

Online Feedback Form Responses for Crop Protection and Status Quo Management Option

Background

- The total number of responses is 83
- The feedback form was available on the deer management website for public input from August 16, 2012 at 9:00 am to August 22, 2012 at 12:00 pm.
- The form was announced through an email to all addresses that had submitted to deermanagement@crd.bc.ca.
- 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 Status Quo management option?

Commentary on Status Quo

- If Status Quo management means absolutely no change in management, I do not believe this will be found acceptable to those who currently are concerned with, or have monetary losses from the current and growing deer population. That may lead to illegal acts, people taking solutions into their own hands (harassing, shooting, bowing, poisonings, etc). Some type of reasonable compromise is probably necessary. This may include a mixed approach. Fencing certain areas, perhaps with some public subsidy or tax rebate, removing some deer from very dense population areas (of deer or people) or where they are particular nuisance animals, landscaping and fencing to reduce vehicle deer collisions, banning feeding of deer, etc. I am not sure any one solution will be effective or acceptable, or even financially viable in all areas.
- How does doing nothing solve anything ?
- I own 3/4 acre off Millstream Rd. Our property is overrun with 5 deer that eat every green thing they can get their slimy mouth over. My shrubs are gone, I did not even plant a vegetable garden this year and now they have acquired a taste for our laurel hedge and are systematically destroying that. Could you please let me know what kind of poison I can put out that will eliminate these vermin if you people won't destroy some of them?? I

am fed up with your dilly-dallying and decision aversion tactics. All these other bleeding heart options only shove the problem deer off upon some other poor soul.

- You should stop studying the issue, and start acting on the issue. The bottom line is that the deer will have to be culled since there are no predators to keep the population in check.
- This is a non-option
- The Status Quo is not acceptable, if I understand the question it is whether I think the option should be rated according to the Low, Medium or High rating levels -- Well, "Low" to me is my choice, if I have to choose, and by that I mean unacceptable -- I "strongly disagree" that any rating be even placed on this option as that is not why I take part in this survey or why I supported some kind of effort to deal with the deer problem -- even if it involves the truly asinine and time-wasting procedure this is underway with this committee. As a letter writer wrote to the Times Colonist, if we had this many stray cats or dogs evident, the poor things would be eradicated by one means or another. So eradicate these deer which are wrecking our gardens and small farms, please. As I have said many times, they can become very good meat.
- The Status Quo is an impossible situation. Just this morning on Tudor Rd on Ten Mile Pt., I saw a terribly injured deer staggering down a driveway while 3 adults stood in the road by their car. They looked upset and anxious, having obviously hit the deer with their car, but they didn't know what to do. Who do you call? I had a dentist appointment so drove on.....they were adults. What a mess it all is.
- This document is so pedantic that I don't want to read and digest it any more than I have tried. I appreciate that you're trying to be thoughtful, but let me reduce it to a practical level. There are deer interfering with residential and garden/agricultural areas. They are a nuisance. They frighten humans, especially small humans. They result in erratic behaviour by pets. We cannot live in a residential area without being watchful not only because of the deer, but because of their predators.
- To my mind the Status Quo is not a reasonable option for the many reasons given in your minutes. Without predators, the deer will just continue to multiply and become even more overwhelming and harmful and dangerous. Please just do the obvious thing and move on a capture and euthanize plan as soon as possible.
- Doing nothing is a perfectly reasonable option to me.
- Last night, in my residential neighbourhood, I counted NINE deer wandering through our properties..Even with road construction noise, dust and a high population of people, they were unfazed--I am hugely upset re how fast numbers are growing and how uncomfortable it is to walk my dog or grow a garden! DO SOMETHING!!!!!!
- The status quo management option is incorrect in its statements about cost and implications. Therefore the cost is higher than stated here. Specifically, the CRD and municipalities may face legal charge if they fail to do anything. In addition, there is the public burden of increased accidents and health incidents. This is not only the direct cost of responding to and caring for injured people and animals, but in addition, the cost to the reputation of the city/region as a safe place to live, conduct tourism business or invest in agricultural production.

- I have not found our neighborhood deer to be a problem at all - in fact we all enjoy having them around even if they sometimes eat our flowers! I think the data on the extent of the over-population is scarce and in light of this, let's wait until we have better data rather than anecdotal evidence.
- I do not think that people in urban areas would support doing nothing.
- If the committee fails to reach a consensus on one option, it might agree to do a series of pilot projects in order to gain further data on the effectiveness of one or more option. Doing nothing will, of course, be one of them. Possibly a professional poll (ex Angus Reid) might give a better idea of support for the various options if a consensus can't be reached by the committee.
- How can any intelligent person agree to status quo??!! The deer are increasing in population (do you have any stats??), and/or are moving into new areas, eating a wider range of vegetation... if status quo was accepted, then I suggest that taxpayers get a refund from the gov't to reimburse us for fencing, native plants (expensive and not immune to being munched) and spraying costs.
- IF the status quo was acceptable the whole process would never have begun. This just denigrates the intelligence of the population.
- Education will go hand in hand with selecting the Status Quo option. The residents of Victoria have far greater issues to be concerned about. There is the beginning of an exodus of the younger generation, as the cost of living will continue to increase. Also retired people are hoping to sell their homes, and move on to greener pastures. Victoria is not the most desirable city anymore. A deer cull will make it even more undesirable. Down the line the cost for the sewage treatment will become an even greater burden on the individual home owner. Re the comment about the deer munching the grass at UVic. To many students and UVic staff, seeing the occasional deer, is close to a wonderful miracle! What an enormous SHAME that the CAG members cannot find joy in God's beautiful creatures. Farmers, please do not be so cheap, and start investing in some fencing. And remember, there is funding available, but of course you will need to do your paper work! I also wonder how often the farmers request the services of the ghost hunters? Very, very disturbing news!
- The deer are an inspiration for all the good people of our region. There will be no slaughtering as long as good people are in charge.
- The status quo is not an option - it is outrageous that this problem and all the negative effects and risks have been allowed to continue to grow up to this time. If governments do not do their jobs and reduce the deer population, it should be expected that individuals will take measures to do so.
- Not a good strategy - just makes it more expensive down the road when you have to undertake different action. It didn't work well for UVic and it won't work well for the CRD.
- I would like to make a comment on this whole process. It is almost incomprehensible to the average person. I have a Master's Degree, and cannot comprehend what it is you are asking. I can therefore not answer the question because it makes no sense to me, even having read the minutes and the other documentation. I have put Strongly Disagree, because an answer is required, and that is it. I would also like to say this. The farmers can complain and want to kill the deer, but THEY do not have to submit any

true evidence of their crop figures???? How is that fair? I am against killing of these animals, and am for the birth control method, if it is determined that there ARE too many deer in an area. Has a proper count even been done? I haven't seen one. I live among deer in an urban setting in Nanaimo, plant a vegetable garden in an enclosure, plant only things the deer won't eat in the open area, and plant other things in pots up on my deck. It works perfectly, and I love to live along with the deer, as an important part of my community. They have been in this area a lot longer than I have.

- The status quo will only produce an amplification of the existing problem ... A cull is the only realistic option
- Do you ever ask yourself why there are deer problems all over BC? Could it be that we have encroached so widely into their habitat that there is no where else for them to go but in our backyards. Again, it isn't that there are too many of them...there are too many of us. If we are going to continue with our encroachment...and I think we will...we need to learn to cohabit with the wildlife we are displacing.
- I could not open the Evaluation Criteria page so I would like to say I strongly agree with the Status Quo of the way the deer are managed right now. No hunting, etc. As I've written before these questions are always worded so they could mean anything when the information is being gathered. I feel that the direction of this deer management survey is already in place. But I am doing the best I can with the information you deem to give me. I feel there is a rush to have the conclusion of all these surveys done by hunting season this fall. I may be wrong and I hope I am.
- This is very time consuming and frustrating...because it's so wordy and not at all easy to understand. I'm not sure exactly what is being asked. I agree that something should be done and the sooner the better. I know that farmers are impacted more because their livelihood is at risk...but that doesn't mean that people whose yards are devastated the deer are not also suffering in many ways.
- The Evaluation Criteria is missing a critical component - level of humaneness for the deer. This clearly shows the CAG do not have the deers' interests in mind at all, which is why there is such negative public outcry over the CAG. When the public loses faith in a process (the CAG) created by the public's leaders (the CRD in this case) the result will most certainly be anger and frustration that their representatives (elected or appointed) are not representing the public's interests fairly. Since a very large portion of the public feels strongly that the interests of the deer should be front and centre during this whole process, and since the CAG clearly is not doing this (as the Evaluation Criteria is missing a criteria representing the deers' interests and the humaneness needed to properly respect the rights of the deer to simply live, and ideally, be helped back to their natural foraging environments through the creation of wildlife corridors, strong educational campaigns about things like fence height needed and affordable options, creation of bylaws prohibiting the feeding of wildlife, speed enforcement by police at known wildlife crossings (the police need only ask the public where deer are often seen crossing/getting hit on roads, etc. Due to the lack of an Evaluation Criteria that speaks to the interests of the deer, it is obvious that the CAG are ignoring the inherent rights of the deer to live and are just contributing to the continuation of human's destruction of wildlife and nature. And since we are part of nature (whether people remember that or not), the

CAG's actions are clearly just another contribution to many people's mindsets that destroying the environment and its creatures will - and is - destroying us.

- Doing nothing blatantly ignores the facts. If you insist on doing nothing, bring in cougars to provide a balance.
- A cull is required ASAP.
- The Status Quo Management Option is more than inane, it is a concept that smacks of current Politicspaying more for less or nothing. This entire process is far too costly for the Taxpayer as well as too bureaucratically inbred meaning that it is so convoluted and jargonized that the average CITIZEN would not follow and give up on the process while their tax money is shovelled out the back door.
- Again, the scoring method is flawed, even non-sensical because all the criteria are weighed as if they can be graded on a single scale. They can't. E.g., how much/little support/enthusiasm vs. how much/little cost/economic impact? These things aren't quantitatively equatable. This eliminates the possibility of decision by principle. That is, even if there were no cost to some engineered or legal imposition on the deer, I oppose it. Conversely, a farmer might say that the deer should be dealt with at any cost. Also, the assumptions are limited. They don't consider the cost to the deer and to ecology generally; just costs to some humans. They don't consider the impact of the increase in human population. All of this would be moot if the human population were decreasing. Again, it's us humans who are the problem; not the deer. We, not the deer, need to be managed. I absolutely oppose any action taken against the deer. Instead, we need to curtail our own growth and impact upon 'nature'. Also and again, the lowest ratings should not be positive numbers, but zero or even negative numbers. Using positive values throughout skews the analysis to a positive outcome. In the Minutes, someone expressed concern about arriving at a status quo solution after spending all this time, effort, and money on the research. That is not a problem. Whatever the outcome of this research (notwithstanding that the research program is itself biased against the deer right at the outset), it would not be known without having spent those resources. The optics of the outcome should have no influence on the decision-making process of this project. Another comment in the Minutes considers the "degree to which livelihoods are affected...." The only livelihoods being considered are humans but at the expense of the livelihoods of the deer. The incompleteness and bias of this research makes it so wrong and valueless. Also, there is no increase in deer conflict, as is considered in the Minutes; there is increase in human conflict with the deer. It's the humans who are causing the change, not the deer.
- I would prefer for the CRD to do nothing rather than take some of the more severe approaches to deer management. My preference would be for the CRD to employ resources on the education of the population, improve their driving behaviour (which would also benefit children and the elderly pedestrians), and for farmers to protect their crops with fences. The option to do nothing would fall after these combined options being employed.
- To say that a "2" rating is appropriate for Urban support and/or negative community impacts would seem to under-rate the seriousness of the problems facing Oak Bay residents - many are becoming concerned about going for a walk in our area because of

the size and increasing number of deer. Yesterday, a neighbour delayed his walk when eight (8) deer led by two large bucks walked up Island Road between Central Ave and Anderson Hill Park. We need a cull - but the sensationalist articles in the TC are really poor - articles about the contractor that uses the bolt gun, sometimes twice and then slits throats in public should not be hired by anyone for an urban cull - ever. Tranquilizing and removal of deer to a private locale for completion of the cull process is a no-brainer. It must be done - soon.

- There simply has to be a better questionnaire. What I am being asked is unclear so I am reluctant to tick off anything but "neutral". I strongly disagree with keeping the status quo. Action needs to be taken immediately, and culling the population is the best solution, all factors considered. You can amend my response from "neutral" to whatever it needs to be, to ensure that this input is reflected.
- Please explain why after the 'general legend' you show a 'reversed criteria legend' because I have no idea what you are trying to get across or how I am supposed to assess your proposals?? I am erudite and anxious to participate but find your format very confusing. I would appreciate a prompt reply - thank you.
- Status Quo solves nothing. Meanwhile the deer multiply and continue to cost us hundreds of dollars annually. Even offering alternatives other than removal or euthanization is a waste of time and money. Eventually the deer will have to be dealt with, Now is the time, not later when there will be even more and much more continuing expense to us, the homeowners and then to CRD to finally act.
- I live in Oak Bay and I am not happy about the deer population. Children cannot play in my yard because of the droppings left by deer on a daily basis. I cannot walk four or five feet without seeing droppings. The deer are also losing their fear. They stand their ground even when approached by humans leading me to wonder if they could become aggressive. I do not agree that Oak Bay residents are willing to live alongside so many deer.
- You've got to be kidding here. Why was this committee formed if the status quo is an option? I clicked on the link to read about this management option. Do you really consider "Generally gradual escalations of damage and costs" an ADVANTAGE of this option???
- So deer will have more rights than property owners/taxpayers? Sign me up for litigation. Stop dithering around.
- this really is a no-brainer. I have no idea why it takes a study and charts to state the obvious.
- Where does ICBC enter into this discussion. They are strictly an insurer of automobiles and have a contractual duty to pay for auto claims which are proven to be legitimate. The deer management issue involves the Residents of the CRD. As stated before in previous survey replies the only satisfactory solution is a cull
- Animal populations generally self-manage; i.e., the deer population will fall because of lack of food, lack of habitat, ease of predator kills -- cougars and feral dogs will be less likely to move into urban areas because they will find deer in rural areas. If the population of deer is artificially reduced by human intervention, it is very likely that deer, which currently live outside the area, will move into the rural/urban fringe. We live in an

area where people love our parks, such as Mount Douglas or Elk Lake, and our beaches. These essentially 'wild' areas will always attract wild animals. Deer and cougars can easily move around the peninsula and west shore on the beach areas, and -- short of eliminating all non-built areas-- the status quo of natural growth and decline of populations is going to be with us, regardless of interventions.

- The idea of using a Sonic Barrier has recently been raised. A barrier that emits sounds that humans cannot hear, but deer can. This may be more cost effective.
- I'm sick of hearing about this whole process! No deer cull - relocation only! Do not spend a single penny of taxpayer money on "protecting the interests of farmers"!
- Please please let's get on with DOING SOMETHING!!!! A cull whatever The method must be IMPLEMENTED! Thank you.
- There is far too much evaluating and not enough action. Allow me to build a taller fence around my yard. The current bylaw is not high enough - deer just jump over the fence.

Commentary on the Online Feedback Form

- It makes no sense to me, and is far too complex for citizen engagement.

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

Commentary on Crop Protection

- It is far too complex and clearly prejudiced to stakeholders.
- I am very opposed to this option, once I understand the meaning of these terms. "Crop Protection" basically means the landowner can take any steps and means to reduce losses of crops including killing the deer on their property. This method is not humane, does not take the agricultural business's responsibility in creating the attractive nuisance, does not acknowledge they have a profitable business and cost associated which should include fencing, are in part their responsibility, and does not take into account that the loss of many of the predators to deer occurred due to agricultural land use, loss of natural range and habitat of predators, and farmers complaints about predation of their livestock. Further, it is not enforceable and could be a thin edge of the wedge. The landowners do not "own" the deer that visit there, however, they are in part responsible for the numbers of deer due to the food sources they have provided without proper protection. It seems to me that the agricultural landowners and food producers want everything their way. They want to be able to maintain maximum yield of their land, yet not have to pay the cost of fencing to do so. They want the cheapest and easiest way out, which is killing the deer. I also object to the ownership of firearms for use in semi-urban areas, the potential for non-agricultural land users (show gardens, etc) to consider their cause "just as valid" and also kill deer and discharging firearms in even more urban areas. I do not support this option, as it gives too much control to landowners without supervision and control and it is both dangerous and inhumane.
- I think crop protection if managed properly can be an effective means of deer control in Agricultural and Rural areas. Animals identified as prime breeders can be harvested on

an individual basis. This can be applied over a wider range and would effectively control the population of the surrounding herd. Resulting venison goes to needy people. I have a crop protection bowhunting service in Central Saanich. I provide assistance in obtaining ALL required permits, including provincial and municipal. I have processed new; ammended; and renewed permits already this year. Currently the Crop protection program allocates 5 deer per property/lease (this can be amended as required). 3 deer, harvested on May 21st, were delivered to an elder of the Tsarlip band. All parts of the animals were used for food; craft; and ceremonies. I've made contacts with the Esquimalt and the Shonhees bands about venison as well. I've made contact and acquired a permit for Brent Palmer of the Mustard Seed food bank to accept venison harvested under a crop protection permit. The food bank needs a sponsor to pay for the required butchering. I have butchers lined up for this. Silver Rill corn (Wendy Fox) is currently a client of mine, as well as 2 other farmers on the Peninsula. I've been in touch with Richard Chritiansen (also on the CAG) to identify other seasoned bow hunters when required. Supporting Crop protection would give the CRD an immediate WIN! Deer management will go forward, AND needy people will receive the harvested venison (I guarantee it). I also employ non-lethal methods, including repellents; deterrents; and hazing. I'm continuing the service. Deer populations need to be managed by entire herds, not just the transient deer from one farm. This could be done by grouping adjacent farms together. The CRD could help with maps and sponsorship for the food banks. I'm attending the Aug. 23rd meeting and could add any further comments if required.

- Well, it costs farmers to do the fencing. Just have a hunting period every week for a while in the fall, probably in the fall after the young are past their pathetic baby stage, and have the hunters stay on their property, only those who are registered as agents of the owners via the local police dept. or owners permitted to shoot, and not on public or other people's property.
- I don't think we have any options except to shoot the deer. Vancouver Island has to start growing more food but the deer are a huge problem. I think that the hunters should be allowed one or two deer for their own food.
- It does not seem to be practical at all.
- "Bag limit"? Good grief. Do you really expect that First Nations groups will thank these hunters or that charitable organizations will welcome the dead deer? This will be making the hunters proud, no doubt - almost like being altruistic fundraisers.
- The final application should be done by a Partnership with a Policy, Plan and Structure, ie for a department of Wildlife Control in the CRD which works directly with the BC Wildlife Branch. The CRD should increase taxes so a good department can be structured and run.
- It would surely be costly for individual farmers to apply for permits and hunt deer on their own property, but also, it must be relatively ineffective if large urban herds remain. This displaces the cost onto the individual. I would therefore say that the cost would be high.
- should allow hunters to keep the meat
- This seems reasonable if farmers are having trouble. - certainly far more reasonable than killing deer for the sake of someone's daffodils in Oak Bay.

- I feel strongly that farmers should have the means to fully protect their crops. If you do nothing else, do something to protect food production on the lower Island
- CRD is going to face a huge lawsuit if it is seriously considering allowing hunting of deer within its boundaries - by ANY method - whether by so called "First Nations" or so called "Game Management Specialists". No cull. Period!
- Culling deer in any location will contribute to reducing their impact - so why not do it where feasible!
- let the hunters keep one or two for meat.
- It is so obvious to note that all of these ratings are the way they are, as they stem mainly from a little pro cull CAG. The CRD Directors will have to be made aware that the CAG did not turn out to be an unbiased citizens group. How can the tax payers respect their recommendations? Mr. Weightman and CAG members, look at yourselves in the mirror. It is still not too late to stop this unethical process.
- There are many farmers in the area who appreciate the deer. They are the ones who have invested in fencing. They are also the ones who are being intimidated by a small number of farmers who not just hate the deer, but all wildlife. Once the deer are gone, then it will be the birds, the geese, the racoons, etc. Victoria will sure become the best place on earth!!!
- Farmers have suffered undue costs and damages from the overpopulation of deer. Farmers should be allowed to cull an unlimited number of deer by way of licensed or certified sharpshooters. Local and provincial governments should expedite any necessary licensing, bylaws, regulations to facilitate this approach.
- Could be useful as part of a range of strategies. Clearly won't work on its own.
- My comments may be viewed above, but I will copy them again here. I would like to make a comment on this whole process. It is almost incomprehensible to the average person. I have a Master's Degree, and cannot comprehend what it is you are asking. I can therefore not answer the question because it makes no sense to me, even having read the minutes and the other documentation. I have put Strongly Disagree, because an answer is required, and that is it. I would also like to say this. The farmers can complain and want to kill the deer, but THEY do not have to submit any true evidence of their crop figures???? How is that fair? I am against killing of these animals, and am for the birth control method, if it is determined that there ARE too many deer in an area. Has a proper count even been done? I haven't seen one. I live among deer in an urban setting in Nanaimo, plant a vegetable garden in an enclosure, plant only things the deer won't eat in the open area, and plant other things in pots up on my deck. It works perfectly, and I love to live along with the deer, as an important part of my community. They have been in this area a lot longer than I have.
- Yes, in regard to any cull, the only practical method is a tranquilizer dart followed by collection of the sleeping deer; it is the safest for the residents and offers little drama for the nay Sayers to in it's negative publicity
- I disagree with any hunting or killing of the deer. I truly believe it is up to the farmers to protect their crops by keeping the deer out of them. Fencing, etc. I also went to the dedicated email address below. Spent a lot of time writing a message and when I tried to send it...was told it couldn't done and to refresh the page. When I did the message

was deleted. This is really frustrating trying to be a part of this OPEN discussion. Please try and fix the "dedicated email address" page.

- Since "Crop Protection" (according to the "Summary of Notes/Opinions/Assumptions /Considerations") does not include any mention of non-lethal options that are being successfully used by some of the smaller farmers on the Saanich Peninsula, again, it shows the CAG is close-minded and biased towards culling the deer.
- Any other options but culling is a waste of time and money. They force the ever-increasing populations of deer onto ever decreasing areas thus making the problems even worse.
- Much of what I've already said applies here. Additionally, to choose whether to lose crop or to 'manage deer', I choose crop loss. Reduce the human population/footprint and impact on 'nature' and we will reduce the needed crops. Leave the non-humans alone.
- Too much time and money may be wasted on monitoring and controlling this option.
- No - do not have any personal knowledge and do not live in a crop-producing area - although growing local/back yard fruits and vegetables here is a very high risk activity. Deer love such things at least as much as humans!
- I find this confusing.....I hope I voted to say....I don;t care how we get rid of the deer...they must go....I don;t think the farmers should be letting our crops be eaten....I am finding my garden being destroyed and it is costing in \$ to fence.....thanks for listening...
- Go for it, but make it a bigger property bag limit. Move all the deer from the city out to where they can actually be bagged.
- If we are serious about attaining sustainability and improving the quality and quantity of food here on the island we need to respect the livelihood of those that do this work and support them fully.
- Using hunters as crop protection is an open invitation for much worse outcomes for people and domestic animals. Gun 'accidents' tend to be fatal or disabling for humans, domestic animals, and pets. As someone who walks and bikes on the roads but through agricultural areas because seeing local agriculture and buying at farm gate, is a wonderful aspect of our area. If the likelihood of being shot increases because the hunting per agricultural plot increases, I am much less likely to support any farm gate sales, or local-farm-based market stores, and my quality of life is significantly decreased.

Commentary on other management options

- No more suggestions, let's just please have some action! Thank You
- You should stop studying the issue, and start acting on the issue. The bottom line is that the deer will have to be culled since there are no predators to keep the population in check.
- ...and how will the residential deer be dealt with???????
- I know farmers here in Nanaimo who have fenced their property and that keeps the deer out and their crops safe and it works well.
- I don't have time to read everything here. I'm finding this very frustrating because your question is so ambiguous. My position remains that something needs to be done

because the problem is only going to get worse. I've tried everything I've ever heard of and nothing has worked for me. Fencing around my property is not an option and what fencing I have used has never been adequate. They always manage to do great damage.

- Crops are only one item. What about the safety of others both pedestrian, auto and truck driver? What about the risk of Lyme disease? Ignoring the problem will not make it go away. The public is counting on you for a sound, fact based decision.
- Get rid of the overabundance of urbanized deer.
- This whole process is taking way too long... certainly in urban areas such as OakBay and Saanich East and Fairfield where the population has once again doubled and tripled depending on how many were born per Doe... I see and chase them out of our property, notwithstanding my continued use of "meatmeal" and "bobex". They now appear to have discovered which leaves have been sprayed and which have not and proceed eating those which they deem acceptable. I'm not so sure the deer haven't developed a tolerance for existing deterrents.
- I don't fully understand what you're asking, but I wish you'd get on with a cull.
- A continuous cull is what is required.
- Stop wasting money on studies. Get rid of the deer or the people. I vote we get rid of the deer. They aren't paying the taxes that pay for these studies.
- 1. You write "The result is that there are limited locations where firearms discharge is not permitted..." The minutes suggest that this "not" is an error. 2. Why is "capture, neuter, and release females" not being considered by the CAG? It directly addresses the problem of overpopulation and would be acceptable to most people (and the deer too, I'd suspect.)
- We need to cull the deer. There is no other alternative that will achieve the same results.
- See answer above!! Why is so much effort going into a simple solution of organising a straight forward cull

Commentary on the Online Feedback Form

- There simply has to be a better questionnaire. What I am being asked is unclear so I am reluctant to tick off anything but "neutral". For the record, I think that farmers' best interests are very important. A cull is the only solution that makes sense for both the agricultural and urban communities. Please change my response from "neutral" to whatever it needs to be, to reflect this opinion and input.

Other Commentary

- The bureaucratic drivel makes my head ache. So frustrating, I can hardly bear it.
- I am not sufficiently knowledgeable to make a comment on this.
- Please see above and reply promptly so we can participate ...