

## Will Watson

My fellow Oregon forest defenders always point to Washington's forest practices as examples of progressive policymaking, but your wolf policies are not in the same category. It seems impossible that Washington now appears to have a smaller wolf population than Oregon, given that wolves have only been reestablished here for about a decade, but this is almost certainly the case. Now there are powerful interests demanding that Washington must give greater latitude for wolf killing even after federal delisting has increased the likelihood of sanctioned kills. This is unbelievable! Ostensibly, new, more liberal, killing guidelines will respond to increased cattle kills, but the USDA's census of stock losses consistently attribute less than 1% of stock kills to wolves. Washington's post-delisting wolf policy should balance this miniscule loss against the absolutely vital role of healthy wolf populations in creating resilient wild lands and all the essential ecosystem services that those wild lands provide: clean water and air, healthy fish and game populations and on and on, as the Yellowstone experience has made clear. The need for healthy wildlands has become even more pressing in the age of climate disruption, bigger, hotter wildfires and longer fire seasons. I implore the governor and his administration to protect wolves in the aftermath of delisting and not give in to shortsighted and anachronistic calls for a return to the ecodical wolf killing practices of a century ago, the sorts of practices that precipitated the current, ongoing ecological crisis. Washington needs wolves to be the best it can be, as do Oregon Idaho, Montana and all the western states. Do the right thing by wolves, and you do the right thing for the human future too. We need, as Thoreau had it, the tonic of wildness that wolves provide. Thanks for your attention to my comments. WLW