

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB SITE AND PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 26,2010		
Comment	Name	Follow-up
<p>The Policy does not give residents of Broomfield a clear picture of what to do when rabbits are killing their grass and plants. The residents in the Forest View St. and Choke Cherry area (Brandywine subdivision) have a rabbit problem and are asking for the city to assist in solving this problem. Please provide clear directions for us. Should we contact Animal Control?</p>	Citizen 1	Information regarding appropriate contacts (CDOW and Broomfield Wildlife Masters) was provided via email.
<p>I read the entire policy and find that is thorough, clear, and well written. I like living in Colorado because we do have nature at our door step. I find it frustrating when someone moves here from an urban center, such as New York City or Los Angeles, and act like someone left the gate open at the zoo. The policy reads that in all negative human encounters the animal will be destroyed (coyotes). There is no language in the policy, but am I safe to assume that someone that makes frequent complaints would be investigated for validity of complaints? I've met people on walks who just want the animals removed, irregardless of whether or not any interaction occurred. I find that sad. Your suggestions for preventing habituation are good. Those that live in HOA neighborhoods will find it more difficult to coexist where most don't allow fencing.</p>	Citizen 2	Information regarding how complaints are investigated to obtain a full explanation of the event was provided via email.
<p>We've read the draft policy and it seems relatively complete. However, we have two points of concern for which we'd like a response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We paid over \$600,000 for our home, \$40,000 for our landscaping (which includes a fence), and nearly \$7,000 in property taxes, yet our dog, in his fenced yard, is considered an unattended animal and is part of the food chain for coyotes in Broomfield. As your policy states, "there are few predators to the coyote in Colorado." That means that the coyote is at the top of the food chain, doesn't it? Isn't that absurd? We honestly can't get our brains around the fact that coyotes have more rights than our domesticated animals or our children. • Why haven't I heard about the coyote attacks on humans before this email from a neighbor in Wildgrass? We read the Broomfield Enterprise regularly and haven't seen anything. In fact, a Google search doesn't even turn up any 	Citizen 3 and Citizen 4	Information on coexistence guidelines provided regarding coyotes and dogs. Citizen recognized that the Policy refers to coyote attacks in 2009 and not 2010.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB SITE AND PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 26,2010

Comment	Name	Follow-up
<p>information about the 2010 attacks in Broomfield. Isn't it part of the plan to alert residents when an attack occurs? Again, seems foolish that coyotes are more protected than humans and domesticated animals in Broomfield. Why weren't we alerted? (Our daughter stands at the bus stop early in the morning where we've seen coyotes running in the evening. Is she safe?)</p>		
<p>I read the draft plan and there are many things I like about it. It is very well written and informative. I like that it emphasizes coexistence, education, appreciation and practical measures to solve problems. I have a concern, however, about emphasizing outdoor lights because they can impact light pollution, enjoyment of the night sky, bother neighbors and some wildlife species. I wonder if this recommendation is effective and warranted. The effect of light on species like insects and frogs could be included to reduce outdoor lighting and better protect these species. I notice that you did say motion sensitive lights but perhaps you could explain why.</p>	<p>Citizen 5</p>	<p>Policy amended to state "Use a flashlight or turn on your porch light at night so you can check to make sure that your yard does not have an unexpected wildlife visitor before stepping outside with your pet on a leash. Section 3.3. Response via email.</p>
<p>You seem to have a good draft in production. I have a question regarding Canada geese. Does the city still employ the gentleman who has a dog which "shoos" away the geese from the pond near the library? That appeared to be a good, if not permanent, at least temporary solution.</p>	<p>Citizen 6</p>	<p>Policy amended to note that Broomfield does have a geese dog hazing program in Section 5.1. Response via email.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB SITE AND PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 26,2010

Comment	Name	Follow-up
<p>I found your draft policy on wildlife to be quite sensible. Even though I am a non-wildlife professional, I found it possible to read and make sense out the document. My one objection is near the beginning of your section on coyotes 3.2.1:</p> <p>"Because coyotes are <u>notoriously</u> opportunistic hunters, they will....."</p> <p>This word "notoriously" puts a negative subjective spin on coyotes. Being near the beginning of the section on coyotes, some people may not read much farther. If your goals include helping people learn to appreciate and enjoy open space, including wildlife, I would urge you to rewrite this as:</p> <p>"Because coyotes are <u>notably</u> opportunistic hunters, they will....."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-or-</p> <p>"Because coyotes are opportunistic hunters, they will....."</p> <p>Thank you for your work on this, I urge you to seriously consider my proposed edit.</p>	<p>Citizen 7</p>	<p>Policy amended to read: "because coyotes are opportunistic hunters." Section 3.2 Response via email.</p>
<p>My family and I support all efforts to coexist with wildlife. They were here first and habitat for all wildlife is rapidly disappearing along the Front Range. Continued efforts to save wild spaces for the animals are important to us. The animals are important to us.</p>	<p>Citizen 8</p>	<p>Response noted.</p>
<p>Since deer are mentioned as a major section they should be included in a few of the animals listed in the introduction page 4.</p>	<p>Citizen 9 and Citizen 10</p>	<p>Policy amended to include deer. Section 2.1</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB SITE AND PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 26,2010

Comment	Name	Follow-up
<p>I believe there might be room for a general deterrent section...a section that could speak to several techniques, personal property maintenance/upkeep or practices that could be used for coexisting with wildlife for several of these species or these could be listed out under each species' section. The suggestions that follow are just things to mull over and come from experiences I've had assisting citizens after the fact with wildlife issues for years ... if you can prevent a bad taste from forming from a bad close wildlife experience I think it would go far..and I think that is what this policy document is trying to accomplish. Prevention..If you can avoid the close encounter with say a skunk, why not...</p>	<p>Citizen 9 and Citizen 10</p>	<p>Policy amended to provide overview of general recommendations to avoid wildlife conflicts in Section 5 and in Executive Summary.</p>
<p><i>-Not inadvertently providing habitat components on one's property(shelter and space)</i> Good repairs: securing shingles and siding Junk, firewood and item accumulated around one's property: Also Exclusion: Techniques such as the application of hardware cloth...I believe discussed in this document for application with squirrels problems but equally effective for birds bats raccoons and skunks , to not only block gaps in ones' house but also blocking access under a home owners' deck or shed, under eaves, also include safe techniques for chimney blocking or better yet recommend a consultation with a chimney sweep so as not to cause fire hazards window well are also a source of animal encounters and animal trapping without a proper cover.</p>	<p>Citizen 9 and Citizen 10</p>	<p>Policy amended to provide overview of general recommendations to avoid wildlife conflicts in Section 5 and in Executive Summary.</p>
<p><i>-Providing food intentionally or inadvertently : habitat component (food)</i> Providing food telling folks not to feed coyotes is one thing but they may not realize they are feeding coyotes while they are feeding foxes same State no feeding law applies Don't feed rabbits is harder when the lawns we landscape our properties is the perfect salad bar for rabbits...</p>	<p>Citizen 9 and Citizen 10</p>	<p>Policy amended to provide overview of general recommendations to avoid wildlife conflicts in Section 5 and in Executive Summary.</p>
<p><i>-I'd make a case for responsible use of poisons in controlling rodents/insects ...and recommending the use of good housekeeping and repellents but urging the reading of labels when any chemicals</i></p>	<p>Citizen 9 and Citizen 10</p>	<p>Policy amended to provide overview of general recommendations to avoid wildlife conflicts in Section</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB SITE AND PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 26,2010		
Comment	Name	Follow-up
are employed. the Label is the Law...		5 and in Executive Summary.
-Providing water intentionally or inadvertently, <i>habitat component: (water)</i> not only for mosquito prevention but knowing that standing water draws in all other life forms, emptying and monitoring containers gutters pet bowls, spare tires, flower pots	Citizen 9 and Citizen 10	Policy amended to provide overview of general recommendations to avoid wildlife conflicts in Section 5 and in Executive Summary.
Common Sense Precautions and Non-lethal Controls. Again, we appreciate the emphasis on non-lethal controls and other common sense actions to prevent conflicts -- rather than a reliance on lethal measures. WildEarth Guardians has a very low regard for the USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services (plan at 18) (see e.g. Keefover-Ring 2009). We will strenuously object to their being summoned – principally because people can prevent negative encounters by acting reasonably and prudently.	WildEarth Guardians, Wendy Keefover-Ring, Carnivore Protection Director	So noted.
Wildlife Habitat. The draft policy indicates that it is “working to improve and protect” wildlife habitat in the community and to “promote and sustain biodiversity and healthy ecosystems” (p. 5). This statement defies the sad reality. Broomfield has developed at an unprecedented rate in the last two decades and the result has been an enormous loss of short-grass prairie ecosystems and agricultural lands. Broomfield has lost of a whole suite of endemic species. For bird species alone in our region, see: http://www.bcna.org/aviansosc.html .	WildEarth Guardians, Wendy Keefover-Ring, Carnivore Protection Director	So noted.
Hazing Definitions. The definitions for “hazing” appear on page 22. We recommend they occur immediately in the first three pages of the plan instead. Currently, as written, the reader wonders what the distinction between “hazing” and “aggressive hazing” is and does not discover them until the middle half of the document. This makes references before page 22 to these terms unclear.	WildEarth Guardians, Wendy Keefover-Ring, Carnivore Protection Director	Policy amended to reference hazing definitions when hazing is first referenced in Section 3.1.
Coyotes Are Important Ecological Actors. The draft plan fails to note that coyotes indirectly benefit ground-nesting bird populations (see plan at 11). Coyotes indirectly protect groundnesting birds such as meadowlarks and killdeer from	WildEarth Guardians, Wendy Keefover-Ring, Carnivore	So noted.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB SITE AND PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 26,2010

Comment	Name	Follow-up
<p>medium-sized carnivores such as house cats, skunks, foxes, and raccoons (Crooks et al. 2001; Henke and Bryant 1999; Mezquida et al. 2006). More emphasis should be placed on coyotes' ecological role in the plan.</p>	<p>Protection Director</p>	
<p>Wolves and coyotes hunt differently (see plan at 8). Wolves generally hunt in packs for large ungulates such as elk in Yellowstone National Park and moose in Isle Royale (see e.g., Beschta and Ripple 2009; Smith et al. 2003). Coyotes are opportunistic; they will scavenge prey killed other species and as hunters, coyotes prefer rodents (mice and voles) and lagamorphs (rabbits and hares). Infrequently, they will prey upon ungulates. Generally, coyotes hunt alone because their primary prey is small mammals (Kitchen et al. 1999). While they are omnivorous, over 90% of their diet comes from meat. The graphic below shows a study of coyotes' diet in southeastern Colorado. (Graphic not included because of space reasons)</p>	<p>WildEarth Guardians, Wendy Keefover-Ring, Carnivore Protection Director</p>	<p>Policy amended to add similar information in Section 3.2.1.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB SITE AND PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 26,2010

Comment	Name	Follow-up
<p>Killing coyotes results in more coyotes. Coyotes occur as solitary individuals, most often as mated pairs, or in family groups called <i>packs</i>. Mated for life, the pack consists of the alpha pair and their progeny—from different age litters. When a pack is left intact, only the alpha pair breeds—a natural birth control mechanism. If one or both members of the alpha pair are killed, all the members of the pack are now “permitted” to breed—which increases the number of breeders (Crabtree and Sheldon 1999). With exploitation such as shooting or trapping, this reproductive repression disintegrates, and more coyotes within a social group will consequently breed. After lethal control operations, litter sizes increase, and individuals migrate from other areas to replace killed individuals (Goodrich and Buskirk 1995; Knowlton 1972; Knowlton et al. 1999). After killing regimes, there may be an initial decrease in coyote population density, but the density may then promptly increase by the ingress of solitary coyotes or infusion from neighboring coyote packs (Crabtree and Sheldon 1999). 3 Knowlton et al. (1999) found that unexploited populations of coyotes tend to have older family structures characterized by lower reproductive rates than exploited populations. The latter group is likely to be characterized by younger adult members, and larger numbers of breeding members with increased litter sizes (Knowlton et al. 1999).</p>	<p>WildEarth Guardians, Wendy Keefover-Ring, Carnivore Protection Director</p>	<p>See Section 3.2.3.</p>
<p>Keep Cats Indoors. The guidelines for coyote co-existence (plan at 11-12) should include a bullet point about keeping domestic cats indoors to protect the lives of cats and native birds (Crooks and Soule 1999).</p>	<p>WildEarth Guardians, Wendy Keefover-Ring, Carnivore Protection Director</p>	<p>Policy amended to include this comment in Executive Summary, Section 3.3, and Section 5.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB SITE AND PUBLIC MEETING ON MAY 26,2010

Comment	Name	Follow-up
<p>The Prairie Dog Policy. We note that Broomfield has failed over and over again to follow its own guidelines. It has not always used extermination as a last resort. Killing prairie dogs with cruel toxicants has often been the first methodology employed. This has created substantial conflict between Broomfield and its residents and conservation groups. Prairie dogs, a vanishing keystone species, should be afforded every protection available including habitat protection.</p>	<p>WildEarth Guardians, Wendy Keefover-Ring, Carnivore Protection Director</p>	<p>So noted.</p>
<p>More designated relocation areas for prairie dogs!!</p>	<p>Anonymous-Citizen 11</p>	<p>So noted.</p>
<p>Good job—thanks for hosting this open house.</p>	<p>Citizen 12</p>	<p>So noted.</p>
<p>Please don't kill the prairie dogs. The hawks, eagles, and coyotes eat them. It breaks my heart when you kill them. Please let them live. They don't hurt anyone. Thanks!</p>	<p>Citizen 12</p>	<p>So noted</p>