

Online Feedback Form Responses for Controlled Public Hunt, Sharpshooting, Immunocontraceptives, Deer/vehicle Collision Mitigation and Public Education Management Options

Background

- The total number of responses is 102
- The feedback form was available on the deer management website for public input from Thursday, July 19, 2012 at 5:30pm to Tuesday, July 24, 2012 at 12:00 pm.
- The form was announced through an email to all addresses that had submitted to deermanagement@crd.bc.ca.
- Responses flagged with green are possible duplicate responses by the same respondent.
- The purpose of the online feedback form is to fulfil the obligations of the communications and consultation section of the Terms of Reference, which emphasizes an open and transparent process that has early and ongoing communications and consultation through an on-line campaign. The CAG has full knowledge of how the form is being administered and the non-representative nature of the input/feedback. The feedback is another source of information for the CAG to use at their discretion. Another purpose of the online venue is to provide the public with an opportunity to follow CAG progress without having to attend the meetings. The online feedback form content is generated by the CAG and is updated weekly in accordance with the CAG's progress and in order to provide timely information out to the public and feedback to the CAG.

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

Commentary on Controlled Public Hunt

- The Deers are what makes this area so wonderful. You KILL the DEERS and mother nature will have her revenge. Nothing that i say will stop you from senseless killing of these wonderful animals. ... but mother nature will have her revenge.
- The deer should be lured to a location where they can be rounded up and transported to an abattoir where the animals can be killed in a humane and controlled way and the meat can go to good use either sold off to offset costs of the process or given away as food for those who need it. No profit should be made from this process.
- do not cull the deer we need to relocate them
- There are no curbs on the ever increasing population of deer in the greater Victoria area. For the reasons of health, safety and protection of our vegetable food source, (farms), we need to significantly reduce their numbers.
- Not on my property!
- Eat them!

- I don't think a public hunt, controlled or not, can realistically be held in suburban neighbourhoods. I think it CAN be held on farmland and rural areas. Capture through sedation and subsequent killing elsewhere can take place in suburban neighbourhoods.
- A public hunt would be a complete nightmare - it would harm Victoria's tourism industry immeasurably and would be incredibly difficult from a logistical point of view. In the populated areas of Victoria there would be protests and shockingly bad PR - nationally and internationally.
- Make the meat available for public consumption
- Incomprehensible option.
- The question you pose is incomprehensible. Let the record show that. I strongly support a controlled public hunt.
- I think the hunting for protection purposes regulations should be changed to allow a higher bag limit and meat to be retained.
- Potentially too dangerous depending on who fancies him/herself a hunter "extradinaire" after watching too much violent American TV. And who knows what additional crazies could show up with lord knows what type of weaponry. Honestly! I'm not joking.
- Should be pursued in conjunction with sharpshooting, where useful, as part of overall strategy.
- I am totally against any killing of the deer at all. Plus when I tried to go to the rationale for the evaluation page it would NOT open. Figures.
- Not practical or safe in urban areas so another strategy is needed there.
- Ridiculous to entertain this option in an urban environment however it is controlled.
- This is a crazy idea and dangerous!
- Are you insane?
- I AM ABSOLUTELY AND RESOLUTELY OPPOSED ANY CULL LET ALONE A PUBLIC HUNT!
- If we cannot co-exist with nature, without destroying it, what chance do we have for getting along with each other as the human race?
- I think agricultural operators and rural residents protecting their food gardens should have the right to hunt the deer within specified guidelines. The meat should not be wasted but butchered and consumed, again according to established guidelines.
- now chas go to the north Island, interior and Alberta for their venison. Let them proceed closer to home. And keep the meat. They would pay a premium for a permit/tag to hunt locally.
- I disagree with any plan that involves a cull of any type, whether professional or sportsman type hunters. We need to set an example here, that the Capital region has advanced beyond 19th/20th century Animal management and to develop Management Strategy that will lead us into the 21st century, setting the example for the rest of North America.
- I believe public hunts are a good solution!
- I believe there is support /enthusiasm from the urban community for this option....there is although more support for the sharp shooting method.

- Need to apply "liability insurance" provisions for the hunters who participate similar to the Fraser Valley or Gulf Islands Special Licence Area requirements under the Wildlife Act.
- Untrained people should NEVER be allowed to harrass and hunt wildlife and bow hunting should not be allowed. It seems ridiculous and wasteful that if an animal has been killed that the meat is not allowed to be used by the farmer or hunter. This would mean then that apart from the farmer who killing deer to protect his crops, the hunter is doing it purely as a blood sport!!
- In regards to agricultural protection, strongly recommend fencing. Not in favour of hunting...
- I totally disagree with a so called 'controlled public hunt' as you have no idea of the exact number of deer you are dealing with plus it is barbaric when there are other options such as an informed SpayVac program (It is used to control kangaroos in Australia)...start with a test trial.
- I strongly believe that other options should be used and that the hunt not be allowed to occur in the CRD.
- A public hunt will be extremely dangerous, not just for the deer, but also for humans and pets. How do we distinguish between a sharpshooter and someone who may be on the rampage?
- there is no justification for lethal management, PERIOD. There is no evidence that it works to control wildlife populations, and it is an inhumane method of dealing with wildlife.
- I am totally opposed to killing deer with firearms or bows. True to form, however, it appears that the CAG has already made up its mind in favour of these two options, which confirms my suspicion that the whole process is a sham!
- Why is cost the main consideration in every strategy considered ? I think that it's extremely inhumane to shoot deer that daily graze in a family group, and have come to trust humans. Public hunters are much less accurate generally, than a sharp shooter.
- I think this is a terrifying option. The likelihood of members of the public, farm animals, or pets being shot is far far too real. It is bad enough that one can hear rifle and shotgun shots at night by public 'hunters' shooting for fun, or shooting geese or deer or I would want to be warned of the period of time of a Controlled Public Hunt so that I could take my dogs and leave the CRD for the duration.

Commentary on the evaluation process

- These criteria are a waste of everybody's time. There is a deer problem - get rid of the deer. How much simpler could it get? Deer do not belong in an urban environment. I am tired of chasing herds of deer out of my garden. The deer are so "urbanized" that they don't even run away when I try to get them out of my garden. For an old man living on limited means, these deer are a god damned nuisance.
- Apparently, I missed a number of the earlier evaluations of non-lethal options, such as hazing and fencing, and I wonder if these non-lethal options were intentionally placed at the very beginning of the surveys prior to high publicity of the options and concerns in

order to lessen the number of respondents and to skew the statistical responses. It does make me more skeptical of this process. I also find the charts offered make a lot of assumptions which are actually based on unknown factors, but as acceptance or support levels of a specific option. This may be biasing the results. Lastly, the layout of the survey is very poor. I was not even aware of the many explanations or clarifications of each element were offered via the survey, and my screen cut off all those details. The explanatory parts of the surveys show to be completely right under the question in a readable column, not part of it under the question and large portions in a column requiring scrolling into a deep right hand part of the screen which on some computers is not directly presented or known to be there.

- I hope we never have to go to war! The time involved in consulting, committees, opinions etc; would make it such that we have lost before it has begun. I sincerely request that the process is contracted and a decision made. If a chosen path is incorrect and adjustments are needed after a 6 month trial, then modern management I believe would put it right. That has been my business experience.
- The evaluation criteria are reasonably good, but the "ratings" do not add value. Controlled public hunt is a fairly good option in rural areas, but has potential problems.
- **It is quite obvious that the Evaluation Process was conducted by a small pro cull group. This whole process is a big waste of money. When will it stop!**
- **SINCE THE EVALUATION CRITERIA IS DECIDED BY SEVEN PRO-CULL INDIVIDUALS WHO CURRENTLY MAKE UP THE CITIZENS ADVISORY GROUP, THIS CRITERIA IS NOT VALID. FORTY-THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$40,000) OF CRD/TAXPAYERS MONEY IS BEING WASTED ON THIS USELESS PROCESS. THE MONEY SHOULD GO TO ASSIST STRUGGLING FARMERS INSTALL FENCING. YOU ARE MAKING A MOCKERY OF THE CRD.**

Commentary on the Online Feedback Form

- This input opportunity is confusing beyond belief, an object lesson in obfuscation. I have 10 years of formal post secondary education, and 45 years adult life experience and I yet I still can't understand it. Please stop this convoluted nonsense and acknowledge that deer in both urban and near-urban-agricultural environments are a serious nuisance and dangerous. Over the short-term, euthanize when capture is feasible, and sharpshoot when it isn't (presuming it's safe to do so). Obviously, public hunt in urban areas is unacceptable, but it might be applicable to agricultural zones. Immunocontraception might then become a long-term strategy to mitigate re-establishment.

Commentary on other management options

- Get on with it. Use qualified sharpshooters whether they be trained military, police, whoever is available. They are still multiplying too fast. Sooner the better to get on with the solution. If necessary, capture them with tranquilizer darts in urban areas and transport to a killing ground where it is safe to do.

- Please elect to use the birth control method of population control, if you must control the population of deer. We have moved into their territory. They have not moved into ours, other than having their own ancient environments taken over by people. Just like bears, cougars, etc. It is the ONLY humane option. They are feeling beings. I have seen them play together. Much like dogs, chasing each other around a set of bushes. These were young adults, not babies. I have seen the genuine love the mothers feel for their young. I have seen too much to think that any other option is human or humane.

Other commentary

- I am not a hunter but I am a gardener & have lost & continue to lose, thousands of dollars to the deer. I have tried every possible prevention device/approach to no avail. I have come to the conclusion that the deer have to be disposed of... like the UVic bunnies. I have an open front yard as the municipality does not allow front yard fences... And the deer keep coming... I am amazed at the lack of action on the part of Victoria municipalities.
- I am an urban planner. This highly praised book <http://www.storyofstuff.org/resources/the-story-of-stuff-book/press-praise/> reveals state-of-the-profession fundamental principles of planning that would benefit the process. This includes especially 1) Variable geographies longitudinal competitively constructed and incremental transitional work-live/flora-fauna effects, and 2) an unaccounted carbon-based radial expansion of monoculturing effects within the zone of concern. Thank you for your attention to this.

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

Commentary on Sharpshooting

- The Deers are what makes this area so wonderful. You KILL the DEERS and mother nature will have her revenge. Nothing that i say will stop you from senseless killing of these wonderful animals. ... but mother nature will have her revenge.
- Disgusting why do we always kill wildlife it is not necessary
- If deer are killed, the meat should be sold to offset costs.
- Sharpshooters are not infallible. They miss.
- Eat them!
- I think professional sharpshooting is a good option for all rural and agricultural areas, not for suburban residential. Use sedation, capture and subsequent killing elsewhere for suburban residential.
- Sharpshooting is a better option than a public hunt but still entirely unsuited to Victoria. How would you conduct it safely? How would you justify it to small children? How would it impact on Victoria's tourism? Is it really worth it? No.
- I like this option. Just shoot them and if any more wander into the area, have a community hot line set up where you phone in and a marksman is quickly dispatched.

- Make the meat available for public consumption
- Incomprehensible option.
- The question you pose is incomprehensible. Let the record show that I strongly support the sharpshooting management option.
- We do not need to have trained murderers hired to kill the deer to control their populations. We encroached on their land, allowed for "overpopulation" to occur and now through or poor management practices we think it is "OK" to slaughter these animals? We are supposed to be the superior beings, and yet we always seem to "fix" problems we create by using force and violence. How does this "raise" our place in the stewards of the land and wild animals? Simply, it does not.
- Shooting the animals is the most cost effective & efficient approach.
- My comments from above hold for this as well
- Clearly not the whole solution but should be pursued where practicable. Sidney Island experience seems useful here?
- I am against any killing of the deer what so ever.
- This method would be best in urban areas.
- I have seen the crossbow cull it in action on Nantucket, it was never a problem for humans and we were walking in the same forested areas as the cull was taking place.
- The same as above. These videos also deal with the underemphasized planning and fiscal options: www.StoryofBroke.org and www.StoryofStuff.org.
- Also a crazy idea! What are we teaching our children today?
- Cruel.
- NO CULL!
- no need for mercenaries.
- Same comment as before, we have assumed that our region has advanced beyond the Cull mentality of the last two centuries.. while I know certain small towns have reverted to using this as a solution, 200 plus years of Wildlife Management has shown the errors of this type of solution and how a cull unbalances wildlife.
- As above!
- I believe there is definitely support and enthusiasm for this approach within the urban community, there is however a lot of stigma against coming out and saying you are in favour of a cull....I believe the support is much stronger than the committee may know. I also do not understand why this option was given a low rating in terms of capability...the deer in Oak Bay, Fairfield, Gonzales and Rockland are so predictable it would be very easy to sit on my front porch and take care of a good deal of the problem during the late hours of the night....I am surprised that a few of my neighbours have not already taken this approach since they are more rattled about the deer than I am....they are however not willing/able to sift thru this form of public consultation.
- In lieu of payment to the hunter, the deer should be provided as payment or partial payment to this person.
- Sharpshooting is highly superior to allowing the untrained general public to kill deer, however I think there are way more superior options.

- In regards to agricultural protection, strongly recommend fencing. NOT in favour of sharpshooting...
- See above in additional comments. Likely have numerous wounded deer wandering around...totally inhumane. You don't even know how many deer are around...one deer does look like another unless you look closely. Has there ever been a deer count?
- I strongly believe that sharpshooting is not an option for the control of deer in the CRD.
- So now the CRD is suggesting that there will be sharpshooting going on. This will sound like an open invitation to have more violence in our usual peaceful area. Coming to these conclusions is no wonder, as the CAG was right from the start, meant to come up with these violent solutions.
- Absolute madness
- Again, no justification for lethal management. Sharpshooters aren't sharp, and animals can be injured and suffer terribly before death, all for the pleasure of 'hunting enthusiasts'. Absolutely disagree.
- It disgusts me that you should even be considering sharpshooting of deer within the CRD, let alone lean towards this option, as the CAG appears to be doing. Drop this option immediately; it is a non-starter!
- Notwithstanding the greater skills of sharpshooters, I would still be frightened of the possibilities for terrible accidents, and would want to leave the CRD for the duration.

Commentary on the evaluation process

- you've rated negative community impacts too high
- The evaluation criteria are reasonably good, but the "ratings" do not add value. Sharpshooting is a very good option in many ways, in both rural and urban areas.
- SINCE A BOW HUNTER IS ON THE CITIZENS ADVISORY GROUP AND WOULD LIKELY BE ONE OF THE PAID PROFESSIONALS (SEE ABOVE) HE HAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN NOMINATED FOR THE CAG. NEGATIVE IMPACT WILL COME FROM PEOPLE WHO LOVE AND APPRECIATE THE DEER - YOU HAVE OMITTED THE OPINION OF THESE PEOPLE. INDEED IT IS A ONE-SIDED PROCESS IN FAVOUR OF A CULL. WHAT A DISGRACE TO OUR CRD!!!

Commentary on other management options

- Again, I only agree with the use of the contraceptive method of population control, if their population must be controlled by artificial means.
- More feasible to corral deer and deal with them out of urban areas.

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

Commentary on Immunocontraceptives

- Expensive, results way too far in the future.

- The Deers are what makes this area so wonderful. You KILL the DEERS and mother nature will have her revenge. Nothing that i say will stop you from senseless killing of these wonderful animals. ... but mother nature will have her revenge.
- I think contraception is a good idea the deer were here first
- This would be the right thing to do. We cannot kill every living creature because they are in our way.
- Eat them!
- Why not consider male sterilization (castration of bucks)? This could be done by qualified vets operating from within a mobile operating facility, together with hunters using tranquilizer guns.
- It looks like it is too complex and that the actual contraceptives are not available. Plus the present population is too high.
- IF there is substantiated scientific evidence of a excessive deer population in Victoria (and there has been much commentary in the media that suggest this is NOT the case) then contraception is the ONLY method of slimming numbers that would be publicly acceptable, easily managed and not adversely affecting Victoria's tourism industry.
- This option takes too long to provide effects. Just shoot them and be done with it.
- The question you pose is incomprehensible. Let the record show that I am strongly unsupportive of the immunocontraceptive management option.
- I agree there are risks and costs in this approach, but I still see it as a more reasonable option to those of bow hunting and sharpshooters. We need to know the potential risks associated with these concepts to make sure we would be narrowing the scope of damage any might employ.
- who are we kidding?
- indeed a useless option
- Seems more trouble than it is worth.
- Doesn't seem to be a lot of point in doing this before deer numbers have already been greatly reduced. Personally, I have little enthusiasm for methods that render the deer meat unfit to eat.
- Might consider a pilot study with drug company support at a later date as a means of herd reduction
- Only if this was done without capture of the deer. Example in the food left out or something like that. No stress to the deer.
- Responded to in <http://www.storyofstuff.org/resources/the-story-of-stuff-book/press-praise/>.
- Far too slow a process and costly for taxpayers even if vaccines or similar were available.
- Are you insane?B) Cruel.C) Are you insane? We're talking about poison--poison that results in infertility. Other species will be affected.
- It would be years before there was a significant reduction in the number of deer
- Immunocontraceptive management is a good alternative to lethal management solutions.

- If contraceptive programs were used it would take too long a period to get rid of the deer leaving years to resolve the problem of all the damage to our gardens.
- Contraception is the least favourable solution for all of the reasons set out above. Those of us in Saanich with ornamental gardens are quite capable of making our properties less attractive for browsing. It takes planning and some expense, but the biggest issues are for the farmers. We need to protect our local food production.
- agree, would take ten years to have any impact, meanwhile the populations will increase. counted 32 on Uplands course last week and the roadways to it going along Cedar Hill X Rd.
- A much better solution, one that will take time to correct the numbers, but as the numbers too time to get to these numbers, a solution should be the same slower process to ensure that the numbers are not excessively reduced which could impact other species on the Southern Island.
- As above!
- It may cost more, but lasts for a number of years. It is humane, and not brutal, as are the other options. They are feeling, living creatures, and deserve to have their lives.
- I don't like the thought of more synthetic hormones in our environment. They can be very dangerous, carcinogenic and we have enough already. Also when we run out of food, does it make sense to reduce our very good local food supply, our wildlife. I do not eat meat but think hunting wildlife is far superior for meat eaters than eating the products of horrendous, inhumane slaughterhouses
- In regards to agricultural protection, strongly recommend fencing. NOT in favour of poisoning...
- Do a trial in an area such as Oak Bay first to find out the effectiveness. This method has been used to manage kangaroos in Australia.
- I do not agree with this option as there is a vast unknown about the effect of these drugs on deer predators. We in the CRD are lucky to have wolves and cougars in the Sooke Hills and I do not want to endanger these predators.
- As usual, complete willful ignorance on the part of the majority of CAG members as to the impressive safety and success of Spay-Vac, which could easily be pushed through as a pilot project by the MoE head vet for Victoria. No effort made to have Wildlife Biologist Rick Page as an expert to appear before the CAG group and answer questions about the SpayVac. That would be too easy. CAG members are interested only in killing.
- Once again, the CAG is off the mark! This humane approach (immunocontraception) should be seriously explored as an option, rather than dismissed out of hand, as it appears to be.
- Immunocontraceptive management is my preferred option. We could be a leading example of the application of this option. Volunteers should be used to help. Cost is obviously important, but humaneness more important.
- What about spaying the bucks? Most veterinarians are skillful in quick and safe spay procedures, even with large animals such as horses and cows, as well as large dogs. This would not have the issues of environmental contamination.

- THE CAG HAVE NOT DONE THEIR DUE DILIGENCE ON THIS OPTION. SPAY-VAC IS CURRENTLY AWAITING APPROVAL FROM HEALTH CANADA. THERE ARE NO KNOWN SIDE-EFFECTS FOR ANIMALS WHEN THIS METHOD IS USED AND YET THIS OPTION HAS BEEN BRUSHED ASIDE. YOU NEED TO RESEARCH THIS OPTION IN DEPTH BEFORE SHEDDING BLOOD AND CAUSING DISTRESS AND PAIN TO THE PEOPLE OF THE CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT AS WELL AS THE UNFORTUNATE DEER.
- Too complicated option. Better to round them up and send to abattoir for humane removal.

Commentary on the evaluation process

- The evaluation criteria are reasonably good, but the "ratings" do not add value. Immunocontraceptive management is a poor option in many ways, and should not be pursued. Other options are much better.

Commentary on other management options

- Vehicle collision is a serious concern. Uplands Golf Course bordering on Cadboro Bay Rd. where Evergreens border on roadway hide numerous deer who jump out onto the roadway in front of cars. The greenery is so dense that the deer are not seen until after a collision or near collision. Perhaps the golf club has to build a high fence or cut back branches that hide the deer and driver's possibility to see them.
- I believe the sharp shooter method would be faster, more economical and more effective.

Other commentary

- Not even knowing how many deer there are, it seems kind of idiotic to try and get rid of them. If the farmers have a problem, maybe they should discuss a solution among themselves, but do not get the rest of Victoria involved.

Do you have any additional thoughts or comments on the application of the Evaluation Criteria to the Deer/vehicle Collision Mitigation management option?

Commentary on Deer/vehicle Collision Mitigation

- Expensive, doesn't really solve all the other problems occurring because of the high concentration of deer (rutting, eating gardens, threat to small dogs).
- The Deers are what makes this area so wonderfull. You KILL the DEERS and mother nature will have her revenge. Nothing that i say will stop you from senseless killing of these wonderful animals. ... but mother nature will have her revenge. Speed limit reduction, speed bumps, and pedestrian crossings, and signs "watch for deer, they live here too" and Deers can't read... so it's the responsibility of the people to ensure their safty. Allowing electric vehicles on the roads will help with less pollution. Make the area across from the children hospital and the university a park. so the deers can enjoy it. dont

waste time on grass cutting lawns (mini golf courses) are a waste of efforts, and lawns should be allowed to be turned onto agricultural grow their own food and sell it.

- warning signs need to be installed and perhaps fencing in some areas.
- Honestly - I don't know what this is. It sounds like a bunch of bureuacratic gobleygook! I was almost killed in 2010 by a deer that decided to race across the highway at dusk - there was no one in the other lane or we would have likely have been dead!
- No, I don't think it is really possible in the Saanich area owing to most of the roads travelling past private property with limited space on either side of the road to build fences, and it is not feasible in residential suburban areas -- I have seen areas where wire fencing exists along controlled-access highways or through-ways, such as in New England through rural stretches on the interstate highways, etc...
- Get these deer off the street. I almost hit a mother and fawn the other night on Shelbourne. I had to brake and swerve to avoid crunching the fawn.
- The question you pose is incomprehensible. Let the record show that I am strongly unsupportive of the deer-vehicle collision mitigation management option.
- I think ICBC should fund part of this cost which is going to reduce claims. Signage and lowering speed limits may help, as would some fencing, We need to consider all non-lethal options.
- waste of money...
- let's not waste time on this
- Speed limits and signage won't help cyclists. When I chase deer out of my urban backyard, they jump onto the roadway right over the boulevard brushing etc. isn't really relevant in the urban environment. There are just as many vehicle collision issues in the urban environment but fewer, if any, viable infrastructure options.
- This option appears not to be suitable for an intensive undertaking on the CRD's part.
- Would rate this as a waste of time. Most drivers are already alert of the problem. Deer don't respect warning signs and barriers
- I have said before that if drivers are not looking out for deer and following the signage, ex. speed limits, etc. THEY should be fined and not deer killed. I think if people had to pay every time they hit a deer (a fine) then maybe they would think twice about just driving like they own the road and don't share it with others (wildlife).
- This option does not deal with the real problem. It is only one part of the overall problem of too many deer and does nothing to address that root problem. Also I think the effectiveness rating for administrative solutions is over rated. We have deer walking the streets in Oak Bay!
- Responded to in <http://www.storyofstuff.org/resources/the-story-of-stuff-book/press-praise/>.
- This is a laughable example of the deer wagging the taxpayers tail. Really....ICBC deer/vehicle impact sites are very concerning for not only safety but cost, the deer must go, we do not need to start reconfiguring roads or removing more brush (important bird habitat) at yet more public expense.
- This has been used in other areas of Canada and has been effective. Providing natural corridors for the deer to move throughout their territories, since they have been here for

10,000 years, and its hard to change their patterns of movement, would be an option to consider. Much easier to change our patterns of movement...after all, we are suppose to be the more intelligent species.

- Has the CRD bothered to track incidence of collisions between motorists and dogs, cats, raccoons, squirrels, birds, and pedestrians in relation to collisions with deer? No? Gee, then I guess it's only deer who throw themselves in front of motorists then.... NOT! More motorists have more likely been harmed swirving to avoid a child running into the road than a deer. Motorist/deer collisions are irrelevant and have no bearing on this process!
- Again I think this would be a very slow and costly process.
- can't see it being effective. deer can't read where they are supposed to cross
- The options here seem to make sense in reducing this type of interaction between wildlife and machinery. One thing missing is enforcement, Speed traps and red light cameras. Excessive speed, or drivers not paying attention (cell phone use) would negate any improvements designed to allow better driver response to wildlife. One prime example.. Sooke Road From Kelly to Veterans Parkway.. drivers doing better than 90 Km/h in 60 Km/h zones, everyday... never an enforcement yet in an area with abundant wildlife..
- As above!
- The deer are wandering down Oak Bay Avenue, Foul Bay Ave, Rockland Ave and along Richmond Avenue during times of heavy traffic. They are also along the less well travelled roads in these areas. They walk out quite unexpectedly. I almost hit one on my bike on Rockland Ave a month ago and have seen the deer running scared thru the traffic. It is completely not practical, economically viable, feasible to install fencing along all the roads that the deer frequent. Additionally there are fence bylaws (4 feet in front yards) which are intended to ensure sight lines of moving vehicles and to ensure some degree of connection between neighbours. Signage, speed bumps and other traffic calming methods are expensive and do little to slow cars. There are also aesthetics to consider in the urban environment and fences, signs, the clearing of greenery all have a negative impact on the way things look in the City.
- I think this should be one of the most important options to avoid deer/human conflict. Until we realize that WE and are burgeoning amounts of our automobiles are the THE PROBLEM we will never reach a resolution. Until we look at this not only as a problem that we have, but also as a problem the deer have, we will not reach a resolution. We have never been elected as keepers and controllers of the planet and it's wildlife and as unelected leaders we're doing a pretty poor job
- It would be more effective to use creative signage rather than the yellow sign with the jumping buck.
- Deer, pedestrians, jaywalkers, sidewalk cyclists, skateboarders = no difference. Situational awareness must be maintained by drivers at all times.
- There are far more collisions involving cars, pedestrians.
- Increase both infrastructure and administrative options. We live near Interurban, and although the police are sometimes giving out "speeding tickets", they could be there more often.

- I agree that infrastructure improvement would be expensive, but would it be more expensive than the motor vehicle, human, and deer damage from collisions? Perhaps ICBC would want to contribute. I know people would be annoyed if they were ticketed more often for speeding, but really, being a dedicated defensive driver, I would be very pleased. Perhaps the most affected municipalities would pass traffic bylaws increasing fines for any motorist who hits a deer while impaired or speeding.
- THE CAG ARE AMATEURS WHICH CAN BE OBSERVED FROM THEIR COMMENTS. ROAD SIGNS WORK IN OTHER REGIONS OF CANADA. TAKE OTTAWA FOR EXAMPLE WHERE THERE ARE ROAD SIGNS 'SPEEDING COSTS YOU DEERLY' THEY WORK AT GREATLY REDUCING CAR-DEER COLLISIONS. IN THE CRD IN GENERAL, INEXPENSIVE DEER WARNING SIGNS ARE RARE. ONE GOOD EXAMPLE OF AN EFFECTIVE WILD-LIFE WARNING SIGN IS ON THE VETERANS HIGHWAY IN LANGFORD/METCHOSIN. SPEND OUR MONEY ON SIGNS NOT BOW-HUNTERS AND GUNS. ARE SIGNS TOO SIMPLE AND INEXPENSIVE FOR THE CRD AND MUNICIPALITIES?
- Again, this attempt is evading the issue: Deer do NOT BELONG in proximity to traffic either vehicular or bicycles.
- Again, willful ignorance by CAG members as to the impressive results from programs such as 'Speeding Costs You Deerly' in Ottawa and other programs to educate drivers.

Commentary on the evaluation process

- The higher ratings under "Administrative" likely reflect the ivory tower/no street smarts aspects of this so-called Option. It is simply the "do next to nothing" way of ignoring the real issues.
- The evaluation criteria are reasonably good, but the "ratings" do not add value. Deer-Vehicle Collision Mitigation measures are a poor option - expensive and ineffective. The best measure for reducing Deer-Vehicle Collisions is to reduce and maintain deer population to reasonable levels.

Commentary on the Online Feedback Form

- I do not know what this means. This is, as usual, a very poorly written questionnaire.
- Your survey is so misleading. It is very difficult to actually fill it out, so that the deer will be protected. It seems obvious that the CRD is trying to pretend that the public was involved in the decision making process. This is not what is happening. Shame on all of you!

Commentary on other management options

- In favour of signs and fencing...
- All of these options are potentially viable, and should be explored and examined in greater detail, instead of focussing on the cruel and inhumane practice of killing these lovely creatures with rifles, bows and arrows, etc.

Other commentary

- The public is educated. Have a referendum, a vote of some kind on whether to immediately cull the deer population. Quit wasting valuable time.

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

Commentary on Public Education

- I would have thought it would have little value and would be very costly and difficult logistically.
- C'mon! If the deer regularly come and eat my entire garden there is absolutely NOTHING you can do to try to brainwash me into perceiving that as okay. I know how much you guys like to focus on "education" instead of rolling up your sleeves and doing something concrete, but it will not work for this problem.
- Spend the public education money on bringing the plight of the poor and the disadvantaged to the public's attention. Deer vs. people. Do deer win? If deer win, why do rats lose, or bears or cougars, or ... they are all 'god's little creatures' aren't they, including people? The guiding principle should be if comes down to people vs. animals, animals lose.
- This would be largely useless and not solve the problem. People do not want to limit their garden plantings to deer resistant plants, and agricultural areas cannot.
- What are you talking about? Do you mean we should advise the public not to feed the deer? Or do you mean we need to educate the public about how to fence their properties properly? Or do you mean we educate children about why deer are being shot in the streets? I am not a stupid person but this questionnaire befuddles me.
- This is again the hand-waving, rally some short term support/enthusiasm Option - the CRD must focus on the "Effectiveness" - or lack of it for this Option.
- What possible education option is there? Are you going to educate the deer so they don't come in to an urban environment? Good luck with that! Deer are not particularly bright.
- Forget anymore education attempts and surveys. Have the public vote.
- The question you pose is incomprehensible. Let the record show that I am strongly unsupportive of the public education management option, since it does not address overpopulation problem.
Public education may help, but I am not sure it will cause major behavioral changes, nor would it likely directly lead to changes of deer population. If you mean propagandize to the public to promote a certain point of view expressed by some members of this group, then I am opposed to this type of education.
- another waste of time...
- Public education is critical to offsetting the bambi image of deer
- There is already a lot of information out there and much of it, particularly as pertains to landscaping options, is useless. I believe education should focus on an ICBC campaign outlining safety issues and costs to the insurance system and the issue of feeding deer.

The latter, I believe there are municipal bylaws against. There should be education around this and bylaws should be enforced with heavy fines to back them up.

- As the most effective methods for reducing deer populations seem to have the least public support, and the least effective methods have the most public support, public education would seem to be a priority, bundled, as you note, with more direct methods.
- I strongly agree that the public has to be made aware of what they do on the road and by not fencing that they will be causing the death of deer. I also want to say that I drive with caution and have never hit a deer. I drive 17 km from Victoria to Brentwood Bay five days a week and have done so for 14 and 1/2 years. So I truly believe deer on road collisions are caused by bad driving. Make PEOPLE responsible for their actions or inactions not the deer. There will always be more deer to replace the ones killed. It's the PEOPLE who have to CHANGE!
- Public education should be used regardless of which method above is used. Even after a deer cull and the resulting reduced number of deer, home owners, farmers would still need to be aware of any conditions, circumstances that encourage the deer population in terms both of increasing their numbers and frequenting residential, urban areas. e.g. no intentional feeding of deer in urban areas.
- This option does not address the root problem of too many deer so in my opinion is of little value.
- The prefaced tone re. education is negative, predetermining its outcome. Responded to in <http://www.storyofstuff.org/resources/the-story-of-stuff-book/press-praise/>.
- Urban condo dwellers have little deer caused cost issues while suburban and rural dwellers, both farmers and residents alike are heavily impacted by cost. Aesthetically and democratically the condo dwellers deserve a voice but the louder voice and evaluative criteria and consideration should be given to those producing food and such.....farmers in the area. This educative component should be presented loud and clearly.
- People need to understand how important it is to protect and preserve our wildlife. As we become more urbanized we become less aware of nature and its importance to our survival as a species. To destroy nature is to destroy ourselves. Any knowledgeable biologist...Eg. David Suzuki, will support my claim.
- This is the only feasible option.
- Public Education is the SOLE measure that the CRD should be paying for in this process. It is NOT the business of the CRD to mitigate farmers' losses to deer nor any other creature! Next the farmers will want the CRD to cull the crows for eating their crops! This entire CRD public consultation process is a complete farce. The numbers of citizens in the CRD who are either a) supportive of the deer or b) have no particular interest in the subject far outweigh the number of people who demand a lethal solution. If the CRD go ahead with plans to cull the deer in order to placate greedy farmers, then they can look forward to a taxpayer's lawsuit!
- don't people already know these things. deer are now eating plants they did not touch a decade ago.
- Education does take time but has been shown to be a consistent long-term solution in other changes in society (i.e. recycling, dumping of waste products, Drink Driving, etc..)

- As a landscaper of over 10 years I feel people lack the consistency to make this option feasible...
- As above!
- I am surrounded by deer, and yet have developed a method of gardening, including vegetable gardening, which allows me to keep the deer out of the things I don't want them in. In the open area, I grow only deer-proof plants. And, I love having them around.
- Education should not be used as a cop out to address the root cause of the problem.... deer in the City. Neighbours who have lived here for 50 years say there has never been this problem before. Deer are being pushed out of the Western Communities as those areas develop and allowed to multiply without any natural predators and with a rich supply of food within the City.
- You said it, "If no problem is perceived there is no conflict, if no conflict is perceived there is no problem". I think Victoria could be a leader in this. EDUCATION is key. We need not to perceive the deer as a problem, rather our massive human populations. I live around deer, there's one walking up my road as I write. I know that if I see one I HAVE to slow down, even stop and wait as there most likely will be more. I know that deer are out at dusk and dawn and these are the times I have to be particularly vigilant. I stop if I see an injured one and care for it. I look on all wildlife not as inferior to me but as equals. Funnily enough, although not a meat eater, I respected the way the First Nations used to hunt and use an animal. Their methods were traditionally respectful to all animals and way superior to the sources from which people get their meat nowadays. We have a lot to learn from them.
- Education is very valuable so agree with this option but needs to be more creative than your criteria. Fruit farmers in Summerland used to gather up their pruning and rotten fruit...placed it in a central location offering deer a place to dine that was not in their fields or orchards. The deer learned where the food was collected for them and left the trees and gardens alone. Proved to be a valuable stratgy.
- Public Education has to be the core of the whole management program and should be the top priority.
- I realize that you are not asking for opinions on this input; you are asking for thoughts on the evaluation criteria. But even if the evaluation criteria seems complete, I still cannot accept any methods, or the associated criteria, that involve killing the deer or even neutering them. I feel that public education, collision management, fencing and smell repellent options are the only acceptable choices.
- The public should be made aware, that If this problem is not addressed now, the eventual size of the problem will double each year given the fact that that a female deer can give birth to up to two, or three offspring, each year.
- There is more than adequate information in the public domain for residents to make sound decisions if they are negatively affected by wildlife such as deer, raccoons, squirrels, rats, birds as well as sea otters on public beaches. CRD, could for example, prepare comprehensive information sheets as a series for inclusion in local newspapers as pullouts which can be collected if so desired. Such Information sheets can also cover other topics which may be of social/moral importance, e.g. water safety in parks in view

of the spate of reported deaths in the media recently. Such information sheets could be syndicated nationally and will show that we are not intellectually lazy, but are a caring and tolerant community and that the actions by other communities is not a magic bullet it is professed to be.

- Public education should be the number one priority. This could already begin in Elementary School. Victoria could be a leader in teaching its residents how it is possible to coexist with wildlife.
- Well, this would be putting the onus on humans to modify their behaviour and make some concessions to wildlife. Couldn't have that, could we? Everything that is wrong with the CRD is because of wildlife, right? Why would we want education, when killing is just so, so easy. And after the deer are culled, and the geese, probably there'll be a CAG group huddled to discuss culling raccoons and grey squirrels.
- Public education should be the number one option, particularly since it does not involve killing the deer. Even farmers can benefit from educational deer management programs, built around fencing methods, sources of funding, etc.
- I agree with public education for urban and rural deer. We fence and avoid plants that would attract deer. I think the problem deer are those affecting agricultural farms, thus impacting the farmers economically. I love the deer, and having lived in parts of Canada where you never see any deer or other wildlife (other than squirrels)it breaks my heart to hear about the Cull being considered. We must learn to coexist with the deer !
- I agree that this option should be packaged with other options. Given that the Internet, especially social media have been used to organize huge campaigns even of the size and danger of the "Arab Spring", I would think that the use of Twitter, Facebook, blogs, and other Internet approaches as well as some leafleting would be very effective at public education, and could perhaps even be used to give tips for increasing livelihoods in agricultural and rural areas.
- THE THING IS IT IS NOT CLEAR IF YOU ARE ASKING US TO APPROVE THE "DOTTY" COMMENTS OF THE CAG OR OF THE CRITERIA IN THE MINUTES.TO PUT IT CLEARLY: EDUCATION WORKS AND CAN BE INEXPENSIVE IN AGRICULTURAL, RURAL AND URBAN AREAS. WHERE THERE'S A WILL THERE'S A WAY. UNFORTUNATELY THE CAG'S WILL IS TO CULL. THIS PROCESS IS INVALID.
- Who is going to "educate" the deer? Option is ineffective.

Commentary on the evaluation process

- The evaluation criteria are reasonably good, but the "ratings" do not add value. Public education is not a useful management option as described. It directs people (both urban & rural) towards "management actions" that we should not need to consider if deer populations were at reasonable levels.
- I like the colours. Very attractive! Did the stickers come from the Dollar Store?

Commentary on the Online Feedback Form

- It would make it so much easier if instead of a multiple choice approach the survey gets a definitive reply from the respondent: "Yes" or "No". You can outline the parameters of the specific topic, enough so to further enlighten the public, as you have been attempting to do, but make it easier for us to give you feedback in a straightforward and clear way. Sometimes it is hard to know just what you are asking. For example: Question: Having read the Evaluation Criteria for the Controlled Public Hunt Option, would you be in favour of this approach? Answer: In my case, Yes! Now you have satisfied the "open and transparent" stipulations, you know what my answer is, and I know that my answer has been received clearly!!!

Commentary on other management options

- Just cull them one way or the other immediately, and then study a long-term solution if you must.
- For those interested in fencing etc, there are excellent websites devoted to prevention of deer damage. Post links to several on your web site and spend money on solving the immediate problem. Those people most strongly affected will seek out information.
- Not in favour of liberalize hunting regulations

Other commentary

- The Deers are what makes this area so wonderful. You KILL the DEERS and mother nature will have her revenge. Nothing that i say will stop you from senseless killing of these wonderful animals. ... but mother nature will have her revenge. Speed limit reduction, speed bumps, and pedestrian crossings, and signs "watch for deer, they live here too" and Deers can't read... so it's the responsibility of the people to ensure their safty. Allowing electric vehicles on the roads will help with less pollution. Make the area across from the children hospital and the university a park. so the deers can enjoy it. dont waste time on grass cutting lawns (mini golf courses) are a waste of efforts, and lawns should be allowed to be turned onto agricultural grow their own food and sell it.*This survey is the WORST survey possible. BTW The CRD shouldn't exist. Or it should be amalgamated into 1 big (small) city of the 'City of Greater Victoria' There are so many things that are wrong with it, it's mind boggling at how bad it is..... but it's a beautiful city, and the Deers is a reason why people love it here :) used to be the bunnies until a UVic Gardner didn't like it, and used his/her union powers to Kill the Bunnies. :(There will more more cougar attacks ... don't be stupid. And if you don't like the Deer - move to Vancouver. And 1 more thought. There are signs for 'Kids playing'.... so why not remove all of the kids, so then the cars can speed. It's only Students and old people that make up the population. Old people drive slow anyway, and students shouldn't get their license so easily from 'lucky driving school' If you want, i can show you on the map exactly where these speed bumps need to be (for free) email me at [redacted] but (of course) you won't bother... because who ever has the most money, gets the most say. This is how it works (unfortunately) in the

CRD.<http://maps.google.ca/maps/ms?msid=202494502151568170302.0004aef6551df6150a8a2&msa=0&ll=48.465068,-123.302822&spn=0.02248,0.038581>

- Nowhere in this survey does it address the tick issue. Deers carry ticks that can severely impact the health of humans who have been bitten. I think people on Vancouver Island are not as aware of this issue as those in other parts of North America. So, I think this issue should be added to the public education management option. Thanks!
- people need to learn how to plant gardens that are not either accessible to deer or plant deer proof gardens.
- Deer do not belong in urban and suburban areas. They also should not be allowed to threaten the livelihood of farmers and threaten our food supply. In decades past the 1st nations people, hunters, farmers, explorers etcetera prevented the deer problem by killing and eating them. We should do that again.
- I don't really understand EC, but I do want the deer gone -now. I know the vocal minority will prevail over the silent majority. It is hard to comes right out and say you want to kill Bambi. Today I had to brake swiftly to avoid hitting a deer. They are around our area every day, munching happily.
- Eat them!
- Round the darn deer up, truck them to a land fill, and shoot them there.
- I think most people have already made up their minds about the problem of the deer.