

## Online Feedback Form Responses for Fencing, Hazing & Frightening and Landscaping Alternatives Management Options

### Background

- The total number of responses is 112
- The feedback form was available on the deer management website for public input from July 5 at 4:45 pm to July 11, 2012 at noon.
- The form was announced through an email to all addresses that had submitted to [deermanagement@crd.bc.ca](mailto: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 Fencing management option?

#### Commentary on Fencing

- Fencing is ugly, expensive and very restrictive to other delightful creatures.....eg quail families.
- The buttons do not provide for a useful assessment for any of the three management options. Too many factors involved to select only one option for agreement/disagreement. Current bylaws restricting height render fencing less effective, and tall fencing surrounding properties curtails neighbourhood interaction. Victoria will look less like a city of gardens and more like a series of fortresses.
- I didn't understand the survey so I put neutral, but I do have opinions on the issue that I would like to share with you. I grew up on a farm so I have some understanding of the problem. Anyone with knowledge of animals and farming will know that in some cases, at least, fences do work. In my opinion any reasonable plan would include fencing as one measure to protect crops. There are a number of places where fences are used effectively to keep animals out of fields, e.g. Elk Island Park in Alberta. I had a neighbor who was a gardener and he put up what I considered to be a fairly rudimentary fence around his garden and it seemed to work. I don't recall him ever losing his garden to deer.

- I think fencing is a terrific option - is this what you mean? It's hard to know what you mean by this question. Use conversational, common sense language PLEASE!!!
- Bylaws can be changed. Any 'management' plan will cost money so CRD should be prepared to put money into positive aspects like fencing. Public roadsides can be fenced as on the Coquihalla and through many of mountain national parks.
- Fencing is an ugly, expensive solution not at all suitable even for urban properties. Do we seriously wish to see high fences surrounding everything?
- Other Subsidy or sponsorship (Private/Corporate) available for fencing solutions? If so this would effect evaluation ratings.
- Currently bylaws do not allow a resident to erect fences of such a height that they will stop deer incursions into private property. Look at relaxing the height restrictions on fences which would allow residents to protect their gardens and their landscaping by erecting taller fences.
- Scores of local farmers have erected fencing with obvious success at their own cost presumably so it must be economic. Try polling the organic farms along Oldfield Road. I would have thought that any cost associated with doing business as a farmer includes the fencing. In the survey conducted by Wendy Fox, several farmers commented on the effectiveness. what is the root cause- need to identify it if it can or cannot be addressed. In urban environments the best solution is to plant deer resistant flora and fauna, the garden centres offer great advice.
- Having toured the rural areas around Saanich where deer fencing has been installed it has been successful, due to the common sense approach of those farming the land. For example, the farmer who sewed grass seeds around the perimeter of his fences ... the deer munch the grass and, as reported, don't bother his crops. The farmer who also has a couple of dogs, as well as fencing - as reported - no problems. Let's concentrate on those rural areas where the land is shared and harmony exists between wildlife and those farming the land.
- It is impossible to fence all the areas that need protected. Fine for the small family estate trying to keep deer out of their garden, but not for the farmer with acres of crops.
- We believe Saanich has been encouraging it's citizens to grow their own produce which is a challenge--effective fencing must be at least eight feet high which is higher than allowed. All the haphazard fencing throughout Victoria takes away from the beauty of the area. It is starting to look like dogpatch.
- Forget it, it is not a viable option
- I do not think growers would be very enthusiastic about fencing their properties and rented properties. The only point I might change would be from 2 to 1 under agriculture for support and enthusiasm.
- We are in an urban area & despite fencing our lot, we are over run with deer! Clearly the fencing option is not available to us, thus regrettably not a solution in any way! Is there a timeline on implementing solutions for the urban situation?
- Fencing should not be considered an option.
- The cost is potentially high in the urban setting for fencing, depending on the property and neighbour cooperation.

- Fencing is useless as a management program except for assistance for farms. Many communities, like Broadmead, have covenants re fencing.
- Who wants to live in a community of fences. Yes it's costly but also unsightly. And it DOES NOT address the issue: TOO MANY DEER WITH NO NATURAL PREDATORS. Fencing simply means deer will congregate where there are no fences, because surely you cannot be considering fencing the entire Greater Victoria region. However, in the short term farmers need to be given immediate relief and should be provided with grants to protect their fields.
- Cost for urban and rural should be scored two or less because of relatively high cost to property owners, who are not subsidized like farmers, and who are forced to put up ineffective fencing due to fence height bylaws, consequently requiring costly additional "barriers" to discourage deer trespass.
- The criteria are comprehensive in that they account for evaluating the option of fencing. As someone who has a major deer problem on my property everyday, I DO NOT THINK FENCING IS FEASIBLE. And there are almost NO DEER RESISTANT PLANTS. (Just ask the people who operate the Horticulture Centre on Quail Road). There are lists of allegedly deer resistant plants, but our deer are adventurous eaters. They eat heather, azaleas, agapanthus. And they rub their antlers on the trunks of trees. It costs a fortune to do what we can to minimize their damage.
- Deer/human interaction on roads, trails etc. either in a vehicle, bicycle or pedestrian would not be helped by fencing as road allowances etc. cannot be fenced
- Fencing, with safe routes for the deer to move from place to place as needed, and appropriate repellants are the only reasonable options.
- Fencing is much more difficult than it might seem. Maintaining fences, in particular around large agricultural tracts is difficult. Also, fawns can squeeze through wire game fencing (as I witnessed just this evening!)
- I have known deer to be able to jump over a 10 ft fence.
- Fencing in a private property is very expensive. I have done it and hate it. I feel isolated in my own yard. To keep the deer from coming in from the driveway a fence has to be put in also. This again is very expensive.
- Fencing of large agricultural tracts will only shift the expanding deer population to other areas of which there is limited availability and ability to contain them to non interactive human/deer locations. Sustainable and viable farming on the peninsula is challenging enough without taking into consideration the costs of deer damage and/or fencing large tracts. Managed culling seems the only option. 6' high fencing is not effective - must be 8' at minimum and where fencing multiple farms, wildlife(deer) corridors are effective at reducing the risk of jumping the fencing at these heights.
- Some break on fencing cost is a good idea.
- Fencing is not a solution. Are we to live in walled compounds with the deer chewing the weeds on the outside of the fences?
- I have found 6 feet fencing is not high enough and have increased the fence to 8 feet. So far it has worked. I have found plastic deer netting does not work. The deer burrow at the bottom of the netting, breaking it and can get under the netting if they can make a

six inch gap at the bottom. I have also found deer can break 1x2 fence posts, so far they have not broken 2x4 fence posts.

- Urban gardeners should pay for their own fencing. Fencing, using metal poles (not plastic), and high enough to prevent deer could be used for agricultural farms. Grants or breaks on property taxes should be given.
- Fencing is not a practical solution for urban gardens.
- Fencing is just not practical.
- Fencing is not a viable solution for urban areas.
- Fencing will only move the deer to parks and other open green spaces
- The City of Gardens would become the City of Fences if everyone opted to protect their property from deer -- even if it was affordable. Seven foot fences in urban locations are an unwelcome addition to the streetscape.
- Its hard enough to make a living farming these days without paying for fencing. If I fence...then the neighbor will have to fence....and small property owners will have to fence....because where will the deer go? Apparently there is increased incidences of lyme disease, and this is carried by deer ticks...So in my eyes fencing should also be accompanied by a humane cull, or else I suppose we can just let cars pick them off or mutilate them as they scramble from one unfenced corridor to the next....
- Fencing works.
- Research shows clearly that fencing does work, be it on farmland, be it in the urban neighbourhoods. There will always be enough food for the deer to eat, outside the fenced areas. Deer will not starve, as one member of the CAG stated. The Province has grants for fencing available. The farmers just need to start on their paper work.
- Having the Fencing Subsidy Program restarted will be a lot cheaper than paying for a deer kill. Also the fencing investment will pay off very quickly, whereas a cull will actually increase the deer population.
- I am only familiar with the urban context so will limit my comments to that area. Fencing is not feasible or "capable" in the urban area. Fence Bylaws are prohibitive and it will take a significant amount of time to have the changed. Many aspects of fence bylaws were established to ensure sight lines for vehicles are not compromised so it is not simple to change these. Fencing is also costly and if not done in an aesthetically pleasing fashion can harm the urban landscape. it also cuts down on neighbour interactions and in small (50x100 foot) lots can cause quite a shadow across your or your neighbours garden. Deer are already hopping between rear yard to rear yard - even through small holes through arched gateway entrances. Many people in urban areas simply do not have the resources or time to install fencing.
- Fencing will not work. The deer can jump higher than the height allowed in urban areas. Expense is also a factor.
- Our Cumberland/Palmer neighbourhood has an unwritten law not to have any fencing at all improving the interaction and back yard life style of this area. We are not willing to accept fencing as a solution to the deer infestation problem. Recently we have succumbed to deer fencing around our vegetable gardens and they are able to penetrate these fences by running at full force and breaking through numerous time per season.

Fencing does not address the root cause of exploding deer populations and management.

- Negative comments made by CRD above are worded in a way to influence the outcome of survey to dismiss the absolutely effective measure of fencing. Outrageous.
- Fencing is cost prohibitive and not an option for many people.
- Fencing is a viable option to protect crops. When considering the cost of fencing we need to take into account farm property requires basic fencing and the expense is the cost of upgrading not building from scratch. Fencing is as much a required cost of farming as seed and farm equipment. The aesthetic needs of urban areas are self imposed and not related to protective fencing from deer. Public lands could be used as natural grazing areas instead of developed landscapes. Fencing does not address the root cause
- Fencing does nothing more than divert the problem from a newly fenced area to an unfenced area. It doesn't address the root of the problem which is a growing deer population that doesn't belong in urban or farming areas. There are ample areas for deer to thrive on the island. Humans and deer cannot co-exist successfully in urban areas....period. Unless you plan on moving people out of the CRD to allow for the continued increase of deer, the only solution to the conflicts is a cull.
- **There was NO consensus at the CAG regarding these results. No voting was taken to settle the argument in violation of the Terms of Reference. ALL the notes on this option are negative.**
- deer do not belong in urban areas: fencing will not work : does not address root cause
- Of course, I wasn't at the meeting(s), so is difficult to evaluate the scores based upon arguments/info presented. All this ignores the possibilities of the status quo being an outcome, that we're assuming there's a problem where there isn't one, and that maybe, if there is a problem, managing the deer in any way is not the solution. To the point of the view that there isn't a problem, this exercise is founded on the notion that, for example, financial costs borne by farmers and gardeners due to deer are necessarily more important than the right of the deer to behave naturally on land that humans have taken over, without any consideration of the effect on deer and other non-humans. Finally, the range of possible scores is too limited and doesn't force an opinion as would an even number of possible scores. There should be a "0" score option in order to place against an option that is seen to have no desirability. In your present system, even the least desirable option has a positive score.
- While fencing every property in the CRD may alleviate the problem in the short term, it does nothing to solve the long term problem of too many (and increasing annually) deer in too small an area. Once they have been fenced out of areas, where will they feed? I see herds of angry, starving deer roaming about looking for food. Not practical at all!!
- I guess they had to talk about something... want input re fencing? Ask the folks who manage Finnerty Gardens at UVic... they deal with it on a daily basis.
- Fencing will not control the deer population which is ever increasing. My property backs on to a golf course. I have made an investment in this property and pay appropriate property taxes to enjoy this location. I am confronted with deer every single day. I will not erect a fence. Another solution must be found.

- My comments apply only to non-agricultural property. Fencing is very effective for many properties, but it does not work well on larger urban lots with challenging terrain and lots of rocks. It is not very attractive in front yards - and we've already seen a conflict between urban bylaws and food security in Saanich when a homeowner fenced their food garden in the front of their house. Reliance on fencing just pushes the deer into other areas - public space, other people's gardens, the roads. It's not a real solution.
- Fencing around gardens will look ugly and be expensive for the homeowner
- A 6 ft fence may not be high enough to keep deer out. Plus, fences around some properties but not others may just force the deer to go to unfenced properties.
- Fencing (at tax payer's expense) is undesirable and impractical in urban communities like Oak Bay
- Our six foot fence is ugly and not high enough to keep them out.
- In the urban area fencing is simply not effective, largely for aesthetic reasons. People are not going to install ugly deer fencing to protect their landscaping plants, especially in front of their homes. Besides, this just does not address the root of the problem -- an overpopulation of deer.
- I agree with the lack of fencing's ability to address the root cause- and believe we must address the root cause. I would personally rate support for fencing as a 1 given the openness of our surrounding landscape as one of the major reasons for the purchase of our home in Oak bay
- Would it not be a good idea to amend bylaws that restrict height in order to make this work? As a taxpayer in the saanich area, I would support funding being cut from other areas (roadside flower displays, for example which are expensive and not necessary) Also, I don't really understand what public health hazards deer pose. They are not transmitting diseases to humans in any way that has caused alarm in the scientific community, or at least Saanich has not provided statistical evidence to prove as much. It concerns me the amount of times that "enthusiasm" is discussed in the minutes. Unless people want to continually have this debate each year for potentially many years, we need to look at long-term solutions that a cull can't provide, and if that does not meet with the approval of residents who have forgotten that they share this living space with other animals, then so be it. I would support working with farmers to find a humane solution, including some initial taxpayer support if it would encourage farmers to adopt humane management practices, but keeping in mind that farms have lost some of their crops to animals since the beginning of time, and it is not the reasonability of the rest of the public to ensure that an individual's business venture makes money over the long term.

### **Commentary on the Feedback Form**

- I read the minutes and Evaluation Criteria and found no description of what each evaluation number actually means. Therefore, as far as I'm concerned the attached chart is useless as I have no way of easily determining what each number means. Your time, attention and energy spent on this project is admirable however if you're expecting this email evaluation process for the public to be helpful, you need to hire someone who

can write about it in a way that addresses the public's full understanding of your criteria seeing as we're not attending the meetings.

- While we recognize the challenges of addressing a complex problem across a variety of jurisdictions and ecosystem types, this process appears intended to obscure the value of any meaningful public input. The reporting is unclear and poorly written; it is unlikely that the types of questions included in this feedback form will elicit any kind of useful public feedback that is based on accurate information. There are some serious issues to be addressed by this process - issues that can be expressed in simple plain English in order to invite feedback. The evaluation criteria do not lend themselves to generating a solution(s) that is/are measurable. The abstruse nature of the discussion information and the evaluation criteria are likely to result in 'public' feedback that is at best, limited in value.

### **Commentary on the evaluation system**

- I disagree that the effectiveness at addressing the problem is only 1, it should be closer to 3 but I agree the CAG should recommend grants or property tax breaks to encourage fencing.
- What do these "scores" mean & how will they be used? E.g. is fencing 3 times as important in Ag./Rural areas than Urban? The minutes indicate that fencing is not a viable overall approach in any of the 3 zones for many reasons. In urban areas, it is absurd to consider fencing to "fortress" standards to block damage causing pests that have become acclimatized to urban life.
- Don't see an explanation of numbering system in the minutes. I presume #1 is best and #3 is worst. If so I do not agree that it is the best solution to address the root cause. The root cause is too many deer. Fencing does not address the root cause. How will the analysis be done on the numbers? I'm guessing least points translates to best option. This might work if all criteria were considered equal. But they are not. Effectiveness is probably of highest importance and should be weighted higher than Support and Enthusiasm for example. This would apply the responses regarding the management criteria as a weighting scale.
- Overall, I agree with the evaluation but I am concerned with the high marks given to cost and feasibility. If some properties are fenced, it will just result in the deer visiting the non-fenced properties. Fencing is costly and it is not feasible to fence in all of the properties in the region. For me, any idea that fails to address the root cause (too many deer) is not worth pursuing.
- This graph is poorly defined. what do the numbers stand for????? Without clear directions I can't read it. You need to describe what 1,2,3 stand for. Personally, I do not support fencing. It hasn't worked residentially so why would it work in any other way???
- Please note that when one tries to go to the links you have provided while completing this form, one loses the responses one has already typed in. While I agree with the need to have criteria by which to assess the options, I have the following concerns: While you have provided a 5 point scale (with definitions) for opinion on the application of the evaluation criteria to each option, for the purposes of completing this form you

have not provided a simple explanation of the three point rating scale that the committee has used for each criterion. While one can go back to the minutes to read the discussion of the ratings, it is confusing, it was not apparent why a three point scale was chosen, nor how these ratings would be used to compare all the options, only some which are included in this feedback form. A three point scale may not provide adequate differentiation among the options. I am not in agreement with the criterion "Support/Enthusiasm" since it combines too many issues: the issue of humane treatment/wildlife ethics/values should be a criterion in of its own. The criterion of cost is confusing since one has to approach the ratings differently, and there is no differentiation of cost to individuals/businesses or to the community at large, which will vary according to option.

### **Commentary on Population Reduction**

- Bureaucrats just trying to justify their existence. Enough bafflegab already. Get on with a cull.
- I am shocked and appalled that CRDRMSCAG has such an extraordinary low level of understanding of wildlife management. We have been managing wildlife in many parts of the world for centuries and culling is a fundamental element to any sensible management plan and the CAG has chosen to ignore that option in this survey. Accordingly, the survey has no validity. There is only one practical solution, culling (including sterilization). In my opinion, the CAG's public duty is to focus on how to manage the Bambi complex of some members of the public.
- Seriously... what kind of questions are these? You have a f\*\*\*\*\* deer problem, logically deer need to be culled. Look no further than your local bow hunters. Trying to do this any other way is to save political face with some fringe groups and waste great amounts of tax-payers money. It really doesn't matter what we say, it's a guarantee you'll f\*\*\* it all up anyways!
- I'm NOT going to complete this survey.....the committee needs to get on with culling the #&\*#^%@ deer as they are multiplying and it will be an even bigger problem. And while you do this, the rabbit population is getting out of control. PLEASE just deal with it. No more committees - no more surveys - no more studies!
- Fencing is not the answer - dealing with the root of the problem - culling the deer overpopulation is the only answer. The agricultural community has enough expenses trying to stay in business, let alone having to pay for and build high fences to protect their crops. In urban areas, high fences will further separate neighbours from each other. Victoria is known as a "City of Gardens", and we sell ourselves economically as such. Shall we be known as the "City of Fences" and hide all the beautiful gardens that attract tourists and the tourist dollars that they bring?
- Cull the deer! We are not fencing the deer out - we are fencing ourselves in and forcing the deer onto the roads!
- Do a cull.

### **Other Commentary**

- Farmers and hunters should not be on the Citizens Advisory Committee and be involved with the evaluation criteria; how can they possibly be objective? Apart from that fact, the rationale for the evaluation criteria as presented in the Meeting Notes is ridiculous and makes no sense to me.
- It does not address the problem of deer in urban areas
- This gives no rights to the human population who need to grow food for themselves and their families and who don't have the income for the strategies suggested - too heavily weighted to the deer population.

**Do you have any additional thoughts or comments on the application of the Evaluation Criteria to the Hazing and Frightening management option?**

**Commentary on Hazing & Frightening**

- I suspect the deer will become accustomed and not frightened away after a short period....anyway shooting them then gives the next property the problem....not a cure in my opinion.
- A cruel option. This will not work in an urban environment - where do you suppose the hazed and frightened deer will flee to? Kinder just to kill the deer. And what option is there for controlling the annual increase in the deer population?
- Again I found the survey question a bit confusing, so rather than put something I didn't intend I just put neutral. I live in the Glen Lake area and noise making devices have been used in combination with other measures with some success to keep geese off the lake. You say cannon-based frightening is not allowed, but here something that sounded like a shotgun going off was used. I would urge the CRD and the committee to look for ways that they can resolve this issue without resorting to a deer kill, rather than look for reasons why other approaches won't work.
- Visual frightening devices should be prioritized.
- I strongly disagree with hazing as an option. It is inhumane and probably not terribly effective.
- Probably far too frightening and disruptive for other species such as humans, horses, cattle, etc.
- Deer don't frighten easily and simply change the timing of their visits. Initially we were visited during the day, the deer now come in the early hours of the morning and browse/dine wherever they want.
- High frequency devices have been used elsewhere, has this been presented during review? How about visual (no noise) frightening devices?
- It does not address the problem of deer in urban areas- these options do nothing to address the problem of individual self - sustaining gardens ravaged by deer
- deer are naturally timid. Even a dog lazing on the verandah is a deterrent. my son has a farm in Australia, the two dogs effectively keep kangeroos and foxes out of the crop. in urban spaces where there are pet dogs, gardeners generally have no problems (according to neighbours in my area. in rural areas, farmers should encourage dog walkers on the verge of their properties. one farmer is reptedly losing \$100k a year. he

could employ an army of seasonal immigrant workers to scare away the deer if that's true. why not pick the crops on shift round the clock with lights on?

- We've used dogs since the beginning of time to protect both ourselves and our homes. We're not talking here about killer dogs, simply dogs like border collies who are first class farm dogs and know how to behave around animals both domestic and wild. "Visual frightening devices" ... scarecrows have been used since the beginning of time - especially effective are the ones that rotate.
- Doesn't seem like it would work in my opinion.
- This will probably just move the deer to another area of the municipality.
- Forget it, it is not a viable option
- It doesn't work.
- Dog-based hazing will bring a higher level of confrontation and aggression from the deer, and could put humans in danger who may be innocently walking with their dogs. There are numerous video clips on the internet showing deer standing their ground or attacking dogs. Deterrents such as noise hazing are quickly disregarded by animals once they realize there is no threat to them. You will more likely drive humans out with noise hazing than the deer you are trying to discourage.
- Hazing is useless, what a dumb idea. Do you want a lot of enraged dogs running around loose? Ridiculous.
- This is ridiculous. It would simply move the deer from place to place without solving anything.
- Deer are getting braver. Three years ago I could chase them away. Now they just stand there looking defiant! They don't even respond to rocks being thrown at them. (I'm not a very good shot, which I think they know).
- The deterrents involved in frightening and hazing are well stated.
- in fields of mixed vegetables and fruit trees (ie, very desirable to deer), 10 years of attempts have left me very sceptical of the efficacy of scaring deer away. They can become accustomed to many scare techniques. Even most dogs are ineffective in agricultural-sized areas. And as an aside, SPCA will not adopt out dogs if they think the dog will be left outside at night, indicating that it is a controversial practice to leave dogs out at night (when deer feed)
- I do not support hazing, or noise options in any form. This does not solve the problem of an imbalance of deer population to the available non farmed and wildlife available land
- As usual this third questionnaire is highly confusing, The CRD can interpret the public's responses in any way that suits them. Dog-based, and cannon-based frightening hazing is inappropriate; the province should NOT lift the ban. What are Mosquito-like frightening and hazing devices?
- Hazing is a bad idea, deer are skittish anyway.
- Again, I need to know what the numbers represent on your graph in order to read it clearly and correctly. please comply and send this survey out again as I question the validity without clear directions. Hazing and frightening deer does not work residentially so I don't find it feasible and therefore do not support it.
- I don't see this as a particularly effective solution.

- Would I be liable if I scared a deer out of my yard and it ran out into the street and hit a car or a child on a bicycle?
- Dog based hazing should be allowed, and ask the province to lift the ban.
- hazing will just move the deer elsewhere.
- Again, this is completely impractical for urban areas.
- Dogs should be allowed to scare away the deer. In the absence of coyotes or cougars it is a natural form of control.
- You can frighten them, but they come right back....And so, is my neighbor just going to scare the deer over to my farm, or vice versa?
- The Ministry of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations has not banned hazing, as a newspaper headline suggested. Hazing is still an option that is being considered in the Kootenays.
- In urban Victoria the deer are not afraid of people or vehicles. It is possible to walk or drive very close to them and they do not move until more aggressive actions are taken.
- Being a dog owner, the deer seem to stay away from our garden, although we would love to see them more often. On the same note, I would not recommend people who worry more about their gardens, to get a dog, as I doubt they would be good dog owners. Either people love animals or they seem to hate them. How sad this world is turning! Rest assured, if people have to witness a deer kill, there will be a huge increase in mental illness in our region. Other people will choose to leave our area.
- see above comments
- See general comments re: fencing option.
- I am only familiar with urban areas...have seen deer walk by barking dogs and are completely at ease.
- This is a ridiculous idea. Shall we stay up all night to frighten deer away?
- Hazing and frightening techniques do not solve the root cause of too many deer! They might have value once the populations have been reduced and controlled to reasonable numbers.
- No
- The Ministry of Environment would certainly be open to the use of hazing by qualified dog handlers, IF the CRD had the WILL to use NON LETHAL methods. Having attended the meetings, I am almost speechless at the foolishness and stupidity of the majority of the CAG members.
- This is ridiculous...much less humane than a cull.
- Animals will adapt to non invasive hazing. Uncontrolled hazing by dogs can be cruel and lethal especially to fawns.
- There are some residents of the greater Victoria area who have suggested a cull would destroy nature's fine balance. The reality is that a balance no longer exists because we cannot allow predators (cougars) to hunt in our communities. It has been said that any method to cull the deer would inflict great pain and suffering. I beg to differ. In the real world where deer do have enemies, their final moments can be terror filled and very painful. In some instances they are being eaten before they are dead. I'm confident level heads will make a just decision and one not based on emotions.

- I won't bother repeating what I said about fencing. The same arguments apply here. You are wasting your time by discussing it.
- Again, the notes on this option are all negative.
- negative community impacts need more consideration
- deer do not belong in urban areas: hazing will not work: does not address root cause
- At least the numbers are low. As I said in my previous comment, the scores should allow for a "0" in order to reflect an undesirable option. As is, even the worst option is given some positive value. But more important, hazing and frightening are inherently oppressive and cruel and, so, should not be considered at all.
- Again, not practical. It just moves the problem from one area to another. Too many hungry deer in too small an area.
- Clearly doesn't work, why bother even talking about it
- Not a practical option!!!
- Like fencing, hazing just moves the deer elsewhere. Many urban gardeners are already using motion-activated devices (either water sprays or ultrasonic waves) to push deer away from their property. Where will they all go if a greater number of urban gardeners use such strategies?
- Techniques would have to be sustainable, deer get used to most deterrents
- Hazing might work on farmland, with bangers, etc., but it won't work elsewhere.
- Seriously?? Will devices be provided to home owners free of charge? Will dogs be endangered? I certainly would not allow my dog to participate. If property is unfenced, unleashed dogs would be in violation of the bylaws as they chase deer around the streets of Oak Bay.
- Ineffective -just moves the deer to annoy a neighbour.
- Does not address the overpopulation of deer. Simply moves the problem deer around and relocates them in someone else's backyard.
- I would support frightening/hazing but very clear guidelines need to be set in place as to how this would be done. I am somewhat concerned about dogs attacking deer and the dogs/deer being injured.

### Commentary on the Evaluation process

- I read the minutes and Evaluation Criteria and found no description of what each evaluation number actually means. Therefore, as far as I'm concerned the attached chart is useless as I have no way of easily determining what each number means. Your time, attention and energy spent on this project is admirable however if you're expecting this email evaluation process for the public to be helpful, you need to hire someone who can write about it in a way that addresses the public's full understanding of your criteria seeing as we're not attending the meetings.
- Don't see an explanation of numbering system in the minutes. I presume #1 is best and #3 is worst. If so I do not agree that it is the best solution to address the root cause. The root cause is too many deer. Hazing does not address the root cause. How will the analysis be done on the numbers? I'm guessing least points translates to best option. This might work if all criteria were considered equal. But they are not. Effectiveness is

probably of highest importance and should be weighted higher than Support and Enthusiasm for example. This would apply the responses regarding the management criteria as a weighting scale.

### **Commentary on population control**

- Why are you not considering a cull as an option?
- Hazing and frightening deer should be second to a Cull.
- Cull the deer! We would suffer more from the hazing process than the deer would. The hazing option is nonsense!
- Bureaucrats just trying to justify their existence. Enough bafflegab already. Get on with a cull.
- I am shocked and appalled that CRDRMSCAG has such an extraordinary low level of understanding of wildlife management. We have been managing wildlife in many parts of the world for centuries and culling is a fundamental element to any sensible management plan and the CAG has chosen to ignore that option in this survey. Accordingly, the survey has no validity. There is only one practical solution, culling (including sterilization) In my opinion, the CAG's public duty is to focus on how to manage the Bambi complex of some members of the public.
- Seriously... what kind of questions are these? You have a f\*\*\*\*\* deer problem, logically deer need to be culled. Look no further than your local bow hunters. Trying to do this any other way is to save political face with some fringe groups and waste great amounts of tax-payers money. It really doesn't matter what we say, it's a guarantee you'll f\*\*\* it all up anyways!

### **Other Commentary**

- i would need to know more information and details before commenting
- I am not impressed with the Evaluation Criteria. The results are very one-sided and do not reflect those communities where deer fencing is working for the serious gardener. Deer fencing does not cost a fortune. Good deals are available at many local stores, including Lee Valley Tools.

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

### **Commentary on Landscaping Alternatives**

- What are urban deer eating? If the answer is largely gardens on private property, and everyone deer proofs their property, what will the deer eat then? Or will those who cannot afford/do not wish to fence or re-landscape their property be left to bear the burden of providing forage and bedding places for the deer? Deer are eating many plants once thought to be deer-resistant, and deer-resistant planting also doesn't address the issues of trampled plants and shrubs - or of re-landscaping mature gardens. Will the deer return to the wild? What are the chances of survival for deer habituated to an urban environment?

- How about planting deer friendly plants (food) on the borders between wilderness areas and urban/rural to incite them to remain there.
- What are landscaping alternatives? Give us examples!! If you mean should people plant plants deer do not like, then yes, this is a good idea. If you mean should people get over the fact that some of their flowers will be eaten, then yes, this is a good idea. I'm a native English speaker - I can't imagine what a non English speaker would make of this ridiculous language!!!
- Again, any management options will cost money, which the CRD should help with. Some people live in the rural areas because they want to live in harmony with nature, so they enjoy seeing the deer among other animals. For people in rural or urban areas want to protect their plants and trees, they can also choose to use landscaping, fencing, and some deer-resistant plants to deter deer from their other plants. Boulevard fruit trees can also be fenced.
- This is not going to work, deer are like rabbits, they will keep reproducing until they run out of food or predators step in.
- Landscaping alternatives are not an option for those of us wishing to grow our own vegetables
- any gardener worth his salt knows which plants are deer resistant. planting anything else is effectively in conflict with the by-law which prohibits feeding the deer, which is exactly what they are doing. i have dozens of plants in my garden which the deer don't touch, and the garden centres can advise you. daffodils are poisonous, deer do not eat them. rhododendrons are one of the most prolific and colourful non-native species, deer don't eat them. peones roses, holly, most hydrangeas, lilies, heather, mock orange, Californian lilac, ornamental grasses, Japanese maple, daisies to name a few, and that's from a novice. what do the municipalities plant? they have no fences and the gardens are spectacular. common sense is needed. in rural areas where "gardens" are for profit, you must fence and provide deer fodder outside the fencing. This was pointed out by one farmer in Wendy Fox's survey. In the same survey, with the exception of three farmers, losses were less than \$5000, with most less than \$1000. I would say this is small enough to be part of doing business, spoilage, and I would support a cash settlement with these individuals on presentation of proof, notwithstanding that they get a very healthy tax exemption for just this. Urban losses cannot be more than \$100 a year for a few households, the weather losses are greater than that. The original survey was open to the public, as opposed to CAG surveys which have targeted only e-mail respondents. In the original survey, residents were asked specifically to comment on just this, damage to gardens. We have 100,000 households in the area, Perhaps 250 have problems, the remaining 99,000 plus have no problem as the survey indicated. Clearly the urban garden issue is not worth discussing.
- It amazes me that this Island exists at all. Between characterizing so-called invasive species along side natural habitat complete with heavily burdened rules and regulations ...! We are the invasive species who are continuing to destroy the natural habitat that has fed the wildlife population on this Island long before we settled here. Simply put, plant deer proof plants in your garden. The argument that people want to " ... grow their own food" is redundant given we live next door to the most easily accessible organic and

non-organic food source in Canada. During the growing season, we should be supporting our local farmers, not growing " ... our own food" which, simply put, is deer fodder - find another hobby. My home is built on a deer path - they pass through my garden which is planted with deer proof plants, they nibble a bit of grass, then move on. I do not feed them, and am certainly not threatened by them in any way. I knew they were here before I moved to this beautiful Island, and after years of concrete city living to work I would strongly recommend we refer to the Domesday Book of Common Sense Values whereby we learn to appreciate what we have around us and share the land we live on.

- You force people to plant only certain plants, not a realistic solution
- The deer eat deer resistant plants in our garden even though there is plenty for them to eat in the park area which abuts out property on three sides. Our grandchildren like to play in our yard and we are concerned about ticks carrying Lyme disease, deer scat and probability cougars next. Since July of 2008 when I took a picture of the cute deer in my yard the deer population has increased greatly. We now spend very little time in our yard or vegetable garden as it is too much work to enjoy it. We are also worried about the deer wandering on our roads - even on busy McKenzie which are accidents just waiting to happen. Relocating the deer or culling them and feeding the meat to the homeless seems to be the only solution.
- Landscaping has been tried and failed by homeowners who have planted different plants. The deer just develop a taste for the new plant.
- Deer are not fussy eaters and they are not consistent in their likes and dislikes.
- Numerous municipalities in BC have already encouraged the local population to change to less deer-friendly plantings, but to no avail. The deer simply change their menu choice and continue to decimate local gardens.
- There are a number of odorous plants that can be used to deter deer when strategically placed on trails.
- You don't want to surely keep the deer the way they are now, and suggest people plant only deer resistant items? It is important for you to eliminate the deer in residential and small-farm areas...Why not dart-gun them with a veterinary sedative then truck them away to where they will be slaughtered. I know some people don't want to kill them, but really, we are killing beef cattle, pigs for pork, chickens for food, all the time, and none of it is very "humane". This survey is incomprehensible and does not tell you what to do with the numbers and what one would be agreeing or disagreeing with -- you need an explanation here of what the numbers mean, your responders would have forgotten what the original surveys instructed. This effort is utterly incompetent .
- Deer eating habits change - they don't follow a manual and plants not eaten one year are attacked the next. Even IF plant selection were effective, it would severely limit the range of plants one could grow and essentially rules out most flowers and vegetables. Gardening should be a permitted pleasure of living in this climate & not be criminalized by the politically correct.
- Urban time to implement should score 1.5 or less on the basis that deer resistant plantings (shrubs, perennials, hedging, etc) take several years to grow to the size that the

gardener has planned for, or in the case of hedges, to the size and density needed to discourage deer.

- This is a ridiculous option.
- does not solve any problems for the agricultural community and has limited application for gardens either rural or urban
- Our front yard is all deer-proof plants and the back is all fenced. There are safe routes for the deer to move from place to place. This has worked well for us for 23 years and certainly has required us to adapt but we feel that it is our responsibility to do the adapting. The deer are residents in our neighbourhood. We protect them as we would any other neighbour.
- Certain possibilities are not included in your chart. The CRD should consider having areas for the deer to graze and eat as in some other countries such as Denmark. Some farmers in the CRD are leaving fields for the deer and fencing other areas to keep the deer out. If these measures were taken with fencing subsidies, the deer would be less likely to eat from gardens and from farmers crops. It is interesting that farmers who have said that fencing works have been silenced and are reluctant to come forward. Are they under some sort of threat?
- Again, your graph is unclear. Residentially the deer are eating everything, even plants that are considered deer resistant. Replanting would be a waste of tax payers money.
- OK, so the "city of gardens" is now going to have only deer-resistant plants - lovely. This is insanity - the deer have all the rights and the citizens must curtail their vegetable and flower gardens. On what planet does this make sense???
- Each time the deer start eating a plant/bush/shrub in my neighbour's yard she removes the species of plant/shrub. The deer then start eating another plant/shrub
- I think the evaluation is too optimistic when it comes to effectiveness. Hungry deer will eat just about anything. And there will not be huge public enthusiasm for replacing their plants with "deer resistant" plants. Whatever enthusiasm there is will disappear when the deer get hungry enough to start eating them too.
- Deer will simply switch to so called deer resistant plants.
- the deer will just start to eat the so called deer proof plants
- You could never convince home owners to change their plantings, besides the deer would simply change their diet.
- As the population grows and food becomes scarce, the deer will eat almost anything
- Don't see an explanation of numbering system in the minutes. I presume #1 is best and #3 is worst. If so I do not agree that it is the best solution to address the root cause. The root cause is too many deer. Landscaping does not address the root cause. How will the analysis be done on the numbers? I'm guessing least points translates to best option. This might work if all criteria were considered equal. But they are not. Effectiveness is probably of highest importance and should be weighted higher than Support and Enthusiasm for example. This would apply the responses regarding the management criteria as a weighting scale.
- Even native plants are browsed by deer, reducing areas for bird nesting. Invasive broom has been removed from many parks around the district allowing native bulbs to return.

Now the explosion of the deer population is diminishing those fragile plants and there is less native plants all the time. I like the occasional deer but without any predators the balance is totally off

- I am curious as to whether deer still don't like certain plants. We on farms are finding deer are eating crops they never used to touch before...
- Once again, in urban areas, it is not reasonable to have to consider major adjustment of landscaping practice to adapt to animals that do not belong in the city.
- Most farmers/gardeners have discovered that given the appropriate conditions, deer-resistant plants are widely ineffective. Apparently no one has yet provided the deer with the plant selection list.
- Again only familiar with urban areas. Many gardens in urban areas are attempting to increase food production....planting deer resistant plants is not consistent with the goal of trying to increase urban food security and to try and teach our children how food is grown. If families that are relying on the greens, fruit, and vegetable to supplement their table's offerings are needing to give up this endeavour it has a significant economic impact on their food budgets. Additionally, some people are very tied to their ornamental plants and although they may not be native they do add charm to neighbourhoods.
- Flowers are impossible with deer around. No option is presented for a massive cull of the deer. That's the only solution. Get rid of the deer before we have an epidemic of tick diseases. Lyme disease etc.
- It seems like you are trying to push this problem right back onto the public and farmers, without humanely addressing the issue of too many uncontrolled wild animals in our cities and farming areas. Is it humane just to exclude the animals from areas and increase the browsing pressure to a point where they have to go to extremes to find food? Controlling the deer populations firstly by culling is essential in order for any of the above evaluation criteria to work.
- As mentioned previously, fencing is the best option, and it is not expensive for gardeners to do so (see Lee Valley Summer Catalog) - otherwise, besides protecting roses and special shrubs, with Bobbex or other non toxic deterrent, planting shrubs that don't attract deer is a viable option, and most of them are not going to be an 'invasive' problem. The notes made above are just nonsense, as is the entire CAG process.
- The deer don't eat Daphne or Hogwart or Thisles...do we want to have these instead of vegetables and flowers? Those who say Deer were here first and have as much right at people apparently don't apply the same logic to bears & cougars and rats. They obviously don't consider the welfare of humans above the welfare of animals...these are the same people who want to control the population humans but not the population of animals. Those who aren't affected by the deer don't understand the problem. The deer not only eat our valuable plants but they destroy a lot of plants by trampling them or pulling bulbs out of the ground. Get on with it already !!! We have a problem and it's only getting worse each year. Many people are adversely affected by the deer. Those who aren't affected don't understand or care.
- Native planting will improve the environment overall and many non native "deer resistant" plants will become tolerable to deer within a generation. The solution does not

address habitat loss however much of the agricultural land currently held by developers could be effective forage areas

- If you want to destroy Victoria's reputation as a City of Gardens, go for this option. I am an avid gardener (ornamental and food). I have had many compliments from the Victoria and Saanich parks staff on my gardens, who have also sought gardening advice as well. I now find I am losing the battle against the increasing deer visits to my yard. If planting deer resistant plants is seen as the solution, then I will move to a condo. I have tried fencing and repellents. They have limited success and make gardening less enjoyable. In addition, all of the none CAG solutions being discussed above address the safety risk deer pose to humans and pets, the negative impact deer are having on the bird population, the risk of deer spreading disease, and the risk of deer-vehicle collisions. They also don't sufficiently acknowledge that deer numbers aren't static. It is a growing problem. What has some success today may have not be sufficient once the deer population doubles in the next few years.
- **Again, notes on this option are negative.**
- I think most gardeners have already applied this management strategy but it is no longer enough.
- deer do not belong in urban areas: landscape options will not work: does not address root cause
- Again, it's not a deer problem. It's a human problem. Some humans LIKE the deer and WANT them in their 'yards'. I would have plants that attract the deer and drive a car carefully in order to avoid colliding with them.
- Also not practical. There are so many deer in our area of Oak Bay that they are eating supposedly "deer resistant" plants. My garden has been decimated. Even the deer-resistant and native plantings are being consumed by hungry, ever-increasing numbers of deer. The only solution is to lower the deer population to a small, manageable level, preferably before another year of multiple births and the consequent doubling of the number of deer.
- Again, doesn't work efficiently... just ask me... the deer's desire for different types of vegetation varies based on what's available when they're hungry... One day they'll ignore one type of plant, shrub, vine, etc, and one thinks ones safe, the next day, gone!
- This is an expensive alternative and still does not answer the question of the increasing deer population.
- The hungrier the deer get, the more likely they are to eat, or at least attempt to eat, plants they supposedly do not like. Many gardeners are reporting deer eating "deer resistant" planting this year. I own a gardening store and hear from customers every day trying to reduce or eliminate deer damage. One of the things that annoys me the most is the notion that urban gardeners are only concerned about aesthetics. Not true. Most of the gardeners I hear from are trying to protect food crops and fruit trees that feed their families. This year, almost every flower in my garden that feeds the hummingbirds has been taken by the deer. Is anyone considering the impact that an uncontrolled deer population has on other species?
- **Best idea, but deer will eat most trees and plants when they are really hungry**

- Planting deer-resistant plants is one option for suburban gardens, as is the spraying of deer-deterrents such as Bobbex on plants.
- Talk about the tail wagging the dog...why not let all the taxpaying deer roam free, noshing on the delectable native plants and fruit trees planted especially for them in the city of gardens
- Deer are adapting their feeding to eat so called "deer proof" plantings. Banning organic vegetable gardens would negatively affect residents' health. People who want deer could provide funding for "adopting veterinarian sterilized deer." If there aren't enough supporters to control this over population, we need humane culling to replace the predation role of cougars.
- Does not address the root of the problem -- overpopulation by deer. Very expensive proposition and not realistic.
- I am not really "neutral" and feel this is misleading. I agree with most but not all of the ratings above. I would lower individual effectiveness in urban areas, and support, from 2 to 1. We have planted deer resistant plants but they do not recognize them as such. As per the minutes, the deer consumption patterns are changing.
- I didn't know that there was "community pressure" to plant fruit trees in our boulevards, but I don't think its a great idea, because not only will it attract deer to our roads, but also squirrels, raccoons, skunks and even bear. Deer are hard on some plants, I am especially sympathetic to those who love roses, but there are a surprising number of plants they don't seem to bother. We have lost a number of plants, but our yard would probably be considered a bit overgrown by some people and we have deer coming through our yard regularly for years. Wild life add to our enjoyment of life. I don't really understand homeowners who get so upset because they have found some deer droppings in their yard or lost a few flowers. Deer are quiet neighbours. They won't steal your computer or your wife for that matter. As I told my partner, if deer were the biggest problem I had in life, my world would be damned near perfect. Let's solve our problems, but without making scapegoats of the deer.
- Drawing deer out to browse on fruit trees planted in public boulevards is dangerous as it brings deer close to traffic but also to pedestrians. These pedestrians may be accompanied by dogs and the deer may take issue and attack.
- What community pressures to plant more fruit trees are you talking about? What members of "the public" would be recommending fruit trees, which will make a sticky, fly/bee/wasp mess once the fruit falls, be planted near boulevards? Where is the documentation on this? How many of these people are there? I also am fully behind encouraging people to plant deer resistant gardens. My mother has made her garden completely deer-resistant and it looks beautiful. She is not a fan of having deer in the neighbourhood but she is smart enough to know you should not fight the inevitable. Saanich already has by-laws in place about planting certain trees on properties, which it is more than happy to enforce....It is amazing how once something is mandated, people quickly get over it and move on to some new "injustice". Unfortunately, I am not able to give my support for this evaluation because of the heavy weight given to negative urban impacts, which when you consider all the intricacies of living in a congested area, aesthetics should not really play such a major role as it appears to here. We are all very

lucky to live in such a beautiful place, and whether you get to plant your favorite pink flowers or some equally pleasing deer-resistant yellow ones, is really just about what individuals want for themselves, and has little to do with the community or its relationship with the larger environment.

- We don't need fruit trees planted on boulevards.
- I have never heard of any community pressure to increase the number of fruit trees in public boulevards. Which CAG member came up with this nonsense? I will contact my municipality and complain about the CAG process. The members do not represent the opinions of the residents in my municipality.
- Changing established gardens to accommodate mainly or even more native plants would indeed be a bigger challenge in terms of aesthetics, time and money than many may wish to believe. The idea of planting more fruit trees on boulevards without removing the urban deer is virtually ludicrous. We have already begun to notice that "deer resistant" is quite variable - fawns will chew just about anything as will hungry deer. The Committee may wish to look more closely at areas such as some of the Gulf Islands where large deer populations are reportedly so in need of food that even native plants are being eaten to the point that the destruction of many plants is reducing/removing what many small animals and even plants themselves need to food, homes and regeneration. We have a large crop of erythroniums/fawn lilies - and the deer are noe eating them - mainly the leaves. A side note - South Oak Bay now has a growing population of rabbits - both the UVIC/pet store variety and the wild ones (hares?). Good luck with your deliberations –

### **Commentary on Evaluation process**

- I read the minutes and Evaluation Criteria and found no description of what each evaluation number actually means. Therefore, as far as I'm concerned the attached chart is useless as I have no way of easily determining what each number means. Your time, attention and energy spent on this project is admirable however if you're expecting this email evaluation process for the public to be helpful, you need to hire someone who can write about it in a way that addresses the public's full understanding of your criteria seeing as we're not attending the meetings.

### **Commentary on the Online Feedback Form**

- Once again I find this survey extremely confusing and misleading. It seems to me that the CRD thinks the public is made up of idiots. Shame on all of you! It is quite obvious that the farmers and the hunter are running the show at the CAG with the facilitator (why was she hired in the first place?) taking credit for the outcome of each meeting. When is this process going to stop? Our tax dollars are not meant to be wasted like this.

### **Commentary on Population Control**

- I want the d\*\*\* things eliminated.
- Get rid of the invaders not our beautiful garden diversity.
- Forget it, it is not a viable option. Come on guys, bite the bullet. Cull.

- is there not a culling option?
- What about a humane cull? We have to be the predator -- unless we want to encourage cougars to do the job. The meat can be used by food banks and shelters.
- Bureaucrats just trying to justify their existence. Enough bafflegab already. Get on with a cull.
- I don't think any of these options are viable. Most logical thing is a deer cull. Some people won't like it - but the majority i think would strongly support a cull of these 'pests'.
- Seriously... what kind of questions are these? You have a f\*\*\*\*\* deer problem, logically deer need to be culled. Look no further than your local bow hunters. Trying to do this any other way is to save political face with some fringe groups and waste great amounts of tax-payers money. It really doesn't matter what we say, it's a guarantee you'll f\*\*\* it all up anyways!
- I am shocked and appalled that CRDRMSCAG has such an extraordinary low level of understanding of wildlife management We have been managing wildlife in many parts of the world for centuries and culling is a fundamental element to any sensible management plan and the CAG has chosen to ignore that option in this survey. Accordingly, the survey has no validity. There is only one practical solution, culling (including sterilization) In my opinion, the CAG's public duty is to focus on how to manage the Bambi complex of some members of the public.
- There are two problems: 1. There are too many deer. 2. The deer are living in the wrong places. There should be no deer in any of the "downtown" municipalities of Victoria. The number on the Saanich peninsula should be dramatically reduced. The deer can have the rest of Vancouver Island.
- Cull the deer! Victoria is known as "The Garden City". Let's keep it that way, please.

### Other Commentary

- See comments above! Thank You!
- Stop urban sprawl and focus on re-inventing current land use space.
- Get on with it!
- I have "strongly disagreed" with all of the above - fencing would be prohibitive particularly for agriculture community, and probably not effective. Hazing and frightening solution is ridiculous - dogs usually ignore the deer, and have been attacked by the deer. This solution would only drive deer into another area and not deter them. As for landscaping alternatives!!! enough said on that. It has to be recognized that the deer will only cease to be a problem if they are culled and/or moved entirely - but to where? rabbit shelters are not going to take hundreds of deer. And they are proliferating at a rapid pace. Quite apart from the nuisance value in gardens, there is the very real danger of health problems (ticks) and driving hazards - I have missed several over the past year when they wandered in front of the car!! If dogs were allowed to roam at will as the deer are, there would definitely be an uproar to control them. Realizing that you are having to cope with a very vocal minority of people who are charmed by this animal, perhaps it should be considered that castrating the males would leave them alive but unable to breed. Not an easy solution, but perhaps a viable one.

- see above comments