

Online Feedback Form Responses Repellents and Capture & Relocate Management Options

Background

- The total number of responses is 105
- The feedback form was available on the deer management website for public input from July 26, 2012 at 9:00 am to August 1, 2012 at 12:00 pm.
- The form was announced through an email to all addresses that had submitted to deermanagement@crd.bc.ca.
- Responses flagged with green are possible duplicate responses by the same respondent.
- The purpose of the online feedback form is to fulfil the obligations of the communications and consultation section of the Terms of Reference which emphasizes an open and transparent process that has early and ongoing communications and consultation through an on-line campaign. The CAG has full knowledge of how the form is being administered and the non-representative nature of the input/feedback. The feedback is another source of information for the CAG to use at their discretion. Another purpose of the online venue is to provide the public with an opportunity to follow CAG progress without having to attend the meetings. The online feedback form content is generated by the CAG and is updated weekly in accordance with the CAG's progress and in order to provide timely information out to the public and feedback to the CAG

Questions

Do you have any additional thoughts or comments on the application of the Evaluation Criteria to the Repellent management option?

Commentary on Repellents

- Not really an ideal solution. Need stronger measures, contraceptives... certainly NOT fencing or "deer-resistant" gardens...
- Can't see this working well, we would need to apply enormous amounts of material repeatedly. The total costs would be prohibitive and it DOES NOT SOLVE the problem - too many deer.
- Repellents work only in a limited way. I have seen the damage and destruction in the gardens at Government where they do use repellants and they only work briefly.
- Repellent would be an option I would agree with.
- My experience in a populated neighbourhood is that deer become used to the repellents and they become ineffective fairly quickly plus, with our perchance for rain, application needs to be repeated frequently to be effective and can become really expensive and time consuming. THANK YOU for the chart legend!
- Makes sense so far. In our area, near UVic and Mt. Tolmie, the deer are already eschewing some repellents. Almost on a leaf by leaf basis. If you miss one, it's gone

- I consider that displacing deer onto adjacent properties does not solve the deer problem. Why should non-farming citizens have to bear the brunt of a deer invasion if the farming community adopted a spray solution?? Also, I for one would not be buying any vegetables or produce called "organic" if it had been sprayed with a deer repellent. What scares off deer scares me off also!
- Given that this is rated as ineffective, the other ratings are of no relevance. This option won't solve the problem...too many deer and the numbers are increasing.
- I have bought several litres of Deerskydd and a spray that starts with Bo..... I think. Other than stinking up my yard and surrounding ones it has had little or no effect on the deer and these repellents are exorbitantly expensive!! Last night they got my blueberries!!!! My freezer remains empty.
- There are many reasons not to use repellents - time, smell, damage to plants, inability to use it on edibles, unable to spray "everything", labour intensive, costly.....besides IT DOESN'T GET RID OF THE DEER that are causing problems other than just defoliating everything! They'll find stuff to eat, and still be a hazard to our pets, on the roads, bringing ticks with them and leaving their feces in our yards
- It stinks!
- It should be viewed as a possible supplement but NOT as a substitute for population reduction.
- Low on effectiveness across all areas.
- Deer are extremely intelligent when it comes to surviving. This option would be marginally effective.
- We used any kind of repellent already. The deer avoid the leaves with the repellent and eat everything around it. You can not spray a whole garden.
- Evaluation criteria are OK; ratings add no value. Repellents are a poor idea. Cannot repel deer from the whole region. Repelling from one local area makes it worse for another.
- Deer adjust to everything. I have studied this and have experienced it also. Repellents may be good until first watering (not shown in the evaluation) and/or rainfall. It is a waste of money as we live in a wet climate except for 2 to 3 months in the summer.
- Yes, repellents will not reduce or eliminate the urban deer. They are multiplying at two to a family
- I use a natural repellent which consists of 1 egg, 1 tsp. baking soda, 1 tsp cayenne pepper and 1 quart of water blended together and administered by a sprayer. It works amazingly well. The deer don't touch my roses. Of course you have to reapply after a rain. I realize this might not be an option for a farm, or it could be if you don't mind using a lot of eggs, but for the average home owner it's a good option.
- I completely agree with this: "When complaints caused by overabundant ungulates are increasing in numbers and severity, then conflict reduction options such as fencing, repellents, and aversive conditioning will not significantly reduce the numbers of complaints. Population reduction is needed to reduce the damage caused by overabundant ungulates. "I also think that relocation options are a terrible idea: cruel, expensive, and silly, akin to shipping bunnies to Texas.

- Repellent in one area just has deer move to another area. As deer population increases, they become less selective about what they will eat...ie they are starting to eat some native plants now...
- repellants are not a viable option. The deer will simply move to the next garden.
- Not feasible for long term sustainability
- concerned about runoff into water
- could help local gardens or yards. not a solution for parks, golf courses, farms, etc.
- Repellents seem to work a little bit on things not of economic or safety importance, that is, if it doesn't really matter if the plants are eaten, then putting on repellents is not a total waste of time. Obviously, they do not inhibit tree rubbing, charging or traffic accidents.
- Not certain to work. More economical alternatives exist.
- As has already been stated...it's expensive and not very effective. I've tried many repellents...and I didn't find anything that really worked.
- Evidence would appear to show that the effectiveness diminishes over time. Individual efforts by homeowners have not been successful. Reductions for a variety of reasons - fewer vehicle collisions, less damage are needed. Repellants do not meet the need to reduce damages overall.
- Deer are smart and adaptable. A repellent option will only move the problem not solve it.
- repellent does not work I personally tried 3 types of them commercial and personal..the urine liquid work only for 24 hres and is difficult to stay on you must spray each day and the odor ouh...the italian recipe with rotten eggs work but renw each time after rain but the odor ouah...the pill of something reproductive product semen of puma work only after a rain and very isolated not all the garden, the powder you dilute with odor of some predators does not work long the deer begin to be blasÃ©...so no repellent yhou made us faint not the deers...they do not read the indication of the product...
- Does not work though I appreciate the suggestion
- The repellent option is not practical and not cost-effective, nor environmentally friendly, thus not really an option.
- I have a large double wooded lot - Repellants have been unsuccessful as well as unpleasant for household. A Scarecrow sprinkler was completely useless - I would need 4 or 5 to cover the property and would not have access to my back door without an umbrella! Expense of repellants and unpleasantness of application have resulted in failure to deter deer. find an effective one and I will gladly use it. Relax unleashed dog bylaws and deer may disappear. JS Oak Bay
- Repellants should be non-toxic, and as inoffensive as possible for neighbours, etc.
- Repellents are not effective enough, and are costly. Also, it does not solve the problem. Unfortunately (for the deer), I see only Capture and Euthanize as an option
- Another one of these ridiculous surveys! Seriously?!? I've already told you that any solution needs to be non-lethal! Why should I keep answering these pathetic surveys?!!!
- The evaluation criteria indicates that there has not been enough research into the repellent management option.

- Repellants do nothing to affect the root issue - an exploding population, are only good for a couple of weeks if that as rain & sprinkler systems reduce their effectiveness - not to mention cost and smell.
- It doesn't work - the deer need to be shot to reduce their population. They are pests, this is an urban environment into which the deer have migrated. Apply effective pest control measures.
- Repellents will not address the present increasing population within rural communities, and farmland. It has no worth in controlling this problem. Only to frustrate, and keep growing numbers of deer moving around and causing more damage to property, themselves and others in confrontation. With increasing cost to all taxpayers and community services. It is no more cruel to assist animals in their control, as it is for humans to practice restraint in numbers, or succumb to unfortunate natural disasters of food, accidents, and disease.
- I think you've rated this too highly. A lot of we home gardeners have tried repellents - limited duration of effectiveness especially with rain, and quite expensive
- Repellents are not enough. I have used various and very expensive brands for 4 years to very little effect. The consequence to the vegetation is unknown. It is unsightly and horribly pungent to the human nose as well. My property is too large to cover the entire perimeter. Rain washes it off etc etc etc. So many negatives not least of which is ineffective!!! Relocate the deer. Sterilize the deer. Euthanize the deer. They are the new comers in this area. We have lived here since 1980 and this problem started 9 - 10 years ago. It is totally unfair to the deer and to the humans, and the urgency to act is increasing dramatically.
- Repellents is probably the least worst solution to the so-called 'deer' problem, mainly because it is probably the least harmful to the deer and because the general public perceives that at least something is being done. However, as I keep saying, repellents don't address the actual problem, that being the ever-increasing human encroachment into the wild/nature.
- I just spent another \$40 for repellent today...This is the only viable option in my urban neighbourhood. I saw deer munching happily in the lovely flower beds on residential properties across Beach Drive from the Victoria Golf Course. Why would homeowners spend time and money to have beautiful gardens when they are immediately and predictably destroyed by the ever increasing deer population?! BTW, please be assured that NO ONE is enjoying deer feeding and defecating on their properties and freely roaming the streets. Are you continuing to squander tax dollars on the beautiful landscaping erected by Parks and Recreation departments throughout the capital region? The deer will make short work of those banana trees, I am certain. Even Oak Bay is admitting to defeat and resorting to Bobbex in the Rose Garden. Dogs, of course, are still forbidden even though they are licenced and leashed...Madness.
- Repellants are a good idea. Organic perimeter spraying should be tried. Property owners who have tried successful repellent formulations could be canvassed for ideas.
- No
- I live in an urban area and have been trying to use repellents. I mix up fish fertilizer and put in buckets so it can ferment (it smells horrible) and spread it on the plants they like

most. The deer still come in. Our yard smells horrible to our neighbours. I also try to keep our garbage can full of smelly cat litter and other rotting things and leave it at the front of our property where the deer come in. They have figured out to just come in the side anyway. Repellents are not feasible with this many hungry deer in the Fairfield, Oak Bay, Rockland and Gonzales neighbourhoods. Plus as soon as it rains or if you water, you have to reapply the repellents. I have been thinking about getting a few sets of deer hooves from my cousin that hunts and hanging them from posts around our property...but that just seems macabre and the flies and potential ecoli contamination???

- Homeowners would have purchase their own repellents and we cannot buy them in the quantities that would yield discounts.
- May help a little - but overall a waste of time and money. The number of deer just continue to increase. Reduce the number NOW.
- I am, quite literally, shocked to read in the report that there are no human health concerns, while it states that there may be a problem with organic certification. There may be a problem with organic certification and, if so, should there not also be a problem with human health concerns in urban areas that have food gardens that are not "certified". We do not use chemicals in our garden for a reason, and the notion that we would pollute our environment to 'repel' urban deer is the closest thing to absurd at best.
- The cost of repellents, the odour of some and the work of applying them can be prohibitive. Also this is just another bandaid activity that drives the deer to a constantly lessening area to find food while the population is constantly growing. This activity would be totally useless.
- IT WON'T WORK!
- Use of repellents is just another way to avoid doing something about the issue. Repellents do nothing to reduce the population which is ultimately the issue. There are too many deer, where ever they are.
- High inputs, low results is what I gather from the minutes. Repellents are not a major long-term strategy. You are going to have to get your minds around the currently unpopular option of killing some deer. That's where the public education should be focused, so people understand the necessity.
- What am I being asked about- whether I agree with the criteria, or the numbers assigned to them by the CAG? It is unclear. In any case, I think there is potential for the use of repellants. In fact, Bobbex is already being used on garden plants, etc. It sure is better than using sharpshooters!
- I am rating this option as neutral because I agree with some aspects, not others. Urban application - costly, time-consuming, needs to be reapplied, smelly, and deer become acclimatized to the scent. Bobex lasts longer than meat meal, but stains foliage. This option just pushes the deer onto other properties, roadways, etc. Deer are wild animals. They do not belong in the city. Period. This option does nothing to control the population, much less reduce it. I have tried all of the repellent options, on my property and on a large public garden - Government House, a national historic site, by the way - for which I volunteer my time. Volunteered, actually. There were so many deer and so much damage that I quit. Up to 22 deer on 36 acres. It became an exercise in frustration. Eventually, nothing works. Damage is not restricted to a few flowers - shrubs and trees

are damaged as well - some beyond renewal. The funds for those plants come from volunteer fundraising efforts. And the deer are becoming increasingly more aggressive, to the point where some long-time visitors to the site no longer take their walks through the gardens. And the risk of ticks is a concern for some of the volunteers, especially in the more wooded areas.

- Fencing is the absolute best option for farmers, and repellants such as Bobbex ARE effective, and can be used safely by urban gardeners, as well as fencing backyards.
- Fencing is the answer....plus planting deer proof plants. Deer may eat them when they are fresh from the nursery but as the plants grow they will not touch them. Perhaps there is such a thing as water spray on a sensor like motion lights...that startles. Also Bobbex Deer Repellent on the plants....it works.
- I forgot to say which area we live in so I am re-sending this. I have answered strongly disagree because this entire process, including repellents is too complex to decide by CAG members using this type of evaluation. Perhaps one might agree with the Agricultural issues but not the rural or urban. You expect us to agree or disagree across the board!! Also it is not clear if you are asking "to what extent I agree or disagree with the CAG's OPINION of the Repellent management option, rather than the CRITERIA per se. Once again the questionnaire is ambiguous and could be interpreted more than one way.
- This is a very expensive and ineffective way to deal with the problem. Adding repellents after each heavy rainfall would be far too expensive and ineffective. Moving the deer from one local area to another is no solution at all.
- Very costly because repeated application required due to rain. Also contamination.

Commentary on Other Management Options

- A cull is the only effective option
- It is very simple - just shoot them and get rid of the carcasses in the most expeditious fashion. Deer do not belong in an urban environment.
- A cull is the only logical option.

Other Commentary

- Idiotic.

Commentary on the Online Feedback Form

- This form is extremely opaque and if this citizen is confused I can guarantee others will be. The quality of input / feedback will be lowered because of the opacity of this form. Are we expected to speak to the option, or to the process of CDR advertisement of the option to the public? I am in favour of repellents / relocation as one of the no-kill options.
- As I commented two weeks ago, it is very difficult to understand what is being asked here. I am not sure why I am being consulted. I do not know what the scores refer to. I cannot find the evaluation rationale in the minutes (there is no heading titled rationale for evaluation and a word search does not turn up any phrase in the text "rationale for

evaluation". I cannot see any framework for evaluation in the minutes. therefore I cannot say whether I agree with the rationale for evaluation. I have therefore selected neutral. I suggested adding a "not applicable" or "abstain" box, but this was not done.

- I've had enough of this BS "consultation procedure". Use non-lethal methods for dealing with these deer. THAT is my input. I'm not wading through your ridiculous evaluation criteria trying to figure out how to answer your questions in a way that reflects my actual thoughts. NO CULL! PERIOD!
- I do not understand what it is you are asking me. These surveys are confusing and incomprehensible which is why I have responded with "Neutral". Let the record state that I think that using repellents is too expensive and doesn't work to address the overpopulation problem. Culling is the only reasonable choice.

Do you have any additional thoughts or comments on the application of the Evaluation Criteria to the Capture and Relocate management option?

Commentary on Capture and Relocate

- I like this option. I understand the mortality rate is high but at least the deer are given a bit of a chance vs just shooting them. There can't be that many deer so this may be economically feasible. Round them up and drive them somewhere remote - if you fly over Vancouver Island, most of it is completely undeveloped.
- Relocating adds incredibly to the costs. Better to trap the animals for consumption. Provide property owners with traps and they can call appropriate people when a capture is made.
- I believe the capture and relocate management will not work. It's difficult to achieve, expensive and time consuming. The only way to control the deer population is to reduce permanently, probably by capture and kill.
- Capture and Relocate would be an option I could live with. This would work alongside the repellent option.
- Where will they go?? How easily will they readjust?? To me this is a hugely time consuming job that will not necessarily guarantee that the problem will be eliminated..there are just too many negatives connected..
- Makes the most sense to me re satisfying the majority, however, how would the cost, which I'm guessing would be expensive, be shared?
- Although the deer problem may be reduced by this method due to relocation and the expected mortality rate of this method, it is very costly. The best option is a controlled public hunt in which the animals are utilized as food and are removed at almost no cost to the taxpayers. My property on Millstream Rd. has 4 resident deer, one buck and 2 large does and 1 younger unaltered deer. They create such a problem with gardening, our laurel hedge, our shrubs etc that I have decided to plant nothing until this deer problem is addressed. I am furious with the furry little critters! They are so tame they will let me walk within 10 ft. or so of them, and just stare at me. The buck is starting to get more aggressive, and has challenged me several times while walking down my driveway at night. I would be happy to shoot him if I was allowed!!

- I'm very disappointed in the ratings for this option. This is the most effective option and despite the supposed mortality rate (unsubstantiated) it is less than euthanization, the only other effective option. I'll be very interested to see the analysis and conclusions/recommendations resulting from all this. In my opinion only the options with the highest effectiveness should be considered. If the objective of reducing deer is not achieved then the option is of no value no matter how the other criteria is rated. As noted above there are only two options that achieve the objective of reducing the number of deer and relocation will have the lowest mortality rate of the two.
- Unless the MoE is playing one sided they should provide a permit to relocate the deer. To me the bottom line is that the deer do not present a problem in the current situation. I have seen maybe 10 deer in Oak bay in the last few years. Again killing them because they are here is not an option.
- This is a joke? When I think of the escaped bunnies that the neighbour offed with a shotgun in Errington - it remains one of the funniest and also most pathetic sagas I have ever heard! Will we ship them to France where they would be featured on the menu?
- They say deer don't relocate well, so I can't comment on that. But again, it's costly. Why can't we enjoy the benefit of capturing them; i.e. it is costly to capture them, but the value of the venison could offset that.
- The deer who get relocated face a very difficult time if the area is already populated with other deer. A turf war will ensue.
- Very stressful and possible injurious to the animals concerned. Records from othe areas have indicated this is not a desireable option.
- Does not deal with the over abundance of deer, simply moves the problem elsewhere.
- Moving the problem somewhere else? That's not a solution.
- Evaluation criteria are OK; ratings add no value. Capture and relocate is poor solution - high cost, low positive impact, only moves problem.
- Consideration of deer conflicts in other locations is unrealistic as that places more importance on that vs. the conflicts deer have with humans in the city. If other Gov't departments won't cooperate, then the deer must be culled and used for food for the homeless or markets. Any process will have to take place over a few years to get rid of them all. Deer have to go and that is all there is to it.
- Just moving the problem. A cull is the only logical answer.
- Relocate?? to where?? Suggest a large (Very Large fenced holding pen). For eventual move to Texes or deer heaven.
- MOVE THEM TO WHERE NATURAL PREDATION AND HABITAT IS PROVIDED AND NOT ONTO THE BACK OF TAXPAYERS.
- ditto to above. What are the scores about? what does (2) mean under the column medium rating in "legend - general"? Am I supposed to be saying whether the principles for evaluation were correctly applied to the scores?
- Cruel. Public education is the only ethical option.
- Deer are territorial animals and would probably come back to their territory, also it is dangerous for the animal and possibly the person capturing them. This is right up there

with shooting them...not a good idea! We need to learn to cohabit with deer and other wildlife.

- Why let a bunch of PETA enthusiasts dictate this option? It's expensive, cruel, and ineffective. All it does is move the problem to another area. You need to encourage birth control options if you don't want predators moving into the urban/rural areas to manage the population. Look at what they do in Britain; they have keepers to manage the populations of both deer and rabbits. The animal populations stay healthy, the people have cheap meat, and everyone is content with the population levels in their community.
- Moving large numbers of deer to a new location would stress that area and likely upset the nature balance. Also it is very time-consuming and costly...and for what gain? Look at what is now happening with the UVic bunnies where the bunny huggers donated money to relocate them to sanctuaries and now donations have slowed down dramatically...ie who would want to KEEP ON PAYING for relocation?? PS I almost hit a deer in broad daylight on Richmond Ave last week (it suddenly bolted from the bushes across the road)...luckily no-one was behind me to rear-end my car!
- This does not seem to be a good option. Culling is the best all round solution
- If capture became an option, albeit an expensive one then I suggest that the males be sterilized.
- I think Capture, relocate and euthanize is a better option, just relocating is not going to help the situation unless they are relocated to a general hunting area, which might be a good idea...
- Capture and relocate is a sensible, viable solution, and should be the one being considered by the CRD.
- fund a farmer to take them all in a large fenced field and raise them for venison
- Relocation is a waste of effort.
- Too costly and unnecessary, plus other people won't want them in their towns either.
- Slow and expensive. The relocated animals may not be welcome elsewhere.
- I don't think this is a viable option. Too expensive and not realistic to expect good results.
- Removal is needed to reduce numbers, damages and overall impacts of a rising deer population.
- This is a very expensive option and again I feel that you are just moving the problem not dealing with it.
- if we pay all of us a minimum amount of 10.00 dollars it will cover the insurance for the poor personnel who are frightened to capture those beasts..why not anesthetic shot and when the deer is sleeping we put them in the truck with cover for movers that prevent harm of the deer during transport...relocate far away and do a minimum of 4 trucks with 60 beasts by truck will be efficient...for a beginning think rain forest to relocate them please it is far away and it will help wolves and pumas to live...
- They will just come back. It's a numbers issue, too many deer not enough land.
- If I am understanding this correctly, the feasibility of implementing the capture and relocation option is not economically practical, which I would agree with. Moving the deer will only result in their potential return to the area, as well as creating an overpopulation problem in the relocated area.

- Relocating just moves the problem to another neighbourhood. Waste of funds. Fencing every yard and farm will force them into the streets and public areas - Jasper south Repellants generally don't work. Find and subsidize a reliable product. Food crops need immediate protection - subsidize fencing and allow free roaming dogs as deterrent in some areas
- I do not expect this method will be effective. It will probably lead to injuries, deaths, and abortions of fetuses if done during the breeding/fertile periods. It is probably costly and traumatic to both the deer and those watching this process, and I do not know if deer will remain "relocated". Also, the question is how much area is available for relocation without overpopulating. I still believe the best long time method to alter population distribution and numbers is by fencing and similar methods to reduce access to food, which will lead to slow reduction of populations. Possible reintroduction of predatory species may also prove somewhat effective in reducing weaker animals and so doing, improve the health of the deer population overall.
- Waste of time. You would be overcrowding an area that has a balanced population. This leads to hunger and disease. The deer would suffer.
- Just relocate the poor things already!
- I do not understand what it is you are asking me. These surveys are confusing and incomprehensible which is why I have responded with "Neutral". Let the record state that I think that capturing and relocating is a ridiculous option. It is too expensive and only creates problems elsewhere. Culling is the only reasonable choice.
- This seems a good option IF there is actually found to be a genuine overpopulation of deer in Victoria (as opposed to loud complaints from gardeners - not necessarily the same thing). From my perspective, there is no discernible problem unless you think that the mere existence of deer in urban Victoria is a problem.
- No rating should be greater than a "1" - this is evading the issue and the potential for just moving the problems elsewhere and/or creating new ones is too high to ignore. Forget it.
- I still believe a continuous cull is required. Capture and relocate just puts the problem in someone else's back yard.
- Apply common sense and fiscal responsibility. Shoot the deer, sell the meat, or use it to feed homeless people. Do it now.
- Vancouver Island already has the largest number of Mule deer in BC. Relocation would add to the problem of overpopulation, and accompanying food depletion, and disease. Nature's only means to control. Deer would be forced to migrate back into rural areas in greater numbers. More animals would then require culling. A futile and costly exercise.
- You've overrated this, even if you are talking relocation somewhere far distant from the CRD
- Try it for some of the deer. But if capturing to transfer to an already overpopulated area - sterilize one gender before releasing. Surely the food value of venison is considered in many areas of Canada and Europe and Africa to be nutritious and delicious ...Free range / organic etc etc
- This is a ridiculous idea. You already point out the problems. Mainly, this solution is disingenuous because you know and the public will learn that the high mortality rate

makes this solution nearly as drastic as the purposeful killing of deer. I say again: humans and not deer are the problem. Leave the non-humans alone. Let's manage ourselves and minimize our impact (and ourselves). Unfortunately, we are out of control and we wouldn't have it any other way. That's the problem.

- If the deer population is not culled/captured and relocated, you can be sure cougars will not be far behind...and they will not go hungry. There is not a perfect solution where there will be consensus. PLEASE stop dithering. The cost of any/all of the options will continue to increase exponentially. Hopefully, it won't take a tragedy to get the attention of anyone who in a position to take action--is there even anyone in such a position?
- Moving the deer to another place is not the answer. The evaluation criteria on this option seems very complete.
- No
- I don't think the capture and relocation idea is a bad one. I am not sure why it was rated as taking a long time in urban areas....perhaps it is that the deer would return? If it is a case that it would be too hard to track them down...they are very predictable in Oak Bay and Victoria. I think ultimately a cull is necessary
- I chose "strongly agree" because this is something that would actually get rid of the deer. But if they are going to die anyway (your last bullet talks about "high mortality rates of Capture and Relocation"), then why not just euthanize them and not put them through capture and relocation?
- Capture and relocate is fine - but how quickly will the deer reproduce? The number of deer in my Cordova Bay neighbourhood is growing exponentially. Instead of one or two deer a few times per week, it is now a herd of 5-10 every day, every night. They pose a health hazard to my family (ticks/lime disease) and they pose a significant traffic hazard on windy and hilly roads. The deer have no predators. I am not happy. It is time to reduce the number of deer NOW! They are cute - but they are a real hazard. This problem will only get worse - and it is a real problem.
- The main problem with this option that I have not seen a solution to in the materials is - where do you relocate them to? If this can be solved without dumping the Greater Victoria area's problem onto someone else, particularly an agriculture area, I think it is a good solution.
- This activity would be totally useless in the long run as it would only crowd over-run areas that are already lessening in size.
- The relocation would have to be completely off the Island ! (such as the Uvic rabbits) You really can not win with any solution for this problem) Islands such as the Northern Haidas.
- I would say the same as above, you are still not reducing the population, moving it about will not solve the problem. It also seems logistically and expensewise a somewhat ridiculous option to consider.
- Capture/relocate is more stressful on the deer than sharpshooting, and relocating is not solving the problem. Are you going to ship them all to Texas, like UVic did with its rabbits?
- I disagree with almost all of your ratings: negative comm impacts medium? A cage in the woods is supposed to affect me? Should be 3 low. Cost is high, could be lowered by

making it a summer job (after rearing of the fawns is well over of course) and hire students to help. How come feasibility/capacity is so low? Again what is difficult in setting a trap? Should be high 3. Effectiveness should be set as high as shooting them should be 3.

- From what I can determine, capturing and relocating doesn't work. Apparently, it is too stressful on the deer, and they risk being injured in the process. On the other hand, it beats shooting them on site, as Butchart Gardens is rumoured to do if one of them wanders onto their property.
- I am rating this option as neutral because I agree with some aspects, not others. Not practical - mortality, relocation problematic. Better to just shoot the deer and use the meat - if not for public consumption, perhaps SPCA, WildArc could make use of it. The deer population needs to be reduced - I would say, in the city, eliminated completely. Deer are wild animals. The city is no place for them. Consider the UVic rabbit situation. The fuss over that has blown over, and there is a zero-tolerance policy towards rabbits on campus now. Note that the sanctuaries in Texas and Washington that accepted the UVic rabbits are now short of funds to keep them. As with the rabbits, it just takes the political will to act. Would we allow cattle to roam our streets? Well, deer have become the sacred cows of Victoria.
- Relocation is not an option. Black tailed deer live in very small areas, where they were born, and need familiarity and the safety of knowing hiding places, trails, birthing areas. They cannot safely be moved. The mortality rate is not acceptable. Tolerance and taking non lethal measures to co-exist with them is the ONLY acceptable solution.
- Deer are difficult to relocate as they live their whole life in a very small area. Often die from shock of move.
- I really question whether respondents throughout this whole survey process have read enough of the background material to really understand the questions and the true meaning of their of their responses, i.e., if you were to give them the same questions a month later, I believe the response would be very different/totally inconsistent. I urge you to do it for a sample and see if I am right or wrong.
- RELOCATION: Deer Injury, death, deer family disruption, fear and disorientation make this option inappropriate. The CRD need to change the sub-division law so that some wild-life habitat is preserved. Regarding agriculture, some wise farmers co-exist with deer and other wild-life by leaving some acreage for them and using fencing to protect their crops. Last week one CAG/ERWG member at the CAG meeting referred to deer as being like cockroaches and vermin. May I remind the CRD that the ERWG and the CAG were supposed to be objective and as unbiased as possible. Instead we have members on the Expert Group as well as the CAG who hate deer. Thank you!
- This seems to be a very cumbersome, expensive and in effective approach as indicated in your summary. I do not agree with this solution. Since this may be may last chance to contribute my feelings on the matter, I suggest that the most logical solution is capture and euthanization. We are doing the deer no justice if we let them continue to grow in numbers and struggle for food and shelter and safety.
- Costly and problem of where to relocate so not just transferring the problem to another area. Best option is euthanization.

Commentary on Other Management Options

- A cull is the only effective option
- Get rid of the deer quickly. It is very simple - just shoot them and get rid of the carcasses in the most expeditious fashion. Deer do not belong in an urban environment. Endless surveys just delay the process. Get on with it!
- Have sharpshooters kill the deer and give the meat to those in need. There are just too many of them now and they are so well fed the does are regularly having twins and triplets. Is there a birth control that can be given them?
- I would also favour immunocontraception for deer reduction.

Commentary on the Online Feedback Form

- This form is extremely opaque and if this citizen is confused I can guarantee others will be. The quality of input / feedback will be lowered because of the opacity of this form. Are we expected to speak to the option, or to the process of CDR advertisement of the option to the public? I am in favour of repellents / relocation as one of the no-kill options.

Other Commentary

- www.StoryofBroke.org shows us how non-lethal approaches are more affordable than culling.