

Part 2: Wolf Reintroduction Scenarios Matrix

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

Scenarios	Pro	Con	\$ for Livestock Loss
<p>Scenario 3: No wolves</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>Scenario 4: Local wolf management committee</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>Scenario 5: Reintroduction of non-experimental wolves</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>

Wolf Reintroduction Scenarios Pro and Con Chart

Scenarios	Pro	Con	\$ for Livestock Loss
<p>Scenario 1: Reintroduction of experimental populations of wolves</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>Scenario 2: Natural recovery (no action taken or current management strategy)</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