape. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Page 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Unfortunately, not one of the alternatives in the draft Environmental Impact Statement allows for dispersal of wolves to the north of Interstate Highway 40, where any scientifically-based recovery plan is likely to call for at least two more populations with connectivity to the current Blue Range population. If it were not for that glaring omission, I would support alternative 3, which holds expansion of take of lobos. In addition to my own comments, state representative Jeff Steinborn, District 37, asked me to convey the following: He supports a modified alternative 3 and a requirement that the population meet projections before any increase take is allowed. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MR. CARTER: Hello. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and personnel with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for having me out and everyone out. My name is Phil Carter, P-H-I-L, C-A-R-T-E-R. I'm the Wildlife campaign manager for Animal Protection of New Mexico. I'm here representing over 3,000 members and many more supporters across the state. We have members in every single county of New Mexico, and based on this, Animal Protection of New Mexico does not endorse any artificial boundaries on wherever wolves may roam within our state. If they have a chance to thrive, then they should be able to be allowed there, wherever that is in New Mexico or across the Southwest. Additionally, we do not support any increased methods of take allowable within Mexican wolf management. We believe that this is a population of large mammals that has been stressed and demonized and overall made pariahs and had a difficult road throughout their entire existence, since the latter half of the 20th century. We want to see these wolves have a chance to thrive. Thanks very much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MR. SCHEMNITZ: My name is Sanford Schemnitz. I'm the chair of the Southwest Consolidated Sportsmen. Our organization consists of 50 various wildlife sporting clubs in Dona Ana County, and we have been a supporter of the wolf introduction program. We would like to see the boundaries increase. We recognize that wolves are enemies of coyotes, and coyotes are a serious problem in maintaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JACKSON: Hello. I am Cody Jackson, J-A-C-K-S-O-N. The fact that you are hearing me speak right now is a truly great thing. So many people in this world simply do not care about anything, and it is nice to address people who do. The future will come and that is an inevitable fact. But how that future will look is completely dependent on the choices we make at present. I want a future full of hope and opportunity, a future that is better than the past. We have the ability to do so, and conservation to me is a commitment to our future, a commitment to preserve what we have and a commitment to right the wrongs that we have made. The Mexican gray wolf is endangered -- is an indigenous species that we have made endangered and that is a fact. We know what it will take to grow their population and that is effort. We must be willing to work to obtain the future that we desire, which for me is a world that is improved by men, not destroyed. I cannot bear the thought of our future generations asking why you did not do more to protect this beautiful creature. This is our duty. It may not be the easiest thing to do, but it is right and it is necessary. Thank you for your time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. I'm going to call ten more names while the next speaker comes up. Robbie (inaudible), Rowan Baxa, Nancy Kaminski, Janes Tyler Boyd, Kaisa Lappalainen, Dee Wear, Bill Weddle, Cheryl Hastings, Roxane George and James Ross. Next speaker, please. MR. SMITH: Good evening, and thank you. My name is Chad Smith, C-H-A-D, S-M-I-T-H. I am a CEO for New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau. The 18,000 Supervisors of Sierra Soil Water and Conservation District, elected by registered voters within my district. Each of the 47 districts are independent subdivisions of state government, federally classified as local government and entitled to recognition as such by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In a letter dated June 23 [sic], 2013, Fish and Wildlife Service regional director Benjamin Tuggle denied conservation districts the opportunity to participate as cooperating agencies. The decision to include or exclude local government in this process is not the agency's to make. Federal law mandates that Fish and Wildlife Service to include local government participation. Not doing so was a clear violation of NEPA, yet the Fish and Wildlife Service unlawfully proceeded in drafting and issuing this draft EIS. Our county manager provided your agency with the detailed economic impacts this program and boundary expansion is having on Sierra County, the poorest county in one of the poorest states in our nation. Our primary income is derived from farming and service providers such as restaurant and gas station owners supposed to do after the wolves have taken away their livelihoods? How will we recover those jobs, rebuild the economic engine? Again I ask, when is enough enough. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker. MS. DIAMOND: Hello. My name is Crystal, C-R-Y-S-T-A-L, Diamond, D-I-A-M-O-N-D. I'd like to begin by thanking Sherry Barrett and John Olsen for their efforts in moving this public hearing from Albuquerque to a region of the state that's been directly impacted since the beginning of the New Mexico wolf recovery program. Also, thank you to the City of Truth or Consequences, Commissioner Rubin Olivas and city staff for quickly providing this event center free of charge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 46</th>
<th>Page 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ranching and the hunting industry, all of which have</td>
<td>1 depredations, wolf habitation, wolves stalking our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 suffered dramatically as a result of the Mexico wolf.</td>
<td>children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 This data has been completely disregarded.</td>
<td>4 Where is the science studying why New Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 You have ignored the pleas of our people, you</td>
<td>5 wolves will so quickly drink with the ranchers' dogs and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 have disregarded the law, and this seems to be common</td>
<td>6 the resident coyotes? How many litters have you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 practice within our federal government and specifically</td>
<td>7 destroyed? We are tired of the Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 this agency.</td>
<td>8 Service trying to get the radical agendas through. We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I ask your agency to reconsider the proposed</td>
<td>9 are tired of you picking whatever is the best available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 boundary expansion of this nonessential wolf and a</td>
<td>10 science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 program that is clearly a failure on all aspects.</td>
<td>11 HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Could you please give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Could you please give</td>
<td>12 your writing to the court reporter, because I know she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 your writing to the court reporter, because I know she</td>
<td>13 was having a tough time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 was having a tough time.</td>
<td>14 Next speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Next speaker.</td>
<td>15 MR. ALDERETE: My name is Joel, J-O-E-L,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 MR. ALDERETE: My name is Joel, J-O-E-L,</td>
<td>16 A-L-D-E-R-E-T-E. I'm with New Mexico Farm and Livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A-L-D-E-R-E-T-E. I'm with New Mexico Farm and Livestock</td>
<td>17 Bureau, representing the southern counties of New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Bureau, representing the southern counties of New Mexico</td>
<td>18 Farm Bureau. Today we're going to submit some oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Farm Bureau. Today we're going to submit some oral</td>
<td>19 comments, and of course we'll be doing written ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 comments, and of course we'll be doing written ones.</td>
<td>20 We are firmly opposed to EIS and any expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 We are firmly opposed to EIS and any expansion</td>
<td>21 of the New Mexico wolf program. It is a complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 of the New Mexico wolf program. It is a complete</td>
<td>22 failure. Millions have been spent on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 failure. Millions have been spent on this</td>
<td>23 reintroduction program and every step of the way you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 reintroduction program and every step of the way you</td>
<td>24 have failed to protect those who live with it in any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 have failed to protect those who live with it in any</td>
<td>25 manner, shape or form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 manner, shape or form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We are definitely opposed to any individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>releasing wolves on their property without the written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consent of every neighbor surrounding them. They will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be responsible for the burden of any costs that comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with those wolves. You have failed to incorporate any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>type of mitigation dealing with on-the-ground problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>our members are having, from livestock losses to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>habituated wolves stalking our children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You continually state that this is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insignificant to the recovery of the wolves. Actually,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>we believe this is the most significant part. Without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the support of those who live with the wolves, you will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never have a successful recovery program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You spend millions of dollars trying to ram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this program down the throats of those who live with it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but don't put any effort into seriously helping those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people, and then you are surprised when the program is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not accepted. Start putting some money on the ground to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>help psychologists to help the children who are having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nightmares about wolves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start putting some money into putting a team on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the ground that will show up to the wolf calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immediately and address problems whether it's real or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not. Where are the studies paid by the agency doing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research and finding the science of the wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through an ecosystem. And that's it. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR. BAXA: Hello. My name is Rowan, R-O-W-A-N,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-A-X-A. I am a proud New Mexican resident. I live in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dona Ana County in Las Cruces, New Mexico, and I am a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>film maker. My primary abilities are to film landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and wildlife. I spend many days out in the field, Rocky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountains, White Sands, photographing and doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>videography on several areas. I have seen many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different species, including gray wolf, and I must say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it is a beautiful sight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is nothing about this wolf that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nonessential. It is a very, very, very essential part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the planet, because if we lose the gray wolf, then we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have increased a population of deer and elk, and then we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have a decrease in crop and plant life, which then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>results in decrease in life in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is an important thing for our ecosystem and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>we should greatly consider broadening our horizon toward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the fact that they were there first. You may forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about that concept because we have a road and our giant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buildings, but the birth was here and they were here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first. We took over. We are the invaders. We should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give them their space and respect the fact that they are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>the ones who were here. Thank you.</td>
<td>HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.</td>
<td>MS. WEAR: My name is Dee Wear. I represent the Sierra County Farm and Livestock. D-E-E, W-E-A-R. I just wanted to highlight the facts that planning needs to define a number of wolves to allow the public to understand clearly what the intentions are. Knowledge is power, and by delaying these decisions, you take the power away from the people to make decisions responsibly, and that is isn't right no matter what side of the fence you sit on. It suggests deception, and it suggests a lack of integrity. And those are two things that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service does not want to suggest to the American public. With that said, my next point is the economy. This expansion will be a devastating blow to ranchers and individual ranch families, especially if you're only that 1 percent or 10 percent. With that said, I'd like to see sound science that represents a substantial impact that our ranching and our agriculturing industries have on our economy and how the wolf will detrimentally impact that in the heartbeat of American society, agriculture. Thank you.</td>
<td>plan for long-term achievements, with clear and quantifiable milestones along the path to success. &quot;That is why I oppose alternative 1 and support an enhanced version of alternative 3. The Service's alternative would remove important protections, which under the present rule ensure a specific measurable level of reproductive success before increased removals and killings of wolves is permitted. &quot;The Service knows that recovery of the wolves will probably require at least three distinct but genetically linked populations of 200 to 350 each. Neither the DEIS nor any of the alternatives provides any numerical targets or time line for achieving them. &quot;In conclusion, I urge the Service to adopt an enhanced alternative 3 by retaining present limitations on removing and killing wolves until the number of breeding pairs is&quot;— HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker. MS. KAMINSKY: My name is Nancy Kaminsky, K-A-M-I-N-S-K-Y. I'm the president for the Southwestern New Mexico Audubon chapter, the oldest chapter in New Mexico. Thank you so much, Dr. Tuggle, for joining us again. It's good to see you. It has been a long time, so it seems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS. LAPPALAINEN: My name is Kaisa Lappalainen, L-A-P-P-A-L-A-I-N-E-N. I'm here because I was asked to read a letter from a Commissioner Hancock, Wayne Hancock, Dona Ana County Board of Commissioners, Commissioner, District 4. &quot;As a commissioner for Dona Ana County, New Mexico, I thank you for today's opportunity to comment. The recent designation of the Organ Mountain Desert Peaks National Monument and measures for increasing the Mexican wolf population protect the scenic beauty and iconic wildlife of southern New Mexico. &quot;And I am pleased that the draft Environmental Impact Statement creates zones in Dona Ana County where wolves may be allowed to naturally disperse and occupy. &quot;Tourism is an important part of the future of our county. As public officials, we are challenged to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>1 I also support alternative 3, modified.</td>
<td>1 well aware that scientists from the recovery planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 altered, however you want to put it, because I believe</td>
<td>2 team have said a reduction in human caused mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 the northern boundary should also be extended. It seems</td>
<td>3 must occur for the lobos to achieve recovery. Likewise,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 that when we're picking up wolves lately and bringing</td>
<td>4 the scientists have published peer review articles that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 them back, they're always at the north end of the</td>
<td>5 state we must have at least two more populations north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 boundaries.</td>
<td>6 of I-40 with movement between the three for recovery to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 And of course, I'm also against more take.</td>
<td>7 occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 We're still losing wolves to illegal shootings. We just</td>
<td>8 Yet, your proposal makes this impossible. It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 picked up a dead wolf last month. They're dying out</td>
<td>9 makes it impossible for Mexican wolves to occupy or move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 there. With the rules we now have in place, further</td>
<td>10 in and out of the best remaining suitable habitat north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 take will only make that worse, especially if it's dogs.</td>
<td>11 of I-40. The expanded area for releases is the only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I'm sure we all understand how canids are wolves'</td>
<td>12 completely good thing in your proposal for the wolves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 natural enemy. A canid in wolf territory threatens</td>
<td>13 and it is long overdue. Otherwise, many of the proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 their family and their home, and they'll kill them</td>
<td>14 changes contradict the best available science on lobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 whether it's a dog or a coyote, so I would not expand</td>
<td>15 recovery and demonstrate an appalling weakness in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 the take for dogs.</td>
<td>16 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services leadership, whose job it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sorry to say that, because I love dogs, but it</td>
<td>17 is to recover endangered species instead of political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 just is their natural enemy. It doesn't seem like it</td>
<td>18 kowtowing to special interests --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 would promote the reintroduction.</td>
<td>19 HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 A healthy ecosystem requires all the puzzle</td>
<td>20 speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 pieces, especially at the top predators. So I'd like to</td>
<td>21 MR. WEDDLE: Hello. My name is Bill Weddle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 see them further protected. I was also a little</td>
<td>22 W-E-D-D-L-E. So we are to understand that it is okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 concerned about the southern boundary just because there</td>
<td>23 and an acceptable price to pay that people are be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 has been a lack of education and outreach to the local</td>
<td>24 maimed, mauled and killed as a result of your efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 population in Luna and Hidalgo Counties.</td>
<td>25 and our government turning wolves loose on us? You hide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>1 I'm in Grant County. I have a ranch in Grant</td>
<td>1 behind the use of wildlife for what would otherwise be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 County and there are plenty of opportunities to go to</td>
<td>2 felonies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 meetings in Hidalgo and Luna County, so I have firsthand</td>
<td>3 Last year in Minnesota, a 16 year old was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 experience at those meetings with their take on the</td>
<td>4 attacked by a wolf, biting him in the head and in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mexico wolf, and it is not positive --</td>
<td>5 back. Wolves killed two people in Alaska and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next</td>
<td>6 last year. You won't see any difference. It is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 speaker, please.</td>
<td>7 comparable to behavior of feral dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 MS. GEORGE: Good evening. My name is Roxane</td>
<td>8 Margaret Salcedo was killed by four dogs in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 George, G-E-O-R-G-E. I live in Arizona. I lived there</td>
<td>9 2011 just a few minutes from this room. In 2012, a nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 most of my life. Mexican gray wolves are intelligent</td>
<td>10 year old was mauled by dogs; in El Paso, a man was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 beautiful animals who are essential to restoring balance</td>
<td>11 mauled; in Taos, a 12 year old; in Valencia County, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 and healthy function to our southwest wildlands.</td>
<td>12 woman was killed by dogs; in Dona Ana, five German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 It is clear to me that the small wild</td>
<td>13 Shepherds mauled a 12 year old. Mix wolves with it, how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 population of Mexican wolves is also essential to the</td>
<td>14 will it turn out?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 survival and recovery of their species. They are the</td>
<td>15 Wolves were never endangered here, they just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 only Mexican wolves in the world with up to five</td>
<td>16 didn't live here anymore. The behavior and end result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 generations of experience living in the wild.</td>
<td>17 of the attacks isn't different whether it's a dog or a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 To waste that experience and those wild</td>
<td>18 wolf that did the biting and chewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 families of wolves and all of the hard work that the</td>
<td>19 Wolves are nonessential. We got by without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 species survival plan captive breeding facilities and</td>
<td>20 them for at least the last 70-plus years. It's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 the biologists on the ground have done for so many years</td>
<td>21 questionable how many of these wolves are part dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 would be criminal.</td>
<td>22 Early on, a black Lab bred with wolves. How many dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 The expanded provisions and allowances for</td>
<td>23 and wolf combinations are out there now, and what is to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 killing, trapping and removing these important animals</td>
<td>24 stop them from more?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 from the wild is unacceptable, especially when you are</td>
<td>25 This is arid country, not a great source for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Other states have worked together with Montana, Wyoming and Idaho.

I'm from T or C. I'm a business owner, I'm a voter, and I feel like dogs are completely different than a dog. And I feel like scenarios, never see out of the offices they're typing.

January Roberts, Joseph Cavosie, Allan Sauter, Jean Gallagher, Rachel Carnes.

First speaker, please.

MS. ROBERTS: Good evening. January Roberts. I'm from T or C. I'm a business owner, I'm a voter, and I'm a taxpayer. I would like to see this program continue and follow through. I don't have an opinion about what the right program or not. I'm not a genius here. I expect other people to know that.

So no one argues the need to protect biodiversity. The question is, how much and at what human cost? There are uncertainties, but we must find the best way to protect the lives and economic viability of our counties in the State of New Mexico, Arizona, big Ben, Texas, etc. And I thank you for your time. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. HYATT: My name is Jim Hyatt, J-I-M, H-Y-A-T-T. I'm from Luna County. It's my opinion here as the reason that we've had so much failure in the reintroduction of the wolves is to start a -- to try to look for genetic purity with beginning with only seven wolves, there's no way to expand the gene pool.

The thought that by spreading them to a larger area will improve the genetic quality of the wolf is -- that's just not genetic science. You can't just move them somewhere and the genes change.

I feel like probably these wolves here are -- never have been pure, and that's probably why you're having so much trouble getting them to adapt, as a wolf is completely different than a dog. And I feel like probably these are crossed up with a dog and that's why you only get a 20 percent or less survival rate in your pups.

Other than that, I don't have, and I think some -- probably some scientific research should be done as far as the purity of your -- even your first established or collective wolves. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. NICHOLS: my name is Karen Nichols, N-I-C-H-O-L-S. I'm the education assistant at the St. Louis was established by Dr. Marlin Perkins to save endangered species focusing on the Mexican wolf.

The center is the birth place of 172 Mexican wolf pups.

In 1971, the Endangered Wolf Center in St. Louis was established by Dr. Marlin Perkins to save the endangered species focusing on the Mexican wolf.

The diseases wolves bring is horrible. Hydatid disease, a communicable disease of cysts on the lungs of many animals and transfers onto humans alike. Our grandfathers eradicated the wolf because they didn't mix with people, same as grizzlies. We eradicated polio and smallpox --

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir.

We're going to take a five minute break.

(Recess taken from 7:21 to 7:27 p.m.)

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Karen Nichols, January Roberts, Joseph Cavosie, Allan Sauter, Jean Gallagher, Rachel Carnes.

First speaker, please.

MS. NICHOLS: Good evening. January Roberts. I'm from T or C. I'm a business owner, I'm a voter, and I'm a taxpayer. I would like to see this program continue and follow through. I don't have an opinion about what the right program or not. I'm not a genius here. I expect other people to know that.

I'm sorry that it's causing so many problems for other individuals in our state. I'm hoping that somebody will have the insight to help them and work with them so that we can all work together. I've always lived in a state where there were wolves: Minnesota, Montana, Wyoming and Idaho.

I cannot imagine a country without wolves. That would be like saying let's go kill all the elephants because they're so funny looking. This doesn't make sense, folks. We just have to find a better common ground and work together and be careful and sensible. It's really important. It's important for all of us to be here.

Other states have worked together with the wolves. We're pretty dang smart down here. I think we can do it too. That's really all I have to say. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. NUNN: Good evening, my name is Lauren Nunn. We ranch in several counties in the State of New Mexico with several generations and four now on our ranches.

As current business owners, county employees or retirees, this is an important issue facing every single one of us. Our customary and established uses of our lands is ignored. Known facts are distorted. Proponents of all these new mandates, in almost all scenarios, never see out of the offices they're typing the regs in.

Saving our public domain just for the sake of preservation just cannot and does not outweigh creating wealth and economic growth while maintaining the resources. The use of biodiversity and conservation biology and today's policy formulation is based more on a well-funded political agenda than on true science.

Most of this is based on myth.

So no one argues the need to protect biodiversity. The question is, how much and at what human cost? There are uncertainties, but we must find the best way to protect the lives and economic viability of our counties in the State of New Mexico, Arizona, big Ben, Texas, etc. And I thank you for your time. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. HYATT: My name is Jim Hyatt, J-I-M, H-Y-A-T-T. I'm from Luna County. It's my opinion here as the reason that we've had so much failure in the reintroduction of the wolves is to start a -- to try to look for genetic purity with beginning with only seven wolves, there's no way to expand the gene pool.

The thought that by spreading them to a larger area will improve the genetic quality of the wolf is -- that's just not genetic science. You can't just move them somewhere and the genes change.

I feel like probably these wolves here are -- never have been pure, and that's probably why you're having so much trouble getting them to adapt, as a wolf is completely different than a dog. And I feel like probably these are crossed up with a dog and that's why you only get a 20 percent or less survival rate in your pups.

Other than that, I don't have, and I think some -- probably some scientific research should be done as far as the purity of your -- even your first established or collective wolves. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. NICHOLS: my name is Karen Nichols, N-I-C-H-O-L-S. I'm the education assistant at the St. Louis was established by Dr. Marlin Perkins to save the endangered species focusing on the Mexican wolf.

The center is the birth place of 172 Mexican wolf pups.

In 1971, the Endangered Wolf Center in St. Louis was established by Dr. Marlin Perkins to save the endangered species focusing on the Mexican wolf.

The diseases wolves bring is horrible. Hydatid disease, a communicable disease of cysts on the lungs of many animals and transfers onto humans alike. Our grandfathers eradicated the wolf because they didn't mix with people, same as grizzlies. We eradicated polio and smallpox --

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir.

We're going to take a five minute break.

(Recess taken from 7:21 to 7:27 p.m.)

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Karen Nichols, January Roberts, Joseph Cavosie, Allan Sauter, Jean Gallagher, Rachel Carnes.

First speaker, please.

MS. NICHOLS: Good evening. January Roberts. I'm from T or C. I'm a business owner, I'm a voter, and I'm a taxpayer. I would like to see this program continue and follow through. I don't have an opinion about what the right program or not. I'm not a genius here. I expect other people to know that.

I'm sorry that it's causing so many problems for other individuals in our state. I'm hoping that somebody will have the insight to help them and work with them so that we can all work together. I've always lived in a state where there were wolves: Minnesota, Montana, Wyoming and Idaho.

I cannot imagine a country without wolves. That would be like saying let's go kill all the elephants because they're so funny looking. This doesn't make sense, folks. We just have to find a better common ground and work together and be careful and sensible. It's really important. It's important for all of us to be here.

Other states have worked together with the wolves. We're pretty dang smart down here. I think we can do it too. That's really all I have to say. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. NUNN: Good evening, my name is Lauren Nunn. We ranch in several counties in the State of New Mexico with several generations and four now on our ranches.

As current business owners, county employees or retirees, this is an important issue facing every single one of us. Our customary and established uses of our lands is ignored. Known facts are distorted. Proponents of all these new mandates, in almost all scenarios, never see out of the offices they're typing the regs in.

Saving our public domain just for the sake of preservation just cannot and does not outweigh creating wealth and economic growth while maintaining the resources. The use of biodiversity and conservation biology and today's policy formulation is based more on a well-funded political agenda than on true science.

Most of this is based on myth.

So no one argues the need to protect biodiversity. The question is, how much and at what human cost? There are uncertainties, but we must find the best way to protect the lives and economic viability of our counties in the State of New Mexico, Arizona, big Ben, Texas, etc. And I thank you for your time. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. HYATT: My name is Jim Hyatt, J-I-M, H-Y-A-T-T. I'm from Luna County. It's my opinion here as the reason that we've had so much failure in the reintroduction of the wolves is to start a -- to try to look for genetic purity with beginning with only seven wolves, there's no way to expand the gene pool.

The thought that by spreading them to a larger area will improve the genetic quality of the wolf is -- that's just not genetic science. You can't just move them somewhere and the genes change.

I feel like probably these wolves here are -- never have been pure, and that's probably why you're having so much trouble getting them to adapt, as a wolf is completely different than a dog. And I feel like probably these are crossed up with a dog and that's why you only get a 20 percent or less survival rate in your pups.

Other than that, I don't have, and I think some -- probably some scientific research should be done as far as the purity of your -- even your first established or collective wolves. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. NICHOLS: my name is Karen Nichols, N-I-C-H-O-L-S. I'm the education assistant at the St. Louis was established by Dr. Marlin Perkins to save the endangered species focusing on the Mexican wolf.

The center is the birth place of 172 Mexican wolf pups.
The captive breeding program, although highly effective, does not exist in a vacuum. It is not a continuous or permanent solution for the recovery of an endangered species. Being at maximum population capacity for several years in the United States and Mexico has hindered the captive breeding program. With only one new release into the wild in the last five years, this forces us to only allow a few pairs to breed annually, and so, no new genes are introduced into the wild, thus harming an already bottlenecked population. Reduced breeding in captivity will also mean a loss of vital genetic information. This is irresponsible management. As of today, we have saved only 80 percent of the original genetic diversity. If the decline continues, the species won't be viable. Our center supports alternative 3 as the best option of the proposal. However, maintaining the designation of nonessential is relying on an older captive population that does not have room to expand. The Endangered Wolf Center wants to support the Service in meeting its recovery goals, but we are at a critical juncture now, and we need a Service that uses the best science available to make its decisions. We need a Service that understands that without remediation of the release side of the recovery effort, the current captive breeding program is unsustainable. We need a Service that's willing to listen to the overwhelming consensus of biologists engaged in a recovery effort, and we need a Service that will protect the health of these ecosystems by opening up enough protective wild space for this wolf to truly recover itself. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Could you please leave your comments for the court reporter? Thank you.

MR. CAVOSIE: My name is Joe Cavosie, C-A-V-O-S-I-E. It's my understanding that there are two types of wolves in the wild. There's a wolf that belongs to a pack, and there's a wolf that is alone, trying to find a pack. The pack is under the control of two alpha wolves who are the smartest and the toughest, and they control the pack. And wolves are very smart. They would be able to accommodate any type of prey, whereas a single wolf by itself is looking for a pack would not be able to take out many of the larger animals that a pack could. I surmise that much of the predation is by single wolves. I don't know that, but I suspect that. And that wolf packs are not nearly the trouble single wolves are. If you could capture the single wolves who are causing trouble, and instead of moving them to another location, take them out of their equation and put them into the breeding -- the breeding -- the captive wolves, and put -- take one of the captive wolves out and put it back into the population, and this will get new genetic material into the wolf pack. But also try to put them, release them, in an area where there are sufficient wolves and they can find another pack. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. PODOLINSKY: Hi, my name is Megan Podolinsky, M-E-G-A-N, P-O-D-O-L-I-N-S-K-Y, from Las Cruces, New Mexico for about a year. Growing up in Montana near where the Yellowstone wolf range introduction took place, I've seen wolves as an extremely polarizing issue. Although I didn't see the actual first days or even years of the reintroduction, I've witnessed the result. Not only have the wolf reintroduction programs succeeded in increasing the habitat of the wolves, it has contributed to the beauty of the area. Plain species have proliferated and increased, especially the willow, with the presence of a major predator in the area, reducing browsing of flora. Predators are necessary in a natural system to ensure the balance between all elements. Without this link in a chain, the balance is easily disrupted. Seeing these results firsthand of the successful reintroduction and management program, makes me believe the same can be achieved in New Mexico. I support a recovery alternative that expands boundaries, limits take provisions, and leaves the wolf as an essential species.

I hope to see expanded gray wolf populations become a reality in the Southwest. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. CARNES: My name is Rachel Carnes, R-A-C-H-E-L, C-A-R-N-E-S. I'm here on behalf the California Wolf Center. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. We would like to recognize the Fish and Wildlife Service for their dedication in recovery of the Mexican wolf in the face of many diverse interests. We support the Fish and Wildlife Services' proposal to increase the area in which Mexican wolves can be released and disperse and occupy, and to push the
those names will not be called, the ones that were
regional line that it was not going to have the economic
would only ask that if you do expand your program, that
there's deer everywhere. There are coyotes and lions
opportunity to address you here tonight. In reviewing
in the (inaudible), and give the public, the people who
are affected by this, the opportunity to protect
themselves, their property, their lives, and their
family. Thank you.

MR. BLACK: Now give me my time back, okay,
registered after 6 o'clock. So I just want to give you
the local communities. We completely agree that we need
be cognizant of and sensitive to the local
measures, because nonlethal techniques have been very
successful in the Southwest. So we would like to use
our resources instead to try and increase our
(inaudible) for nonlethal techniques --
HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. HAMILTON: My name is Glenn Hamilton,
G-L-E-N-N, H-A-M-I-L-T-O-N. I thank you for the
opportunity to address you here tonight. In reviewing
your EIS, it appears as though the Fish & Wildlife
Service has taken a regional look at this expansion
rather than looking at the impact that it's actually had
on the local communities. In the PowerPoint, it indicated that on a
regional line that it was not going to have the economic
impact or severe economic impact as much as it would on
small isolated and local areas.

Two, your lack of funding for the current
project right now concerns me. And now we're looking at
expanding this operation. Our nation is 17 trillion in
debt, and yet we have government agencies that are now
asking for more money for nonessential programs, in my
opinion.

Lastly, and my third point, just like the plan
in 1998 to reintroduce the Mexican gray wolf into the
area, amidst strong opposition, the plan was put in
place anyway. I suppose that this is probably – this
expansion is probably going to go into effect too. I
would only ask that if you do expand your program, that
you adopt the plan one.

As a 19-year veteran of local law enforcement
here in the Sierra County area, I have spent my career
in protecting and serving the community here. I would
request that under take provisions, that you keep those
in the (inaudible), and give the public, the people who
are affected by this, the opportunity to protect
themselves, their property, their lives, and their
family. Thank you.

MR. BLACK: Randy Black, B-L-A-C-K. What I
hear is a lot of these people don't live with it. We
know why? Because of the spotted owl. You
devastation.

MR. HAMILTON: My name is Glenn Hamilton,
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your EIS, it appears as though the Fish & Wildlife
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rather than looking at the impact that it's actually had
on the local communities. In the PowerPoint, it indicated that on a
regional line that it was not going to have the economic
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Two, your lack of funding for the current
project right now concerns me. And now we're looking at
expanding this operation. Our nation is 17 trillion in
debt, and yet we have government agencies that are now
asking for more money for nonessential programs, in my
opinion.

Lastly, and my third point, just like the plan
in 1998 to reintroduce the Mexican gray wolf into the
area, amidst strong opposition, the plan was put in
place anyway. I suppose that this is probably – this
expansion is probably going to go into effect too. I
would only ask that if you do expand your program, that
you adopt the plan one.

have people in Catron County, the kids are living in
cages to catch the school bus to get off of it. Are you
all aware of that? Your great little endangered wolf
that you want? It's ridiculous.

The economical impact that it's going to have
on our wildlife and our livestock. You guys act like
there's deer everywhere. There are coyotes and lions
will eat it up. They're gone.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're not allowed to
talk to the audience.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Sir, I don't
appreciate your comments. If those continue, I'll ask
you to leave. He has a right to his comments, and I
expect you to respect that. Thank you.

MR. BLACK: Now give me my time back, okay,
please? You know what, people? You know it's our job
to maintain or to be called a self-sustaining population
to call ten more names. And I also want you to know
that we have more speakers than we'll have time for this
evening. I also received the late registrations and
those names will not be called, the ones that were
registered after 6 o'clock. So I just want to give you
a heads up on that.

Randy Lack, Billy Garrett, Mary Ray, Steven
McLoon, McAloon, Parry Larsen, Bob MacPherson, Skeeter
Leard, Casey Hampf, M. Fry, Kim Chesser.

Next speaker, please.

You're going to have to write up -- just keep
up here. You know the people that --

MR. BLACK: Randy Black, B-L-A-C-K. What I

In the PowerPoint, it indicated that on a
southern boundary of the experimental population area to
the US/Mexican border.

However, we have some major concerns about
certain other components of the plan, most notably the
allowance for state agencies to request the removal of
wolves in order to maintain their self-determined
ungulate population.

There are currently only 83 Mexican wolves in
the wild, and the research shows that this is not enough
to maintain or to be called a self-sustaining population
given the genetic context of this species, so we would
like to urge the Fish and Wildlife Service to reconsider
the alternatives in order to construct a plan that does
not increase the lethal take of this very rare
subspecies.

The Service has stated that they want to
continue wolf reintroductions while being responsive to
the local communities. We completely agree that we need
to be cognizant of and sensitive to the local
communities, but this is no reason to increase lethal
measures, because nonlethal techniques have been very
successful in the Southwest. So we would like to use
our resources instead to try and increase our
(inaudible) for nonlethal techniques --
HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.
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What it does, is not that we don't like the wolf. It's nature. It kills for fun. It can go and kill 200 sheep and not eat any of them. It's not that we don't like the wolf. We don't like its nature. That's why the government eradicated them the first time.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir. Thank you. Next speaker, please.


I want to speak to a central issue. Words are important. Mr. Regional Director, I wish you'd pay attention to this. Words are important. We talk greatly about essential and nonessential. This is an important distinction. There's another important distinction. Species.

Sherry Barrett, in her introduction comments and her written text there, referred to Mexican gray wolves. She did not say canis lupus baileyi. I'm sure you would acknowledge that's the subspecies we're talking about. She referred to it as a species. Several times your professionals referred to this as a species.

Sir, you have highly trained wildlife biologists on your staff. I would insist that they always refer to this as a subspecies. Many of the people that spoke from the floor talked about endangered species, the poor wolf, the endangered species. It is a subspecies. And I think it's imperative that in all future written and oral testimony that you refer to it as such, a subspecies. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Next speaker, please.

MS. HAMPF: Hi, my name is Casey Hampf, H-A-M-P-F, and I represent the State of Colorado.

The wolves don't want to harm us. There has only been two fatalities in the past 60 years due to wolves, and never Mexican grays. Yet, we continue to slaughter them and we call it a solution to the cattle rancher's problem. However, wolves only account for a tenth of one percent of all cattle thefts. If that statistic does not satisfy you, then change your cattle ranching methods. Treat the carcasses with lime or remove them from your homes.

Your solutions are expanding the wolves into a territory where they cannot survive, not taking advantage of the forested area above the recovery line shown on the map earlier, that scientists and you yourselves deemed as a suitable area for them to live.

If you actually cared about the wolves, you would make wolves essential and not allow them to be unethically taken. Let's not pretty up the word "take." What you mean is that more people can kill, or easily kill, the animals you supposedly protect.

Keep your integrity and do the job you're funded for. Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker. Next speaker.

MR. MacPHEARSON: My name is Bob MacPherson. I'm a retired scientist from Santa Fe, and I'd like to just address the rule.

There are some provisions in the proposed rule that will promote the conservation of the Mexican gray wolf. These are required by the Endangered Species Act. The expansion to a much larger MWEPA will help. The expanded area for release of wolves, including in New Mexico, will also help.

However, there's some changes in the proposed rule that will not promote the conservation of the Mexican gray wolf. The proposed rule loosens the guideline for take on Mexican wolves in this new area.

We've been there before with loosening of the rule, and this will not help. Wolves will not be allowed to disperse out of the MWEPA to other suitable habitats. There was a draft recovery plan that was leaked where it called for three subpopulations of about 250 each as a minimum for viability in the future.

The nonessential designation is retained in this proposed rule and the designation is contrary to fact. This does not help either. In summary, the proposed rule is unlikely to conserve the Mexican gray wolf as required by the ESA. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. RAY: My name is Mary Kathryn Ray, R-A-Y, resident of Sierra County and what I hope becomes part of the zone one of the Mexico wolf experimental population area. I hike frequently, and one of my favorite places is a cottonwood park on national forest land.

The cottonwoods are all old, and every year a few more die. There are no cottonwood seedlings to replace them. I like cottonwoods because they harbor so many different kinds of birds. There is new document research that indicates the presence of wolves in ecologically effective numbers can give trees like this a chance.
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| 1. cottonwoods a reprieve from herbivores so the seedlings can grow. Restore the wolves and you can save the trees; save the trees and you save the birds.  
2. Enlarging the places where wolves can roam and be released is a positive step, but it's negated if the result is they are killed anyway because of lax rules that allow more killing.  
3. The state game agencies, in true 1900 Century fashion, do not want wolves and have demonstrated their hostility toward them. In fact, next week the New Mexico Game Commission may vote on giving themselves permission to disallow the release of any predatory animal for the purpose of reintroduction. It does not further the conservation of wolves to hand their fate over to these entities or to anyone who just wants them dead.  
4. The only alternative that will not bring Mexican wolves to extinction again is alternative 3, but you can do better. Write a new recovery plan that reflects the best available science, not what was available 30 years ago. Declare this lobo population in the wild to be essential -- the wild born population could not be replicated -- and require a good-faith effort from livestock operations to use nonlethal solutions to avoid conflict before allowing wolves to be killed.  
5. MR. GARRETT: My name is Billy Garrett, G-A-R-R-E-T-T. I'm a third-generation New Mexican, and a retired National Park Service manager. I'm currently the chair of the county commission of Dona Ana County. As a policy maker, I support a modified version of alternative 3, because in my opinion, that option does the best job of addressing the biological factors involved in wolf recovery. To be successful, the wolf population must be large enough to avoid the problems of inbreeding and must have a territory large enough for the packs to sustain themselves. In addition, consideration should be given to strengthening the protected status of the Mexican wolf, and in developing nonlethal programs that will minimize the conflicts with other range issues. The fundamental choice involved in this ruling is whether or not the American people want to slowly kill off this animal or ensure its future.  
6. If our choice is to save the wolf, then we must have the courage and wisdom to put measures in place that will achieve that intent. If our choice is to save the Mexican wolf, the rule under consideration must be based on the best available science. And more importantly, where data is subject to alternative interpretation where good data is missing, our decisions must give the benefit of the doubt to the wolf.  
7. We can always pull back if the recovery is successful and new information supports changes of management, but if we are too conservative and wolf recovery fails, we cannot bring the species back. I understand that the recovery program will directly affect more people in our region, more specifically ranchers, hunters and rural residents.  
8. To minimize impact of wolf recovery on these people, the rule should provide measures to mitigate adverse impacts where they can be demonstrated. And more importantly, the affected communities should be provided with opportunities to actively participate in the recovery process.  
9. In looking at the conflict between wolves and humans, we must understand the fragile condition of the wolves and the -- HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir. If you would present your comments. Thank you. Okay. I'm going to read some more names.  
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2. MR. GARRETT: My name is Billy Garrett, G-A-R-R-E-T-T. I'm a third-generation New Mexican, and a retired National Park Service manager. I'm currently the chair of the county commission of Dona Ana County. As a policy maker, I support a modified version of alternative 3, because in my opinion, that option does the best job of addressing the biological factors involved in wolf recovery. To be successful, the wolf population must be large enough to avoid the problems of inbreeding and must have a territory large enough for the packs to sustain themselves. In addition, consideration should be given to strengthening the protected status of the Mexican wolf, and in developing nonlethal programs that will minimize the conflicts with other range issues. The fundamental choice involved in this ruling is whether or not the American people want to slowly kill off this animal or ensure its future.  
3. If our choice is to save the wolf, then we must have the courage and wisdom to put measures in place that will achieve that intent. If our choice is to save the Mexican wolf, the rule under consideration must be based on the best available science. And more importantly, where data is subject to alternative interpretation where good data is missing, our decisions must give the benefit of the doubt to the wolf.  
4. We can always pull back if the recovery is successful and new information supports changes of management, but if we are too conservative and wolf recovery fails, we cannot bring the species back. I understand that the recovery program will directly affect more people in our region, more specifically ranchers, hunters and rural residents.  
5. To minimize impact of wolf recovery on these people, the rule should provide measures to mitigate adverse impacts where they can be demonstrated. And more importantly, the affected communities should be provided with opportunities to actively participate in the recovery process.  
6. In looking at the conflict between wolves and humans, we must understand the fragile condition of the wolves and the -- HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir. If you would present your comments. Thank you. Okay. I'm going to read some more names.  
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service for providing this opportunity for input.</td>
<td>at public meetings with Fish and Wildlife Service to work with the ranchers and to address their concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noralyn, N-O-R-A-L-Y-N, Warren, W-A-R-R-E-N.</td>
<td>But I've been disappointed that the politics of an anti-wildlife minority has trumped science as the recovery program progressed. So at this point, I urge and beg you to let science guide you in decision-making and in forming policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fish &amp; Wildlife Service is of course charged with preservation of the Mexican wolf. From its important role in the balance of nature in the wild to its spiritual role in the lives of many, it's a valuable species.</td>
<td>I support a modified alternative 3, but believe it is still too restrictive and limited to saving a large viable population of the Mexican wolves. Bottom line, expand the range into northern New Mexico, southern Colorado and southern Utah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding the recovery area is important. North of I-40 would be even better. I'm sure that the extra opportunities for taking wolves that the proposed rule provides will negate the progress. And I still don't understand why there is nothing mentioned about keeping ranches clear of inviting carcasses. So cleaning up ranches would seem to be important to be mentioned.</td>
<td>I think a good economist would tell you that it is too much attention has been put onto the negative economic effects to ranchers by the Fish &amp; Wildlife without seeing the equal positive effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fish and Wildlife Service needs to allow serious science to guide you to do the work necessary to conserve the species and due to inbreeding pressure, time is of the essence.</td>
<td>The wolf can benefit small businesses through eco-tourism. I've had guides and ranchers tell me that. With a change of attitude, the wolf could help create more small businesses and wolf-related businesses. Eco-tourism. You have to be creative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.</td>
<td>Most folks where I live in the Hillsboro and Kingston area support the wolf being in the Gila National Forest. I have land within the Gila National Forest. Most residents there believe that the range should be expanded. Polls show a large majority of New Mexicans do too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. FARRELL: David Farrell, F-A-R-R-E-I-L. I've lived in Hillsboro, Sierra County for the last 28 years and I was an early advocate of the reintroduction of the Mexican gray wolf. Back then, I also advocated for the last 30 years has been in Valencia County.</td>
<td>the extinction of a species to protect our property or our livestock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The species cannot recover unless human-caused mortality decreases. And that means protect wolf populations, their recovery areas; ban trapping on public lands; and do not issue the depredation permits without rigorous efforts to resolve conflicts using nonlethal strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We know wolves and wild carnivores are killed because they are hated and feared and not necessarily because of a direct attack. There must be rules and consequences in place to prevent the reckless and unnecessary killing of wolves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let's give wolf recovery a real chance. And by the way, I'll volunteer to help monitor the wolves. Thank you very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS. COWAN: My name is Caren Cowan. I'm here tonight representing the New Mexico Wool Growers, Incorporated, the oldest trade organization for livestock in the State of New Mexico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some items in option one that appear promising. We haven't finished our evaluation of the entire document. But some of the things that appear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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promising, like recovery removal when wolves are
transgressing outside their areas, we've been told that
before. It hasn't happened. And unless and until the
Fish and Wildlife Service can work with the people on
the ground, and understand that they have to be able to
live there, this program is going nowhere.

The utter disdain that we feel is the document
and the stuff that was shown up on the screen, that
losses are insignificant, our livestock losses are
insignificant. If somebody's taken 1,200 to $3,000 out
of your bank account 20 or 30 times a year, tell me
that's insignificant.

And terming the population -- saying that the
populations of concerns aren't being harmed by this? Do
you have any idea how insulting that is to the people
sitting in this room? You've got to figure out a way to
work with us in a believable manner if anything is going
to go forward positively. Thank you.

MR. TRUJILLO: A-U-D-O-N, Trujillo. I'm a
speaker.

MR. TRUJILLO: A-U-D-O-N, Trujillo. I'm a
fifth-generation New Mexican from Sierra County. I've
had the opportunity to live abroad and in countries
where, in Latin America, in countries where one would
think you'd see a lot of wildlife and you see none.

So I really value what Fish & Wildlife does in
this country, both at the state and national level, and
we need to do a little bit more in Sierra County. There
was a hundred when I left here in about 1970, went to
college and I came back in 2003. The deer population in
Sierra County has really been reduced drastically.

I think I've got -- the drought is really a
huge cause. We also have got a good deal of poachers,
and we also have a problem with the federal and state
government.

This side of the Continental Divide maintains
two watering holes for wildlife. I found this out from
the biology person that -- up the street here, the
Forest Service for the Black Range. But on the west
side of the Continental Divide, there are 200 watering
holes.

Now, why do I mention that? It's because if
you have that kind of a disparity, those wolves when
they come here, what are they going to do? They are
going to go after the rancher's cattle. That's going to
be what their feed is. So why not help the deer
population, the elk population, by having more water
locally by having habitat improvement?

One of the biologists who spoke here talked
about habitat. I think it's extremely important. We
learned today that two breeding pairs -- you need ten
wolves to have a breeding pair of two. What is killing
them? I mean, if we're really poaching them, we've got
to do something about that too. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next
speaker.

MR. BRISTER: My name is Bob Brister,
B-R-I-S-T-E-R. I'm an organizer for Wild Earth
Guardians, a western regional conservation organization.

I have a couple of concerns. One is at what
point will recovery planning and essential designation
issue going to be addressed? If it's not going to be
addressed at this point in the planning process, when is
it going to be?

It seems to me we need to know where we're
going with this process, and the way to do that is to
have an end goal. And how are we going to get to that
end goal without defining it is not clear to me.

My second concern is that you talked about
unacceptable impacts for an ungulate herds and the
possibility of killing the wolves for that purposes.

Why not let carnivores and prey find their own balance?

Wolves and other -- wolves and ungulates lived together
for millennia in balance. They can do it again. Just
let them find their balance. We don't need to kill
wolves. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next
speaker, please.

MR. KERR: Good evening. My name is Drew Kerr,
D-R-E-W, K-E-R-R, and I am the carnivore advocate for
Guardians works to protect and restore
wildlife, wild places, wild rivers and health of the
American West. We strongly oppose your classification
of the only wild Mexican wolves in America as
nonessential. How can the only wild population of an
endangered species, which represents over 20 percent of
the entire population, be nonessential to that species'
recovery? If this rule revision revises the
experimental nonessential designation rule, how can the
Service justify taking redesignation as experimental
essential off the table?

The only DEIS alternative which approaches
improving management of Mexican wolves enough to ensure
their survival and recovery is alternative 3, which
expands the wolves' available range while continuing the
more stringent legal protections and safeguards for the
reintroduced wild population against take.

We urge you to adopt a revised alternative 3,
including the expanded available range, throughout the
totality of the species’ historic and current available
habitat, and granting wolves essential status.
Finally, please revive the draft 2012 recovery
plan, set clear and defensible recovery objectives, and
base management on that instead of a woefully inadequate
1982 plan still in effect.
Recovery is the goal and purpose of the
Endangered Species Act. How can the Service manage or
propose to manage a listed species toward that goal with
that purpose with no articulated and identified recovery
goal? How can you say this population is a component of
recovery if you don’t know what recovery is?
The Service claims this program is intended to
achieve conservation and recovery, and you propose to
revise the 10 J rule to improve conservation of the
species, but completely ignore recovery in contravention
of the ESA. This betrays the law, your mission, and
does a disservice to an imperiled species.
HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next
speaker, please.
MR. RILEY: Good evening. My name is Zac
Riley. I speak on behalf tonight of the New Mexico Farm
and Livestock Bureau. I’d also like to point out that I
am a fifth-generation rancher located in southern New
Mexico as well.
And tonight I want to speak on behalf of a
demonized industry that has been made a social pariah.
This industry has been told to produce more product to
feed a greater number of a growing population. These
people are responsible for feeding the US, while also
being good stewards of the lands and the wildlife within
them, all the while contending with the ever increasing
number of predators, including those present who wish to
do away with them.
Every one of these stewards would go out of
their way to properly care for any animal. These people
understand the importance of predacious species and
their place. They understand that this experimental
nonessential wolf population has its place in the wild.
But their place is not amongst species that any and all
defensible characteristics have been bred out of.
Nor is their place amongst people. These
habituated captive raised domesticated canines are a
threat to the population. I do not understand how much
proof there needs to be for a wolf approaching a child
or stalking a family. This is a master predator, you’ve
all admitted that. This master predator being released
into a population area, or a highly populated area,
doesn’t need proof that it will habitually and

eventually stalk or go among people.
Expansion of the habitat area of this size will
far over encroach upon those species that are already
imperiled themselves; i.e., the prairie chicken. You
were present, you were asked the same question about
this wolf and the expansion of this area. And
furthermore, this will diminish the efforts on behalf of
the ranches to provide --

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir. Next
presenter.
MR. DIAMOND: Hello, my name is Jack Diamond,
J-A-C-K, Diamond. I do live in the Gila, which is in
the reintroduction area. I also do support sound
science.
You have some major issues here. We talked
about the genetics. That’s your first major issue.
Your next one is a small ecosystem. Your third is an
ecosystem with people that live in that ecosystem.
I’m not against the wolves. I think there’s a
place for wolves. I think they do belong in Alaska,
Canada, where there’s no people. But you cannot put
them in a place such as New Mexico or Arizona where
there is people that live there, and livelihoods that
are at stake, industries that are at stake. It will not
work.
This is a failed program. Sometimes things
don’t work, people. We tried this. I think it’s time
just to say Look, we’ve done everything we could to try
to get this to work. It has not worked, so let’s just
drop it and let’s move on.
If it’s another species, let’s move on. But
this species here will not work in New Mexico or Arizona
due to the people that live in the communities, the
people that are there, the hunting industry, the
ranching, it will never work.
So I think you guys need to back up and say
it’s not your fault, you’ve done all that you could, but
this program is not going to work. It will never work.
You can keep trying, you can expand the boundaries.
That’s not going to do it.
These people from Las Cruces, they’re decent
people, and all the other people that have spoke for the
wolf are decent people. They do not understand that
wolves in Las Cruces will not make it. They’re going to
get into neighborhoods, they’re going to prey on dogs
and people’s livestock --

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir. Thank
you.
MS. SPENCER: Hi. Wendy Spencer,
S-P-E-N-C-E-R, Wolf Haven International. When we talk
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about stakeholders in this program, what generally comes
to mind are the livestock producers, sportsmen and
conservation groups.

However, there is another faction that is
often overlooked, and that is the facilities that house
and maintain the captive population for the Service.
Wolf Haven has been a dedicated partner in the New
Mexican wolf SSP for 20 years. And as such, we have
played a vital role in both the captive and wild
components of this population.

We serve as both a captive breeding facility as
dwell as one of only three prerelease breeding facilities
in the US. Over the years, we have housed dozens of
wolves, and we've seen the release of two family groups.
The Hawk's Nest pack, which was part of the initial
reintroduction in 1998, and later the Cienega pack in
2000.

Wolf Haven spends over $10,000 annually on the
Mexican wolves in our care and SSP-related activity.
All of these activities are funded by the individual
institution, and for small nonprofits, participation in
this program is a considerable expense. But we do so
because we recognize and appreciate the value of this
program and how critical the captive component is to the
system and the eventual biologically self-sustaining
population of the Mexican wolves on the landscape.

As you know, limited gene diversity, high mean
kinship values and inbreeding pressures are impediments
to this program. The biggest hindrance, however, is
space. Expanding the Mexican EPA and releasing more
wolves with suitable genetics and behavioral
characteristics will not only improve the genetic
fitness of the free ranging population, but it will also
free up valuable space in captivity.

We ask the Service to consider alternative 3 as
its preferred alternative. Wolf Haven feels that this
alternative is the only current option that will help
the Service achieve its recovery goals of this
critically endangered animal.

We thank the Service and the IFT for their
continued commitment and dedication to this program.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. And if you
would leave your comments for the court reporter, I
would appreciate it.

Cindy Norris, Adrienne Seltz, John Waugh, Jim
Wood.

Next speaker, please.

MR. PEARSON: My name is Ira Pearson, P-E-A-R-S-O-N.
I come from Luna County, New Mexico, right on the Mexican border, and I want to speak about

what the actual policy and what these different
alternatives might cause, but what it might force in
Luna County.

There's no water in Luna County. There's no
natural water. So any water that is available is going
to be made by someone. So there's a rancher, there's a
farmer, we're inviting the wolf to come to us. So
anything that happens in Luna County, we're asking the
wolf to come to our back door.

So the interactions that are going to happen is
going to be around water. And the corridor from the
Mexican wolves to the northern boundaries are -- if
they're going to come through Luna County, they're going
to have interactions with humans.

What's the economic impact going to happen is
what are they going to eat? Everybody's talking about
the ungulate population, and I'd like to see the
ungulate population in Luna County. We don't have any.
There's no elk, very little deer. What do they eat? I
don't know. But we're inviting them to our back door.
Are we going to feed them? Fish & Wildlife going to
feed them? What are we going to do?

So the economic impact, if they do prey on any
of the cows, anything that -- any of our wildlife, pets,
it's going to cause a huge impact on the population. We
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only have 25,000 people in our whole county.
If they devastate a herd of cattle, how's that
going to -- where's the economic impact going to happen
all the way throughout Luna County? It's a huge impact
on us. We can't afford it. We don't want to have it
happen to us. We don't need any more -- we are a poor
county and we don't need more devastation.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir. Next
speaker.

MR. WAUGH: My name is John Waugh, W-A-U-G-H.
I'm from Dona Ana. Thanks for being here.
I support the option 3, the expanded version of
option 3. After 16 years of the previous recovery plan,
83 wolves is not a recovery. There's many captive
releases from other places for the Mexican wolf. The
territory needs to be expanded and the gene pool needs
to be expanded. As a keystone species, they do extend
biodiversity. We've seen that in Yellowstone, the
northern Rockies. The hunting is better, the elk herds
are better.

Also, remove the nonessential experimental
population classification. And I do not think that they
should expand the takes and kills. It's like bringing
back standard operating procedure 13, which allows more
removals. And you know, with all these wolves in these
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about the wolves, but I just wondered how many of these wolf hunters out here are associated with PETA. Because you know, all them, they oppose every kind of killing there is like horses and dogs and things. One of the last -- I read a documentary about the last wolf that was killed over in eastern New Mexico and this ranch hand went out there and found this big old steer that a wolf had cut the hamstring on. Most people don't know what a hamstring is. It's the bleeders that lead down to the hind leg.

Drag around the wolf, kept eating on his back end for days and days. You can see where he just drug him all over the place there. And anyway, anybody that has any heart for anything, a whole lot of suffering goes on in them kind of deals.

And then one of the things that I'd like to say before I give up here, my mom just told me about an incident down in Texas. Getting to be 101 here pretty quick. And she said that down here, there was a family that three kids, and two big ones and a little kid went out there and they buried the little baby in the leaves, and a big wolf showed up there and the kids run, all of them, the big ones, up the hill. The mama says they run to the house.

And so, Where's the baby? He's buried out there in the leaves. Well, there's a big wolf went over there and looked at them. He went up on the hill and howled, and so mama ran out there and grabbed the kid and ran back to the house, and the wolf got out there and a big old pack showed up there, and there wasn't any kid to eat, so they killed the wolf that called them in and ate him, so.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. LYON: Hello. My name is Ken Lyon, L-Y-O-N, from Sierra County. I'm a former Sierra County commissioner. I want to go on record as presenting an ordinance that is on the books. It was passed February 3, 1994. I was instrumental in helping pass this. It's an ordinance that says if a wolf is released in Sierra County, it is against the law, and there is a punishment that goes with that of $30 fine, 90 days in jail, or both.

I do, with no disrespect, to the people from California, the people from New York, the people from Valencia County, Dona Ana County, when we pass this ordinance, we passed it for Sierra County. And this represents the will of the people of Sierra County. More important, it represents a vital part of the economy of Sierra County, the ranching business. So
1. folks, this is not just the will of Sierra County, it's
   the law of Sierra County. We expect it to be respected.
2. HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next
   speaker, please.
3. MR. NEWTSON: Kannan Newton, K-A-N-N-A-N,
   N-E-W-T-S-O-N. The Land of Enchantment is widely
   regarded as one of the great natural wonders of America.
4. Everything we can do to maximize the health and growth
   of the Mexican wolf population in New Mexico will
   greatly enhance that reputation.
5. Of the alternatives addressed in the U.S. Fish
   and Wildlife's draft, EIS, alternative 3 with some
6. modifications would be an excellent start. These
   modifications should include expanding the wolf release
7. area, eliminate boundaries to wolf movements and permit
8. movement north of I-40 into northern New Mexico and
9. southern Colorado, and redesignate the wolves as
10. essential.
11. Let us make the Mexican wolf a star of the New
12. Mexico show. Thank you.
13. HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next
14. speaker.
15. MS. SCHAFER: Hi, my name is Nicole Schafer.
17. of Las Cruces. I'm in support of the science that is
18. necessary for the recovery of Mexican wolves. I favor
19. the recovery alternative 3 with modification.
20. For this endangered species to recover, I ask
21. the Fish and Wildlife Service to eliminate northern
22. boundaries that restrict wolves from the best suitable
23. habitats for their recovery. The likelihood of recovery
24. increases with multiple diverse populations, and the
25. I-40 boundary decreases the distances wolves can travel
26. to establish new populations.
27. The Mexican wolf has the right to their native
28. land. Thank you.
29. HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next
30. speaker.
31. MS. SELTZ: Hello, my name is Adrienne Seltz.
32. I'm from the Sandia Park, New Mexico. A-D-R-I-E-N-N-E,
33. S-E-L-T-Z. First, I want to thank Fish and Wildlife
34. Service for the work you have done. I've met and
35. interacted with a lot of the biologists on the ground.
36. I am also a volunteer. Although I am speaking
37. for myself today, I volunteer with Wild Spirit Wolf
38. Sanctuary, so I have hand raised, bottle fed, grown with
39. wolves, worked with wolves. I have trapped and captured
40. and sedated Mexican wolves and examined them. So I'm
41. intimately familiar with these animals.
42. Mostly, they are really scared of people. But
43. what I want to say today is I don't really know why
44. we're here doing this without that recovery plan. I'm
45. just adamant about the fact we're changing the rules,
46. again allowing for more destruction of this very
47. threatened species that should definitely be essential.
48. There is no way that you can replace four or five
49. generations of wild animals that have been born in the
50. wild from any captive breeding facility. This is an
51. essential population.
52. I am also adamantly opposed to any kind of
53. turning over to either state Game and Fish Commissions
54. who expressly have already decided that they're going to
55. get rid of them and they'll never survive.
56. So that happens when the species is recovered.
57. Up until that point, this is Fish & Wildlife. Issue a
58. mandate to recover and conserve these species, not
59. hyper-manage them. That's why we don't have as many as
60. we should have right now. They've been killed, they've
61. been removed by you, they've been killed by wildlife
62. services mistaking them for coyotes, they've been killed
63. with collars destroyed and smashed and disappeared.
64. That has to stop.
65. We have got to stop killing them. So I am in
66. support of modified, again, alternative 3, but I think
67. that we have got to -- we're expanding to the east and
68. west, into some not so good territories -- Luna
69. County -- there's no food -- when they can go up north.
70. I think there's rumor of promises to Colorado and Utah
71. not to have wolves. So they got to go worth --
72. HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you very much.
73. Guy Dicharry, Scott Chandler, Patricia Snyder.
74. Next speaker, please.
75. MR. DICHARRY: Good evening. My name is Guy
76. Dicharry, D-I-C-H-A-R-R-Y. I'm a 30-year resident of
77. Valencia County -- there's no food -- when they can go up north.
78. I am also a member of Backcountry Hunters and
79. Anglers. The eastern border of our property in Valencia
80. County is the bosque along the Rio Grande. We raise
81. chickens for eggs and meat. We have goats and horses
82. and dogs. We will be in zone two on that land as well
83. as the land in Torrance County where we sometimes graze
84. our horses.
85. I know what it's like to find my animals
86. slaughtered by other animals, but in our case, it's
87. always been domestic dogs. But over the years, I've
88. learned how to protect my animals.
89. The Western Governors Association Wildlife
90. Council has identified areas of crucial habitat and
91. wildlife corridors in New Mexico. The project
92.
identifies the Rio Grande as a major wildlife corridor. The expansion of the recovery area to take advantage of this corridor is needed if the Mexican gray wolf is to have any chance of achieving the necessary genetic diversity that's consistent with survival.

Also, the expansion of the recovery area means that the risk of predation will no longer be borne solely by those in the current recovery area. I don't want to lose my animals to predation, but I also understand that no undertaking is risk free. I cannot, nevertheless, condone the intentional extinction of an important species simply because of the risk of predation.

We as humans caused the near extinction of this species and it's up to us to give them their chance for survival. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Next speaker.

MS. SYNDER: My name is Patricia Snyder, S-N-Y-D-E-R. Thank you for the opportunity to comment today. I'd like to start by saying that I also support a modified version of alternative 3. Scientists have been sounding the alarm on the genetic diversity crisis that the Mexican wolf is facing for years, and you know that scientists agree recovery in groups of three interconnected populations. It's imperative to the

survival of these wolves in the Southwest to release more wolves into the wild. I do support the expansion of releasing and roaming areas. Our native Southwest top predator deserves more land to roam. I do vehemently oppose the boundary of I-40 to the recovery area, and I urge U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to eliminate boundaries to the wolves' movements. Some of the best remaining habitats for wolves would be shut off with these boundaries. And the best available science shows that in order to recover the Mexican wolf, additional populations are needed, along with the ability for individual wolves to move between populations.

I'd also like to say that I vehemently oppose the expanded provisions for take of Mexican wolves in the draft EIS. The scientists agree that removing wolves from the wild is contrary to the goals of the reintroduction program and has been a major factor in the Service's inability to meet its objectives.

It doesn't take a scientist to understand that expanding the ability to remove critically endangered wolves in the wild is the wrong direction. We need more wolves and less politics, not the other way around. I oppose -- I also oppose the continued designation of experimental nonessential of the wild wolves. The 83 wolves in the wild are absolutely essential to the survival of the subspecies as a whole. To continue the this --

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you very much.

Next speaker.

MS. RENN: Hello, my name is Emily Ren, R-E-N-N, and I am the executive director of the Grand Canyon Wolf Recovery Project, which is a nonprofit based in Flagstaff, Arizona. I also received both my bachelor's and master's in wildlife biology from Northern Arizona University.

When I review this draft EIS, I see an archaic way of zone management that looks like it could be from a textbook out of the 1960s. It doesn't represent the most current wildlife biology that we know about Mexican wolves and how much genetic information has changed in the last 30 years.

This approach to the zone management does not represent the best biology for a wide-ranging mammal. We know that it's actually kind of tying your own hands and putting these endangered subspecies at risk. Every time you suggest that you're going to capture a wolf and take it back and translocate it into the recovery area, it puts that animal at risk.

I represent, as I said, a Grand Canyon Wolf

recovery Project, and we are doing the work of building a base of support in Coconino County in the Grand Canyon region. I believe that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should stop bowing down to special interests and actually listen to the majority of residents in both Arizona and New Mexico who support the expanded recovery of Mexican wolves.

And thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Next speaker.

MR. CHANDLER: Hi. My name is Scott Chandler. I'm from Luna County. My family ranches here in Sierra County and I have a ranch in Otero County as well.

First, I'd like to say we are opposed to any expansion and have been opposed to it from the beginning. I think that this is an action that takes no consideration to what the founding fathers had for our country and it runs all over private property rights, our right to the sovereignty of our state, and the county, and you know, I was kind of flabbergasted when our county commissioner got up and said about the laws that have been passed against wolves in this county and I didn't see that in any presentation.

It was all just everything just good and satisfactory. They do not take into account the locals and the people -- I mean, predominantly, I guess polling
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Finally, I'm a little frustrated by the attitude toward predators, that it seems that some think there should be no predators. Nature has predators. That's just the way it is. So, are we going to have a nature with predators or some alternative big zoo?

Thanks.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Next speaker, please.

MR. WEAR: Mike Wear, Hillsboro. Last name, W-E-A-R. I'm a 27-year retired law enforcement officer. I'm also a fifth-generation rancher from the state of Arizona. I currently have a ranch in Hillsboro.

You people are passing policies which are in conflict with local law, of which a sheriff will come in and be able to take care of such. You people need to ensure that you get all these things clear before you start doing these.

In other words, you need the good graces of the people. Otherwise, like the previous gentleman who stood up here and said if you don't have the people behind you, your program's not going to -- it's not going to go. It's just there. It's a fight that you can't win. You'll continue to fight it.

So you need the ranchers. You really do. I'm not against the wolf. I think it has a place, just not in my backyard where I pay taxes. I have a Second Amendment right, a Fourth Amendment right, to protect property, to bear arms. I have all of those things.

And we -- you people need to look at that too. I have to pay the taxes for people to cross my property. I have all of those things.

Our country, the first 150 years wasn't founded in a country where our vets are dying in the hospitals because we don't have appropriate deals, we have homeless people wandering around, and we're spending money on this kind of thing, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

Our country, the first 150 years wasn't founded on this. If we were run like the last 20, we would be a Third World country.

Third World country.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. HINCHMAN: Eric Hinchman, H-I-N-C-H-M-A-N. I wanted to say that I've been a supporter of the reintroduction program since it happened 16 years ago.

I've also been frustrated with the lack of releases and what I see to be a lot of half measures. It seems like as one gentleman had said, that the program just isn't working and it won't work. It can work, but it just seems like there's been a lot of half measures.

taken where you can go here if you're a wolf, but you can't go there if you're a wolf. You can do this to a wolf, but you can't do that to a wolf.

So I think that if you want to go forward and save this species from extinction, you need to do something a little bit stronger. Either go forward with this program if you're going to do it. It just seems like keeping less than a hundred wolves just out there, is -- I'm not sure what the -- I'm not sure what the goal of that is. It's not really accomplishing much.

I'm encouraged by the expansion of the boundaries; however, making it easier to kill wolves and saying you can't go north of I-40 doesn't make a lot of sense either.
My husband and I have been living here in Silver City for seven years. We hike the Gila a lot. It is a wonderful, wonderful place. I am in support of proposal 3 modified without any more -- taking any more wolves’ lives, and I would suggest a couple other places for you way up north, like the Pecos Wilderness would be a great place for wolves. Thank you.

MR. DIAMOND:  Good afternoon. My name is John Diamond, spelled J-O-H-N, D-I-A-M-O-N-D. I'm going to read from page 58, chapter 4, no peer reviewed studies have been conducted and no significantly collected data available to make an evaluation as to whether the reintroduction of wolves into the Black Range or Blue recovery area has or has not had a positive, neutral or negative psychological affect on children living in rural communities within proximity to the recovery area.

However, it is noticed in the five-year review, fear and not necessarily a fact, data, or logical based emotion.

An abstinence of a factual or logical foundation for fear does not make the personal impact any less real.

Fear is a personal thing. Some people will fear wolves no matter what the facts are. Others will fear wolves no matter what the facts are. But whether this goes true with the facts that people fear sexual predators. Because that's how I feel these wolves are.

I had two encounters with wolves with my two little girls and my wife that are documented. You guys know and are fully aware of these encounters. My children fear wolves and they have a reason to fear wolves.

The human safety concern should be your number-one consideration when you guys are developing a recovery plan or this draft EIS. And if it's not, you're going to hear from me over and over and over again because we've lived it.

On a second note, you guys have a constitution, to uphold the constitution to protect the human safety and well-being of the general American public and that should be your number-one concern. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. I'm going to read some more names. Tim McKimmie, Gene Whetton, Rita Gentry, Jessica VanDerVea, Leona Wear, Jeff Richter, and Michael Robinson.

Next speaker, please.

MR. McKIMMIE: My name is Tim McKimmie. I'm from Las Cruces. M-C-K-I-M-M-I-E. I ask you to follow the intention of the Endangered Species Act. The ESA was originated about the same time the Southwest lobo disappeared from the wild. Nearly lost forever, the Mexico wolf might now have a chance in spite of its many obstacles. Yes, it is a predator, and predators are essential parts of healthy ecosystems. Wolves can also be part of healthy economies.

Fully recover this animal. Try to reduce handling, capture and recapture. Poaching wildlife is bad enough, but illegally killing endangered species is a high crime, so come down hard and fast on poachers. And do not relax lethal control rules.

Expand the Mexican wolf's territory clear up into the Four Corners region, thereby reducing the loss of animals that wander out of the currently very limited range.

The wolf population in the wild is absolutely essential for the species' survival, and should be classified as essential. Expand and release opportunities will improve chances for recovery. Mexican wolf recovery is what most people want and what the ESA demands. I wish you success.
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The wolf population in the wild is absolutely essential for the species' survival, and should be classified as essential. Expand and release opportunities will improve chances for recovery. Mexican wolf recovery is what most people want and what the ESA demands. I wish you success.

Endangered Species Act. The ESA was originated about the same time the Southwest lobo disappeared from the wild. Nearly lost forever, the Mexico wolf might now have a chance in spite of its many obstacles. Yes, it is a predator, and predators are essential parts of healthy ecosystems. Wolves can also be part of healthy economies.

Fully recover this animal. Try to reduce handling, capture and recapture. Poaching wildlife is bad enough, but illegally killing endangered species is a high crime, so come down hard and fast on poachers. And do not relax lethal control rules.

Expand the Mexican wolf's territory clear up into the Four Corners region, thereby reducing the loss of animals that wander out of the currently very limited range.

The wolf population in the wild is absolutely essential for the species' survival, and should be classified as essential. Expand and release opportunities will improve chances for recovery. Mexican wolf recovery is what most people want and what the ESA demands. I wish you success.
members and supporters throughout the United States.

Our organization under a different name was the original -- was one of the original organizations to sue the Fish and Wildlife Service to compel you to follow the Endangered Species Act and re-introduce the Mexican wolf into the wild, as per the 1982 recovery plan.

And I'm happy to be at this hearing because I was also the author of the petition for rule making in 2004, which we submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service to get expanded release areas, expanded areas for wolves to roam without boundaries and taking care of the livestock carcasses that over and over again are correlated with wolves switching their hunting behavior from elk and natural prey to domestic livestock, thereby causing the very problems that turn into a cycle of conflict and scapegoating the wolves.

And these recommendations were made in the 2001 report, a scientific report commissioned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. So we support alternative 3, with modifications.

Designating the wolves as experimental essential; you will not be able to persuade a federal government acting in spite of the constitution, NEPA, ESA, and all the other acronyms you can think of. The true not so well hidden intent of this introduction proves us out later and wolves are gone, how are we going to bring them back?

We need to look to the future and acknowledge the past without staying locked in the past. Thank you for your time.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. RICHTER: Good evening. My name is Jeff Richter. I'm not fussy about the spelling.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Can you speak a little --

MR. RICHTER: Good evening. My name is Jeff Richter. I'm not fussy about the spelling. Start my time over.

I attended the session this afternoon, and I want to thank the Service for their slick presentation and their canned responses to our questions. The answers to our posed questions, both pro and con, were short on substance and long on (inaudible).

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is just another example of the increasingly lawless federal government acting in spite of the constitution, NEPA, ESA, and all the other acronyms you can think of. The true not so well hidden intent of this introduction expansion of this recovery area is to drive us from the land, destroy us economically, and with total destruction of our private property rights.

It's interesting listening to the comments here tonight. The people that are pro, the people that support the expansion of this recovery area, are those people who have the least to risk. Their livelihoods are not at risk and their private property rights are not at risk.

In my estimation, there's very few places for the wolf on this earth. Let's say perhaps Alaska, Canada, a zoo or two, Grimm's Fairy Tales, or hanging on the wall. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: I'm going to call a couple more names. Michael Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: Michael Robinson, M-I-C-H-A-E-L

R-O-B-I-N-S-O-N. I represent the Center for Biological Diversity and our over three-quarters of a million members and supporters throughout the United States.

Our organization under a different name was the original -- was one of the original organizations to sue the Fish and Wildlife Service to compel you to follow the Endangered Species Act and re-introduce the Mexican wolf into the wild, as per the 1982 recovery plan.

And I'm happy to be at this hearing because I was also the author of the petition for rule making in 2004, which we submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service to get expanded release areas, expanded areas for wolves to roam without boundaries and taking care of the livestock carcasses that over and over again are correlated with wolves switching their hunting behavior from elk and natural prey to domestic livestock, thereby causing the very problems that turn into a cycle of conflict and scapegoating the wolves.

And these recommendations were made in the 2001 report, a scientific report commissioned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. So we support alternative 3, with modifications.

Designating the wolves as experimental essential; you will not be able to persuade a federal judge that you do not have to consider whether or not to designate them as experimental essential.

Protect the wolves from scavenging on livestock; by holding them blameless if they're allowed to scavenge and then subsequently depredate.

Remove the telemetry receivers from private hands that you have imprudently lent out. You have admitted, your agency has admitted in the El Paso Times several years ago, in 2008, I believe, that you had given out telemetry receivers and had not kept track of who you had all given them to, which is stunning irresponsibility from a federal agency given that these tools strip the wolves of their anonymity and their ability to hide and survive.

And for recovery to take place, you have to reduce the mortality not just from the federal government and not just from the private sources, but also not increase mortality. Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MR. ANDRADE: Good evening. My name is Lynn, L-Y-N-N, A-N-D-R-A-D-E. I just want to start with a couple of comments. I think it's grossly unfair of the people from the Service to put up such intelligent professional and obviously thoughtful people. How can we hate you? There's just no way.

A little bit about myself. I'm a third-generation Arizonan. My grandparents were all the
Despite the misunderstandings and aware that we were able to seek assistance or should I have three small grandchildren, a son that on a hill, and that one wolf turned around and came benefit of the American people. I am asking you to expanded provisions. I also want to say that we need YouTube and look at it. It's extremely enlightening. three daughters a new puppy. And two months later, they very short film you can see on the Internet called "How Iraq. And so, it's had a severe impact on our family. MR. NUNN: My name is Joe Bill Nunn, N-U-N-N. Boone, B-O-O-N-E. Thank you for allowing us wolves on our property in Sierra County. I was not forget the big bad wolf stories and wake up to the wolves back a mere fraction of what we have taken from them, their land and their freedom. I cringe at the thought of having to point to a picture in my book to show my future children what a growing up, and now that mother refuses to let her three the interests of cattle ranchers, and I understand that ranching is a way of life in this area. However, there have been proven successful nonviolent methods of co-existence between ranchers and wolves that have been implemented in other areas of this country which can and should be implemented in the Mexican gray territory in this area. Despite the misunderstandings and misconceptions that surround wolves, now is the time to forget the big bad wolf stories and wake up to the reality that these are essential predators that our ecosystem is in desperate need of. These proposed rule changes not only are the best available science, but also gives in to anti-wolf hysteria, greed and political agendas. I never will understand how it is to hard to give a small group of wolves back a mere fraction of what we have taken from them, their land and their freedom. The father chased that pair, and chased them up a hill, and that one wolf turned around and came right back down toward the family. And that is a real experience, truthful in every detail. And all of you that are defending the wolf, I would ask to consider if there is more to this than emotion. This is a truth of what can happen in a family and to small children. And to this day that mother -- I roamed that creek and ran up those mountains the whole time I was growing up, and now that mother refuses to let her three daughters do that because she is from a city and saw that for the firsthand, and won't allow it. And so, it's had a severe impact on our family. And I just want to thank you for your time and opportunity to tell you a real account, and if you have a moment I'd like to speak with you afterwards.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker.

MS. LaRACK: My name is Danielle LaRack, L-A-R-A-C-K and I am from Colorado. I came here today to be a voice for the voiceless in the face of the proposed rule changes surrounding the Mexican gray wolf recovery program. I am aware that a large concern regarding the management of the Mexican gray population has to do with the interests of cattle ranchers, and I understand that ranching is a way of life in this area. However, there have been proven successful nonviolent methods of co-existence between ranchers and wolves that have been implemented in other areas of this country which can and should be implemented in the Mexican gray territory in this area. Despite the misunderstandings and misconceptions that surround wolves, now is the time to forget the big bad wolf stories and wake up to the reality that these are essential predators that our ecosystem is in desperate need of. These proposed rule changes not only are the best available science, but also gives in to anti-wolf hysteria, greed and political agendas. I never will understand how it is to hard to give a small group of wolves back a mere fraction of what we have taken from them, their land and their freedom. I cringe at the thought of having to point to a picture in my book to show my future children what a Mexican gray wolf was. It hurts my heart that yet another group of animals could perish at the hands of the human race. I'm asking you, though, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to adhere to your mission statement to work with others to conserve, protect, enhance, fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. I am asking you to provide the Mexican grays the protection and resources they not only need but truly deserve. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: I'm going to call one more name. Joe Bill Nunn.

MS. BOONE: Hi. My name is Velma, V-E-L-M-A, last name Boone, B-O-O-N-E. Thank you for allowing us this opportunity. And I don't want to speak on facts and figures, but I do want to speak on emotion. We've heard a lot of that this evening and this is a personal account of an encounter with a pair of wolves on our property in Sierra County. I was not aware that we were able to seek assistance or should report, and so this is my opportunity. I have three small grandchildren, a son that has received the Purple Heart and served 38 months in Iraq. He came home at Christmastime, brought his three daughters a new puppy. And two months later, they drove up to our property on the Animas Creek, and mom, puppy and one daughter unloaded, and two wolves came out of the creek bottom and took it right in front of all three of the girls and killed it.

The father chased that pair, and chased them up and down the hill, and that one wolf turned around and came right back down toward the family. And that is a real experience, truthful in every detail. And all of you that are defending the wolf, I would ask to consider if there is more to this than emotion. This is a truth of what can happen in a family and to small children.

And to this day that mother -- I roamed that creek and ran up those mountains the whole time I was growing up, and now that mother refuses to let her three daughters do that because she is from a city and saw that for the firsthand, and won't allow it. And so, it's had a severe impact on our family.

And I just want to thank you for your time and opportunity to tell you a real account, and if you have a moment I'd like to speak with you afterwards.

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you. Next speaker, please.

MR. NUNN: My name is Joe Bill Nunn, N-U-N-N. I am president of the Southwestern New Mexico Grazing Association. Our membership comes from the seven southwestern counties in New Mexico. We are the ones bearing the brunt of the wolf population and the depredation by the wolves.

I was present at one of the very first hearings on wolves in the Southwest and in the industry. And with that, I want to thank you for your time.
educational meetings that Fish and Wildlife Service
sponsored back in the 1990s at the inception of the
program. I think that meeting was in Silver City, New
Mexico.

Your representatives from the U.S. Fish and
Wildlife Service told us that -- made it very clear that
100 wolves was the target. And there was no reference
was ever made to the possible expansion of the initial
recovery area or the increase in the number of wolves
above 100. It was also made clear by the forest -- Fish
and Wildlife Service personnel that if the program was
unsuccessful, if it didn't work over a reasonable period
of time, that the Fish and Wildlife Service would be the
first to terminate a program.

The program was -- has obviously been
unsuccessful. After 16 years, it is time for you to
recognize your original promise and honor your original
promise of ending the program. If you continue the
program, do not expand the initial recovery areas.

The problem with depredation of privately owned
livestock, including horses, working cow dogs, hunting
dogs and family pets and cattle is only going to get
worse.

Owners of those domestic animals or their
agents should be allowed to take the wolves, if they are
found attacking their privately owned livestock or pets
without a permit, and regardless of whether that attack
is taking place --

HEARING OFFICER TRAVERS: Thank you, sir.
Thank you. It is now 9 o'clock p.m. On behalf of the
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, we appreciate your time
and effort you took this evening to present your
comments. They have been very informative and will be
fully considered in their final decision.

Again, as a reminder, written comments may be
submitted to the staff at the registration table or they
may be submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service by
September 23, 2014. The hearing is closed. I show the
time to be 9:01. Thank you.

(The hearing was concluded at 9:01 p.m.)
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