

Tom Paterson's Written Testimony for the
House Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries
Concerning H.R. 4255 (Rep. Gosar), "*Enhancing Safety for Animals Act of 2025*"
Wednesday, September 3, 2025 at 2:00 p.m.
Longworth House Office Building, Room 1324
Washington, D.C.

My name is Tom Paterson. I grew up along the Arizona and New Mexico state line. My family and I raise cattle in Arizona and New Mexico. Our ranch headquarters is located just inside New Mexico in Catron County. I serve as president-elect of the New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association. I am a long-time member of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, as well as a member of both the National Cattlemen's Beef Association and the national Public Lands Council.

My familiarity with Mexican wolves dates to the initial releases in 1998, the year my wife and daughters and I began building our ranching operation. Wolves have killed our cattle in Arizona and in New Mexico. Wolves have changed our culture. They have changed how we live in wolf country.

Federal efforts under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to recover Mexican wolves now satisfy threshold requirements for delisting: population numbers are robust and there is the necessary genetic diversity to sustain populations into the future. But that progress has come at great cost to the taxpayer and to rural residents, ranchers, outfitters and guides who have been forced to live with an apex predator with few tools to defend ourselves or our livelihoods and with no "finish line" in sight.

My testimony is submitted on behalf of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association and the New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association, in concurrence with the National Cattlemen's Beef Association and the Public Lands Council. It is my experience that farm and livestock groups in these states are aligned in our support of Congressional intervention.

We are grateful to Representative Gosar and the co-sponsors for introducing H.R. 4255 and for the opportunity to share our perspective today.

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the cost to taxpayers to recover the Mexican wolf as of December 31, 2024 was \$74.6 million or \$286,839.16 for each of the 286 wolves it says are now on the landscape.¹ The annual burn rate to pay for this program has exceeded \$5 million in each of the last three years. This subcommittee often hears about the rising costs of conservation and the chronic underfunding of ESA-related activities. It seems clear that the \$15 million spent in the last three years on recovered Mexican wolf populations could be better spent elsewhere.

¹ See Appendix 1.

Wolf management needs the attention of our lawmakers in Congress. We need your action to ensure federal policy does not continue to view rural communities, ranchers, farmers, outfitters, guides, hunters and our visitors as acceptable casualties in efforts to recover a species.

We urge the subcommittee to pass the *Enhancing Safety for Animals Act of 2025*. The findings in section 2 of the bill are spot on. Cattle Growers commend Representative Gosar and all involved for the careful chronicling of the impacts recovery has had on our community. We support those findings. Cattle Growers are united in endorsing the bill to delink recovery of Mexican wolves in the United States from recovery of that apex predator in Mexico. We are further united in endorsing the delisting of Mexican wolves under the ESA.

The Mexican wolf meets the recovery criteria to be delisted.

Recovery of Mexican wolves has clearly met federal recovery thresholds. By the government's own numbers, these wolves are recovered: USFWS recovery plans require an average of at least 320 wolves in the U.S. over an 8-year period, a stable or growing population rate over an eight-year period, and successful integration of captive-bred wolves into wild populations.²

According to USFWS, there were at least 286 Mexican wolves on the landscape as of December 31, 2024.³ Since 2020, the wolf population has increased by 53.8 percent, and we are currently in the ninth consecutive year of population growth across the U.S. range.⁴ USFWS has admitted to us privately over the years that their minimum estimates are understated by at least 10 percent. That puts the number of wolves on the landscape at least at 318 wolves, with a likelihood that populations far exceed this total. Not all wolves are collared. Depredation investigation officers for the U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's (USDA-APHIS) Wildlife Services who work in the field often encounter uncollared wolves in as-yet not documented locations. They put the number of wolves on the landscape significantly higher. Those numbers also don't include the 350 Mexican wolves at more than 60 zoological facilities throughout the U.S. and Mexico, facilities that USFWS admits are at capacity. The genetic diversity requirement for recovery is 22 cross-fostered Mexican wolves surviving to breeding age. There had been 21 such cases as of April 2025. The one remaining should be satisfied this year.

Delayed delisting activity unfairly burdens communities.

No matter how long the wolf is on the endangered species list, it will never be possible to count every wolf to know precisely how many animals are in the area at any given time. The wolves' behavior, however, makes it clear that there are many more animals than have been

² https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Final-Mexican-Wolf-Recovery-Plan-Second-Revision-2022-signed_508-compliant.pdf

³ <https://www.fws.gov/story/counting-mexican-wolves#:~:text=Numbers%20continued%20to%20grow%20in,growth%20in%20the%20wild%20population.&text=The%20most%20recent%20count%20also,first%20year%20is%20around%2050%25..>

⁴ See Appendix 2.

counted. We've long had a livestock crisis with these Mexican wolves. What's relatively new for us is that we now have a public safety crisis. The considerable increase in wolf encounters in our communities makes it clear that being expected to bear this risk with no tools to protect ourselves has become a disaster for the people in Arizona and New Mexico. You will see those real-life stories from the videos posted on WolvesAmongUs.org. They show the reality of what it's like to live and run our businesses among wolves. Mexican wolves stalk our kids and our elderly; they're at our homes and in our school yards. There are elderly people in my community who will no longer walk in the woods because of the wolves. Wolves snatch and kill pets off our front porches and from front yards. They kill our kids' horses.

The increase in human encounters reflects both the increase in the wolf population and the fact that these wolves are habituated to people. Past management practices have directly contributed to wolves becoming habituated to people. They don't fear us. Many were raised in captivity. USFWS feeds wolves at food caches. Problem wolves have rarely been shot or trapped. Rather, they have been hazed or, perhaps a better term is shooed, from one place to a neighbor's place. Because of the ESA listing, there are dire prohibitions on taking Mexican wolves. Whether raised in captivity or not, Mexican wolves rarely suffer any negative consequences from an encounter with humans or our livestock. Accordingly and unlike with other species on the landscape, such as bears, lions, coyotes, elk or deer, they are not afraid of people or our livestock.

The federal government has paid for wolf recovery, but it has not paid the bill for damages resulting from federal recovery. Instead, it has shifted a disproportionate share of those damages to state and local governments and to livestock producers. The damage is extensive. According to USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services, there were more confirmed depredations in Arizona and New Mexico (130) during the first six months of 2025 than there were in all of 2024.⁵ Livestock Demonstration Grant funding for payments to livestock producers in New Mexico in 2025 are anticipated to cover less than one-third of damages on confirmed depredations. The federal government pays no damages for probable depredations, no damages for decreased conception rates, no damages for decreased weaning weights and no damages for active conflict avoidance costs. Payments through the USDA Farm Service Agency's (FSA) Livestock Indemnity Program for missing cattle due to Mexican wolf depredations are estimated to cover only slightly more than half the market value of such cattle. Nor does the federal government reimburse counties that provide for public safety or depredation investigations. That unreimbursed cost to Catron County alone exceeds \$100,000 each year.

And yet, even today and regardless of facts, wolf advocates refuse to acknowledge the problems associated with recovering an apex predator under the ESA. Despite testimony from local residents, some wolf advocacy groups continue to dismiss the safety and economic realities for rural residents. They refuse to admit that wolves have become a public

⁵ See Appendix 3.

safety problem. They won't admit that wolves kill livestock and, if they do, they argue it's the rancher's fault for not being out at dark in rugged, deeply incised, ten to twenty thousand-acre pastures to protect our cattle. They won't admit that wolves kill and displace wildlife, which has a significant impact on the outfitting and guiding economy in rural communities. Some will advocate for coexistence but oppose every intervention that would make any kind of adjustment to the status quo. By their actions and their conduct, these wolf advocates clearly demonstrate that wolf recovery is simply a platform they are using to remove people and our rural communities from the landscape.

Rural families and ranching communities are here to stay. We cannot and will not be driven off our land by the consequences of this program. Although well-funded wolf advocacy organizations have largely controlled the dialogue on Mexican wolves for many years, truth repudiates their message. Public testimony from the people who live among wolves, not those who are bussed in for hearings, shows the outrage. The public is now learning that those who live among wolves never had a choice about wolves being recovered in our backyards. The public is now learning that rural residents' long-standing requests for relief have been soundly ignored. We are saying that rural America and our way of life are not acceptable sacrifices in the pursuit of activists' unrealistic vision of "rewilding" the West.

Ranchers, who are critical to many of our rural economies, are describing to the public how our livelihoods from livestock production are threatened. Louis Sanders on the San Augustin Plains had nine confirmed depredations over five months. Ranchers on the Toriette Allotment had five kills in just one night. On the Centerfire Allotment, 24 depredations threaten that rancher's entire livelihood. Livestock producers cannot sustain these levels of loss and stay in business. And we're not alone: Outfitters and guides are describing how wolves are killing or displacing the elk and deer herds that they and our local businesses depend on for their livelihoods.

As we've endeavored to raise the voice of rural Arizona and New Mexico about Mexican wolves, we've had opposing responses. On the one hand, our public officials and residents have been threatened. The three county commissioners and their families in Catron County have received death threats. Our livestock facilities in eastern Arizona and western New Mexico have been vandalized, including water systems that provide water for wildlife in our incredibly dry states. Most recently, New Mexico Governor Lujan Grisham fired a Game Commissioner, not over a conflict of interest because there was none, but because the Commissioner was committed to making sure rural New Mexico had the opportunity to raise its concerns over Mexican wolves.

On the other hand, however, our state and county political leadership has rallied to express their outrage over the status of Mexican wolf mismanagement. Three counties in eastern Arizona have passed resolutions supporting H.R. 4255, as have political leaders in the Arizona Senate and House. In the wolf's principal range in New Mexico, three counties have passed public safety disaster declarations asking the Governor to provide relief, which to date she has refused. Ten other New Mexico counties and the Alamo Chapter of the Navajo

Nation have passed resolutions in support, declaring that wolf management practices need to change before dispersing wolves pose the same problems for them as they do in Catron, Socorro and Sierra Counties. New Mexico political leaders have added their voice to the outrage.

Perhaps the best summary of the Mexican wolf situation came from the chair of the New Mexico Game Commission during a wolf hearing on April 25. Chair Stump stated, “those who want wolves don’t have them.”

Continuing to link the U.S. and Mexican populations dooms domestic recovery efforts to failure.

Mexican wolves in the United States have reached recovery thresholds. The population objective has been met. The genetic diversity objective has been met. There are only two things standing in the way of a return to successful state management: the recovery plan declares we cannot de-list the Mexican gray wolf in the U.S. until this apex predator is recovered in Mexico. The other is eight years of documented numbers at or exceeding the population threshold and genetic diversity requirements for delisting.

Linking recovery of wolves in the U.S. to successful recovery of wolves in Mexico was a mistake. According to the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish Commissioner Fernando Clemente Jr., at least 70 percent of Mexican wolf habitat today is in Mexico. The USFWS recovery plan requires a documented population of at least 200 wolves, sustained over eight years, in order to meet the U.S. delisting requirement. The best estimates are that Mexico now has less than 20 wolves, and it appears that Mexico has made little investment in recovery, or there is little documented. That reality means that, so long as the tie exists, we will never be able to delist the Mexican wolf in the U.S. Those of us who have had to pay the price for domestic recovery should not be held hostage to the decisions of a foreign government to be able to protect ourselves, our livestock and our ecosystems. H.R.4225 provides the necessary severance.

Second, the recovery plan requires eight years of a population sustained over 320 and sufficient genetic diversity. With nine years already of sustained growth, wolf counts that support the threshold population requirement and regular establishment of captive populations, these requirements are clearly met. We’ve already endured this program for 25 years. For all the reasons I’ve given, we can’t tolerate waiting any longer. In eight years, we will have same issues as we have now, except the taxpayer cost and the damage to rural Arizona and New Mexico will be even greater.

As this subcommittee considers this bill and others, I ask this on behalf of all livestock producers: First, please don’t leave us naked to deal with the aftermath of the public safety, livestock and wildlife disaster the federal government has created with Mexican wolves and other apex predators. Even with delisting, we will face the danger that comes from robust populations of this predator for many years to come. We appreciate the recent provision in the Big, Beautiful Bill that expanded the payment for depredations to 100 percent of the

market cost of the animal if the depredation was caused by federally protected species, but there are so many other impacts that are not the lethal depredations that we find in time to have confirmed.

Second, reforming the process is crucial so that our communities, livestock producers, outfitters and guides are not burdened for years and years by delayed delisting of a recovered species. The process should work for imperiled species, communities, and for the American taxpayer.

Breely Green, a 12-year-old from Quemado, New Mexico who was stalked by a Mexican wolf, made the severity of the situation before you all too clear: She asked, “When did Mexican wolves become more important than I am?” To that we must all respond, “No, Breely. They are not.” Rural Arizona and New Mexico will not allow wolves to continue to threaten our people or our livelihoods. For 25 years, rural families in Arizona and New Mexico have borne the cost of a national experiment on Mexican wolves. The reality of that experiment has devastated our communities. H.R. 4255 is overdue. We urge you. Pass this bill.

Thank you, Representative Gosar, Chairwoman Hageman, and members of the Subcommittee.

Mexican Wolf Recovery Program Estimated Funds Expended by Primary Agencies for Mexican Wolf Recovery and Management

(Revised: December 31, 2024)

This summary provides the best-available information on costs to date of the primary agencies involved in Mexican wolf recovery and management: Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD), New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), U.S.D.A.-APHIS Wildlife Services (APHIS/WS), U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and White Mountain Apache Tribe (WMAT). Since WMAT only expends Mexican wolf funds received from USFWS, their costs are included in the USFWS cost column. From June 2011 to November 2019, the New Mexico State Game Commission directed the NMDGF to suspend all participation in Mexican wolf reintroduction, thus the lack of costs displayed during that time.

This is not an exact accounting of actual costs of the subject activities. It is simply the best-available estimate. If a more exact accounting is required, please contact the specific agency of interest.

Several cautionary notes should be kept in mind about the estimates provided herein:

1. The figures contained herein are estimated costs, not exact expenditure figures. Exact expenditure figures cannot be generated because:
 - a. Cost accounting systems for these agencies are not sufficient to provide exact figures, especially for pre-1997 years; and
 - b. The reporting periods (Fiscal Years) differ among these agencies (State Fiscal Years end on June 30; Federal Fiscal Years end on September 30), and neither the cost accounting system records nor project staff historical recollections are sufficient to prevent redundancies among the estimates. However, we estimate that actual costs probably do not exceed the estimates reported herein by more than 10% in any given area and are probably less than 2% overall.

Estimated Primary Agency Costs of Mexican Wolf Recovery and Management
 Caution: See Page 1 (Introduction) and Page 3 (Endnotes) for information essential to understanding the limitations of the information provided below. The costs reported herein are “best possible” estimates, not exact figures.

This summary¹ begins with 1977 because, to the best of our knowledge, no records (not even estimates) exist for prior years.

Fiscal Year	AGFD State ²	AGFD Federal ³	NMDGF State ⁴	NMDG F Federal ⁵	USD A FS ⁶	USD A WS ⁷	USFWS ⁸	Total
77 – 90 ⁹	25,800	14,100	0	0	0	0	55,000	94,900
91	15,888	26,664	0	0	0	0	2,000	44,552
92	14,046	25,038	0	0	0	0	100,000	139,084
93	17,133	25,599	0	0	1,000	0	125,000	168,732
94	22,250	44,250	0	0	3,000	0	150,000	219,500
95	63,633	35,680	0	0	3,000	0	435,000	537,313
96	12,967	22,102	0	0	3,500	0	479,000	517,569
97	4,750	750	0	0	3,500	0	433,000	442,000
98	60,632	25,797	0	0	3,000	0	489,700	579,129
99	36,094	100,100	9,301	0	10,000	0	581,750	737,235
00	50,896	139,513	20,632	0	11,500	0	744,187	966,728
01	56,500	168,711	15,040	0	13,500	0	936,589	1,190,340
02	53,000	161,277	19,753	0	7,000	0	781,223	1,022,253
03	110,000	188,163	21,685	0	12,500	150,000	819,977	1,302,325
04	174,357	210,135	20,080	0	62,500	150,000	833,790	1,450,862
05	279,942	312,246	26,612	0	142,500	150,000	1,057,000	1,968,300
06	378,975	327,340	42,524	0	62,500	150,000	1,117,000	2,078,339
07	363,542	304,463	72,470	80,774	66,000	150,000	1,264,000	2,301,249
08	399,855	363,632	75,366	161,954	100,000	150,000	1,206,159	2,456,966
09	117,973	124,123	88,286	176,531	147,500	150,000	1,609,795	2,414,208
10	127,685	204,605	36,734	148,079	137,500	150,000	1,649,546	2,454,149
11	116,705	179,192	53,918	243,267	181,500	150,000	1,882,508	2,807,090
12	105,623	316,868	0	0	191,250	150,000	2,133,861	2,897,602
13	126,776	312,000	0	0	159,750	150,000	2,019,795	2,768,321
14	163,311	234,641	0	0	148,000	119,012	2,157,988	2,822,952
15	12,330	411,368	0	0	158,500	100,000	2,278,815	2,961,013
16	212,763	503,255	0	0	153,500	125,000	2,261,927	3,256,445
17	300,598	558,254	0	0	166,208	125,000	2,494,388	3,644,448

18	146,642	586,569	0	0	161,200	119,813	2,463,677	3,477,901
19	238,834	116,339	0	0	178,200	138,440	2,448,077	3,119,890
20	26,000	375,000	30,000	0	178,200	348,568	2,743,405	3,701,173
21	34,928	370,055	58,859	176,576	147,917	365,000	2,813,780	3,967,115
22	135,000	422,578	78,503	235,511	260,696	375,000	3,649,996	5,157,284
23	110,000	432,247	107,659	322,998	\$276,918	685,000	3,648,237	5,583,059
24	97,928	267,450	156,866	470,597	272,741	702,000	3,400,000	5,367,582
Total	4,213,356	7,910,104	934,288	2,016,287	3,424,580	4,852,833	51,266,479	74,617,927

¹ This Summary supersedes all previous versions. The costs outlined herein (especially for the early years), are simply “best estimates.” See Endnotes below for additional comments regarding information in this Table.

² “AGFD State” includes all AGFD funds other than those received from Federal sources.

³ “AGFD Federal” includes all funds expended by AGFD that were of Federal origin via ESA Section 6, Pittman- Robertson, Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program, State Wildlife Grants, and/or contract with USFS, or another Federal agency. It does not include USFWS Mexican Wolf Recovery Program contract funds conveyed to AGFD from FY98 onward (all of which are included in the USFWS column in this Table, to avoid duplication) are as follows: FY98 \$400; FY99 \$88,100; FY00 \$126,513; FY01 \$152,711; FY02 \$146,277; FY03 \$162,623; FY04 \$189,795; FY05 \$0 (zero); FY06 \$175,000; FY07 \$170,398; FY08 \$207,500; FY09 \$225,000; FY10 \$133,000; FY11 \$165,000; FY12 \$165,000; FY13 \$165,000; FY14 \$165,000; FY15 \$165,000; FY16 \$165,000; FY17 \$255,000; FY18 \$233,328; FY19 \$246,672; FY20 \$165,000; FY21 \$165,000; FY22 \$240,000; FY23 \$240,000; and FY24 \$240,000

⁴ “NMDGF State” includes all NM funds other than those received from Federal sources.

⁵ “NMDGF Federal” includes all funds expended by NMDGF that were of Federal origin via ESA Section 6 and State Wildlife Grants. Prior to FY07, all Federal Funds received by NMDGF were USFWS Mexican Wolf Recovery Program contract funds. USFWS Mexican Wolf Recovery Program contract funds conveyed to NMDGF from FY98 onward (all of which are included in the USFWS Federal Funds column in this Table, to avoid duplication) are as follows: FY98 \$0; FY99 \$27,903; FY00 \$61,895; FY01 \$45,120; FY02 \$59,258; FY03 \$65,053; FY04 \$60,240; FY05 \$79,835; FY06 \$127,571; FY07 \$69,244; FY08 \$100,000; FY09 \$100,000; and FY10 \$145,000.

⁶ “USFS” cost figures through 2002 are estimates generated in April 2003. USFS costs are for the Apache- Sitgreaves National Forests (Alpine, Black Mesa, Clifton, and Springerville Ranger Districts), Cibola National Forest (Magdalena Ranger District), and the Gila National Forest (Black Range, Glenwood, Quemado, Reserve, and Wilderness Ranger District).

⁷ “USDA WS” cost figures through 2012 represent directed Congressional allocations specifically for wolf work in AZ-NM. It does not include USFWS Mexican Wolf Recovery Program contract funds conveyed to USDA WS, which are as follows: FY18 \$9999.99; FY19 \$75,000; FY22 \$30,000; FY23 \$30,000; and FY24 \$30,000.

⁸ “USFWS” cost figures are for the Service’s Mexican Wolf Recovery Program only, and (from FY98 onward) include all funds conveyed by contract to AGFD (ongoing), NMDGF (terminated with FY11) USDA WS (terminated with FY03) and WMAT (ongoing) for work in recovery and management of Mexican wolves and to SCAT for wolf-related activities that are not part of the Reintroduction Project (i.e. SCAT is not a Signatory Partner in Mexican wolf recovery and management and Tribal Council policy requires immediate removal of any Mexican wolf present on the San Carlos Apache Reservation).

⁹ FY77-90 “USFWS” is an estimate of the total funds expended from Federal FY77 through FY90. USFWS does not have a per-year estimate for that period.

Appendix 2 (source: US Fish and Wildlife Service,
https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-05/mexican-wolf-population-statistics-population-estimate-508_0.pdf)

Mexican Wolf Population Statistics

Minimum population estimate, minimum breeding pair estimate,
and population estimate numbers per state 1998 - 2023

Data current as of December 31, 2023

Year	Minimum Population Estimate	Arizona Population Estimate	New Mexico Population Estimate	Breeding Pair Estimate
1998	4	4	0	0
1999	15	9	6	3
2000	22	15	7	1
2001	26	21	4	1
2002	41	34	7	5
2003	55	42	13	3
2004	44-48	26	18	6
2005	35-49	24	18	5
2006	59	25	34	6
2007	52	29	23	3
2008	52	29	23	2
2009	42	27	15	2
2010	50	29	21	2
2011	67	32	35	7
2012	80	37	43	3
2013	88	40	48	5
2014	112	58	54	9
2015	98	50	48	7
2016	114	64	50	13
2017	117	63	54	12
2018	131	64	67	15
2019	163	76	87	19
2020	186	72	114	20
2021	196	84	112	25
2022	242	105	137	31
2023	257	113	144	26

Notes: From 1998 through 2014, a Breeding Pair (per the 1998 final 10j rule) is defined as an adult male and an adult female that have produced at least two pups during the previous breeding season that survived until December 31 of the year of their birth. From 2015 through 2022, a Breeding Pair (per the 2015 final 10j rule) is defined as a pack that consists of an adult male and female and at least one pup of the year surviving through December 31. In some years (prior to 2015), at least one operational breeding pair was documented in the Blue Range Wolf Population. **The operational breeding pair is not represented in the Breeding Pair Estimate listed above.** An operational breeding pair is defined as an adult male and an adult female that have produced at least two pups during the previous breeding season and which survived until December 31 of the year of their birth, despite the loss and replacement of at least one biological parent of the offspring. This is a modification of the "Breeding pair" definition per the 1998 final 10j rule, to include pairs where

alphas (one or both breeding adults in a pack) have been replaced but are functioning as a biological unit with a high probability of breeding success in the subsequent year (USFWS 2008).

For additional information about operational breeding pairs and years with ranges of numbers (2004-2005), see the annual reports.

Mexican Wolf Population Statistics

Mexican wolf reproduction and recruitment 1998 - 2023.

Data Current as of December 31, 2023

Year	Population Estimate	Reproduction	Pup Recruitment
1998	4	1	0
1999	15	18	11
2000	22	7	5
2001	26	5	3
2002	41	21	20
2003	55	22	21
2004	44-48	22	17-19
2005	35-49	28-32	10-17
2006	59	31-32	21
2007	52	27	9
2008	52	18	11
2009	42	31	7
2010	50	18	14
2011	67	40	27
2012	80	29	23
2013	88	30	19
2014	112	46	40
2015	98	42	23
2016	114	65	50
2017	117	54	29
2018	131	81	47
2019	163	90	52
2020	186	124	64
2021	196	144	56
2022	242	121	81
2023	257	141	86

Notes: Reproduction is defined as the maximum number of pups documented throughout the year
Pup Recruitment is defined as the number of pups documented surviving at years' end.
For additional information about years with ranges of numbers (2004, 2005, 2006), see the annual reports.

Appendix 3
APHIS/Wildlife Services
Mexican Wolf Depredation Investigations
January 1, 2015-June 30, 2025

Determinations Arizona							
Year	Confirmed	Probable	Injured	Possible	Other	Unknown	Total
2015	13	1	0	0	1	1	16
2016	25	0	0	0	6	5	36
2017	16	3	1	0	10	10	40
2018	26	2	1	0	11	4	44
2019	54	0	2	0	5	4	65
2020	56	4	2	0	12	22	96
2021	55	1	9	0	9	21	95
2022	50	5	11	2	27	55	150
2023	37	0	7	0	15	55	114
2024	23	3	5	0	31	61	123
2025*	31	0	13	0	15	19	78
Total	386	19	51	2	142	257	857

*January 1, 2025 through June 30,2025

Determinations	New Mexico						
<i>Year</i>	Confirmed	Probable	Injured	Possible	Other	Unknown	Total
2015	29	1	8	0	1	2	41
2016	25	2	1	0	2	10	40
2017	18	3	0	0	0	3	24
2018	66	7	2	0	14	8	97
2019	117	6	4	0	0	1	128
2020	88	1	14	0	6	20	129
2021	90	1	0	0	8	19	118
2022	92	6	15	5	9	17	144
2023	82	13	11	1	20	25	152
2024	77	29	20	0	25	17	168
2025*	89	17	8	0	14	25	153
Total	773	86	83	6	99	147	1,194

*January 1, 2025 through June 30,2025

Source: APHIS/Wildlife Services, August 1, 2025