

## Wolf Reintroduction Scenarios Pro and Con Chart

Scenarios	Pro	Con	\$ for Livestock Loss
<p><b>Scenario 1:</b> <b>Reintroduction of experimental populations of wolves</b></p> <p>The designation “experimental wolves” gives the people who manage wolf populations more freedom in decision making and gives the wolves less protection.</p>	<p>In this scenario, wolves get reintroduced and that could mean better health of the park’s ecosystem as it is restored to a more natural state with a top predator to check the population growth of elk and other animals</p> <p>If wolves are designated as experimental, decision-makers have more freedom in figuring out how to deal with problem wolves that kill livestock. Wolves in the act of wounding or killing livestock on private land could be killed by livestock owners.</p> <p>Under this scenario, any wolf presenting a threat to human life or safety would be removed from the wild.</p>	<p>The experimental designation doesn’t protect wolves as much as it could. If people think the wolves are trouble, it seems that they could be removed. The people in charge of wolf management would constantly have to evaluate claims of livestock interference and make difficult decisions about the wolves.</p> <p>The private fund for livestock loss compensation might not have enough money to adequately compensate owners. Additionally, it may be hard to prove that wolves killed the livestock.</p> <p>This scenario will probably be met with resistance from portions of the public who are concerned about the wolves interfering with their homes and livestock.</p> <p>People against wolf reintroduction may argue that there’s no data that proves wolf reintroduction will benefit the park and the risk to their livelihoods is too great to try it.</p>	Private fund
<p><b>Scenario 2:</b> <b>Natural recovery (no action taken or current management strategy)</b></p> <p>Encourage wolf populations to naturally expand into Idaho and Yellowstone</p>	<p>This solution is a “business as usual” approach that may appeal to people who don’t want wolves to be introduced because of threats to their livelihood.</p> <p>People who are opposed to more human interference may prefer this scenario.</p>	<p>The scenario makes it sound like the expectation is that wolves will “naturally” expand. But it seems that if wolves have been gone from the park since the mid 1900’s, then it’s not likely that they will naturally come back.</p> <p>Additionally, this scenario doesn’t make any provisions to protect wolves, so if they did return, they might not be able to establish a population large enough to make any difference in the Yellowstone ecosystem.</p>	Private fund

Scenarios	Pro	Con	\$ for Livestock Loss
<p><b>Scenario 3: No wolves</b></p> <p>Change laws in order to prevent wolf recovery. Congress would pass legislation to remove wolves in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho from the list of Endangered Species.</p>	<p>This scenario provides the greatest protection to livestock owners since existing wolves that interfere with animals could be killed.</p> <p>The lack of a top predator (the wolf) would mean more game animals like elk for hunting.</p> <p>More hunters could also mean an increase in tourism to the area as hunters might be invited in to help cull the elk herds. States may generate money through the sales of hunting licenses.</p>	<p>The states of ID, MT, and WY would remove wolves from the protection of state law. Unregulated killing of wolves by the public would prevent wolf recovery.</p> <p>No wolves in Yellowstone means continued pressure on the ecosystem from grazers like elk. Top predators keep other populations healthy by culling the old, sick, and/or weak animals.</p> <p>The Fish and Wildlife service would stop all funding toward wolf management, education, research, and control (this could also be a pro since it saves money).</p> <p>Changing laws to prevent wolf recovery could make it even harder to revisit this issue in the future.</p>	<p>No compensation</p>
<p><b>Scenario 4: Local wolf management committee</b></p> <p>Turn wolf recovery management over to individual states and limit federal government involvement. Local approach vs. national issue.</p>	<p>Under this approach, the federal government would not be “interfering” with local problems.</p> <p>The local wolf management committee would be more aware of local issues and could make decisions based on local concerns, rather than having people in Washington, DC, who might be out of touch, making the rules.</p>	<p>It’s feared that a local committee would side with livestock owners and that could lead to mismanagement and perhaps the extermination of wolves that were reintroduced.</p> <p>Taxpayers may not appreciate their tax dollars being used to pay for the livestock losses of ranchers.</p> <p>The park’s lands lay in 3 different states – MT, ID, and WY. With 3 different committees making management decisions, it’s possible the decisions could contradict each other and the wolves would face different types of protection as they move to different areas of the park.</p>	<p>Federal fund (taxpayer dollars)</p>
<p><b>Scenario 5: Reintroduction of non-experimental wolves</b></p> <p>By designating the wolves as “non-experimental” they are given much more protection.</p>	<p>This scenario gives wolves the most protection because “problem” wolves that interfere with livestock could not be eliminated.</p> <p>Key wolf habitat would be protected at all costs.</p>	<p>This scenario does the least to address concerns about wolf interference to livestock because there would be no wolf control of wolves that impact livestock.</p> <p>If the communities around Yellowstone don’t support this, there is concern that wolves may be killed out of protest.</p> <p>People against wolf reintroduction may argue that there’s no data that proves wolf reintroduction will benefit the park and the risk to their livelihoods is too great to try it.</p>	<p>Private fund</p>

## **USFWS Employee Prompt Card for Public Meeting**

Hello everyone and thank you for coming today. The Fish and Wildlife Service has convened this meeting to hear the public opinion regarding the 5 scenarios we are proposing regarding wolf reintroduction to Yellowstone. You have been invited because you represent a diverse group of Americans who have varied interests with regard to the reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone National Park.

As a reminder, the following scenarios are being examined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- Scenario 1: **Reintroduction of experimental** populations of wolves. The designation “experimental wolves” gives the people who manage wolf populations more freedom in decision making and gives the wolves less protection.
- Scenario 2: **Natural recovery** (no action taken). Encourage wolf populations to naturally expand into Idaho and Yellowstone.
- Scenario 3: **No wolves**. Change laws in order to prevent wolf recovery.
- Scenario 4: **Local wolf management committee**. Turn wolf recovery management over to individual states and limit federal government involvement.
- Scenario 5: **Reintroduction of non-experimental** wolves. By designating the wolves as “non-experimental” they are given much more protection.

It is our goal to hear your concerns and try to come up with a solution that will help protect your interests and balance the needs of the Yellowstone ecosystem.

Let’s begin the forum by going around the circle and having each one of you introduce yourselves by stating your name and your role in the community. Then state which scenario you support and explain why you support it. Also express any concerns you may have about other scenarios.

After everyone has spoken, we will open up the discussion for clarifying questions from members of the public and from USFWS employees who may want to better understand your concerns.

During this meeting USFWS employees will be observing and making notes on your concerns for use in their deliberation.

Please remember to be courteous to each other and to respect each other’s opinions even if they are vastly different from your own. Yelling, arguing, and emotional outbursts are grounds for dismissal from this public forum.

Thank you and let’s begin. (Choose a member of the public to begin).

**Part 2: Wolf Reintroduction Scenarios Matrix**

	<b>Scenario #1: Reintroduction of experimental wolves</b>	<b>Scenario #2: Natural recovery</b>	<b>Scenario #3: No wolves – wolf prevention</b>	<b>Scenario #4: Local wolf management committee</b>	<b>Scenario #5: Reintroduction of non- experimental wolves</b>
Ecosystem Services					
Constraints					

### **Tourist**

I've never seen a wolf before; I think I'd make a special trip to YNP just to see wolves! I'd bring my whole family and make a vacation out of it.



© Blake Gordon for The Nature Conservancy

### **Rancher #2**

I don't think that people who aren't from this area should have a say in the matter. They don't know what's going on, they aren't familiar with the land, and they don't understand how it will impact our way of life.



© Ami Vitale for The Nature Conservancy

### **Rancher #1**

If wolves are released in YNP, very few people are ever going to see them and landowners and ranchers would continuously have to deal with wolves killing their livestock. If wolves are introduced, I feel like the federal government should compensate me for any livestock losses due to wolves.



© Ami Vitale for The Nature Conservancy

### **Hunter #1**

I think the people that want to introduce wolves to the park are the same people that want to ban hunting, trapping, fishing, and other recreational activities. Eliminating livestock from public lands is just one more thing they want to take away. I can't get behind this.



© Simon Williams for The Nature Conservancy

### Hunter #2

I'm concerned that if wolves are reintroduced to the park, the big game like elk and other species that I hunt will be killed off by the wolves and there won't be anything left for me to hunt.



© Janet Haas for The Nature Conservancy

### Scientist #1

The ecosystem of YNP has been so degraded in the absence of wolves, wolf reintroduction is necessary if we are ever going to restore the park. If ranchers don't properly manage their animals, it's not taxpayers' responsibility to compensate them for their losses.



© Janet Haas for The Nature Conservancy

### Homeowner

I'm afraid that wolves will leave the park and kill my dogs and cats. I'm also worried that my life and my children's lives will be endangered by the addition of wolves to the park. What's to stop them from attacking my family?



Adrian Moy via Flickr Creative Commons

### Citizen

Public land is for everyone and everyone deserves a say in what happens on that land. Western ranchers have grazed on federal lands for years. Since we taxpayers are subsidizing the livestock industry, we should have the right to demand that the wolves be part of the landscape.



© Dylan Rorabaugh for The Nature Conservancy

### U.S. Government Official

A private program exists that can pay ranchers for livestock losses due to wolf predation. The U.S. government should not compensate for livestock losses due to wildlife.



© Breana Taylor for The Nature Conservancy

### Local Restaurant Owner

I'm really excited about the idea of reintroduction of wolves. My business could really benefit from having more tourists in the park.



Holly Hayes via Flickr Creative Commons

### Nez Perce Tribe Member

I'm concerned that by reintroducing wolves to the park, the status of the naturally occurring populations of wolves will be in jeopardy. For example, if hunting the introduced wolves is a management strategy, will the safety of the native wolves be in jeopardy?



© Janet Haas for The Nature Conservancy

### Scientist #2

Wolves were once part of this ecosystem. Until we can bring the wolves back, the ecosystem of Yellowstone will always be disturbed. Wolves aren't going to come back to the park on their own, or they would have done so already.



© Dylan Rorabaugh for The Nature Conservancy

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Employee**



My job is to listen impartially to those who will be affected by the proposed scenarios regarding reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone and to make an informed decision that will be the best for maintaining biodiversity and providing the most ecosystem services for humans.

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Employee**



My job is to listen impartially to those who will be affected by the proposed scenarios regarding reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone and to make an informed decision that will be the best for maintaining biodiversity and providing the most ecosystem services for humans.

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Employee**



My job is to listen impartially to those who will be affected by the proposed scenarios regarding reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone and to make an informed decision that will be the best for maintaining biodiversity and providing the most ecosystem services for humans.

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Employee**



My job is to listen impartially to those who will be affected by the proposed scenarios regarding reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone and to make an informed decision that will be the best for maintaining biodiversity and providing the most ecosystem services for humans.