

From the USFWS website accessed October 2013:

Mexican Wolf Recovery Program Chronology

The chronology below provides an overview of significant events related to the Mexican wolf recovery program, updated as of July 2013.

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| Pre-1970 | Mexican wolves extirpated from the Southwestern US primarily by private, state, and government control campaigns. |
| 1976 | Mexican wolf listed as an endangered subspecies under the Endangered Species Act (note: the subspecies level listing was subsumed into a species level listing of the gray wolf in 1978). |
| 1977-1980 | 5 wolves captured in Mexico to establish a captive breeding program. |
| 1979 | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service forms Mexican Wolf Recovery Team. |
| 1982 | Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan completed; contains goal of maintaining a captive breeding program and re-establishment of a viable, self-sustaining population of at least 100 wolves within their historical range. |
| 1990 | Wolf Action Group files lawsuit against U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service alleging failure to implement the 1982 Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan. |
| 1990 | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service hires a Mexican Wolf Recovery Coordinator to implement recovery of the species. |
| 1992 | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issues Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Experimental Reintroduction of Mexican Wolves into Suitable Habitat within the Historic Range of the Subspecies. |
| 1995 | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service releases draft EIS. |
| 1996 | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service publishes proposed Mexican wolf experimental population rule in the Federal Register. |
| 1996 | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service releases Final EIS entitled: "Reintroduction of the Mexican Wolf within its Historic Range in the Southwestern United States." |
| 1997 | Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt issues Record of Decision on the Final EIS and selected the Preferred Alternative: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will reintroduce captive-raised Mexican wolves in eastern Arizona within the Blue Range Wolf Recovery Area (BRWRA). Released wolves and their offspring are designated a nonessential experimental population and will be allowed to colonize the entire BRWRA. If necessary and feasible, White Sands Missile Range could be used as a back-up area. |
| 1998 | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service publishes the Mexican Wolf Final Rule (Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of the Mexican Gray Wolf in Arizona and New Mexico) in the Federal Register. |
| 1998 | Captive breeding population of Mexican wolves reaches approximately 177 animals. |
| 1998 | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service releases the first 11 Mexican wolves into the wild in the BRWRA. |

- 1998 New Mexico Cattle Growers Association et. al., files lawsuit against U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service alleging violations of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Endangered Species Act (ESA), and Administrative Procedures Act (APA) in authorizing and implementing the Mexican wolf reintroduction project.
- 1998 At year's end, at least 4 Mexican wolves in 2 packs are in the wild.
- 1999 Courts rule U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service complied with NEPA, ESA, and APA; lawsuit is dismissed.
- 1999 At year's end, at least 15 Mexican wolves in 5 packs are in the wild.
- 2000 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service prepares an Environmental Assessment for Translocation of Mexican Wolves Throughout the Blue Range Wolf Recovery Area in Arizona and New Mexico.
- 2000 First Mexican wolves translocated into the Gila Wilderness in New Mexico.
- 2000 White Mountain Apache Tribe enters into a cooperative agreement with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to allow wolves to inhabit the Fort Apache Indian Reservation (FAIR), adding approximately 2,440 square miles to the recovery area.
- 2000 The Hawks Nest pack produced the first documented wild conceived, wild born Mexican wolf pup (mp674) in the Blue Range Wolf Recovery Area.
- 2000 At year's end, at least 22 wolves in 6 packs are in the wild.
- 2001 Pursuant to the Final Rule, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service completed the 3-Year Review. Scientists recommend program should continue but with modifications.
- 2001 Congress directs U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct an independent review of the 3-Year Review. Outcome of the independent review (completed by States of Arizona and New Mexico September 2002) determines the need to restore the States role in the Mexican wolf recovery program; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service begins developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with program partners to restructure the Mexican wolf program with the States and Tribes.
- 2001 At year's end, at least 26 wolves in 8 packs are in the wild.
- 2002 The White Mountain Apache Tribe signs on as a primary cooperator, providing the potential for wolves to be directly released on tribal lands.
- 2002 Coalition of Arizona and New Mexico Counties, et al. file a 60-day Notice of Intent to sue for violations of NEPA, ESA, and APA alleging Mexican wolves are hybridizing with domestic dogs.
- 2002 San Carlos Apache Tribe passes resolution to remove all Mexican wolves from the Reservation.
- 2002 At year's end, at least 41 wolves in 8 packs are in the wild.
- 2003 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reclassifies the gray wolf into 3 Distinct Population Segments. Mexican wolves maintain classification as endangered or non-essential and became part of the Southwestern Distinct Population Segment.
- 2003 Coalition of Arizona and New Mexico Counties et al., file lawsuit regarding the 2002 Notice of Intent alleging the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: 1) failed to consider the impacts of hybridization; 2) failed to

prepare a supplemental EIS; and 3) violated Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) by improperly withholding documents.

- 2003 San Carlos Apache Tribe enters into a cooperative agreement with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for wolf monitoring and management to include removal.
- 2003 The first release of a pack of Mexican wolves occurs on Fort Apache Indian Reservation in cooperation with White Mountain Apache Tribe.
- 2003 Defenders of Wildlife et al., files lawsuit against U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the Gray Wolf Reclassification Rule.
- 2003 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service appoints and convenes the Southwestern Distinct Population Segment Gray Wolf Recovery Team to begin recovery planning for the newly established Southwestern Distinct Population Segment. This recovery plan will supersede the 1982 Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan.
- 2003 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service finalizes the MOU with Arizona Game and Fish Department, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services, USDA-Forest Service, White Mountain Apache Tribe, New Mexico Department of Agriculture, and several counties. The MOU restructures the Mexican wolf recovery program to allow the States and Tribes to implement the BRWRA reintroduction project while the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service maintains responsibilities for recovery. The MOU establishes an Adaptive Management Oversight Committee (AMOC) and an Adaptive Management Working Group (AMWG).
- 2003 At year's end, at least 55 wolves in 9 packs are in the wild.
- 2004 Pursuant to the Final Rule, U.S. Fish and Wildlife and AMOC cooperators begin the Mexican Wolf Blue Range Reintroduction Project 5-Year Review; draft reports released to public for review and comment in December.
- 2004 At year's end, between 44 and 48 wolves in 14 packs are in the wild.
- 2005 Courts rule in favor of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the Arizona and New Mexico Coalition of Counties, et al., hybrid lawsuit; lawsuit dismissed.
- 2005 Court enjoins and vacates the 2003 Reclassification Rule; the ruling negates the 3 previously established DPS's including the Southwestern DPS. Recovery planning for the Mexican wolf is put on hold.
- 2005 Arizona and New Mexico Coalition of Counties, et al., file for appeal regarding the hybrid lawsuit.
- 2005 The AMOC completes the Mexican Wolf Blue Range Reintroduction Project 5-Year Review and submits to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for consideration. Included are a set of 37 recommendations for improving management of the Blue Range wolf reintroduction project, many of which would require a change to the Final Rule.
- 2005 At year's end, between 35 and 49 wolves in 12 packs are in the wild.
- 2006 The Center for Biological Diversity files lawsuit against the Service alleging the Service had been unreasonable in its delay in making a final decision to grant or deny a rulemaking petition to implement steps to stop the critically imperiled Mexican gray wolf from becoming extinct in the wild.
- 2006 At year's end, at least 59 wolves in 10 packs are in the wild.

- 2007 On August 7, 2007, the Service issued a notice of scoping meetings and intent to prepare an EIS and socio-economic assessment for the proposed amendment of the rule establishing a nonessential experimental population of the Arizona and New Mexico population of the gray wolf (72 Federal Register 44065-44069). The Service held scoping meetings in 12 Arizona and New Mexico communities in 2007, and received approximately 13,500 written comments from the public, non-governmental organizations and government agencies at the local, state and federal levels. In response to considerable interest in cooperating agency status among Arizona and New Mexico counties, on September 10, 2008, the Service held a welcome and kick-off meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico for parties that had requested or obtained cooperating agency status on the EIS . The meeting was attended by thirty-five people representing four military organizations, fifteen Arizona and New Mexico counties, four federal agencies and one Native American tribe. Work has been temporarily suspended on the EIS pending resolution of the nationwide status of the gray wolf and the status of the Mexican wolf.
- 2007 Forest Guardians and Sinapu (later merged and renamed "WildEarth Guardians") issued a 60-day Notice of Intent to sue the Service for failure to actively further the conservation of Mexican gray wolf.
- 2007 At year's end, at least 52 wolves in 11 packs are in the wild.
- 2008 WildEarth Guardians and the Rewilding Institute filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona alleging that the Service and the USDA-Forest Service had failed to meet the requirement of Section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act that any release of an experimental population of an endangered or threatened species will further the conservation of such species (WildEarth Guardians v U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2:08-CV-820, D. AZ, 2008).
- 2008 Defenders of Wildlife and ten other conservation and non-governmental organizations filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona alleging that the Service violated the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act and Administrative Procedures Act in creating AMOC and authorizing Standard Operating Procedure 13, which requires permanent removal of wolves that have engaged in three livestock depredation incidents during a one-year period (Defenders of Wildlife v Hall, 4:08-CV-289, D.AZ. 2008).
- 2008 In July, the court consolidated the WildEarth Guardians and Defenders of Wildlife cases due to their similarity. From July 28 through October 20, 2008, the parties filed briefs in response to the Service's motion to dismiss. At year's end, the court was still considering the motion to dismiss.
- 2008 At year's end, at least 52 wolves in 10 packs are in the wild.
- 2009 The Service, in cooperation with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, established the Mexican Wolf / Livestock Interdiction Trust Fund (Interdiction Fund) on September 23, 2009. The objective of the Interdiction Fund is to generate long-term funding for prolonged financial support to livestock operators within the framework of conservation and recovery of Mexican gray wolf populations in the Southwest. Funding will be applied to initiatives that address management, monitoring, and other proactive conservation needs for Mexican gray wolves as they relate to livestock, including alternative livestock husbandry practices, grazing management alternatives, livestock protection, measures to avoid and minimize depredation, habitat protection, species protection, scientific research, conflict resolution, compensation for damage, education, and outreach activities.
- 2009 The court denied the Service's motion to dismiss, and on December 2, 2009, the Service and the plaintiffs finalized settlement in a Consent Decree in which the Service stated it would make no further decisions that relate to the Mexican Wolf Recovery Program pursuant to the MOU, nor would the Service make decisions that relate to the Mexican Wolf Recovery Program pursuant to Standard Operating Procedure 13.0: Control of Mexican Wolves. In the Consent Decree the Service also recognized that AMOC does not oversee the actions of the Service, and has no decision-making authority over the Service with regard to the Service's management of the Mexican Wolf Recovery Program or the Mexican Wolf Reintroduction Project.

- 2009 At year's end, at least 42 wolves in 10 packs are in the wild.
- 2010 In August, Americans for the Preservation of the Western Environment, Adobe Ranch, Beaverhead Ranch, Alan Tackman, the Gila National Forest Livestock Permittees' Association, Inc., the Otero County Board of Commissioners and the Catron County Board of Commissioners filed a lawsuit against the Service and the NMDGF in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico alleging National Environmental Policy Act and Administrative Procedures Act violations relative to the Service's management decisions regarding Mexican wolves, specifically claiming the Service violated the enabling rules and altered the program without completing the environmental review required by NEPA (Americans for the Preservation of the Western Environment, et al. v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, No. 1:10-CV-00788 (D. N.M.). NMDGF's motion to dismiss was granted on December 16, 2010. This case remained open through 2010, however, on February 1, 2011, the parties stipulated to voluntarily dismiss the case without prejudice as to the Federal Defendants.
- 2010 The Service submitted to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia a multi-year listing work plan that will enable the agency to review and address the needs of more than 250 species listed on the 2010 Candidate Notice of Review. The multi-year listing work plan was first developed through an agreement with the plaintiff group WildEarth Guardians and filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on May 10, 2011. On July 12, 2011, the Service reached an agreement with plaintiff Center for Biological Diversity that reinforced the multi-year work plan.
- 2010 On August 4, 2010, the Service announced in the Federal Register a positive 90-day finding on two petitions to list the Mexican wolf as a subspecies. Pursuant to the court-approved settlement agreements, on October 9, 2012, the Service announced a 12-month finding on the two petitions, stating the petitioned action was not warranted because all of the individuals that comprise the petitioned entity already receive the protections of the Endangered Species Act. However, it was also stated that the Service continues to review the appropriate conservation status of all gray wolves that comprise the 1978 gray wolf listing, as revised, and may revise the currently listing based on the outcome of that review.
- 2010 A new Memorandum of Understanding is signed.
- 2010 The Southwest Region initiated the revision of the 1982 Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan. In December 2010, the Service charged a new recovery team with the development of a revised recovery plan for the Mexican wolf. The team includes a Tribal Liaisons Subgroup, Stakeholder Liaisons Subgroup, Agency Liaisons Subgroup, and a Science and Planning Subgroup. When completed and approved by the Service, the plan will include objective and measurable recovery criteria for delisting the Mexican wolf from the List of Threatened and Endangered Wildlife and Plants, management actions that will achieve the criteria, and time and cost estimates for these actions.
- 2010 At year's end, at least 50 wolves in 10 packs are in the wild.
- 2011 In April, the Service appointed an 11-member Interdiction Fund Stakeholder council (ISC), which has the authority to identify, recommend, and approve conservations activities, identify recipients, and approve the amount of the direct disbursement of funds to qualified recipients. In 2011, the ISC developed an interim program to compensate livestock producers for wolf depredations and continued to work on a long-term strategic interdiction plan that focuses more on coexistence than direct compensation for livestock losses.
- 2011 During the year, the Mexican Wolf Recovery Team holds three full-team meetings.
- 2011 At year's end, at least 67 wolves in 11 packs are in the wild.
- 2012 October 9, the Center for Biological Diversity notified the Service of their intent to sue for violations of the Endangered Species Act in connection with the Service's not warranted finding. On December 10,

2012, the Center for Biological Diversity filed a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief challenging the determination made by the Service that listing the Mexican wolf as a subspecies or "distinct population segment" is not warranted. This case was ongoing at the end of 2012.

2012 On November 14, WildEarth Guardians filed a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief to compel the Service to produce documents and records in connection with two Freedom of Information Act requests. This case was ongoing at the end of 2012.

2012 On November 28, the Center for Biological Diversity filed a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief seeking to compel the Service to conclude a formal rulemaking to amend a federal regulation promulgated in 1998 under the Endangered Species Act that governs the Service's Mexican wolf reintroduction program. This case was ongoing at the end of 2012. On December 26, 2012, the Center for Biological Diversity notified the Service of their intent to sue alleging violations of the Endangered Species Act in connection with the renewed and amended Research and Recovery Permit for the Mexican Wolf Recovery Program and the associated Intra-Service Biological and Concurrence Opinion.

2012 At year's end, at least 75 wolves in 13 packs are in the wild.

2013 Service proposes to remove the Gray Wolf from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and maintain protections for the Mexican wolf by listing it as an Endangered subspecies.

2013 The Service proposes a revision to the Nonessential Experimental Population of the Mexican wolf.