



Managing deer for healthy deer, healthy habitat, and reduced deer-human conflicts for current and future generations.

*Deer Management Section, Bureau of Wildlife Management
Pennsylvania Game Commission¹*

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE: WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT UNIT 4B PILOT

April 12, 2006

An objective in the Pennsylvania Game Commission’s (PGC) deer management plan was to pilot the use of a local stakeholder group to recommend a Wildlife Management Unit (WMU) specific deer population goal. Through a local Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), comprised of representatives of stakeholder groups within WMU 4B, participants communicated population goal recommendations based on input actively solicited and obtained from individuals within each representative’s stakeholder group.

After interviewing and selecting stakeholder representatives from individuals recommended by PGC staff, county conservation districts, county cooperative extension units, and local conservancies, Bureau of Management Consulting (BMC) staff convened and facilitated an introductory and educational meeting on February 1, 2006. BMC staff asked CAC members to attempt to communicate with 10 individuals from each of their respective stakeholder groups. BMC facilitated a subsequent meeting on March 7, 2006 for the purpose of representatives providing stakeholder feedback, collectively discussing summaries of stakeholder perspectives, and reaching consensus, if possible, regarding a deer population goal recommendation for WMU 4B. CAC stakeholder groups and attendance at both meetings is shown in Table 1.

The following is documentation relative to this process. It includes meeting agendas, information requested of and provided by PGC staff, stakeholder representative findings, the context of various perspectives, and the resulting consensus that led to the CAC recommendation of a deer population goal for WMU 4B over the next five years:

Seven CAC members agreed with an increase of 10% to 20% in the WMU 4B deer herd, and the Public Landowner Stakeholder Representative agreed with a “slight” increase in the WMU 4B deer herd.

Table 1		
List of CAC Stakeholder Groups/Representatives and Attendance at Meetings		
Stakeholder Group	February 1	March 7
Conservation/Wildlife Recreation		
Homeowners	✓	✓
Resident Sportsmen	✓	✓

¹Prepared in conjunction with the Bureau on Management Consulting

Business (direct impact)	✓	✓
Forestry	✓	✓
Agricultural	✓	✓
Public Landowner	✓	✓
Highway Safety	✓	
Municipalities/Planning Boards	✓	✓
Rural non-agricultural landowner	✓	✓

FIRST MEETING SUMMARY

The purpose of the first meeting was to provide information to the members about the CAC process as well as background on deer management, both statewide, and within WMU 4B. BMC staff also polled members on their initial thoughts on the deer population in WMU 4B. This is presented as part of Table 6, which includes the complete history. The first meetings agenda is shown in Table 2.

<p>Table 2 Citizen Advisory Committee Public Input for Deer Management Goals in Pennsylvania Meeting Agenda, February 1, 2006</p>	
<p>I. Introduction A. Stakeholder introductions</p> <p>II. Overview of the process A. Purpose B. Objectives C. Process/Consensus D. Role of participants E. Meeting ground rules F. Questions</p> <p>III. Present Tabulation of Initial Thoughts</p>	<p>IV. PGC Presentations A. PGC responsibilities and mission B. History of deer management in Pennsylvania C. Deer resource information and management system D. Consequences of biological and social management at different deer population levels E. Questions</p> <p>V. Preparation Work for Second Meeting A. Agenda for second meeting B. Definition of consensus C. Stakeholder Opinion Worksheet D. Presentation Template for Stakeholder Summaries</p> <p>VI. Questions and Comments</p>

Prior to the first meeting, members received a document entitled “Pennsylvania Game Commission Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Pilot Study, Objectives and Process Overview” (Appendix A), which explained each of the items under part two in the agenda and the worksheet and template listed as part five of the agenda. Highlights from the first meeting included reviewing the following information:

- PGC Deer Management Program Goals:*
1. Maintain a healthy deer herd.
 2. Maintain healthy habitat for the deer herd.
 3. Reduce deer and human interaction.

Objectives of CAC's:

- A. They provide an opportunity for the Game Commission to understand stakeholder values regarding deer management.
- B. They provide an opportunity for stakeholders to interact with one another, facilitate communication among, and increase understanding of different stakeholder values and concerns.
- C. They provide an opportunity for stakeholders to have direct input concerning deer population goals that ultimately affect all Pennsylvanians.
- D. They provide an opportunity to inform stakeholders on the mission of the Game Commission, complexities of deer management, and the importance of proper management.

Outcome of CAC proceedings:

1. The goal is to build consensus among the committee and agree on a recommendation to increase, decrease, or stabilize the deer population in their WMU.
2. *Definition of consensus: Consensus is reached if all but one member agrees with the other members.*
3. If a consensus has been reached, the committee will present the recommendation to the Game Commission in a written format that explains how each stakeholder group's concerns were considered in the decision.
4. If a consensus cannot be reached among committee members, a recommendation will be made following the guidelines given in the first meeting.

PGC staff grounded the process in an overview of the mission and history of the Commission, as well as details about the deer management program in conjunction with the goals of maintaining a healthy deer herd and a healthy habitat. Especially effective was the historical perspective on how deer management has been an emotional and controversial issue going back to the origins of the Commission. Specific deer and habitat data for WMU 4B were presented.

Members were provided with forms to collect opinions from other people within their stakeholder group as well as summarize the results into an overall report. For each stakeholder group, the goal was to speak with at least 10 other people. The meeting ended with questions and comments as shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3	
Questions, Answers, and Comments Following PGC Presentations on February 1, 2006	
1.	<p>Q. – Is the coyote population a factor in decreased deer numbers, especially in PA's northern tier, due to their effect on fawn mortality?</p> <p>A. – We know coyotes and bears were the primary predators taking fawns (up to 7 months of age) in our fawn study. We also know that predators accounted for less than 2% of mortalities during the buck study (bucks 7 months and older). Currently, the doe study is investigating causes of mortality for adult females (7 months and older). Coyote predation is factored into the deer management program as part of "non-hunting season" mortalities.</p>

Table 3
Questions, Answers, and Comments Following PGC Presentations on February 1, 2006

2. Q. – Does the PGC conduct studies in such areas as the Rhineman sanctuary (on the North Mountain, and owned by Dickinson College)?
 A. – There is no PGC study involved with the Rhineman sanctuary, since PGC gets data from hunted areas/populations only.
3. Q. – Is there any consideration to realign the WMU's?
 A. – PGC staff do not recommend this, although some Commissioners and others do. It is more difficult to obtain accurate data from smaller units. Also, small units can cut hunting opportunities by fragmenting areas.
4. Q. – Is there any consideration to return to antlerless allocations on a county basis?
 A. – No, again, there is not enough data to manage by such small units. Overall, PGC staff feels that WMU's are the most workable alternative for the PGC and hunters.
5. Q. – Are harvests in WMUs consistent with previous harvests on a county basis?
 A. – Yes
6. Q. – How well has the CAC model worked in NY?
 A. – CACs have worked successfully in NY for more than 15 years.
7. Q. – Is the CAC Pilot just in WMU 4B?
 A. –Yes
8. CAC Member Comment: The CAC is a good thing to have.
9. CAC Member Comment: The CAC is evidence that the PGC is listening to stakeholders.
10. CAC Member Comment: The task of deer management is difficult where hunting is prohibited. It's not unusual to see many road kills adjacent to private, restricted ground.
11. Q. – Whose idea was it to have the CAC?
 A. - During the late 90s, statewide stakeholders recommended the CAC on a WMU basis.

Table 4
Information Regarding the Second CAC Meeting, Closing Questions, and Answers, February 1, 2006

The second CAC meeting will occur during the week of March 6, 2006. It will take place on Tuesday, March 7, 2006, at the Tuscarora State Forest DCNR Office (same location) at 7:00 P.M.

1. Q. – Would the PGC please send out a map of WMU 4B to all the CAC members?
 A. – Yes.
2. Q. – Would PGC accept additional information on how to get to management levels?
 A. – While suggestions may be made, PGC staff recommend retaining the current season structure. To effectively assess the impact of recent management changes on deer health, habitat health, deer-human conflicts, and deer populations, it is important to maintain stability in deer harvest regulations.

SECOND MEETING SUMMARY

The purpose of the second meeting was for the members to present their findings, ask questions of one another, and attempt to move towards consensus. The meeting agenda is shown in Table 5.

Table 5 Citizen Advisory Committee Public Input for Deer Management Goals in Pennsylvania Meeting Agenda, March 7, 2006	
<p>I. Quick review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Review of CAC handout document B. Process for this meeting <p>II. Interest Group Presentations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Presentations B. Clarification C. Initial tally of interest group positions <p>Break</p> <p>III. Discussion/Consensus</p>	<p>IV. Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. BMC completes summary of proceedings B. Summary is sent to CAC members and Game Commission staff C. BMC and PGC staff presents the summary to the Commissioner's <p>V. Questions and Comments</p> <p>VI. Evaluation of the Process</p>

For each stakeholder group, four questions were posed for the members to answer. In addition, members were asked to collect comments to answer why those among their stakeholder group felt the way they do. The individual stakeholder reports are included in Appendix B.

The questions are as follows:

- A. In the opinion of your stakeholder group, is the deer herd in WMU 4B increasing, decreasing, or stable?
- B. In the opinion of your stakeholder group, is the deer herd in WMU 4B too high, too low, or about right?
- C. In the opinion of your stakeholder group, should the deer herd increase, decrease, or remain the same?
- D. In the opinion of your stakeholder group, by what percentage should the deer herd in WMU 4B increase or decrease?

At the beginning of this discussion, BMC tabulated the results of stakeholder sentiment reported at the March 7th meeting (based on responses from 129 individuals) and displayed it on a table that was subsequently compared to the results of CAC member sentiment (based on responses from eight individuals) that they provided at the beginning of the February 1st meeting. As indicated in Table 6, some results were unchanged and some demonstrated variance.

The individual reports resulted in a shift towards recommending that the deer herd should increase from the February 1st meeting (4) to the March 7th meeting (6). In addition, many

reported concerns with the future of hunting, especially for the younger generation, due to their belief the deer herd has decreased in WMU 4B.

The discussion was extensive. However, while there was generally quick agreement on the need for the herd to increase in 4B, there was a lot of discussion on what the percentage should be. As shown in Table 6, the range of increase was substantial, from 20 to 69 percent. Stakeholder members from forestry, public land, and agriculture were concerned about the use of a percent value versus some other scale for the CAC to come to consensus. They pointed out that in their view a 25% increase over five years is significant.

After much thought and consideration, the following consensus was reached:

Seven CAC members agreed with an increase of 10% to 20% in the WMU 4B deer herd, and the Public Landowner Stakeholder Representative agreed with a “slight” increase in the WMU 4B deer herd.

Table 6 CAC Summary for WMU 4B Deer Herd Questions and Consensus Decision			
Question	February 1, 2006	March 7, 2006	March 7, 2006
	Initial Survey	Presentation Results	Consensus Decision
In your opinion, is the deer heard in WMU4B increasing, decreasing, or stable?			
o Increasing	0	0	
o Decreasing	7	7.5	
o Stable	0	.5	
o Do Not Know	1		
In your opinion, is the deer heard in WMU4B too high, too low, or about right?			
o Too High	0	0	
o Too Low	4	6	
o About Right	2	2	
o Do Not Know	2	0	
Over the next five years, do you think the deer herd in WMU4B should increase, decrease, or remain the same?			
o Increase	4	6	X
o Decrease	0	0	
o Remain The Same	2	2	
o Do Not Know	2	0	
Increase by approximately how much (percent)?	5, 10, 25	46, 69, 40, 30, 25, 38, 20-25	10-20
Decrease by approximately how much (percent)?	0	0	
Number of present CAC members	8 ¹	8	
Number of stakeholder feedback collected by CAC members	Not Applicable	129	

¹Nine members were present; however, one member arrived late and did not get polled.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

The following is a compilation of information received from individual members of the CAC through the Individual Evaluation Forms and comments made during meetings.

Key findings include the following:

1. Members were very supportive of the CAC process.
2. They were pleased by the performance of both PGC and BMC staff.
3. Three of six respondents feel the goal of talking to at least 10 other people within each stakeholder area is *too low*.

Additional Comments:

- *“Deer management is a very complex, emotionally charged issue. I understood that from the beginning. I did not really hear anything new or different from anyone during the meetings. All participants were, however, willing to listen to everyone’s views. That was different. Several comments from stakeholder groups were encouraging.”*
- *“I have a better understanding of the PGC goals and methods. Much of the information received is not generally to the stakeholder groups. I also understand the other stakeholder needs and concerns better. Great group to work with.”*
- *“A little better understanding of other viewpoints and of PGC activities and problems.”*
- The CAC is a good thing to have.
- The CAC is evidence that the PGC is listening to stakeholders.
- There were multiple comments in favor of using the CAC as a tool to assist the PGC in obtaining stakeholder input, relative to tolerable deer-human conflict, but also as a means to improve and maximize the effectiveness of outreach and education by the PGC to stakeholders throughout the Commonwealth.

APPENDIX A: Citizen Advisory Committee Objectives and Process Overview

Pennsylvania Game Commission Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Pilot Study Objectives and Process Overview

Introduction

The PA Game Commission has three goals for the deer management program:

1. Maintain a healthy deer herd.
2. Maintain healthy habitat for the deer herd.
3. Reduce deer and human interaction.

An objective in the Pennsylvania Game Commission's (PGC) deer management plan is to test the use of a local stakeholder group to recommend a Wildlife Management Unit (WMU) specific deer population goal. Through a local Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), comprised of representatives of stakeholder groups within a Wildlife Management Unit (WMU), participants will communicate population goal recommendations based on consideration of available biological data and the values of the group they each represent regarding deer populations. Through the direct participation in a Citizen's Advisory Committee, stakeholder values will be shared with the Game Commission.

Objectives

Use of Citizen Advisory Committees addresses important needs of the Game Commission:

- A. They provide an opportunity for the Game Commission to understand stakeholder values regarding deer management.
- B. They provide an opportunity for stakeholders to interact with one another, facilitate communication among, and increase understanding of different stakeholder values and concerns.
- C. They provide an opportunity for stakeholders to have direct input concerning deer population goals that ultimately affect all Pennsylvanians.
- D. They provide an opportunity to inform stakeholders on the mission of the Game Commission, complexities of deer management, and the importance of proper management.

Process

After enlisting participation from representatives of stakeholder groups, independent facilitators from the Commonwealth's Bureau of Management Consulting will convene an initial meeting of the CAC. The purposes of this meeting include the opportunity for stakeholders to become acquainted, an introduction of the initiative, orientation regarding the process, and an explanation, by Game Commission staff, of the deer management system, including historic and current deer resource information. The facilitators will instruct stakeholders in how they are to gather information from their respective organizations to contribute at a second meeting of the CAC.

After a sufficient period for obtaining stakeholder input, the CAC will convene a second meeting. Without participating in the discussion, Game Commission staff will be available to clarify technical information and answer technical questions. Facilitators will guide the discussion of the committee as members identify, clarify, and explain their concerns relative to how they are affected by deer. The goal is to build consensus among the committee and agree on a recommendation to increase, decrease, or stabilize the deer population in their WMU.

Definition of consensus: Consensus is reached if all but one member agrees with the other members.

If a consensus has been reached, the committee will present the recommendation to the Game Commission in a written format that explains how each stakeholder group's concerns were considered in the decision. Finally, facilitators will ask members to evaluate the process.

If a consensus was not reached at the second meeting, a third meeting will be held to make another attempt. If a consensus cannot be reached among committee members, a recommendation will be made following the guidelines given in the first meeting.

Roles of Participants

Advisory committee members will represent the stakeholder group to which they belong through availing themselves of orientation and information by the facilitators and Game Commission staff. They will pass information to their stakeholder group, obtain feedback regarding the group's perspective, and provide input to the CAC at large. Finally, members are vested with decision-making power on behalf of their groups for the purpose of making recommendations to the Game Commission.

Game Commission staff will serve the committee as advisory members that provide technical information on deer management, including biological data, social data, and necessary background material. Their focus will be on the effects of deer populations and not on technical deer management procedures. They will have no voting or veto power.

Facilitators will interview potential stakeholder representatives, and recommend their invitation and appointment to the CAC. They will organize, lead, and conduct meetings with a focus on positive interaction and consensus among members. Finally, they will serve as the point of contact for CAC members.

Ground Rules

In conducting the CAC meetings, facilitators will begin with recommending the following ground rules to maximize positive interaction and consensus among members. Members will have the opportunity to recommend any additional ground rules they feel may be necessary.

- Everyone is encouraged to participate
- Look for opportunities to learn from one another

- Listen thoughtfully
- Be open to feedback
- Strive for understanding
- BMC will summarize and share proceedings with CAC members and Game Commission staff
- Other ones to be added

Citizen Advisory Committee on Deer Management Operational Procedures

When convening a citizen advisory committee, the following procedures will be used to ensure continuity, equal representation, and fairness.

1. All members will treat each other and those involved in meetings with respect and courtesy. All member input will be accepted. No input will be suppressed by objection or intimidation by other members.
2. Game Commission staff and outside experts are information providers only. Only committee members have recommendation-making power.
3. Members cannot be represented by alternates or proxy.
4. Since there will be maximum of 3 committee meetings, attendance should be mandatory. However, if extenuating circumstances exist, at least 85% of the committee must be present for a meeting to proceed.
5. Consensus is an agreement in the judgment or opinion reached by the group as a whole. All committee members will strive to reach this definition. Majority vote will not be used to make a decision. However, no single individual should be able to stall the process. Therefore, consensus will be reached if all but one committee member is in agreement.
6. If no consensus can be reached, the Game Commission will consider the input of all members and data in developing a recommendation.
7. Members pledge to support committee recommendations.
8. Requested tasks and materials are completed and submitted within the specified timeframes.

Citizen Advisory Committee on Deer Management
Committee Members
Roles and Responsibilities

Members of the advisory committee are such because they represent a stake. A stake refers to the interest someone has in the decisions being made regarding deer management. Members must consider how the outcome of the advisory committee process will affect the stakeholder group they represent.

Members are expected to reach out to others within their stakeholder category to obtain their views and opinions about the deer population within the wildlife management unit.

Members must be willing to set aside their personal viewpoint and voice the collective feeling of their constituents. This can be confusing when members are often constituents of other stakeholder groups being represented by other members. Nonetheless, every member must understand his or her role within the advisory committee. For example, an agricultural representative may also be a sportsman, landowner, and motorist. Those outside his or her stakeholder group may also approach this representative. While this member should bring this information to the advisory committee, he or she should not factor this view in with the views of his or her constituents.

Only those willing to work towards consensus should serve on the advisory committee. The advisory committee represents broad citizen input. All members will have to collaborate to reach a decision. Individuals unable or unwilling to do this should not serve on the committee.

The advisory committee will hold a *maximum of three* meetings. At these meetings, information needed by members to make an informed decision will be presented and discussed. Member attendance at these meetings is critical to the advisory committee process. Only individuals willing to make this time commitment should serve on the committee.

Citizen Advisory Committee on Deer Management
Facilitator
Roles and Responsibilities

1. Aid the Game Commission in identifying stakeholder groups in the WMU.
2. Facilitators will be point of contact for the committee, develop agendas (with aid of the Game Commission) and materials for meetings, and manage meetings.
3. Facilitators are responsible for promoting positive committee interaction.
4. Prepare a written report explaining consensus recommendations and how concerns of each stakeholder group were addressed. Report will follow standard format provided by the Game Commission.

APPENDIX B: Individual Stakeholder Reports

1. Municipalities/Planning Boards Stakeholder Group

Answers to Questions

- A. From 14 responses, 13 indicated “decreasing” and one said “stable”.
- B. Herd is too low (13). Just right (1).
- C. There should be an increase (13). Remain the same (1).
- D. The average of 13 responses is that the increase should be 46%. One response said that there should be a 0% increase.

Whys – The sport needs young hunters, so the tradition can be passed down. In order to interest young hunters, they need to be able to see deer. License sales are down and this will have a negative impact economically – both for the PGC and the large and small retailers. A wide range of respondents haven’t seen crop damage like they did 15 years ago.

2. Homeowners

Answers to Questions

- A. From 15 responses, all said that the herd is decreasing.
- B. All but one (14) said that the herd is too low. The remaining respondent said it is just right.
- C. All but one (14) said the herd should increase. The remaining respondent said it should remain the same.
- D. The average increase from 14 respondents is 70%. The remaining respondent said there should be a 0% increase.

Whys – The future of hunting is at stake. The next generation needs to be involved in the sport. The negative consequences do include an increase in car damage and an increase in crop damage.

3. Rural/non-farm landowner

Answers to Questions

- A. From 19 responses, all said the herd is decreasing.
- B. They all said the herd is too low.
- C. They all said that the herd should increase.
- D. The average increase recommended is 40 %. (This is calculated as a “weighted” percentage.)

Whys – The benefit is that young hunters will have the incentive they need to become interested in the sport. However, the growth of the herd needs to be monitored so habitat is not compromised. Respondents are from Cumberland, Juniata, and Perry Counties.

4. Public Land Owner

Answers to Questions

- A. Of 12 responses (from individuals representing various tracts of public land within WMU 4B), two indicate that they don't know, and of the remaining, half said that the herd is stable, and the other half said that the herd is decreasing.
- B. All respondents said that the size of the herd is about right.
- C. All respondents said that the herd size should remain the same.
- D. Not applicable, because of "C", above.

Whys – We must see what the habitat will do. We need five years to see the effect of the current herd size to determine if it should change. Emotions should not dictate the decisions to be made. What happens to the habitat? We need five years to see the effect to determine the correct size of the herd.

5. Forest Industry

Answers to Questions

- A. Of seven responses – from loggers, Christmas tree growers, and foresters, five said that the herd is decreasing, and two said that it is stable.
- B. One said that the herd is too high, three said too low, and three said just right.
- C. Three said that the herd should increase and four said that it should remain the same.
- D. The three recommended increases are 20%, 25%, and 50% - average equals approximately 30%.

Whys – For those that feel there are too few deer and are recommending an increase, they feel that this will benefit future generations, and give them opportunities to participate in the sport. The foresters feel that the size of the deer herd should remain the same. They said that regeneration appears to be occurring at an acceptable rate, and that the current rate of deer damage is acceptable. Among those responding, the situation is extremely variable. Respondents are from Franklin, Juniata, and Perry Counties, so the Wildlife management Unit is well represented geographically. The level of deer 10 to 15 years ago was too high.

6. Business

Answers to Questions

- A. Of 15 responses, all indicated that the herd is decreasing.
- B. They all advised that the herd size is too low.
- C. They all expressed that the herd size should increase.
- D. The average of the increase recommended equals 25%.

Whys – The respondents represent the WMU geographically well, and they represent various businesses, including sporting goods stores, butcher shops, taxidermists, and restaurants. They

feel that youth are losing the opportunity, and, therefore, the interest in participating in the sport. Consequently, the sport is not being passed down to the next generation. Also, some businesses are down 50% over each of the past two seasons. The sport is losing hunters too quickly, and hunters are not willing to move to a new area – outside of the traditional areas where they have camps and have hunted in the past.

7. Resident Sportsmen

Answers to Questions

- A. Of 32 responses, all of them said that the herd is decreasing.
- B. All respondents said that the herd is too low.
- C. All of them said that the herd should increase.
- D. The average of the recommended increase is 37.9%.

Whys – The sport is losing the interest of youth, and there is a decrease in license sales. This has a negative effect on the PGC’s ability to manage the herd. The sport is losing hunters faster than gaining new ones, so there must be a way to interest youth and keep them involved. There is a concern regarding the negative economic impact. Negative consequences include the loss of hunters, the loss of financial resources for the PGC, and the negative effect on the economy. However, the condition of the habitat must be monitored carefully. The respondents represent the WMU well, geographically. Although respondents don’t favor large management units, they overwhelmingly support the Citizens’ Advisory Committee, and think it is an excellent tool to assist the PGC in making decisions regarding deer management.

8. Agriculture – Dairy/Cash Crop

Answers to Questions

- A. Of 15 responses, from Juniata (3), Franklin (2), and Perry (10), all indicate that the herd is decreasing
- B. 40.7% said that it is too low, 53% said it is just right, and 6% said it is too high.
- C. 53% said it should increase, and 46% said it should remain the same.
- D. Of those favoring an increase, they recommend a 10% to 25% increase over the next five years.

Whys – Respondents are concerned about the financial viability of the PGC. They are willing to tolerate crop damage to have more deer. Respondents expressed that those located near deer “sanctuaries” do experience high crop damage.

There was the **question** – does PGC have data on deer numbers? The PGC **answered** that they will have recent data for the last few years after current harvest figures are fully compiled. These data could compare to a prior period.

The stakeholder representative recommended that providing this type of information in the PGC presentation could be helpful, and should be added to the evaluation of the WMU 4B CAC Pilot.

9. Traffic Safety *(Due to ill health, this representative was unable to attend Meeting II, however, he provided the following input he received from stakeholders, via e-mail, following the meeting.)*

Answers to Questions

- A. Of the 10 responses, they all indicate that the deer herd is decreasing.
- B. They all said that the deer herd is too low.
- C. All respondents said that the deer herd should increase.
- D. The average increase recommended by the respondents equals 29.75%

Whys Basically, respondents indicate that whether they get a deer or not, they would still like to see deer. Regarding benefits, in light of negative consequences, there may be a few more vehicle/deer collisions with an increased herd; however, there will always be vehicle/deer collisions. Hopefully, seeing more deer will keep younger hunters interested. A few more vehicle/deer collisions do not seem to negate the desire for an increased deer herd.