

Memorandum

**Joint City of Bloomington-Monroe County Deer Task Force
Tuesday, 18 October 2011, 5:30 PM
Hooker Room (#245), City Hall, 401 N. Morton St.**

PRESENT: **Task Force Members:** Keith Clay, Stefano Fiorini, Bob Foyut, Judith Granbois, Sarah Hayes, Thomas Moore, Laurie Ringquist, Dave Rollo and Susannah Smith **Staff:** Stacy Jane Rhoads

Public: Dave Parkhurst

I. WELCOME

II. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

III. REPORTS FROM TASK FORCE MEMBERS

- Clay reported that the IU Research and Teaching Preserve Executive Committee recently met. Lynn Coyne serves on the Committee and is the director of real estate for IU. Angie Shelton presented her exclosure research to the Committee. Coyne said that IU will not allow hunting on their property. At this point, the prohibition is absolute – IU policy does not allow any weapons or hunting on campus. However, Coyne said that he found Shelton’s presentation compelling.

IV. SURVEY UPDATE

Rollo asked Rhoads for an update on the survey. Rhoads said that GIS is mapping the geography of responses. The questions mapped include: frequency of sighting in yard, frequency of sightings in neighborhood; opinion about number of deer in neighborhood; subjects of concern (e.g., damage to ornamental plants, gardens, DVCs, ecosystems, etc); methods used to mitigate damage; amount of money spent in addressing deer damage; evidence of a successful deer management program and preferred management options.

- Fiorini said that the goal is to identify “hot spots” of concern.

- Rollo asked if he could have the maps for the next meeting. Rhoads said she will do her best – it is in the hands of GIS right now.

V. DISCUSSION OF MANGEMENT MATRIX RANKINGS

The group continued its review of management strategy rankings. Note that the below reflects ranking by nine of the ten voting members.

Sharpshooting	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3.66	3	3	3	4	2	4	4	1	3	3	3	4	2	3.25	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2.89	1- quick & painless; can be effective, relatively safe and humane; 2- can be effective, relatively safe and humane; no cost to public; meat could be donated to food pantries, etc.; 6- rapid way of reducing population size or removing problem of individual deer; 7- effective, trained individuals would be hired, sharpshooting by firearm is probably more humane than by bow and arrow and would provide the quickest most humane lethal means if a lethal mean has to be employed.	1- reluctance to engage in mass slaughter; 2- expensive and time consuming; 3- access for hunters may be limited; 5- must be done by experts; costly; 6- involve killing of the animal, not socially acceptable in urban context by citizens; 7- community backlash; only temporarily effective if other issues are not addressed; 8- expensive. Without data captured, how will effectiveness be measured and how do you stop other deer from moving into the territory; 9- costly							
Regulated Hunting	3	2	4	2	3	3	2 to 3	3	2.5	2	3	3	1	3	3	1	1	2	3	2.3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3 (if IDNR involved)	3.2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2.4	1- extension of accepted activity; 2- relatively safe and humane; 5- could be effective if hunter participate; 6- cost effective; 7- low cost; 9- probably more effective; would prefer bow& arrow	1- small fraction killed; doesn't work in urban areas; 2- not very effective at impacting urban deer population with current hunting regulations; 5- requires care in places such as Griff; not practical in residential areas; 6- social acceptability, effectiveness depends on hunting pressure, humaneness and safety depends on hunter's skills; 7 may not be able to get more hunters, only temp effective; 9- difficult to secure a "hunt" area; major oppositions
Managed Hunt	3	3	3	4	4	2	3	3.14	2	3	1	3	3	1	3	2.29	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3.5	3	3	2	4	3	2	2.71	1- Like IDNR park hunts; 2- relatively safe and humane; could be effective if targeted; 5- safer than regulated hunting; 6- see above; 7 - low cost; 9- quick, confined timeline	1- less effective in urban areas; 2- May need to be organized for multiple locations and repeated more than one time; not effective in residential areas; 5- not effective in residential areas; 6 - see above; 7 - community backlash (hunting near city), only temporarily effective; 9- some people strongly oppose								

SHARPSHOOTING

Effectiveness: 3.56; Humaneness: 3; Legality: 3.25 and Safety 2.89 (Task Force average)

- Griffin said that sharpshooting is most usually discussed as using high-powered rifles. Sharpshooting can also be conducted using archery equipment. Clay asked if archery equipment, including crossbows, is as effective as using rifles. Griffin replied, no.
- Griffin said death is instant with sharpshooting via rifles. It is much more difficult to kill deer by headshot with archery.
- Clay asked about darting deer with drugs to kill them. Griffin replied that the meat could not be consumed.
- Hayes said that it takes a while for the drugs to take effect. The deer would likely still run some distance before dropping. Griffin agreed.
- Rollo asked if a bullet could stray during a sharpshooting effort?
- Griffin said it is highly unlikely, a backstop is required.
- Ringquist asked if the effort is advertised so that people are aware it is going on?
- Griffin said that usually there is notice to neighbors. It is usually conducted at night, in the winter, around January and February.
- Granbois asked if the cost estimate includes the cost of processing? Griffin replied, no – it may involve the cost of getting it to the processor, but not processing itself. Griffin added that the USDA provides sharpshooting and is usually cheaper than private companies. They perform sharpshooting
- Clay said if most of the problems are in the southeast part of the city, could sharpshooting be conducted there?
- Griffin said that it is very difficult to say without looking at a particular property. So much depends on the suitability of the particular property and the presence of absence of a natural backstop. A consultant would be able to provide guidance on where sharpshooting would be suitable.
- Rollo asked how the group should proceed.
- Foyut asked Smith: If a deer is wounded when it is shot with archery equipment and it is down, but not dead, how is it dispatched? With a firearm? He said that his concern is about that scenario and the current firearm prohibition.
- Smith replied that it depends. If the deer is unconscious, the hunter can put another shot through it with a bow at close range. Smith said that she does not carry a firearm, but some hunters do. Usually, deer hunters do not want a bullet through their deer, because they eat the deer. Smith added that hunters can use a hunting knife to the heart to expedite death. However, if the deer is down and conscious, it will get up if you approach it. In that case, the best approach is just to wait.
- Griffin pointed out that during the archery season only, it is illegal for a hunter to carry a firearm while bow hunting. He further added that non-lead bullet alternatives are not a good alternative at this point. Smith said that you want the bullet to disperse and not pass through the body.
- Griffin asked about the expense of sharpshooting.
- Rollo said some remedies for certain areas might be borne by private residents.
- Rollo said that if does are killed when they have fawns, it would be traumatic to the fawns. Griffin replied that sharpshooting would occur in the winter. Similarly, hunting season is scheduled for the fall, when fawns are self-reliant.

REGULATED HUNTING

Effectiveness: 2.5; Humaneness: 2.3; Legality: 3.2 and Safety 2.4 (Task Force average)

“Regulated hunting” refers to the legal deer hunting season provided by the State of Indiana. In contrast, a managed hunt is much more controlled. There can rules about hunter proficiency, hunter orientation, etc.

MANAGED HUNTING

Effectiveness: 3.14; Humaneness: 2.29; Legality: 3.5 and Safety 2.71 (Task Force average)

-Griffin pointed out that there would be some administrative costs associated with running a managed hunt.

-Rollo asked if added hunting rules of a managed hunt would discourage some people from hunting.

- Griffin said requirements, like a proficiency test, might discourage some people. However, a managed hunt gives communities more control over the practice.

- Rollo said that managed hunting is probably not appropriate for urban areas.

- Griffin said Hidden Valley in Lawrenceburg, Indiana is a homeowners association that runs a managed hunt. There are managed hunts around Washington, DC also.

- Smith asked if communities can apply further managed hunt requirements (proficiency test, etc.) if the area is designated an Urban Deer Zone. Griffin, said, yes, provided the added requirements do not conflict with State law.

- Foyut asked Griffin who pays for the administrative cost of running a managed hunt? Griffin replied that someone would have to pay; it could be local government, homeowners association, etc. Foyut said he wondered if any of the tag fees go to the administration of managed hunts.

- Rollo said in some area of the southeast part of the City, areas of 6 units/acre, is hunting really practical? His perspective is that it is not.

-Griffin said that, that is what the Task Force is here to decide.

- Rollo said that he just wanted to reflect.

- Smith said that they will be able to address this better once the group has the survey mapped.

► Rollo asked for a motion to keep sharpshooting, regulated hunting and managed hunting all in play as the Task Force moves toward recommendations. It was moved and seconded. Via voice vote, all present indicated “aye.” None opposed.

VI. WORKING TOWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

The group discussed breaking up some subjects and tasking some group members with certain subject matter. If the group breaks up some of the issues, then it might expedite getting to recommendations faster. Rhoads said that she developed some subject matter areas that might be separated out:

Education/Outreach – Sarah and Bob said they would work on a plan.

Griffy – Clay, Granbois and Smith said they would work on this. Rollo said that he has a background in ecosystem science and is concerned about Griffy.

Deer-Vehicle Collisions – Rhoads has mapped the accidents by location and season and has provided the group with a review of literature on mitigating deer-vehicle collisions. It would be helpful is someone would work through this further to determine what techniques might work best here. Kiesling said documentation of locations is sufficient.

Smith said that the main factor in deer-vehicle collision damage is speed. Rollo said that if there are no takers, then let’s just compile and include the data.

Fiorini said that DVCs are a monitoring/measurement tool.

City/County – Rollo, Kiesling, Fiorini and Ringquist agreed to help.

Measurement – Clay, Fiorini and Moore will work on this.

- Fiorini mentioned that it is critical to have a monitoring system in place to track success of any program. In the Scottish Highlands, biologists monitor deer browse.
- Clay pointed out that the last half of the semester is gearing up and many people will be very busy.
- Rollo said that for the business next time, the group should start talking about ideas for recommendations.

VII. OTHER

Task Force directed Rhoads to develop a press release for driving tips during rut. Kiesling added that the release should also be sent to CATS so that the tips can be broadcast on Channel 12.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Parkhurst lives on 8/10 of an acre in Sycamore Knolls and his neighborhood is not as dense as Rollo thinks.
SPEA has a Transportation Research Center might have data on deer-vehicle collisions.

IX. ADJOURN

7:18 pm