

## Martha Hall

I have followed the return of wolves to WA State closely because I have been interested in wildlife and its role in healthy ecosystems all of my life. My favorite activity is hiking where wildlife watching is good. I have also followed WDFW's management of wolves in WA and I tried to participate when the Profanity Peak Pack was killed in 2016. I am very familiar with WAG and non-lethal deterrence measures that work and do not work in WA State. I try to read wolf research and stay informed about what is going on with wolf management in WA State. WDFW should be focused on fixing the problems in the Protocol for Wolf and Livestock Interaction, not post recovery, until it solves the problems in the Kettle Rang. Look at the statistics - of the 30 wolves WDFW has killed, 26 wolves were killed for one rancher, 4 packs, 3 successfully breeding packs, all for one rancher. So far, WDFW has killed all of the wolves who have tried to live on one rancher's 80,000 acres of great wildlife habitat. The draft, revised Protocol doesn't address the problems in the Kettle Range. WDFW and most of the public knows this. Have open houses for us. The public comment period on the Protocol was not well advertised, it happened in the summer when many of us were gone, and it was before the OPT Pack was slaughtered. Let the public comment on the Protocol - we will tell you what is wrong with it. Solve this problem because we are not ready for post wolf recovery until the issues in the Kettle Range are resolved. Start using the "best available science" in the Protocol - for deterrents and for lethal removal. What science supports WDFW's statement that it hopes to "change pack behavior" when it shoots a a wolf or two or more from a helicopter? How does removing most but not all carcasses, some not until they are largely consumed, how does this work as a deterrent? When will ranchers need to document how and when they use deterrents so the public knows if our public money is being spent on something that might work? Instead of worrying about post-recovery, it is obvious that WDFW needs to do a lot more education on how to live with wolves. Wolves are being shot by ranchers and hikers who say they are "afraid", when many other options were open to them - such as leaving the area, using bear spray, and learning the facts about wolf behavior. As a person who spends a lot of time hiking in Yellowstone, I know wolves do not pose a huge danger and I know non-lethal ways to deal with fear like walking away or using bear spray. Hikers in Yellowstone are in grizzly habitat and we aren't shooting anything! How much education has WDFW done in wolf country, and with hikers and ranchers? Is bear pray and teaching its use being promoted as it is in Yellowstone - and Alaska - and Montana with hunters in grizzly country? Finally, when post-recovery is discussed, I hope it is done very differently than the process used for writing Protocols. 1. First and foremost, open up the process to the public and to wolf and livestock experts. WAG is the wrong group to use in this effort. 2. Use the best available science", not science picked by WDFW to support what it wants to do. Open this up to the experts in wolf behavior. Go beyond WDFW and have an unbiased panel of wolf experts 3. Educate the public on the role of apex predators in healthy ecosystems. Hunters and ranchers esp. need to appreciate this. Too many hunters still think they are a good replacement for wild predators. 4. Manage wolves for the 97.58% of the people in WA State who do not buy hunting licenses and probably the large number who do not own ranches. Unfortunately the 2.42 % who hunt dominate WAG as do ranchers. Many if not most people in WA State view WDFW as an agency that serves folks who hunt and fish. For proof, look at the main interests of folks chosen to be on WAG. Thank you for considering my comments.