For this work sample you will be reading two articles about wolf reintroduction in Oregon. The authors have opposing views about wolves being in Oregon.

**Taking the Bite Out of Wolf Reintroduction**  
*Bill Hoyt, President, Oregon Cattlemen’s Association, 2010*

Today Oregonians face the coming of the Canadian gray wolf -- an icon to some, a threat to others. Whatever the view, it's clear that wolves must be dealt with and the conflicts they create must be addressed.

The Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan is currently up for review, and the Oregon Cattlemen's Association seeks reasonable adjustments to it. Many new issues have arisen since the plan's inception five years ago, but one thing remains constant: Ranchers have a great need to protect their livestock. OCA members seek the same types of management tools provided to ranchers in Idaho and other states that have experienced successful wolf reintroductions. They also seek a fair and equitable compensation plan that takes into account unconfirmed kills.

Ranchers care deeply for their livestock. They fight tooth and nail to keep them alive every day from birth. It’s difficult for a rancher to do nothing when a wolf is threatening his livestock. Wolves are prolific predators, hard to manage and not efficient killers like cougars, which keep bloodshed to a minimum and kill quickly. Wolves often leave their victims partially consumed before the animals finally die of blood loss or violent injuries.

Ranchers have never been against a diverse wildlife population. In fact, ranchers
are proud to be the last and best bastions of open spaces, rangelands and forest. We help ensure that Oregon's natural landscapes remain unbroken and pristine, and that the state's wildlife have a home. The Oregon Departments of Agriculture and Fish & Wildlife estimate that Oregon's ranchers provide habitat for more than 70 percent of the state's wild animals. This ensures ongoing -- and often unnoticed -- protection of forage, water and large expanses of land.

Ranchers are not only concerned about wolf-livestock conflict, but also about the diversity of Oregon's wildlife. Elk, deer and antelope suffer extreme impacts when wolves are not adequately managed. In one Idaho elk management zone, elk populations have declined 85 percent, from 9,729 in 1994 (pre-wolf) to 1,473 in 2010. The sad tale of what has happened in other states' ungulate* herds is an unintended consequence of an agenda that favors wolves at the expense of ungulate herds, sportsmen, hunters, pets, farmers, ranchers and local communities.

In a survey by Defenders of Wildlife, more than half of respondents said wolves should be recovered to some level; however, 90 percent said ranchers should not bear the brunt of costs for wolf recovery. That sentiment cannot be ignored.

Oregon's natural landscape is a wondrous and diverse place, home to hundreds of animal species. Working in this environment is both a challenge and a privilege for our ranching community. Name-calling does nothing to address serious impacts caused by wolves to communities, wildlife and agriculture. It also fails to provide solutions. It simply fosters discord and polarization. The time for rhetoric has passed. It's time to engage in a more meaningful approach to resolving issues Oregonians face.

**Learning to Live with Wolves**  
_Kate Ritley, Executive Director, Cascadia Wildlands, 2011_

My great-grandfather homesteaded in eastern Oregon back in the days when wolf packs roamed the range. By the time his son -- my grandfather -- claimed a homestead, wolves were gone. Bounty hunters and settlers, perhaps including members of my family, had shot, trapped and poisoned Oregon's gray wolves to extinction.

Now, after a 60-year absence, wolves are mounting a historic comeback across our state. In 2009 several wolves, descendents of wolves reintroduced to the Rockies in the mid-1990s, wandered from Idaho into Oregon. Today three packs, comprised of two dozen wolves, live in northeast Oregon. For the first time in decades my relatives must readapt to the reality of ranching with wolves on the range.

*Ungulate: A hoofed mammal.
But what does this look like where the rubber meets the road? What is different about living and ranching in a state with wolves? Can we coexist with another top-of-the-food-chain species? The decisions we make today will determine the answers to these questions.

One thing I know is that Oregon ranchers are some of the most determined and resilient folks on earth. Given practical guidelines and the proper tools, Oregon livestock producers can take proactive steps and successfully protect their livestock from wolves. In fact, some ranchers have already started the transition to wolf-compatible livestock practices.

Over the past month, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been outfitting ranchers with electric flagging to string around livestock pens near wolf packs. This proactive measure, which shocks wolves if they try to enter a livestock pen and teaches them to stay away, has been an effective deterrent to wolves in the Rockies, the Great Lakes and Europe for years.

In neighboring Idaho, Lava Lake Lamb has experimented with tools to safeguard flocks in an area prolific with wolves. Lava Lake has adopted wolf-compatible ranching practices, from range riders patrolling the range on horseback to carefully disposing of bones and animal parts, and the operation has nearly eliminated livestock losses to wolves. The company, which has won multiple awards for its business practices, provides an excellent model for livestock producers in Oregon.

Inevitably, there will be some conflicts between wolves and livestock in the state. But through these proven, proactive measures we can reduce these conflicts, ease the transition for wolves into Oregon, and all the while protect livestock and livelihoods.

I encourage the Oregon Legislature to approve a plan to compensate responsible ranchers for livestock lost to wolves, particularly ranchers who have taken proactive measures to protect their livestock from conflict ahead of time.

But I vehemently oppose several bills currently being considered in the Legislature that would strip protection for wolves and encourage ranchers to protect their livestock with guns rather than preventive, proactive measures. These bills completely undermine the science and stakeholder support behind Oregon's current Wolf Management Plan. I shudder to think Oregon could regress to the days of wolf hunts before wolves even have a foot in the door.

Our generation of Oregonians has the opportunity to redefine our relationship with wolves. Will we be proactive and learn to coexist with this species, or will Oregon say goodbye to gray wolves for good?
Demonstrate Understanding
1. In the chart below identify **two** facts and **two** opinions from these articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facts</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demonstrate Understanding
2. According to the articles, the authors agree and disagree about several issues concerning wolves. Fill out the diagram below to show your understanding of what the authors believe.

Bill Hoyt believes:  
Kate Riley believes:  

They both believe
Develop an Interpretation

3. Bill Hoyt, President of the Oregon Cattlemen’s Association and Kate Ritley, Executive Director of Cascadia Wildlands have different viewpoints on this topic, but both represent specific groups of people. How do you think their jobs shape their opinions about wolves?

Develop an Interpretation

4. Which author is more effective in convincing you of their point of view? Why? Use evidence from the article to support your opinion.
**Analyze Text**

5. Authors use many techniques such as expert testimony, scientific evidence and personal stories to add credibility to their writing. Identify one technique from each article and explain how it adds credibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author’s Technique</th>
<th>How it adds credibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Article #1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Article #2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVER**
Analyze Text
6. Both authors use loaded words to persuade you to empathize with their side of the argument. Pick **two** examples from each article and explain what the author wants you to feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loaded Words (Article #1)</th>
<th>How the author wants you to feel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loaded Words (Article #2)</th>
<th>How the author wants you to feel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>