

From reading comments in support of the proposed action, I have several concerns: 1) the vast majority of those in support of the resolution are either from out of county or do not have a residence listed. They are not familiar with our area, the wildlife population and our needs. 2) There already exist laws and policies for the non-lethal exclusion of wildlife and for the control of dangerous or nuisance wildlife - those laws and policies are enforced by several different agencies. Lethal means cannot be used until and unless all other methods have failed AND they must be at the request of the landowner. 3) Trapping, snaring etc can only be used under very specific and controlled circumstances and not just will nilly as the resolution supporters would have you believe. Wildlife exclusion services cannot be done on public lands. 4) Landowner education is the primary focus of the current Wildlife Specialist and most calls for destructive wildlife are for feral hogs 5) Animal is in desperate need of an additional officer (or two) but this resolution is not the way to achieve that goal - a better option would be to offer an increase in wages so as to attract a better candidate who is willing to make ACO a career and not use it as a stepping stone into a Law Enforcement Agency. 6) While ACO's are required to attend the Humane Officer training academy, the focus is on the law enforcement aspects of animal care and the associated laws. There is no requirement for an ACO to be trained in animal behavior or wildlife management skills. Asking an officer without a background in animal behavior, wildlife management, animal husbandry, biology, zoology etc to handle a wild animal call will usually not be effective. Our county is already habitually short-staffed when it comes to ACO's and asking them to add wildlife management to their duties is ridiculous. 7) The county only pays a portion of the wages and expenses of the current Wildlife Specialist. Terminating that contract and moving wildlife services to an agency within the county will result in less service and higher costs.

This county was already without a Wildlife Specialist ('county trapper') for several years when a small, vocal and misguided minority complained about 'the trapper killing all the animals'. What happened then was an explosion of incidents and complaints regarding raccoons, skunks, feral hogs, venomous snakes etc. Because there was not a wildlife specialist and because the other agencies are not trained or permitted to engage in wildlife services (lethal or non-lethal), people were unable to get help. The current program is working. The current wildlife specialist is required to perform community outreach and public education/presentations (once covid is over) and works with landowners to solve their wildlife problems. I strongly urge you to vote NO on this resolution or, at a minimum, table the vote until you have allowed sufficient time for public input and have been able to educate yourselves as to the wildlife situation in Mendocino County instead of relying on vague, misleading and untruthful statements. Thank you - Kelly Boesel

--

Kelly Boesel
Blue Ribbon Pets