

Online Feedback Form Responses for Capture & Euthanize Management Option

Background

- The total number of responses is 206
- The feedback form was available on the deer management website for public input from July 13, 2012 at 3:00 pm to Wednesday, July 18, 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.

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

Commentary on Capture & Euthanize

- Recoup costs by selling the meat
- That all concerned; for, and against, realise that the deer population is doubling constantly as this problem is being discussed. The food supply to sustain these animals in a rural setting is dwindling, as is any food grown by, and for residents use. A greater need for sustained farming is evident where less will be produced by individuals due to increasing deer intrusion, and destruction. Deer are already seeking to destruct shrubs, and foodstuffs, not normally eaten by them. Unlike humans, deer cannot control their numbers by choice - unfortunately. Starvation and disease is nature's result.
- I would prefer the option of castration, but this would be the second choice providing the meat is not wasted.
- It needs to be done. If it were bears or cougars there would be no hesitation. The deer are attacking my dog in the garden. They are eating all the flowers. Victoria can no longer be called a City of Gardens. Sure they are cute but they have taken over.
- I have plenty of thoughts against capture and euthanization. It is inhumane and will cause grief not only to the deer but also to people in the area. You will never capture all the deer. The reputation of the CRD and the city will be tarnished world-wide. Ask the University of Victoria about the flak they received not to mention the many thousands of

emails, letters and petitions they received over their plan to kill the rabbits. We cannot simply kill animals because they are there.

- I would suggest that the committee not get locked into endless study but move decisively. There will be some that feel the deer should be left to wander freely but in reality that doesn't make a great deal of sense. It took years to get rid of the U Vic rabbits which were a plague in the area and spreading.
- Disagree 100% with the capture and kill option.
- Let the record show that I fully support a capture and euthanize model, no matter what "applications of criteria" are used. The language you are using here is clumsy and confusing. Please consider less committee-type talk and more direct questioning to ascertain public opinion. Thank you.
- I strongly disagree with any option to do with killing the deer. In my neighbourhood (Cordova Bay), we co-exist with the deer using several options, including deer-proof plants, topical applications and fencing. The public needs to be educated about living with the deer and other animals.
- Overnight traps would work, deer come out to eat overnight and into the early morning, and leave around 9 am. There seems to be no other option other than a cull, but this would result in a great quantity of meat, it could be distributed island-wide.
- We have to assume that a 2.5 score is a high score. And it appears that there is support for the cost as it should be most effective. Yesterday we had 8 deer in our garden -- 3 big bucks, 2 doe's, 1 mid sized doe and 2 fawns. They were all eating and resting. I approached the nearest buck and got to within 10 feet of him and I had to back off, This is my garden, not his. We live on Beach Drive near Trial Island. It is severely out of hand and scary. Suggest the deer meat be used to feed the homeless and sell the balance to house the homeless. Action please!
- I do not think you could go onto private property, if home owners refused you access to their property to kill and butcher deer. If property owners do not allow you to enter their property to kill deer, the entire option is a waste of time and money.
- If capture and euthanize is less humane, I go with sharpshooters. My hope is that the deer will regain their natural fear of humans and stay in the forest.
- I marked "strongly agree" notwithstanding the cost for more than one reason... being involved at U Vic... when the decision was made to euthanize the rabbits, lots of bad press, etc, you know the story. However, it was done quietly at night, a little at a time and I don't think most people even noticed. One day they were mostly gone. Forgotten for the most part.. I don't see another solution other than to split it and tranquilize a lot and move them to a location where they can thrive in a more natural setting. At the same time, I don't know how feasible that is cost wise and how far would they have to go? Off the island. There is a farm near Campbell River that raises deer for meat, perhaps that could be explored. I imagine they'd be happy to acquire more stock at a minimum cost. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
- This is not a reasonable option, in my opinion. Besides that it likely to be inhumane (probably cause many unintended deaths during the "capture" process) unethical, expensive, and not effective long term. Killing the deer population is not the answer. Individuals with gardens to protect should fence their property. Agricultural land owners

should do the same, using methods to keep deer off their property by the use of non-lethal techniques (fencing - that is part of the cost of doing their business, is tax deductible and a land improvement and once amortized is not an unreasonable burden, especially if they are offered some type of tax break or partial subsidy) dogs can be trained to chase them deer or other problem animals off the property until they no longer venture there, etc. Otherwise what's next, crow kills (I could say murders of murders of crows), starlings, pigeons, other grain and fruit eating birds? This problem was created by allowing for farmers to remove natural predators, and they need to take some responsibility for it.

- Sadly, capture and euthanize would seem to be the only viable option as the deer have no natural predators.
- I understand that if this is managed with the help of first nations personnel it is easier to obtain permits. Perhaps some of the cost could be offset by donating the meat to the butchers.
- Local Golf courses may be agreeable to provide space for trap locations
- Quit talking, just get rid of the deer!
- Municipalities need to pressure the Province to allow "capture and relocate behind fence", as done in New Zealand, to create a much stronger and more viable deer farming industry in BC. NZ's deer farming and related policies have created jobs, a food supply for restaurants, and huge exports. Makes more sense than just killing them.
- I think euthanizing the deer is absolutely unacceptable we have invaded their home not visa versa, mankind should stop considering themselves better than other creature, capture and spay not euthanize.
- At the present time there is no natural balance. That of course ended with the influx of humans into the deer's territory and the cougars exit. We must move forward. I see no practical avenue other than a humane cull. To those who suggest there is nothing humane about a cull I offer that in the wild, with predators, a deer's death can be much more agonizing.
- Capture and Euthanize appears to be one of the most effective models, according to your discussion. In the example of Sidney Island, it seemed to work very well with a minimum of stress to the deer during the capture phase. Being able to sell the meet gives this option a self-financing possibility lacking in all the other options. Other than a perceived squeamishness amongst the public at large, this option seems to have few negative features. Intense public education should, over time, make this option more politically palatable.
- Please choose the much more humane, yes expensive, but it lasts awhile, method of contraception for deer. Killing these beautiful, sentient, and innocent creatures who are rarely aggressive is inhuman. They deserve to live and are part of our communities. We have moved into their areas and encroached upon them.
- I think that capture and euthanize is best option. The deer should be used to feed the homeless. That way no one could say that we just killing them to get rid of them.
- I think the Capture and Euthanize management option is created to treat a symptom and not the cause of negative interactions between deer and humans. The focus should be on how we can help the deer stay wild and alive, as well as allowing for human

population centers. Perhaps humans need to adjust their behaviours and create less appealing refuges (i.e. golf courses) and food sources for the deer. Killing the deer does not address the bigger picture. It merely satisfies a small group of people in the short term.

- It is sickening to read capture and euthanize the Deer. Please provide food source in their existing habitat ie. planting whatever they need to eat to stay alive! We would gladly volunteer to plant vegetation specifically for the Deer. WE ARE ADAMANT AGAINST A CULL!
- Why with all the options to keep deer out of the garden etc is it that we are so lacking in creativity that the only option is to kill them. What is wrong with coexistence? It works in other areas of North America where they value their wildlife. If you're golfing at Pebble Beach Ca. you had better not hit a deer. After all were they not here first? The only reason they are in our backyards is because we took their backyards.
- I would support euthanization and the meat being donated to food banks, charitable organizations and/or first nations. Deer do not belong in urban areas nor should they be allowed to damage agricultural crops. As a gardener we are spending hundreds of dollars replanting, spraying, putting up fences to no avail.
- What a bunch of BAFFELGAB!!! The money being spent on the decision process will exceed the cost of the carrying out of the solution!!!
- Deer are very sweet looking and evoke emotional responses. However, they pose a definite problem and have become aggressive. We have lost several trees and many large plants to deer. They have the ability to just about wipe out a garden. When I hear people say, "Oh for goodness sake can't you spare a few plants?" They have no idea the extent of the damage that they are capable of very quickly. Plants and trees have a right to live. At great expense we installed a fence but not everyone can afford to do so. Even with a fence they still pose a problem and from time to time find a way in. I definitely believe that it should be municipal policy to ban the feeding of all wild animals deer, bears and racoons. If only for the sake of the animals. I believe that deer belong in the forest and not in the suburbs or city where they are exposed to various kinds of foods that would not be part of a wild deer's diet. No doubt there will be problems down the road with such a diet of plants that are most likely not good for their diet.
- This approach to deer management is abhorrent to me. It typifies what is wrong with 'civilisation'. We have no right to kill these animals anymore than we have a right to kill other people who we have to share this place with.
- I find this survey very ambiguous and difficult to understand. However, I am solidly in favour of a deer cull given the exponential increase in the number of urban deer and the total lack of natural predators that would normally keep this population in check. I am NOT in favour of spending public money to butcher these deer, nor am I in favour of donating the meat to food banks or First Nations. This could and should be a self-funding program, like that on Sidney Island, where a commercial butcher euthanizes, cuts, wraps and sells the meat. The CRD may be able to recoup costs involved by allowing commercial butchers to do this for a fee.
- I'm not sure I understand what you are asking in this question...but if you are saying, should we capture and euthanize the deer...my answer is a definite yes. So many

people are adversely affected by the increasing deer population. Some bleeding hearts...who aren't affected are always going to be against this, but many more are suffering and growing increasingly frustrated.

- capture and euthanize should NOT be an option... fencing is the solution for agricultural.
- Move ahead to an annual cull
- Rather than euthanize I'd prefer an option whereby deer would be shot with a dart gun and sterilized if such an option exists and if it is close to cost-competitive with euthanizing. If euthanizing is the selected option I certainly endorse the idea of using as much of the meat as possible by donating it to appropriate organizations and/or by selling it to recover culls to the extent possible.
- DO NOT UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES TRAP THEN LEAVE FOR AN ENTIRE NIGHT TO SUFFER IN PAIN AND THEN KILL THEM THE NEXT DAY. PERHAPS WE SHOULD TRAP AND EUTHENIZE SOME PEOPLE FIST. DON'T BE RIDICULOUS.I did some research on my own and BIRTH CONTROL for this population would be far more effective, less costly, and more humane than killing and or fencing. It's easily delivered, effective and won't cause pain and suffering. Have you even considered this?
- I really don't want them killed - I just want them to be gone from my backyard for health reasons (potential lyme disease threat).
- Capture and euthanize is a second best. I favor reducing population by sharp shooter as more humane, less costly.
- I believe after reading what you have sent us, that you look at Winnipeg, they were able to relocate the population of does, yes this may be risky to the deer, but to capture and euthanize because they are a problem, to our natural habitat, when we allow more and more condos to be built on these same habitats, just does not make any sense to me, you look at View Royal, Saanich and Colwood, areas where people are being so called "CONCERNED" about the deer population and the affect that the "Deer are having on our natural habitat,, we constantly are looking at new buildings, condos malls, businesses, being built in these areas(IE new development On Watkiss Way being planned, view Royal , New condos, Colwood, and Saanich)I think if we can relocate we should, even if it is the does only, and to seriously look at allowing local residents to take advantage of this by hunting for their family's needs, limit the amount of does and you will probably find less interactions within the communities as food will be more available to the population, thank you for the information, was very helpful
- It is difficult to come to the conclusion that there needs to be some form of euthanization, but this is what it has come to. In Oak Bay and parts of Victoria (Fairfield, Gonzales, Jubilee) I see multiple deer everyday. There is one doe with four fauns. There are many other does with one or two fauns as well as a number of bucks. By next spring I expect the population will double again.
- I find the culling or "harvest" of wildlife highly upsetting in any context, be it the killing of a few hundred deer in urban areas or the mass slaughter of tens of thousands of seal pups off Canada's east coast. Both actions illustrate the same thing: A total disrespect for the environment and a belief in the superiority of humans over everything. That approach will eventually lead to our demise as a species and that's why those of us who respect nature must consistently oppose the slaughter of innocent animals. You should

be looking for ways in which deer and people can peacefully coexist. Such as a strict prohibition on feeding deer, fencing along main highways, reducing speed limits in some locations, signposting, etc. Thank you.

- Let's get after it.
- I disagree that support and enthusiasm is as high as 2. Should be closer to 1. You are dreaming if you think Health Canada will let you give the meat away, too many health requirements no doubt. The animal will have died for nothing in the end, what a waste.
- Euthanize and process the venison!
- The deer need to be culled one way or another. Are you also considering sharpshooting which seems to be more effective and less expensive?
- The people of Oak Bay will not accept the killing of deer. If the farmers want to get rid of the deer because they prefer to shoot, rather than to install fencing, that is their choice, Maybe they could use some help with filling out requests for subsidies. You better leave our deer alone!!! It is quite obvious that the above evaluation was done by farmers and pro cull members. If deer will be killed in our area, it will be time to leave this city.
- Contract Crd Bylaw and Animal Care Services to humanely cull the deer population.
- I totally disagree with the capture and euthanization option. There is no need to destroy these animals. They were here before us. Trap and move to another location I would accept. I see deer on a daily basis, and it's one of the joys of living here.
- I strongly support the Cranbrook method of capture and humanely kill and for the butchering of the meat.
- What the CAG notes, should be ignored, as those views are from a mainly pro cull committee. It is very unfortunate that the CRD seems to ignore all the glitches it has already created, right from the start. The general public is not aware that the CAG is mainly a group of farmers who think they have all the power. How many percent of farmers do we have? I caution the farmers to realize that their attitude might back fire. As is the case, most of our fruits and vegetables are imported or originate from other areas of Canada. Some farmers are blaming the deer for loss of crop, when in actual fact, their crops are simply poor because of the weather conditions. Other farmers (the wise ones) have put of fencing. When I purchased local strawberries, (I will not mention the farm) I was shocked at their quality. They looked o.k. but were basically not sweet. Sadly this means there will not be many repeat customers. So eventually, the berries will be lost, but not to the deer! It is time the CRD steps back from this process, as the deer issue needs to be discussed openly in each community. What a shame that the CAG will be remembered as another failure as far as using our tax dollars wisely.
- I can sympathize with the farmers. It has been a bad year for their crops. (Cold temperatures). I suggest that rather millions of dollars are going to be spent on an ugly slaughter (lots of bloodshed and emotional stress) we use that money to help the farmers install good quality fencing. I am sure the people of Victoria will support this kind of a decision.
- Seems reasonable. We need to get on with this.
- I don't agree with the use of any program that includes any culling or killing of deer.
- I actually have absolutely nothing to say but, that I am disgusted! I can't believe that actual human beings had this idea. Obviously those who are for this aren't real humans

and I mean not real humans as in they have no heart or soul. I can't believe that there are actual people who want to euthanize these innocent animals. I didn't realize that there were these types of selfish, arrogant and crude people around. I could say much more but honestly I don't want to get into too much trouble! You have no idea how mad this makes me at the people who are for this application!

- This is really bad, I can't believe anyone would want to hurt these innocent animals. For those who are for this application, I have absolutely no clue how they sleep with themselves at night!
- Let me start off by saying I believe the answer is of course to kill the deer. In the deer population in Town, most attrition comes from death by vehicle, fence, dog or other man made obstacles. And sometimes that is not a very pleasant death at all. In the end the clover trap is not going to satisfy those who believe that supermarket meat is more humane than hunting or euthanizing, or people who want to see the deer population controlled. The eastern US has used bow hunting in towns successfully I believe for some time now. Hunters pay for special lice. and in some cases have to pass a proficiency test as well. People who want the meat pay for the right to hunt in the area of overpopulated deer. Cost affective?
- Please, please, please don't keep this 'study' going on for years....just make a decision and get on with it!
- "Euthanize" means "the good death." Your own validation comments concede that this method causes stress for the animals.
- Rather than capture you could go straight to kill with bow/arrow or low velocity bullet.
- I absolutely oppose this option. It is NOT a solution. It is admitted that it would have to be an ongoing option. It has proved to be ineffective in other jurisdictions. It is an "easy" option. It also shows the unwillingness of communities to face the real causes of the problem. It is unethical. It makes our wildlife pay for human mistakes and reckless lifestyle. And I could go on and on.....
- Surely you could have come up with an easier survey than this. Having said that I will state yet again something needs to be done soon. There is a provincial election approaching which seems to be an ideal time to pressure the government to assume their responsibility in the matter. I am quite sure in the feasibility of the urban environment category you could find residents as ready and willing as agriculturalist to have traps on their property if it meant reducing the population to provide a safer environment on the roads and protect individuals investment in their gardens.
- Just to say that the sooner the deer population is reduced the better. I've now been unable to grow any vegetables for my family in my back yard for the past 3 years and the deer are constantly decimating my perennials.
- A continuous cull is what is required. "Fixing" the males at some point would be effective as well.
- I had to indicate 'neutral' as I did not understand the question. This survey is confusing and a frightening example of obfuscation. If you want input ask us if we agree to the killing or culling of deer. If the answer is no, the survey stops. If yes, then offer some options on how to kill. I am opposed to any kill/cull program; however, I would be

interested in other options. The bolt option is not supportable. However, you haven't offered me other options. A survey without options isn't useful.

- I find your survey very difficult to perform owing to its complicated setup. You should provide the criteria in abbreviated form on the page of each survey. I am pro capture-and-euthanize, and pro using the meat productively. We should not be afraid of dealing with it this way, it can be carried out in a professional way. Why not use the federal Plant Health facility up in North Saanich? The one that is now closed. Or a section of park in the Sooke area which would be closed and used for this purpose. The animals could be sedated with darts and then shot, to reduce stress. Not pleasant, but if we permitted regulated hunting in rural Saanich under certain conditions, that would take care of it too. There are just too many deer and they are bothering the residential and agricultural communities.
- **As the CRD mainly chose pro cull members to the CAG, it is not surprising to see these results. The CAG can go on and on, it will all be in vain. Once a fair and public process takes place, the CRD will regain the faith of the people of Victoria. To help the farmers protect their crops, an immediate fencing subsidy should be made available, which will be a lot more economical, than a cull. No cull! Period!**
- The sooner a decision is made to end the deer infestation, the fewer the animals will be that are affected. The population is exploding. Vehicle accidents are becoming more of a daily hazard and concern, than vegetation destruction, especially if human lives are lost. Urgency to take action now.
- I agree that the deer need to be eliminated and to euthanize is the best way to me but am less inclined to the capture and euthanize than to the sharpshooting method which would be quicker and more humane to me..Yesterday I counted 8 deer in my neighbourhood (Gordon Head)alone--3 were newborns..HURRY!
- I do not believe humans have the right to exterminate God's creatures at our whim...I'm sure there must be alternatives that we could live with--my thought has always been that if we could capture and kill, then we could capture and neuter a certain amount to stop the population explosion so we could live in harmony with these beautiful creatures. I live in an area where there are many deer and I moved here 37 years ago knowing that and have loved living where they roam. Yes, there are sometimes too many pooping in my yard but I have fenced the areas I want to keep for myself, and left lots of area for them to graze, rest, etc. PLEASE do not kill these beautiful creatures! You do not have the God given right!
- Regardless of the above noted criteria, I believe that a cull is a necessity, as the numbers are clearly getting out of control. To minimize negative public perception/reaction to the process, I think a tranquilizer of some sort could be used and then collection of the sleeping animals would be relatively straight forward.
- changing everyone's gardens/shrubs, fencing everywhere and hazing/blowing horns just aren't feasible and practical options for our homes, parks and golf course areas.
- Seems to be a cumbersome and costly approach. Sharpshooting would be quicker and likely less costly.
- I strongly believe that Capture and Euthanize option or Capture and Relocate option are the only ones being considered that offer any serious possibility of effectiveness. All

other options simply redistribute the deer, creating new problems, and don't address the increasing deer population. If Euthanization is more cost effective and includes the possibility donating the meat to a good cause or selling it as part of cost recovery then I believe this should be selected. Thank you for your efforts in studying this option.

- If this is determined to be a viable option, implement sooner rather than later.
- The BC Urban Ungulate Conflict Analysis laid out the situation and options very clearly. I got a bit lost in the minutes. Deer populations in my area have increased steadily over the last 10-15 years with no sign of abatement. I have nearly given up gardening because of them. As well, I regularly encounter deer on roads and highways in Victoria, sometimes in dangerous situations. Because of leash laws, deer now show no fear of urban environments in Victoria. We must control them by other means, now. I support both capture and euthanize and, where appropriate, sharpshooting to reduce populations. I would love to return to the days of no deer in my immediate neighbourhood.
- A cull, based on insufficient population data and other information, is sheer folly; it will leave a permanent resentment and doubt how the CRD are managing projects. The efficacy of decisions, the selective consultation process will linger for a very long time as will the CRD's commitment to the natural environment will sound hollow. The residents should be informed of the proposals in timely and succinct manner; alternatively, hold a referendum since, costs to the residents do not seem to matter. We have more pressing and worthwhile issues that need our urgent attention and limited resources. Why are we solving the wrong problems for a small minority?
- There are many non-lethal solutions available. Let us begin with reinstating the subsidy for fencing. A deer kill just does not look well at all in Victoria. Just think of the tourists!
- The cost is relatively small when compared to the damage deer do to properties and the cost to the individual land owner to protect the property from the deer.
- Get rid of the damned pests in urban areas, and thin out the population in farm areas.
- I do not understand your questions so please allow me to state my simple view as a long-term resident of Rockland neighbourhood in Victoria. I think deer should be culled by sharp shooters or clover traps. Failure to do this will condemn deer to a more inhumane death by car accident. Some cost recovery could come from sale of venison and ICBC / medicare cost savings (due to decreased car accidents).
- In Invermere the cull divided the community. This would also happen here, if the CRD's plan gets approval. The residents of Victoria are not paying attention to what is going on. When they find out, the "fight" will begin. The deer issue needs to be openly discussed by all the citizens.
- While the Capture and Euthanization program may appear to be a higher cost than other methods proposed by the Deer Management Advisory Group, it is by far the most effective and long-term solution as well as providing meat to a good cause (to charitable groups). Likewise, the meat could be sold and the funds used to repay the costs that have been incurred.
- Don't kill deer. Use humane nonlethal alternatives. If you kill then Victoria will be known worldwide as the deer murderers. BC's Shame! See <https://www.facebook.com/pages/Boycott-BC-Deer-Kills/273730359348586?sk=wall>

- I am not sure what the numbers in the second column of the table are related to in value. I'm certainly interested in the democratic procedure but will be only satisfied with a cull. Thirteen years of waiting for action is a long time to watch our garden being ravished.
- Please do go with this option. It makes sense that if the increase in deer numbers created the problem that the solution be a cull. None of the alternatives can be as effective. They may move the deer around, while they continue to breed, but they won't alleviate the stress/risk they are causing. The longer they are allowed to inhabit urban and farm areas the bigger, and more expensive, the solution will be.
- I am absolutely against any culling and am disgusted with this city for even considering that as an option. Any "damage" that deer do to the city is minimal and at worst superficial. If residents (or whoever) don't want the animals in their yard then they should just look into fencing and other safe & practical options. Killing and destroying animals should only ever be a last possible option (and in the best interest of the animal--they're injured and beyond saving).
- I believe that this is the most viable, affordable, long-term option available and I am strongly supportive.
- Euthanizing should not be an option. Period. Other solutions are workable and more humane.
- I'm not an authority to advise as to the action to take to control the deer, however, I request that you control this dangerous health situation with the deer spreading Lyme disease through the ticks they carry. Not only does our quality of life depend on action being taken but also the fact that deer are strong animals that can trample us. I know first-hand. I have come but a moment away from being trampled by a deer - running at a full gallop from down the street behind me. Please do whatever can be done to prevent further health and safety problems. Regardless of deterrents, the deer come through our yard - with their young - approximately four times per day. Your evaluation criteria is deeply embedded in your information material. A simple yes or no answer option would be clearer. My selection above to "agree" is only in agreement for control or eradication of the ever expanding deer population in urban areas.
- first nations concerns for one of their sources of food
- I am strongly opposed to a deer cull or any lethal action against the deer. I find it unacceptable....what 'group' will be next....if a situation can't be managed....the solution is to kill. 'Man' has never managed the environment well even though people believe they can. I find it unacceptable...and the whole CAG process seems to be bias and undemocratic.
- At this point with populations out of control there is little choice as i see it. I would like to see the meat donated to soup kitchens etc. whenever possible although I chose not to eat meat.
- I think the CRD should take the initiative and start removing deer in places where farmers or land owners are willing to have traps on their land and have the deer culled immediately. the problem is getting extreme with deer eating all sorts of plants they are supposed to find distasteful. Have talked to both farmers and residents who are really pissed off at the lack of action on the part of the CRD.

- Just speed up the cull process so citizens are not injured by deer collisions and are able to enjoy their yards and vegetable gardens again. If capture and relocation is a cheaper, easier option then we are all for it.
- I am very upset by the idea that you are even considering culling the deer from our areas. Why? Because a few people have complained about their plants being eaten? We've taken their space, we hit them with our cars, can't we allow them at least to live as well as possible? If people are concerned about their plants, put up a fence around them or around the yard. I have a few plants I'd prefer not be eaten so I have put barriers around them -- guess what, it works!! I love to have the deer in my yard and so do all of my friends. Send them to Colwood.
- I assume that you're talking about killing, I mean culling, deer and not humans. The question of capturing and euthanizing deer shouldn't even be on the table. I oppose it absolutely. Like I said before, the problem isn't the deer; it's the humans. It is the humans who are encroaching into and destroying non-human habitat. If there were fewer of us, the problem would be diminished; we could even learn how to live with them (again) and there would, then, no longer be a problem. Human habitat is forever expanding and we think that deer are the problem and so should be removed. Relocation to where that we won't find them to be a problem again? Humans are the problem species. Not deer. Not to mention that we all knew, at the outset, what the outcome of this farcical exercise was going to be.
- I am against the killing of the deer.
- 1) It is very important to me that the criteria contain first and foremost a supportable determination of the number of deer and the different herds. 2) Second, is the need understand their travel patterns - it's not random - it's very well planned for their needs. 3) If we are talking management, we need to also talk about wildlife corridors in our planning documents, particularly between natural park spaces. For example, we know animals reside in parks of reasonable size, i.e. Mt. Doug and Christmas Hill, and travel between these spaces. (Frankly, the notion that this is not acceptable to our public should be a concern to you and send a confirmed message as to public intolerance.) 4) Public policy with respect to wildlife corridors needs to fit into the criteria. 5) There needs to be an acceptance of where animals can live unthreatened. Where is the strategy to identify (e.g. ear tag) animals whose home is our natural park areas, like Beaver Lake Park? I strongly OPPOSE any capture, but I would vehemently oppose a capture within areas close to or within natural parks - that's morally wrong. 6) How many deer is too many, currently and in the future? If you don't have the numbers, or the means to get the numbers, how will you know you made your target. What is the system to measure the actual numbers (or in least factual estimate) in which to base the kill. 7) Include a strategy to deal annually with an public process of the deer kill program. When is the right time of year to do so? Will the Ministry of Environment take oversee the kill program? 7) How does a public education program fit in as well. Perhaps, with a bit more positive messaging and education we urbanites could be (and should be) a bit more tolerant of the creatures we share spaces with. As noted above, you also need to incorporate some proactive measures, instead of just reactive, which is what all the points in the criteria are based. Public policy regarding required wildlife corridors,

acceptance that natural parks will be the home of deer (yes, raccoons too) and education to promote public tolerance pieces should become part of the criteria because these two components will help to better prepare for the future and benefit everyone. (Could lessen the number of complaints.) Finally, we secure wonderful natural parks and open spaces, but don't want the wildlife. When we approve development, our planners and politicians secure wonderful tracts of land in the interest of public enjoyment. But, why does that not include wildlife? Who speaks for them? We need to better understand the numbers, and their patterns - it is probable that if we approach this by really trying to understanding the animal, we will find the solution in this knowledge. I leave you with this reminder, If the goal is find a solution to the complaint, we will never reach the goal and we will always have the complaint. Hearing the complaint is easy, reacting to the complaint is also easy....understanding the situation is difficult and takes time. I look forward to seeing another version of the criteria - perhaps a proactive approach, with some out of the box (non-Cranbrook-like) thinking. Respectfully.....

- Euthanasia is not our only or the best option to manage the deer.
- I would like to see the deer protected.
- I believe in feeding and caring for them and they will not be a nuisance any longer. Please take the example of Nara in Japan. they live in the town along with everyone else, are fed and cared for and loved by the residents as well as the tourists. The cows in India, the deer in Japan... why do we always think we should exterminate what also has every right to be here as well as humans?
- The fact that the CAG rated "negative community impact" of capture and euthanasia as "Low" shows that the members must have been confused by the simple double-negative. Rating "negative community impact" as "low" says that the CAG is completely oblivious to the wide-spread public outcry AGAINST a cull. It is distressing knowing how our communities will be ripped apart if the CRD blindly follows such blatant ignorance of what its citizenry is currently mobilizing to DEMAND - non-lethal management strategies for dealing with a problem that HUMANS have caused, and therefore must solve. Killing innocent creatures will not be allowed.
- What is this? Kill all the animals? What is wrong with people - fence your yard, plant items deer do not eat. We have had deer in our garden and all they eat are the blackberries - they are welcome to them. Arm the animals, I say
- I don't feel deer should be relocated or euthanized. I believe we should find effective ways to live harmoniously with them.
- Capture and euthanize would seem to be the only option with an actual measureable outcome. I have lived on this property for over 30 years and we have always had deer, it's only in the last 10 years where they have become a problem. Too many deer equals too much pressure on agricultural production and gardens. Less deer will allow the deer to forage on natural habitat. One reality we all need to face is that this is not a one time event; this will be an ongoing problem that will require ongoing solutions as the deer no longer have natural predators here in the area to control the populations. I fully support this option.

- I am wondering if the deer population needs to be culled? According to a report in 1995 by the Ministry of Forests, the deer population was in decline on Vancouver Island, (<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/pubs/docs/bro/bro41.pdf>). That being said, this report was over 17 yrs old. Has there been a more recent assessment. Will this cull reduce the local population below its sustainable capacity? Or has there been a study to find out the current population and compare it with birthing mortality rates to find a suitable number to cull. I believe we have essentially caused the deer problem by clearing forest in the vicinity of the CRD. Have you looked at an option like inoculation sterilization of captured deer? I am not affiliated with this company but have heard about it, since I have worked in wildlife sciences. Check out: <http://terramar.bc.ca/faq.html>
- Alternatively, all so called animal lovers could contribute money to help defray the cost of fencing!!!!!!
- The capture and euthanize option will cause extreme distress to the deer. I don't agree with bow hunters who will often not immediately kill the deer but wound it...
- I don't think there is a one size fits all solution. Deer are not a problem for me, personally, my child and I love to see them. Not that long ago all traffic came to a halt on the Lion's Gate Bridge to geese and goslings to cross the road - where are we going with this? To a world with no animals? Smell the roses, people!
- I am completely in favor of the controlled euthanization of the burgeoning deer population. They have increased in numbers now to the point of being a huge problem in urban areas. Travelling in packs of 6 or more now they can wipe out an entire landscape in the City of Gardens and provide a serious hazard to drivers as well. Let's get over the Bambi concept and get real - take back our gardens and our own driving safety.
- The fact is that in the wild animals such as deer do not generally die peacefully in their sleep: they are torn apart by predators, they die of starvation or disease or, in non-rural settings, they are struck by motor vehicles. A cull is a humanitarian option, even if an over-exposure to the Walt Disney view of nature prevents some people from seeing this.
- As farmers who have "successfully" fenced our land against deer we would like to say we have still had a deer problem because the deer still seem to find that hole in the fence or a dry ditch. It is amazing the damage they can do in one night. Not to mention that in the eleven years we have owned this property we have seen 4 dead deer on the stretch of property in front of our property line. They have all been hit by vehicles. One lady was so shaken after hitting a deer that I took her in so she could calm down before proceeding on her way. Furthermore we need our gates open for customer sales. They can sneak in and go unnoticed for hours and maybe even overnight.
- I do not believe that people have the right to kill off another species. The deer are innocent inhabitants of land that we have confiscated. They do not intentionally destroy our plantings. They wander and graze and are peaceful creatures sharing our space. We should leave them alone. "Capture and Euthanize" should NOT be an option for deer control. People considering this process are the inhumane ones.
- We farm organically and we have installed a fence to deter the deer. So far the fence has proved to keep the deer out successfully. Our farm is a small blip on the map however and I empathize with neighbors who cannot have a garden because of they

don't/ can't have a fence. I also empathize with large farmers who cannot afford to fence their entire properties at 8 or 9 feet all the way around their property. The report looks good

- If you want to farm, you need a fence at least 7 ft high. Culling is cruel and not the answer.
- we love to see deer around the neighbourhood. so many animals have gone. Shouldn't each municipality "do their own thing"?
- The evaluation criteria is ridiculous and manipulative. DO NOT trap and kill deer. The Terms of Reference say the CAG is to be unanimous in its decision-making or take a vote, neither of which is happening. The facilitator leads the way with the numbers and L and H on the chart and the CAG look like they are falling asleep. The CAG should be looking at fencing and other alternatives in a realistic way instead of being told it does not work; some farmers say fencing works. Guns and bow hunting will not be tolerated in agricultural, rural and urban areas.
- I believe both the deer and the rabbits should be culled on a regular basis. The deer are a safety hazard on the roads particularly at night and the rabbits carry disease. Both of these, if not found to be infected, should be butchered properly and sold for food rather than wasting them. Thanks.
- The huge benefit of being able to donate the meat to food bank/charities appears to be under-valued - the societal benefit that this provides should significantly offset the "high" cost noted in the evaluation.
- To everyone I talk to, they all say "Get on with the job, cull the deer. Less talk and more action!" Endless criteria list making only exasperate the public and the problem. We are all very frustrated with the overabundance of deer.
- The deer are not out of control. People just don't want them to eat their gardens. Put fences around the garden. Use plants that deer don't like. The deer don't want us living in their habitat. Maybe they'll decide to "cull", which is political-speak for "kill" those pesky humans.
- There must be other options available besides killing these deer. They are not the problem, we are. What message are we sending if we(you) choose to simply kill animals just because they are interfering with our lifestyles. You have no heart or soul if you feel that a cull is the option.
- on going euthanization must be an option to reduce to deer numbers especially in the ALR areas. Strong help from the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment must be applied here, as there are likely no other areas that the deer can be routinely killed. And they likely cause some of the most severe and costly damage in the ALR. The continuation of farming... on many farms is at risk.
- Dear members of the CAG, I am a large commercial operation on the Saanich Peninsula that cannot afford to fence the hundreds of acres that we farm each year. Already this year I have lost thousands of dollars due to the deer eating and damaging our vegetable crops and I cannot deal with this alone! We need help and fast! This is not a problem that can be solved with fencing as it just drives the problem to another farm. Please know that the farmers are suffering financially every year that nothing is done whether you hear from them on this survey or not. To be honest, to review the materials and sit

and write this is hard to find the time as this is harvest time and farmers are BUSY! If you haven't heard from every farmer, that doesn't mean they don't have a problem with the deer eating their livelihood, it means they are in the fields trying to make a living!

- We do believe that a cull is required in areas that are far from the rural areas - and that the "trap and Bolt Gun" method is unnecessarily sensational and bound to rally the deer-hugging groups. To trap, tranquilise and remove to a private location for euthanising would be much more appropriate. To say that those for and against a cull are equally divided is not consistent with opinions expressed to us by our neighbours and by others living in Oak Bay - nor is it consistent with earlier reports published by the CRD.
- The CAG is so heavily biased in favour of culling as to be a joke! There is not even a hint of objectivity here. The whole process, with its lack of direct public input, is a travesty. Instead, irate farmers, a bowhunter and other pro-cull members will determine the outcome, which is no doubt what the CRD had in mind in the first place. CAG should be disbanded.
- Total eradication of vermin deer is the only solution. Any alternative is doomed to fail as there would be continued damage to property, fouling of private property from deer excrement, risk of death from accidents, and increased risk to health from Lyme disease.
- If L = Low and H = High, what do 1 to 3 indicate? Prefer the sharpshooting option but above all, establish zero tolerance for deer in the city. By all means, utilize the meat, hides, etc.

Commentary on the evaluation process

- You are asking for ranking of agreement level for use of evaluation criteria for management options!? Why should evaluation criteria be applied differently to different management options? What are these "scores" - not explained in the minutes. Why
- I do understand that you want the public to assess whether capture and euthanize meets the agreed upon principles but I have read the minutes, reviewed the evaluation criteria and looked at the provincial report and I do not understand what you have done here. Please repost and make this clearer. Particularly: what does "score of 2 for Effectiveness for the Individual and 1 for Effectiveness: Broader Impacts" mean? (p. 4, minutes). 2 out of what? although it seems it would be out of 3, the contrast of 1 for Effectiveness suggests that a score of 1 indicates a different type of thing. What is low and what is high? the example of 1.5 indicating low-medium is given, but then is 1 low or high? What does Effectiveness mean? What does it mean in relation to the category of Individual? Individual opinion? or indiv. deer? or Indiv landowner? What does broader impact mean? economic? environmental? social? btw when you click on "rationale" above, you are taken to the date of the next meeting. Not helpful as you then have to guess where the rationale is contained. Please highlight, point to, or excerpt the part that refers to the rationale. if the clover trap is chosen, or this herding option, then how do you select the area? I am concerned that this on-web feedback mechanism does not constitute a wide enough consultation. I have selected "disagree" because I cannot proceed without selecting something. Can you please put a "decline to answer" button on the next survey?

- This evaluation criteria is invalid. It has been directed by an off-island facilitator and pro-cull CAG members including a bow-hunter who enjoys killing deer. There is no balance in the CAG and the one or two people who were on the CAG and asking for a numbers count of the deer and wanting to look at alternatives to killing such as fencing, have been shut down by the facilitator and the pro-cull CAG members. Therefore this process should be considered null and void.
- The hwy barriers are a big waste of money. They not only will kill numerous animals, but it will take more time and closures for emergency vehicles to get from one side to the other. There has been not one accident along the straight stretch in 40yrs of our neighbors living here on the malahat so for them to put barriers on the hwy then kill more deer, raccoons ect...seems pointless !!!
- Please include an explanation of your scoring in the next feedback email. It is very confusing. I presume 3 is better than 1. Correct? But now you have introduced High and Low scores which makes no sense. For instance does the High rating on Cost/Economic Impact mean it is a good thing or a bad thing? Similarly, Low for Negative Community Impact is a double negative which should mean it is good. This is basic stuff. The criteria should be worded in a way that it is clear that a high score is considered the best and a low score is considered the worst. Get rid of the High and Low scoring and use one numeric scoring system for all criteria.
- I could not answer this question as it was not at all clear what you are asking. Is the table related to the question? What are the numbers in the table? are these the evaluation criteria? How are the numbers to be used? What are the definitions for the topics? The hyperlink to the evaluation criteria does not work. Please provide a summary or explanation before phrasing future questions so that users can understand what they are answering. (I have an MSc and experience in land use planning and management but could not figure this out, so the general public must be guessing!) PS. I am in favour of a cull as the deer are exceeding the ecosystem capability to support them and their natural predators are absent).

Commentary on the Online Feedback Form

- The survey is so incredibly badly designed and presented as to make its credibility and that of the group highly suspect.
- I have a Masters Degree in planning and a B.Sc. in Conservation Biology and do not understand your questions. After rereading this three times, I am giving up lest I give the wrong answer. Please considering hiring some good communications people to help with this exercise.
- I am finding the questions more and more difficult to understand, and evaluate. I do not know what you are asking me to do in this survey.
- This survey is a mess. What are you actually asking? You should toss it out and start again.

Commentary on other management options

- I wonder how the individual whose opinion was voiced in the letter enclosed, would like to see 8' fences around all the farmland on Southern VI. Think of the sizes of Michell's and Galey's farmland, of the dairy farms and the dozens of small farms, all with 8 ft high fences around them all over the Peninsula, Metchosin and Sooke and suburban Greater Victoria. We would look like a jailyard or perhaps look as if we are really some sort of juvenile detention centre! However, the more serious problem is when farmers face the possibility of losing farm status because of loss of income due to deer damage.
- After reading the report, i prefer the sharpshooter option.
- What our community needs to do is educating the public on how to install fencing, using deer repellent etc. for those folks, who feel so very proud of their flowers. Not all folks in Oak Bay worry about their flora, but they do care deeply about their wildlife, which makes Oak Bay the envy of so many. Although I have lived in this area for many years, the deer (how many are there actually) have never bothered me. Humans have been more of an issue! And remember, this is Victoria, not the wild-west!
- I forget whether 1 is "high" or "low". We get deer in our yard most days if we do not block off our driveway (which is bounded by fences). The deer do not look very healthy, they appear to have next to no fear of humans and graze on flowers. We are reluctant to grow vegetables, have added a hedge in the front yard and are planning gates to keep the deer out. I do not believe that a neighbourhood of 8 ft high hedges or fences is particularly appealing buy I have no interest in growing flowers and/or vegetables for the deer. The deer were not in our yard 4 years ago and at first we thought they were cute but now want them out of our yard. I see many more fences and gates going up in the neighbourhood, neighbours have also expressed concern to me about their fight to keep the deer out.
- I am vehemently against controlled public hunting and sharpshooting. That method is just a nightmare waiting to happen in an urban area. I'd rather see my tax dollar go to 'fertility control' options. Why not try a more humane option first. It states in the 'Capture and E. Management Option' document that the fertility control method is untested. Why not initiate a study at UVic and offer Victoria as a test study? Perhaps funding could then come from a national level. Our City would then stand out as a progressive community willing to seek viable humane options. That is a City that I would be proud to live in. I've lived here for 22 years and I know the communities of Victoria would support this. Let us set a potentially positive precedent for other cities. Thank you for your willingness to hear my opinion.

Other commentary

- Have lived on Clare St. for over 50 yrs. and this is the first time I have seen deer in this area. Just got inside after finding the tops eaten off of 3 of 5 tomato plants and some potato plants. Last year ate tops off of peas. I have seen 8 daytime deer so far this year. 5 of them between Gov't House and waterfront.
- Two charming video animations: www.StoryofStuff.org, www.StoryofBroke.org ...make clear what an appropriate response is.

- I have lovingly tended my one-acre garden in South Oak Bay for 25 years, but instead of gardening serving as the mentally healing exercise it once was, as I head towards retirement it is now the source of anguish. Sadly, deer now live on my property throughout the year, while few are to be seen in the wild anymore. I just returned from Seattle and saw plants growing there we can no longer produce on account of the deer. Ours is no longer the city of gardens so long as the deer wreak their havoc. It may be just coincidence, but on the 9:30 pm Coho Ferry last Thursday there were perhaps 20 cars and few passengers where long lines of cars used to wait to board. Then again, there are few thriving gardens of note left to see, unless they are walled in. I believe in animal rights but when the only deer you see are in the city destroying what many of us have spent a lifetime creating, it is time to take action.