



Making a difference...together

CRD Regional Deer Management Strategy Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 11, 2012 – 4:00pm

Activity Room, Burnside-Gorge Community Centre, Victoria

Meeting Notes

Present:

Robert Moody (Vice Chair)
Richard Christiansen
Wendy Fox
Lisa Kadonaga
Sol Kinnis
Terry Michell
Patrick O'Rourke

Regrets:

Robin Bassett
Jocelyn Skrlac (Chair)
Phil Tom
Kerri Ward

Staff:

Jeff Weightman (Deer Management Project Manager, CRD Regional Planning)
Marg Misek-Evans (Senior Manager, CRD Regional Planning)
Corey Burger (Recording Secretary, CRD Regional Planning)
Jan Pezarro (Facilitator)

1. Approval of Agenda

P. O'Rourke moved approval of the agenda. S. Kinnis seconded

CARRIED

2. Vice Chair's Remarks

R. Moody welcomed everybody and said there was a lot of ground to cover today

3. Review and Discussion of Minutes of July 4, 2012

P. O'Rourke moved approval of the minutes. R. Christiansen seconded

CARRIED

4. Facilitated Discussion

R. Moody turned the meeting over to J. Pezarro, who thanked the CAG for sending in their ratings of the remaining management options in advance of the meeting so that the numbers could be compiled on the poster sheets. J. Pezarro also thanked the CAG member for the suggestion of using a median value for the score that would be the basis for discussion. J. Pezarro updated the CAG on the process, mentioning that they had now finished 4 of the 11 management option evaluations.

The CAG completed the rural geography for the Repellents evaluation from the previous week, as the CAG had not split out the Effectiveness criteria. The CAG agreed to a score of 2 for Effectiveness for the Individual in the rural geography. The CAG then agreed on a score of 1 for Capacity, 2 for Cost, Time, Support & Enthusiasm and Negative Community Impacts for the rural geography. The CAG then discussed Feasibility/Capacity and agreed to a score of 3.

The CAG discussed Feasibility/Capacity for Repellents in the urban geography and whether it was higher or lower than in the agricultural geography before agreeing on a score of 3. One of the agricultural representatives mentioned their personal experience with Repellents had not been successful.

The CAG then discussed Capture & Relocate, starting with Effectiveness for the Individual. The CAG discussed the distance deer would need to be moved for relocation and how that distance affected Effectiveness. The CAG noted the literature suggests that Capture & Relocate may not be that effective and that deer reproduction may replace relocated animals quickly, as had happened with UVic's rabbit population. The CAG did note that professionals would need to be consulted about locations for relocated deer. The CAG considered potential deer relocation habitat and what impacts on the local populations of deer in those areas might occur. The CAG also noted that K. Brunt of the Ministry of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations had stated in his presentation that deer populations are currently increasing in the wild areas of Vancouver Island based on Ministry counts. The CAG asked if the Expert Resources Working Group (ERWG) could provide guidance about locations for deer relocation.

ACTION: CRD Staff to ask the ERWG about potential relocation sites.

The CAG further discussed Effectiveness for the Individual in the agricultural geography and noted that it might be more effective if bundled with other management options before agreeing to a score of 2. The CAG discussed Effectiveness: Broader Impact and its potential similarities and differences compared to Effectiveness for the Individual. The CAG discussed the issues of relocation, noting that not every location on Vancouver Island is appropriate noting the existing biological carrying capacity for deer and considered the survival and breeding rates for relocated deer. The CAG also noted that it took time to implement relocation, which reduced its effectiveness over the shorter term. The CAG noted that the problems deer might cause in their relocation habitat fall

under Negative Community Impacts, not Effectiveness. The CAG agreed on a score of 2 for Effectiveness: Broader Impact in the agricultural geography.

The CAG then discussed Feasibility/Capacity and noted that relocation has been done in other jurisdictions with other animals and that the feasibility of the capturing aspect could be higher than the feasibility of the relocating aspect. The CAG then agreed on a score of 2.5 for the agricultural geography.

The CAG discussed Capability and the legal barriers involved in moving deer from one jurisdiction to another (either within the region or out of region), noting that the province regulates all game animals and agreement would be required from the jurisdiction the animals were captured in and the jurisdiction the deer were ultimately relocated to. The CAG also noted that volunteers might be available, but that there were challenges with transportation and logistics. The CAG agreed to a score of 2 for Capability in the agricultural geography.

The CAG discussed Cost, noting that more resources were required for all the transport costs, hiring professionals to monitor the move and the release. The CAG assumed that there was some potential mitigation of costs with the use of volunteers. The CAG noted that Capture & Relocate probably has higher costs than Capture & Euthanize due to the transportation costs, given that deer would need to survive the transportation and arrive in reasonable condition. The CAG agreed to a score 1 for Cost in the agricultural geography.

The CAG discussed Time, noting that Capture and Relocate would be a multi-year endeavor and that capturing deer and transporting them requires time. The CAG also noted that the regulatory approval process, including the need to negotiate a location to relocate the deer to would take time. The CAG agreed on a score of 2.5 for Time.

The CAG then discussed Support & Enthusiasm, noting that the high potential cost would likely reduce support, as well as the split in the community between those who would want to see the deer removed versus those who would want the deer to remain. The CAG also noted that Support & Enthusiasm would be higher for removing deer on specific properties based on the owners requested.

The CAG discussed Negative Community Impacts, including deer mortality during the Capture & Relocate process and considered stress on relocated animals. The CAG also discussed the environmental costs of transporting deer before agreeing on a score of 2 for Negative Community Impacts in the agricultural geography.

The CAG then discussed Negative Community Impacts the rural geography noting that the deer population is likely more transient in this geography and the literature stated that deer are more elusive in the rural geography. The CAG then agreed on a score of 1.5 for Effectiveness for the Individual. The CAG discussed the urban geography and

how Capture & Relocate is more effective for smaller, constrained populations such as those found in an urban geography before agreeing to a score of 2 for Effectiveness for the Individual in the urban geography.

The CAG agreed on a score for Effectiveness: Broader Impact of 1.5 for rural and 2 for urban.

The CAG discussed Feasibility/Capacity in the rural geography, noting that it may be relatively more difficult to catch the deer however, given limited home ranges. Comparatively larger lots in the rural geography made catching deer easier, the CAG agreed on a score of 2 in the rural geography. The CAG then discussed the urban geography and the issue of where net traps maybe placed, suggesting the use of green space such as golf courses, wide boulevards and small parks before agreeing to a score of 1.5.

The CAG discussed Capability and noted that the majority of Capacity is related to the relocation aspect, which doesn't change by geography. They agreed to a score of 2 for both rural and urban geographies.

The CAG discussed Cost, noting that although costs to relocate were similar to other geographies, the increased complexity in the urban geography due to use of traps on smaller properties made the cost per relocated deer likely higher, before agreeing to a score of 1 for both the rural and urban geographies.

The CAG discussed Time, noting again that increased complexity would require a greater amount of time spent per deer before agreeing to a score of 2.5 in rural geography and 2 in urban geography.

The CAG discussed Support & Enthusiasm and the higher relative visibility of the placed net traps in urban areas. The CAG considered the impact on Support and Enthusiasm if the public educated themselves on the mortality rate for relocated deer and the stress levels that animals are subjected to during the capture and relocation process. The CAG then agreed to a score of 2 in both rural and urban geographies.

The CAG discussed Negative Community Impacts and whether or not the impacts were higher in the urban geography before agreeing to a score of 2 for both rural and urban geography.

As a final note on Capture & Relocate, the CAG discussed letters which had been submitted in support of maintaining deer populations and thought that some members of the public may become attached to resident deer and may not support Capture & Relocate because their resident deer would be relocated.

The CAG then discussed Controlled Public Hunt and its Effectiveness for the Individual, noting that effectiveness would be higher in less developed areas such the rural geography as opposed to the agricultural and urban geography where there were restrictions on hunting locations. The CAG also discussed the relative skill level of the non-professional hunters and assumed that the general success rate of nonprofessional hunters was lower than professional hunters. The CAG noted that successful hunting would likely decrease over time as animals became more secretive and nocturnal. The CAG noted the time restrictions limited hunting to daytime hours and local bylaws would limit areas to hunt. The CAG then agreed to a score of 2 for Effectiveness for the Individual and Effectiveness: Broader Impact for all three geographies.

The CAG discussed Feasibility/Capacity, noting that with the current Goose Management strategy, the farmers may select hunters to partner with from a short list of approved members and build a mutually beneficial partnership where the hunter may harvest geese from the farmer's property. The CAG considered whether the farmer-hunter relationship called 'Crop Protection' should be considered a standalone management option. The CAG noted that with Crop Protection, animals could be taken out of season, but the meat could not be kept and that the total number of animals taken was quite small. The CAG also noted that some part of the agricultural geography had smaller, more confined properties that were more like urban properties in their characteristics.

The CAG also discussed municipal bylaws that prevented firearms and bow discharge, noting that some municipalities like Central Saanich have exemptions for crop protection while others, such as Saanich, do not and that harmonization of bylaws might need to be recommended. The CAG considered that even relatively rural municipalities like Highlands and Metchosin have bylaws preventing firearms and bow discharge. The CAG also noted that hunting on private land, which constitutes the vast majority of the CRD, requires permission of the private property land owner. The CAG then agreed to a score of 2.5 for the agricultural and rural and 1 for urban for Feasibility/Capacity.

The CAG then discussed Capability, noting overall the restrictive bylaw issues and that their score can be based on an assumed recommendation to update those bylaws. The CAG discussed the Goose Management strategy again, noting that animals must be flying in order to be targeted and that shotguns must be used. The CAG noted that there are a number of different harvest methods and that the safety factor depending on the harvest method (ie. type of weapon chosen). The CAG also noted that Capability in the rural geography would be relatively higher due to less restrictive bylaws than in the urban geography; adding that the current Capability in the agricultural geography is limited to Crop Protection. The CAG then agreed to a score of 2.5 in the agricultural geography, 1.5 in rural and 1 in the urban geography for Capability.

The CAG then discussed Cost, noting that the cost would be borne by the hunters rather than by the CRD, province or local governments and thus scored it a 3 for all geographies.

The CAG discussed Time, noting that the time to change bylaws can be highly variable and is largely dependent on political will, but that even without considering the bylaw issues it would take time for this option to reduce deer-human conflict across all geographies. One of the agricultural representatives noted that results of any hunting season effects would not be seen until the following planting season. The CAG then agreed on a score of 2 for all geographies.

The CAG discussed Support & Enthusiasm and noted relatively higher support in the agricultural geography, especially when discussing food security. The CAG discussed the differences between support of the non-land owning general public versus support of the support of land owning general public when considering each option in each geography. The CAG also noted that there likely wasn't a great deal of public support for hunting. The CAG then agreed to a score of 2 for agricultural and rural and 1 for urban.

The CAG discussed Negative Community Impacts, noting that the score was relatively higher (less desirable) in the urban geography due to safety issues in addition to considering the optics of a Controlled Public Hunt. The CAG considered the limited land availability for such an option in an urban geography for non-professional hunters to hunt and whether options such as bow hunting in constrained spaces with such tools as tree stands could mitigate some safety issues. The CAG noted that human error was a consideration citing an example of speeding vehicles despite laws controlling vehicle speed. The CAG noted that similar issues could arise with a Controlled Public Hunt. J. Weightman noted that the province may require prospective hunters to take additional testing for licensing and that it was possible to augment that procedure to maximize the skill of hunters closer to that of professionals. The CAG noted that at the municipal level, Central Saanich currently requires a police check for hunters seeking a crop protection exemption to their firearms discharge bylaw. The CAG considered whether or not to rule out Controlled Public Hunt in the urban geography before deciding to score Negative Community Impacts as 1 (low negative Community Impacts therefore highly desirable) for agricultural and rural geographies and 3 for urban geography (high on negative community impacts therefore less desirable).

In their last comments, the CAG noted that First Nations right to hunt could be impacted by a Controlled Public Hunt.

5. The CAG broke for dinner from 17:50 to 18:30

6. Facilitated Discussion Continued

The CAG validated the evaluation of Capture & Euthanize and noted an issue with Feasibility/Capacity relating to the capacity to butcher animals, due to provincial

regulations that require separate facilities for game and domestic meat. The CAG also noted that the relative level of humaneness of Capture & Euthanize versus Professional Sharpshooting. The CAG also noted that the Cost criteria needs to take into account the declining price of venison, one of the agricultural representatives noted that due to the new provincial food safety regulations around butchering and overproduction, many farmers are no longer keeping small numbers of animals.

The CAG then discussed Professional Sharpshooting, noting that in the urban geography this option was relatively more difficult to recommend, affecting both Effectiveness and Feasibility/Capacity. The CAG agreed to a score of 2.5 for Effectiveness for the Individual in the agricultural and rural geographies and 2 for the urban geography. The CAG also agreed to a score of 2 for Effectiveness: Broader Impact for all geographies.

The CAG discussed Feasibility/Capacity, noting that relatively larger agricultural areas would for be easier for sharpshooters to work in. One of the agricultural representatives brought up the Goose Management strategy, stating that that based on past experiences, Feasibility/Capacity was high for this option. The CAG agreed to a score of 3 for Feasibility/Capacity in the agricultural geography.

The CAG discussed the difference between rural and urban geographies and the safety issues associated with firearms use in urban areas further noting that the two geographies would likely require different types of methodologies. The CAG noted that the Urban Ungulate Conflict Analysis report mentioned that crossbows and rifles could be used for professional sharpshooting and that the report recommended this option for small scale deer overabundance. The CAG discussed other jurisdictions that had implemented Professional Sharpshooting including the specifics of the implementation methods used. The CAG agreed on a score of 2 in the rural geography and 1.5 in the urban geography.

The CAG discussed Capability, noting a higher frequency of legal and bylaw restrictions in the urban geography considering whether those barriers could be overcome. The CAG agreed to a score of 2.5 for the agricultural geography, 2 for the rural and 1 for the urban geography.

The CAG discussed Cost, noting a higher relatively expense to hire professional staff and to process the animals. The CAG noted similar costs for processing and transportation and were the same regardless of geography. The CAG discussed the possibility of offsetting cost through sale of meat acknowledging current provincial regulations prevent the sale of game meat. It was also noted that selling meat would likely be more challenging to implement than donating the meat. The CAG also noted that relative to Capture & Relocate or Capture & Euthanize, the cost of Professional Sharpshooting is lower. The CAG discussed the sale of meat from the Sidney Island deer cull, noting it is a cull of introduced European fallow deer rather than native

Columbian Black-tailed deer and the CAG requested further information from the ERWG. The CAG agreed to a score of 2 for all three geographies.

ACTION: Request that the ERWG provide further information on the sale of meat from the Sidney Island culls

The CAG discussed Time and the degree to which the factors they were considering were similar to Controlled Public Hunt, including the number of qualified, local individuals that would qualify as sharpshooters and the variable amount of time required to change bylaws. The CAG agreed on a score of 2 for Time for all three geographies.

The CAG discussed Support & Enthusiasm, noting assuming lower Support and Enthusiasm in the rural geography and lower still Support and Enthusiasm in the urban geography. Additional costs to the landowner may further decrease Support and Enthusiasm. The CAG agreed to a score of 2 in the agricultural geography. The CAG noted that some rural residents may have moved to the rural geography to experience deer and may not be impacted by deer-human conflict as strongly. The CAG agreed to a score of 1.5 for the rural geography. The CAG then discussed the individual verbal reports CAG members were being told from people who support a cull. The group considered the relatively higher visibility of a cull in an urban area and if there is a difference in support between a cull and the means of implementing a cull (ie. a cull may be supported but sharpshooting may not be a supported method of a cull). The CAG then agreed to a score of 1 for Support & Enthusiasm in the urban geography.

The CAG then discussed Negative Community Impacts, noting that the same issues exist as with a Controlled Public Hunt, but that with professionals, the potential safety issues are partially mitigated. The CAG agreed to a score of 1 in the agricultural and rural geographies and 1.5 in the urban geography.

For final notes on Professional Sharpshooting, the CAG discussed the number of hunters who would qualify to implement this option, as well as the capacity of butchers to process deer meat.

The CAG then discussed Immunocontraceptives and its Effectiveness for the Individual, noting that treated deer are potentially creating deer/human conflicts throughout the duration of their remaining lifespan (10-12 years). The CAG discussed the high percentage of does that would need to be treated in order to be effective and the various techniques used in implementing Immunocontraceptives. The CAG noted that on James Island they corralled, injected and marked the does and that James Island experienced a high failure rate due not treating enough of the population.

The CAG discussed that Immunocontraceptives would need to be bundled with other options, such as a method of population reduction. The CAG discussed if there was a difference between geographies and noted that there was not. The CAG also noted that

there are no currently legal drugs in Canada and that capturing and treating 70- 90% of the does in the region would be unfeasible. The CAG agreed on a score of 1 for Effectiveness for the Individual for all three geographies.

The CAG then discussed Effectiveness: Broader Impact, noting that regular and ongoing treatment increased effectiveness. Furthermore, the CAG noted urban geographies would have a higher effectiveness due to more constrained population and less outside influence on population. It was noted as with Effectiveness for the Individual, the potential deer human conflicts would exist for the remainder of their natural lifespans. Bundling with other management options is advisable. The CAG also noted that if natural deer mortality was higher than assumed, Immunocontraceptives would be more effective. The CAG agreed to a score of 1.5 for all geographies for Effectiveness: Broader Impact.

The CAG discussed Feasibility/Capacity, noting that handling animals to for treatment introduced stress and the high percentage of the population of does required to be treated effectively would reduce Feasibility/Capacity scores. The CAG also noted increased difficulty to capture deer as they habituated to traps. The CAG noted minimal differences across geographies before agreeing on a score of 1 for all three geographies for Feasibility/Capacity.

The CAG discussed Capability, noting that there are no legal drugs in Canada, although small scale, experimental and scientific permits have been issued. The CAG noted that with political will at multiple levels of government, immunocontraceptives could become legalized, this resulted in a score of 1 for Capacity in all geographies.

The CAG discussed Cost, noting that the cost is high, and therefore less desirable, resulting in a score of 1 in all geographies. The CAG discussed Time, observing the time to capture 70-90% of the female population would be considerable and political will to approve the drugs is necessary.

The CAG discussed Support & Enthusiasm, noting higher scores in urban geographies but that given agricultural needs are immediate, support would be lower in the agricultural geography. The CAG also noted that a certain percentage of the population may not support this option due to the cost and time to implement. The CAG noted that Support & Enthusiasm in the agricultural geography would dependent on crop selection and its relative level of attractiveness to deer. The CAG agreed on a score of 1 in agricultural geography, 2 in rural and 2.5 in the urban geography.

The CAG discussed Negative Community Impacts, noting that deer which have been treated with Immunocontraceptives are no longer fit for human consumption and that in the rural geography hunters hunt treated deer accidentally. The CAG also discussed the slow progression of the drug through the Federal approval process and noting potential side effects yet to be discovered, including risk to predators. The CAG also compared

the safety of this option versus Professional Sharpshooting, noting that Immunocontraceptives were relatively safer. The CAG discussed the issue of disposal if hunters mistakenly took treated animals and whether Immunocontraceptives in the deer would create a problem similar to the known problems of estrogen overabundance in ecosystems due to human birth control. The CAG also noted that treating deer with Immunocontraceptives would affect the number of individuals available to First Nations to hunt for food. The CAG agreed to a score of 1 for all geographies for Negative Community Impact.

The CAG then discussed Public Education for the effectiveness criteria for the Individual in the agriculture and rural geography noting a low score, while in the urban geography, home owners opinions may be more flexible. The CAG noted perceptions of deer, while some see deer human conflicts others view them as an asset. One of the agricultural representatives noted that while information on fencing might have been useful in saving the cost of the trial and error process personally, public education would not have been useful overall for their specific case. The CAG agreed to a score of 1 in both the agricultural and rural geographies and 2 for the urban geography.

The CAG then discussed Effectiveness: Broader Impact, noting that in the urban geography again Public Education would have a larger impact due to increased awareness around local issues and the mitigation strategies. The CAG then agreed to a score of 1 in both the agricultural and rural geographies and 1.5 in the urban geography.

The CAG then discussed Feasibility/Capacity, including the different implementation options affecting the feasibility. Competition for the public's attention was noted and that public apathy could be an issue. The CAG discussed the Public Education surrounding pesticide bans and the limited uptake. The CAG noted the relative ease of generating the education materials, including online materials. The CAG then agreed to a score of 2.5 for all three geographies for Feasibility/Capacity.

The CAG then discussed Capacity, agreeing to a score of 3 for all geographies. The CAG discussed Cost, noting relative higher costs in the urban geography due to the higher population. The CAG noted that costs included printing and signage, in addition to potential new bylaw enforcement costs. The CAG asked CRD staff about CRD costs for Public Education and M. Misek-Evans replied that compared to other options such as Capture & Relocate and Capture & Euthanize, Public Education was relatively inexpensive. The CAG agreed to a score of 2 for the agricultural and rural geography and 1.5 for the urban geography.

The CAG discussed Time, agreeing on a score of 2 for all geographies.

The CAG discussed Support & Enthusiasm, noting that Public Education would have no immediate effect on deer/human conflict until materials were read and internalized and behaviours changed. The group noted the example of recycling education and length of

time before it became effective. The CAG also discussed whether the public would perceive Public Education as a status quo option. M. Misek-Evans replied that Public Education was seen by the CRD as a default option that would be bundled with other management options. The CAG then agreed to a score of 2 for all geographies.

The CAG discussed Negative Community Impact, noting that there were no major negative impacts beyond paper use. The CAG agreed to a score of 3 for all geographies.

The CAG discussed Deer/vehicle Collision Mitigation and considered the options to evaluate the large variety of costs and times involved in the range of options. The CAG agreed focus on those options seen to be effective in the Urban Ungulate Conflict Analysis report and to split those into two different categories, Infrastructure (Exclusionary Fencing, Wildlife Crossings and Roadway design and planning) and Administrative (Speed Limit Reductions and Right of Way Brushing). The CAG noted that they had already covered two options from the list: Public Education and Repellents. The CAG then discussed evaluation of the sub options across the three geographies and whether the geographic separation was applicable in this option, the CAG had a discussion regarding the sub-options and how they deal with the road infrastructure rather than the land use. The CAG agreed to produce a single score for the entire region, separating the two sub-option groups (Administrative and Infrastructure) rather than evaluate by the three geographies. The CAG also noted the difference for most of the options was related to size of the road and that feasibility was limited on smaller roadways.

The CAG discussed Effectiveness as a single category and agreed on a score of 2 for the Administrative sub-options and 1 for the Infrastructure sub-options.

The CAG then discussed Feasibility/Capacity, noting that road infrastructure in the region has already been built out; M. Misek-Evans noted that when roads were rebuilt considerations for Deer/vehicle Collision Mitigation could be built into the capital planning and design process. The CAG discussed sightlines and speed limits, including the methods used in Newfoundland & Labrador to reduce moose vehicle collisions. The CAG noted that accidents happen on all roads, not just the provincially-controlled highways. The CAG agreed to a score of 1 for the Infrastructure sub-options and 2.5 for the Administrative sub-options.

The CAG discussed Capability, noting that fencing roadways would not be affected by municipal bylaws that restrict fencing height and type. M. Misek-Evans noted that in the CRD, the only provincial highways are the Trans-Canada, Pat Bay Hwy and Sooke Road and all other roads are municipally-owned. The CAG agreed on a score of 2 for the Infrastructure sub-options and 3 for the Administrative sub-options.

The CAG discussed Cost, noting that many of the Infrastructure sub-options are relatively expensive, while the Administrative sub-options are already completed, for example highway brushing could be done more frequently. The CAG then agreed to a score of 1 for Infrastructure sub-options and 3 for Administrative sub-options.

The CAG discussed Time, noting that the Administrative sub-options are can be achieved in a relatively short amount of time but that highway brushing could need to be repeated. The CAG also noted that differences in geography may affect Time. The CAG discussed the potential differences in reducing speed limits on slower urban roads versus faster roads in the rural and agricultural geographies. The CAG also noted that brushing wasn't truly possible on most urban roads. The CAG considered that Infrastructure sub-options such as road planning take comparatively longer to be effective. The CAG agreed to score of 1 for Infrastructure sub-options and 2.5 for Administrative sub-options.

The CAG then discussed Support & Enthusiasm, noting that the Infrastructure sub-options such as roadway planning, fencing or crossings are relatively expensive and that the Infrastructure sub-options are perceived to have comparatively limited impact. The CAG agreed on a score of 1 for Infrastructure sub-options. The CAG discussed the Administrative sub-options, noting that resident land owners would be more supportive of speed limit reductions than drivers. The CAG also noted that on Blenkinsop Road the speed limit was already 40 km/h and there were deer warning signs, yet these measures appeared to have little effect on driver behaviour as the number of deer/vehicle collisions remains high. The CAG agreed on a score of 2 for Administrative sub-options

The CAG discussed Negative Community Impact, noting that fencing and crossings might have impact on green space and could require more impermeable surfaces. The CAG then agreed on a score of 2 for Infrastructure sub-options and 3 for Administrative sub-options.

The CAG discussed the impacts of lowering speed limits and the resulting broader highway safety goals which may be achieved including reducing vehicle/vehicle collisions. The CAG requested further information from the ERWG about where such measures could be applied. The CAG noted that the CRD already has lower speed limits than many US examples. J. Weightman noted a journal that devoted an entire section of articles to deer /vehicle collision mitigation. The CAG noted that ICBC could also recommend lower speed limits to municipalities.

ACTION: CRD Staff to ask ERWG about where lower speed limits have been applied

ACTION: J. Weightman to forward articles on deer/vehicle collision to the CAG

7. Next Steps

J. Pezarro noted that the CAG have now fully evaluated all the management options and that next stage is the creation of recommendations. To aid that process, CRD staff will create a matrix of the options by geography to show all the 11 management options against the 8 criteria. M. Misek-Evans noted that CRD staff will review the minutes and extract all the information the CAG has shared regarding caveats, notations, and assumptions for the CAG's review to assist with the drafting stage.

The CAG also requested time to discuss the difference between measures which effect population growth today and those which have no effect and how to frame those.

8. Next Meeting

The CAG agreed to the next meeting of July 18 from 4-8 at the Burnside Gorge Community Centre pending availability.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35