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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

worthwhile and effective way for stakeholders to become involved in deer
management and DECC, determining if members believed the approach was a
knowledge and impressions (perceived credibility) of deer management in the
recommendations; (4) assess the degree of change, if any, in members’
the extent to which CIL members perceived they participated in making the CIL
operation (i.e., presentations, sequence of events) to CIL members; (3) assess
for suburban deer management; (2) determine the suitability of the CIL’s
The objectives of the evaluation were to: (1) describe the CIL approach used
to involved during development, implementation, and adjustment of the DMW 96 CIL.
achieve the objectives. Human Dimensions Research Unit (HDU) evaluators were
only deer population objectives, but also deer management techniques to
hunting management practices. In DMW 96, however, CIL members recommended not
recommending to DECC a deer population objective that DECC administered through
population. CILs implemented in rural DMW involved a variety of people in
stakeholders in developing solutions to address concerns about the deer
management, DECC developed a public communications plan for DMW 96. The
York State. Expanding on the successful attributes of rural CILs in reaching
Citizen Task Force (CIL) model used in rural DMW in the southern tier of New
DECC worked together with Cornell Cooperative Extension (CCE) to modify a
problem by convening a group of citizens to discuss deer population issues.
Bureau of Wildlife took the initiative to help resolve the deer management
area, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC),
management unit (DMW) 96, which includes the greater Rochester metropolitan
increasing concern to wildlife professionals and the public. In deer
problems associated with managing deer in suburban environments are of
Members hunted deer. The CLF process played an educational role for CLF members in learning about deer biology, management, and policy-making. After selecting a deer, members described themselves as being affiliated with various organizations and affiliations, such as 4-H, 6-G, Shooters’ Club, and women and men volunteer groups, which were among the most popular of which was hunter education.

RESULTS

Conducted before, during, and after the one-month operation of the CLF, this document serves as a summative evaluation for comparison with rural CLFs.

Formative evaluation. Results from mailing questionnaires that were reported in assistance with planning subsequent meetings while the CLF was in progress, i.e., telephone interviews were relayed to DEC staff and the CCC facilitator to assess the opinions of the eleven CLF members. Each data collection technique was used for a different evaluation purpose, information from which was integrated to assess the utility of the CLF approach in a suburban environment. We implemented both telephone interviews and mail questionnaires.

METHODS

Rural environments and the application of CLFs in suburban and...
member serving on the CCL. Overlooking any stakeholder group can reduce

Any and all stakeholders in the community should be reflected by a

Rural environment, we suggest the following:

Based on the evaluation of the DW 96 CCL in a subregion compared to

DISCUSSION

Options about dear.

State and local government officials tend to be more attuned to people’s

experience of educating some interested groups, but that the CCL caused the

majority of the outcomes. Most agreed that the CCL activated consensus at the

negligible outcomes. Respondents perceive that the CCL resulted in both positive and

- Effective at the meetings (37%).

- Discussions (50%). Several indicated the need to participate more

agreed or were undecided about the need to be more involved in CCL

agreed to the results of the meetings. Several respondents were more

able to learn about the process, all believed that CCL provided

their own. Midway through the process, all believed that CCL provided

respondents were more favorable towards CCL’s performance than other

- Participation on the CCL. About two-thirds of the respondents (65%)

- Perceptions of CCL members imply all CCL members benefited equally from

- Compared to recommendations and management technique.

- Supportive of CCLs as a way to recommend a dear population objective.

- Recommended a dear management technique. It appears more members were

- Making a few members rated CCLs as fair or poor after they had

- Excellent way to involve a variety of people in dear management decision

- The majority (> 75%) of respondents rated CCLs as a good, very good, or

- With people in the DW.

- That sensitive protocols make the decision based on information

- Important from the public (12%), Home prepared

- Prepared a public meeting (12%), and another that DC protocols decide

- One-fourth (25%) preferred that many people be surveyed, one member

- Midway through the CCL meetings, all (50%) preferred the decision in DW 96.

- CCL members were asked which technique they preferred for collecting

- Communication, and personal.

- Critical and more supportive of DC’s image in terms of management,

- Members participated in more CCL meetings; members became less
Implementing a Community Survey.

Advocates, and/or human dimensions researchers in planning and research plans into the CFF model, that involves members, technical organizers of future suburban CFFs may want to consider building a desktop consultation on a scientific basis - conducted survey approach to obtain information about opinions of people in the community.

4. Consideration.

More members of suburban comparing to rural CFFs indicated that they desired implementing a scientific basis - conducted survey approach to obtain information about opinions of people in the community.

Such as the Humane Society and the Audubon Society, needs further population issue initiatives. Involvement of non-governmental agencies, officials was effective in mitigating the political nature of the dead.

In DMV 96, mitigating the CFF to citizens only (excluding government technical advisors and keep them apprised of the progress of the CFF. An effective way to involve government officials was to identify them as the community.

Others should be invited to reflect accurately the interests present in the community. For member's input, a facilitator could convene CFF members initially for member's input. A facilitator could convene CFF members initially for member's input.

Newspapers, sending direct mailings, or holding an initial CFF meeting community leaders, holding public meetings, designing advertisements in that may be overlooked are obtaining nominations through contacting key suburban locations. Examples of mechanisms to identify stakeholders identifying and selecting stakeholders to participate on CFFs in suburban to rural CFFs, more stringent criteria are needed for officials and the community at large.

The potential for creating a plan that will be accepted by government.
created a network for agencies to interact with influential members of
and knowledge about wildlife. The agency’s thinking with volunteers also
provided to biologists, and served to increase volunteers’ understanding
of car-killed deer. Base-line data collected by volunteers were
volunteers, at least one of whom was a CFF member, assessed the health
volunteers to monitor wildlife populations. In 1996, trained
volunteers to monitor wildlife populations, In 1996, trained

A way to continue involvement of CFF members in deer management is using

Recommendaions after the CFF has terminated. A need to continue involvement in the implementation phase of the
collection of the deer herd, organizers and some members of CFF may
condition, because the CFF, organizers and some members of CFF are
the citizens, and the media about the CFF’s recommendations and the
management agency continued meeting with policymakers, interested
recommendations were used by policymakers. The State wildlife
and the community, additional work was needed to insure that the CFF
Once the CFF recommendations were communicated to government officials

Why.

Which recommendations achieved unanimous consensus or not, and reasons
consensus can not be reached, the final report could identify explicitly
hardest to create mutual gain among participating. If unanimous
recommendation on the CFF, however, may have forced members to work
the recommendations, defining consensus as all members agreeing to a
Consensus for DMW 96 CFF was reached when all but one member agreed with
operation of the meetings.

use members’ feedback indicate how input from members changed the
the needs of CFF members might be improved if, periodically, those who
Members’ perceptions of the agency’s and facilitator’s responsiveness to
The utility of CFFs in suburban environments needs further consideration.

DEC, other than as a regulatory agency, important in suburban areas where citizens may have little knowledge of communications. Developing a communication strategy is especially challenging. A communication strategy in which the CFF approach was the only strategy developed a community support, exchange and consensus-building that occurred on the CFF to the community at large. To address the need for building community support, the challenge was to magnify the information important part of the CFF members' ability to build a practical and external communications with the public and policymakers was an involvement approach. If they are willing to commit the time and energy required, the rewards could be substantial in facilitating the coexistence of agency and the community to decide. Dear managers and cooperators need to appropriate for a particular suburban community is for the wildlife management could yield vastly different outcomes. Whether the CFF approach is the DNN 96 CFF, the report of this approach in other suburban environments and research, although community action did result from recommendations of the utility of CFFs in suburban environments needs further consideration.
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For deer management techniques recommended by the CDFW, based on CDFW members' recommendations.

In New York, the CDFW recommends a 30-degree angle for deer movement in the suburban DWMs and a 45-degree angle for deer movement in rural DWMs.

In New York, bow and arrow is prohibited for locations in DWM 96. The discharge of firearms or other dangerous weapons is prohibited in DWM 96 in New York State.

LIST OF FIGURES
serve as deer habitat.
The intersection of residential, parks, open spaces and other land uses that
environments which support a high density of people and deer due in part to
In this report, we will use the term “suburban” to describe those

Wildlife management agencies

Wildlife management agencies, unless state funds provide adequate support from taxpayers to the
with the dilemma of using funds generated by hunting to pay for nontraditional
license sales from deer hunters. This presents the wildlife management agency
Wildlife management agencies fund deer management programs primarily through
the distribution of costs for implementing nontraditional techniques. Many state
possible demise of recreational hunting. A related concern is the

professions will contribute to decreased opportunities for and the
concern is that by supporting nontraditional management methods, wildlife
support recreational hunting as a solution to deer population problems. One
manage deer living in suburban environments if the community is unwilling to
A current debate among wildlife professionals is whether they should

and Wildlife Conference (December 12-14, St. Louis).

"Urban Deer - A Manageable Resource" featured at the 1993 Midwest Fish
management issues exchanged experiences and research results at a symposium
1993). Recently, wildlife professionals who grapple with suburban deer
Samuel 1992; Specker 1992; Altez 1993; Johnson 1993; McCarthy 1993; Reeves
human health and safety are reported frequently in the media across the United

to gardens and ornamental plantings, deer-car accidents, and other risks to
increasing concern to wildlife professionals and the public. Damage by deer
problems associated with managing deer in suburban environments are of

INTRODUCTION
populations in their community (Baker, 1992; Handback and Blumig, 1993). Other's perception is that managing deer available, effective, feasible, and humanly acceptable so an
Handback and Blumig (1993). Free-rangeland deer is uncertain
the effectiveness and application to wild, free-ranging deer is uncertain
report various success associated with controlling captive deer, although
1999; Handback and Blumig, 1993, Decker et al., 1993). For example, researchers
1989; Handback and Blumig, 1993, Decker et al., 1993). For example, researchers
and believe about deer management techniques (Decker and Brown 1987, pullitice
sportsmen, animal rightsists, and the general public have different knowledge
on others nuclear or unknown (Curtis and Richmond, 1992). Deer managers,
the efficacy of nontraditional techniques for managing deer populations is
impeivable to making decisions about suburban deer management is that
For private or public gain.
removing deer is beneficial to the public, regardless of whether deer are used
Other's contend that the bureau's mission is achieved in instances when
Harmony with public need, (Bureau of Wildlife 1993)
clearly described, consistent with the law, and in
clearly described, consistent with the law, and in
accompanied by the scientific sound management
accompanied by the scientific sound management
of the state's now and in the future, this shall be
of the state's now and in the future, this shall be
opportunities to enjoy all the benefits of the wildlife
opportunities to enjoy all the benefits of the wildlife
of New York the
people of New York the
New York’s Wildlife professionals interpret the private use of deer as contrary
private ownership of deer are of concern to some wildlife professionals. However, the long-term legal, social, and economic ramifications of allowing
private ownership of deer, and deer would be removed at minimum cost to taxpayers.
Ventson farms would provide a source of profit for Ventson farmers in the
use of deer, a public resource. For example, removal of nuisance deer to
Another concern pertains to suburban deer management is the private
2
Implementing nontraditional methods, the distribution of costs, and the private use of a public resource are a few of the challenges facing suburban communities with deer-related problems. A case in point is suburban deer management in deer management unit (DMU) 96, which includes the greater Rochester metropolitan area in central-western New York. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), Bureau of Wildlife promotes hunting as the best deer management technique available for solving suburban deer management problems. Hunting is permitted in most of DMU 96 except in the town of Irondequoit, where a myriad of laws restrict its use. A wildlife biologist explained:

While hunting is allowed by State law, the Town (which does not have the authority to prohibit hunting) has received State legislative prohibition of discharge of firearms for more than 30 years, prohibiting the discharge of the bow and arrow. In 1976, prohibited the discharge of certain implements. Thus, the Town of Irondequoit prohibits the discharge of firearms for more than 30 years, prohibiting the discharge of the bow and arrow. The overall effect of not allowing hunting, but it is through the prohibition of use of the implements themselves, not the act of hunting. While this prohibition otherwise is false and gives credence to the assumption that, for some reason, hunting is inappropriate here. That is not the case! (Hauber, DEC, pers. comm.)

Deer managers associate this restriction with the subsequent increase in the size of the deer population in Irondequoit that has since exceeded its biological carrying capacity and the wildlife acceptance capacity of many residents (Hauber 1993). The wildlife acceptance capacity for deer is the maximum deer population level that people will tolerate in consideration of the problems deer may cause (Decker 1991, Decker and Purdy 1988). Given this situation, some residents of DMU 96 have expressed in public the need for the deer management agency to address suburban deer management...
Regulate the agency. 

Subsequently, transfer the authority away from the agency and into a management agency to address constituent needs in suburban areas, and regulate, policy makers, and the public may question the ability of wildlife and safety (e.g., deer-related vehicle accidents, Lyme disease). State responsibilities in failing to address threats that deer pose to public health hard, and (2) public backlash against the agency because of perceived agency interaction are: (1) the deterioration of the health of the deer. Some of the dangers of issues could result in a loss of management authority. The political reality of the consequences of agencies not addressing suburban deer management

solutions (Baker, 1992).

Reduce the number of deer. Management should therefore and diverse community. Management should reframe and reframe the needs of a neighborhood. This is a new problem in the goals of deer populations is a concern. Human interactions--that is, the real problem is deer-human interactions--that is, opportunities for hunters in rural areas. Instead, appropriate, traditional means of wildlife management are no longer in this urban/suburban setting that the it is in the urban/suburban setting. It is no surprise that wildlife has adapted very well.

There is a trend toward suburban-home development has creased the excellent job. During the last few decades, however, recreational hunting and maintenance the balance between recreational hunting and maintenance the balance between population to provide sufficient animal for near a century, wildlife managers (such as the.

practiced, starting:

issues. The resident challenged agencies to reverse current deer management.
In the 1990’s, Irondequoit Department of Government officials proposed alternative solutions for managing deer population. Ridges or ravines on the perimeter of the park.

Picnic areas, meeting facilities, and hiking trails. Houses about the steep Department. The 900-acre Durand-Eastman County Park includes a golf course.

In 1992, the town (15 mi² total) in 1992 (J. Hamburger). The highest concentrations of deer in the DMW occurred in the

bow and arrow (Fig. 2). County regulations prohibit hunting in parks.

Irondequoit passed an ordinance prohibiting the discharge of firearms or

of bow and arrow was permitted throughout the DMW, but by 1978 the town of
evidenced in significant numbers (Hamburger 1993, Curtis 1993). In 1976 discharge

harvested deer. DEC did not open DMW 96 to hunting until the deer herd

tags issued to motorists claiming vehicle-killed deer exceeded the number of
during the Great Rochester Area (Fig. 1). DMW 96 encompasses all or portions of

Description of Study Area
Table 1: Description of towns located within DMU 96.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Portion of DMU 96 from 1990 Data</th>
<th>Human Population (estimate)</th>
<th>Portion of Town within DMU 96</th>
<th>Deer Take</th>
<th>Human Population/Km²</th>
<th>Deer Take total</th>
<th>Archery Deer</th>
<th>Vehicle-Killed Deer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>40.061</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsford</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irondequoit</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discharge of firearms or bow and arrow is prohibited in Irondequoit.

Data about human population/Km² derived from Bureau of the Census (1990),

Reported vehicle-killed deer and deer take from J. Hauber, DEC, Pears, Community.
Public community forums plan for a suburban environment (Stout and Knuth 1994). Successful attributes of rural CTFS in reaching agreements, DEC developed a
the deer herd via hunting techniques in rural areas. Expanding on the population objective for the DMU. DEC used these recommendations to manage
1993). CTFS involved a variety of people in recommending to DEC a deer
successfully seven citizen task forces (CTFS) (Helson 1992, Stout et al.)
Meanwhile, in rural DMUs throughout the region, DEC had implemented
agency.

Efforts did little to enhance the credibility of the wildlife management
economically feasible (Appendix A). DEC's reflection of these community
but the proposed solutions required legislative approval or were not
monohunting solutions to the various problems caused by deer overpopulation,
be used for commercial profit. Grassroots organizations also proposed

FIG. 2. Locations in DMU 96 where discharge of firearms or bow and arrow
is prohibited.
population level that managers believe (1) cannot be achieved realistically.

Dear management permits to hunters. If CTF members recommended a deer

dear herd and the agency's ability to achieve the objective through issuing

feedback to indicate how the proposal deer population level will affect the

agrees to a deer population level or range. DEC provides CTF members

with deer herd. Then members attempt to reach a consensus in which every member
citizens discuss preferences and opinions of people in the community about the

and the status of the deer herd in the DWU. At the second and third meetings,

the DWU. At the first meeting, DEC informs CTF members about deer management

present in the DWU face-to-face to negotiate a deer population objective. For

1993) (Fig. 3). The Rural CTF model brings a diversity of stakeholders

dwgs in the southern tier of New York State (Cutts et al. 1993, Stout et al.

for the suburban DWU 96, DEC and CCE modified a CTF model used in rural

of both the interests of the community and the deer population.

members was intended to strengthen the group's recommendation to the advantage

deer management expertise to the CTF. The interaction between CDE and CTF

role. DEC deer managers and biologists attended meetings and provided their

(CCE) staff who facilitated the meetings and supported the policy education

population issues. DEC worked together with CDE to support the Cooperative Extension

management problem by convening a group of citizens in the DWU to discuss deer

In DWU 96, the DEC took the initiative to help resolve the deer

Desertification of the Citizen Task Force Approach

The community in developing solutions to address concerns about the deer

The cornerstone was implementing a modified CTF approach that would involve
about the policy framework within which deer management decisions are made.

1993). CIFS are a form for policy education in which participants learn
alternatives and consequences regarding policy decisions (Rham, 1998, Stout et
intervention model in which participants identify concerns and weigh

The CTF approach corresponded to an issue evolution--educational
how CTF recommendations will be considered in deer management decisions.

as the CTF recommends. Deer managers and biologists explain to members
managers and biologists will use the nearest achievable deer population level
potential benefits that the deer herd could provide to people, then deer
(2) will have a negative effect on the deer herd, or (3) jeopardizes the

Fig. 3. Sequence of steps for the CTF approach in rural TMUs in New York.

Meeting 2 & 3:

- Recommendation
- Discussion
- Information exchange

Meeting 1:

- Deer management education about
- Orientation

Stakeholders

Conflict
advisors to the CFF. Government officials and university researchers could only serve as technicians and CCE limited the CFF to citizen members only--state, county, and town councillors. To reduce the potential of politicizing the approach, DEC facilitated the CFF. Several recommendations-participated in planning, implementing, and evaluating the CHW 96 CFF were to recommend deep population objectives and management techniques for the CHW.

The main charge to the citizens serving on the CHW 96 CFF was to

The technology could be implemented.

State governments would be necessary before practicality any management process. Multiple levels of legislative action from the town, county, and pressure for population reduction was preferred during the first portion of the CHW. Alternatives to recreational hunting would have to be agreed upon if deer hunters, but local laws in Vermont prevented hunting (Fig. 2). Clearly, New York state was to issue deer management permits to firearm and bow management techniques in rural and some suburban CHW in the southwestern tier of New York state was to issue deer management permits to firearm and bow management techniques in rural and some suburban CHW. The established deer to achieve the objective (Currie et al., 1993). The established deer to achieve the objective (Currie et al., 1993) of which was that the CHW 96 CFF was charged with the suburban CHW 96 CFF differed from its rural counterpart in several ways, the most significant of which was that the CHW 96 CFF was charged with the deer herd.

Participants learn how their input affects decisions concerning the size of
GROUP DISCUSSION. Members were given a handout they would use to record biology, social considerations, and administrative constraints, followed by a presentation of information about deer and human health issues such as the prevalence of Lyme disease in Michigan. Members were treated to an informal dinner reception. Guest speakers provided practice sessions for the press conference (Appendix B). At the first meeting, CTT members convened for seven CTT meetings, a press conference, and a deer damage complaints.

Bowhunting, deer-carcass permits issued for possession of car-killed deer, and deer damage complaints for possession of car-killed deer.

The state, plus data relevant to the DHW 96 about deer harvest via this included general information about how deer management is conducted in community and educational materials provided by DHW about deer management. Participants. Those agreeing to participate were mailed a letter of which one, an example of a deer-related business, later chose not to participate and telephoned twelve stakeholders inviting them to participate.

CCW staff telephoned twelve stakeholders inviting them to participate, of which two were selected. In the deer population, initially held and concerned which stakeholders were present in the DHW. Stakeholders are concerned with the stakeholder management and cooperative sources of CTT members. DHW and CTT gathered input from several community sources. Perhaps the most critical aspect of the CTT approach was the selection process.

To communicate the recommendations to the public, reached among members, members and advisors that could discuss an action plan reached among members, members and advisors that could discuss an action plan.

If consensus was part of the rural counterpart (Fig. 4). In an informal setting, the CTT approach modified for the suburban setting was an extended.
Fig. 4. Sequence of steps for the CFF approach in the suburban DWU in New York.

Revise Recommendations by Consensus as Needed

Evaluation of Action Implications

Recommendation Distribution and Press Conference

Send Meeting Notice and Minutes

Work Toward Final Recommendations
Build Consensus on Issues

Third Task Force Meeting

Send Meeting Notice and Minutes

Additional Data
Present Issues and Character
Second Task Force Meeting

Send Our Press Release

Send Meeting Notice and Minutes

Background and Sophie Issues

Initial Task Force Meeting

Select Representatives to Task Force Members and Technical Advisors

Invitation Letters and Background Information

Select Stakeholder Groups, Federation

Technical Advisors

Stakeholder Groups, Federation

Task Force Members, Chairperson
third and fourth meetings.

E.g., Ellinghamwood and Cattermoor 1988, Brush and Eshventil 1991), Members read articles about deer management options
plan (Mitham 1991). Members read articles about deer management options
State Park in Illions was shown as an example of a suburban deer management
construction of the third meeting. A video about deer management at Rock Cut
information about deer management techniques was presented near the
town.

Subsequent years until an estimated 20 deer/mile inhabited the town.

Occurring that year. They recommended deer removal should be increased in
removal of deer that equals the number of deer-car accidents
the northern portion, CIL members proposed a conservative number of deer be
reduction in the deer population (0-5%) for a herd size of 20 deer/mile. In
the southern portion, CIL members recommended none or slight reductions in the
long-term goal for the size of the deer herd be 20 deer/mile for DWM 96. In
DWM into two parts, the north and south (Fig. 5), because CIL members that a
deer population objectives of the DWM, CIL members recommended dividing the
deer population data points of the DWM. A consensus had been reached for the
By the end of the third meeting, a consensus was defined as
agreement by at least all the members present.

The discussions toward reaching consensus, consensus was defined as
their findings from discussions with people in the DWM. The facilitator then
was asked by what percent. During the second meeting, CIL members reported
population. If the preference was an increase or decrease, the stakeholder
stockholders in the DWM and asked their preferences for the level of the deer
between the first and second meetings, CIL members concurred other
containing people in the DWM.

discussed the purpose of this handout and agreed to use it as a guide when
the number of deer should remain the same, increase, or decrease. Members
responses from people they would contact in the DWM community as to whether
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of Wyoming where laws had prevented hunting for 15 years, the CFF, in their report, recommended the continued use of bow hunting to regulate deer populations in three-fourths of the DMU (Fig. 6). In the town with recommendations.

The CFF's report discussed a draft of the CFF Report, options and concerns. CFF members also expressed his interest in the latest immunonuclotin receptor research, and an additional member was updated about the techniques they would recommend at the sixth meeting, a meeting of various options. CFF members began discussing and clarifying their ideas about the political and financial feasibility and acceptability of state, city, county and town officials were invited to speak frankly and openly about the political and financial feasibility and acceptability of deer research. At the fifth meeting, CFF members discussed the status and technical feasibility of various deer management techniques with a deer researcher.

At the fourth meeting, CFF members discussed the status and technical feasibility of population objectives.

Fig. 5. Division of DMU 96 based on CFF members' recommendations for deer.
reading from right to left.

The CF management team attended a picnic to discuss members' and setting up workshops with the community. The CF with which included issuing press releases, holding a press conference with CF report, which other members decimated. DE proposed a communication strategy called Deep Infringement and requested entering a minority opinion into the government officials and the media. One member opposed recommendations to Key recommendations and to develop a strategy for distributing the reports to Key After a one-month break, the CF recommended to finalize it.

solution.

solution, followed by experimental immunocoagulation as a long-term recommended a controversial plan to cull deer over half of a short-term management techniques.

FIG. 6. DIVISION OF DIV 96 based on CF members' recommendations for deer.
Strategizing the CFF process during its implementation, various stakeholders, including government officials, shared experiences and feedback on the CFF meetings. We also provided organizers with immediate feedback for adjusting and improving the meetings. During the implementation, we collected valuable information from CFF members, and critically observed the CFF meetings. Proprietary decisions were made, such as the selection of stakeholders to participate. Evaluators were involved in the early stages of CFF development as HDR.

**Evaluation Objectives**

Governments or non-government organizations.

Because of a lack of funding support from either the town and county or private foundations, the local government officials have not received a report. A report from the SUNY- Syracuse University has not been taken into account. Therefore, the effectiveness of an experimental immunocapture technique has not been evaluated. However, the long-term solution of constructing a barrier was implemented in the months of March and April.

Police officers have carried out the plan in areas with high concentrations of deer. To date, the framework to develop details and an implementation plan for the short-term has been developed. Locals, government officials, and the recommendations used the recommendations as a guide.

The CFF recommendations provided a direction for deer management in DNP.

Prominent officials attended and expressed their opinions to reporters, as well as reporters opposing the recommendations. The CFF report was distributed at the press conference. Seven CFF members attended the press conference and conducted interviews with reporters. A spokesperson announced the CFF's recommendations.

The agenda and practice strategies for working with the media, CFF members, and reporters.
Suburban CIL: The timing of the data collection methods was crucial for
used to evaluate the Rural CILs. The approach used in the evaluation of
The first two questionnaires and telephone interviews were similar to those
were conducted before, during, and after the nine-month operation of the CIL.
The series of three mail questionnaires and three telephone interviews
with Rural CILs (Stout et al., 1993).
are reported in this document serve as a summative evaluation for the
progress, i.e., formative evaluation. Results from mail questionnaires that
facilitator to assist with planning subsequent meetings while the CIL was in
Information from telephone interviews was relayed to DEC staff and the CCE
facilitate data collection techniques used for a different evaluation purpose.
Each mail questionnaire was used to assess the opinion of the eleven CIL members.
approach in a suburban location. We implemented both telephone interviews and
summative evaluation (Stout et al., 1992) to assess the utility of the CIL.
We conducted a comprehensive evaluation using both formative and

METHODS

Rural environments,
management decisions, and (6) compare the application of CILs in suburban and
a worthwhile and effective way for stakeholders to become involved in the
in the DMU, and of DEC; (5) determine if members believed the CIL approach was
members' knowledge and impressions (perceived credibility) of their management
making the CIL recommendations; (4) assess the degree of change, if any, in
assess the extent to which CIL members had the opportunity to participate in
organization (i.e., presentations, sequence of events) to CIL members; (3)
used for suburban CILs management; (2) determine the suitability of the CIL
The objectives of the evaluation were to: (1) describe the CIL approach
decisions are necessary? (g) opinions about the CTF approach, being a CTF preferences for how CEC should collect information when deer population
perceptions of the CTF and DEC: (g) image of the deer management agency: (7) making decisions: (4) opinions about deer in general: (5) changes in personal opinions from people in the community: (3) important considerations when making decisions: (2) information and perceptions about the task of collecting the importance of specific types of information in making deer management decisions: The objectives of the second questionnaire were to assess:

After the third CTF meeting, a second questionnaire (Appendix D) was mailed that focused on the process used to recommend a deer population
urban, or suburban location of current and childhood residence.
determine past actions regarding deer management, and (g) determine rural: wildlife-related activities; (7) determine membership in organizations; (g) determine the role of members; (g) identify specific concerns about deer; (g) assess the first meeting: (2) assess perceptions about material received regarding deer and the first questionnaire were to: (1) assess information needs prior to the administration previously in rural CTFs (Start et al., 1993). The objectives of the first meeting. The first questionnaire was similar to those
Initially CTF members received a questionnaire (Appendix C) in advance of feedback to the organizers, and to facilitate comparing the responses with key junctures in the CTF process to maximize the utility of immediate achieving the purpose and objectives of the study. The methods were conducted
members, and their need for additional information.

Suggestions for improving presentations and facilitating discussions among CFF members included: (a) fairness and balance of information presented to CFF members, (b) to assess their impressions of the process for recommending deep management alternatives, members were interviewed a third time reflecting by the respondent. After setting a dear population objective and underrepresentation levels, specifically members' perceptions of over- or under-representation levels. The second meeting focused on communications about alternative members learned, and suggestions for improving the meeting. The second interview after the second meeting focused on improving the meeting, what the first interview was to assess their impressions of the meeting, while interviewing those members who had attended the first meeting. The purpose of interviewing opinions of CFF members as the approach was underway. Telephone interviews provided CFF organizers with immediate feedback with the public and media.

Involvement of others in the CFF approach and (7) subsequent communications outcomes from implementing the CFF approach: (6) suggested improvements to and (5) achievement of the CFF approach; (4) fairness and efficiency of the CFF approach; (3) change in the views of crowded and deep management based on Hahn's model of issue evolution information presented at the CFF meetings. (2) how the process affected their conclusions. The objectives were to assess members' opinions about: (1) the last questionnaire (Appendix E) was mailed to the eight members who participated in the last four meetings. Four months after the CFF had

CFF approach.

The last questionnaire (Appendix E) was mailed to the eight members who
CLF organizers sometimes were unable to reach a member in time to get timely feedback to the call all members who attended the meeting prior to the interview, but one of eight who attended the fourth meeting (62%). We made multiple attempts to meet one of ten who attended the second meeting (90%), and seven of eleven CLF members by telephone after the first. We interviewed the eleven CLF members, whose study reflected those who were more committed to the CLF approach, and responded to the last two meetings (100%). Therefore, results in this study reflect those who were more regularly attended subsequent meetings, and were mailed and surveyed. Eight of eleven CLF members responded to the second question, and were mailed CCL meetings, indicating they were busy with field activities during spring population objectives were set. Farmers did not attend many of the subsequent CLF meetings. After the third meeting, in which dearer CCL meetings, ten of eleven members who attended the first meeting responded. We mailed questionnaires and interviewed those CLF members who attended.

RESULTS

People who participated in a subsurface CLF (i.e., respondents represented the whole population, not a sample of CLF members, SPSS, INC. 1990). No measures for detecting significant differences were undertaken, because observed differences in response were

We used frequencies and mean response to report quantitative assessments from using qualitative methods of categorizing and detecting patterns of responses. Telephone interviews and questionnaires. Open-ended questions were analyzed, members responded to a mix of open- and closed-ended questions for the we analyzed data using both qualitative and quantitative methods. CCL
active in organizing a citizen action committee to address deer-related issues to the editor, donated money to lobbying efforts, signed a petition, and was management issues (30%). One of the most active members (10%) wrote letters for or against a political candidate because of his or her position on deer joined an organization to increase their political clout (50%). A few voted those who had taken actions, most contacted DEC wildlife biologists (60%) or taken actions to make their opinions known about deer and deer management. If The majority of respondents (70%) were "deer activists" in that they had percent of the respondents indicated family members hunted deer.

Sixty percent of the CCF members hunted deer in DWM 96 during the previous season. None respondent had hunted deer in the past, but was not currently a hunter. Another These four (40%) also hunted deer in DWMs other than DWM 96. Another four of 10 respondents hunted game 27 days on average in the past year.

Fifty respondents (70%) made trips to observe wildlife. Seven viewing birds (60%, \(x = 25\) days) and deer (20%, \(x = 25\) days). Seven respondents enjoyed photographing wildlife as a hobby (30%, \(x = 6\) days).

Respondents made trips to observe wildlife. Some respondents provided food sources for included reading (90%, \(x = 46\) days) and watching television programs or movies at their residence (90%) for an average 249 days per year. Other activities wildlife-related activities, the most popular of which was observing wildlife responding to the first questionnaire (n=10) participated in a variety of 96 (Table 2). Three women and eight men volunteered to participate. Members CCF members were affiliated with interests and organizations within DWM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Deer Population Preference</th>
<th>Stakeholder Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in deer population</td>
<td>Affiliation	Organizational	Deer</td>
<td>Preference	Affiliation	Deer</td>
<td>Interest	Organizational	Deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer-car accidents, deer health, deer property damage</td>
<td>Decrease 20-50%</td>
<td>Decrease 50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer狩猎活动, 鹿的健康和鹿的财产损失</td>
<td>Decrease 20-50%</td>
<td>Decrease 50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No concerns</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in deer population</td>
<td>Decrease 20-50%</td>
<td>Decrease 50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer狩猎活动, 鹿的健康和鹿的财产损失</td>
<td>Decrease 20-50%</td>
<td>Decrease 50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial loss, crop damage</td>
<td>Decrease 30-50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop damage</td>
<td>Decrease 10-50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer狩猎活动, 鹿的健康和鹿的财产损失</td>
<td>Decrease 20-50%</td>
<td>Decrease 50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer狩猎活动, 鹿的健康和鹿的财产损失</td>
<td>Decrease 20-50%</td>
<td>Decrease 50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer狩猎活动, 鹿的健康和鹿的财产损失</td>
<td>Decrease 20-50%</td>
<td>Decrease 50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer狩猎活动, 鹿的健康和鹿的财产损失</td>
<td>Decrease 20-50%</td>
<td>Decrease 50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: CUF members’ affiliation, and their preference for and concerns about deer and management techniques prior to participation.
Information, facilitation, and the monetary and time investment of DEC and CCE

With the preparation, organizational efforts, presentation of technical
and comments from the first questionnaire, the indicated members were impressed.
After the first meeting, results from interviewing members (Appendix F)
to modify the CTF approach in progress.
Observations follow, with examples of how DEC and CCE used input from members.
Potential modifications. Findings from telephone interviews and meeting
monitor activities and dissatisfaction of members, and discuss
the CCF facilitator while the CTF was underway. DEC and CCE used feedback to
HDOU collected input from CTF members as feedback for DEC staff and the
Feedback from CTF Members

Rochester (>100,000 people)

At the time of the study, respondents lived in surrounding suburbs (59,000 to
99,999 people) or in rural areas (40%). One (10%) grew up in a small city between 25,000 and 99,999 people.
Cities with >100,000 people, others in smaller communities or >25,000 people
agriculture, and education. One member was retired. Some (40%) grew up in
members were employed in corporate, industries, sales and marketing.
not a farm (20%).

Deer near their residence. A couple of respondents owned rural land that was
vegetables for household consumption, half (50%) raised crops and/or
shrubs around their homes (60%), and half (50%) raised fruit trees. Some others owned ornamental
risk of deer-related vehicle accidents in the DMU. Others owned ornamental
respondents drove a car or truck (100%), indicating they held a stake in the
respondents held a variety of shareholder interests in deer. All
After the first few meetings, several members noted the absence of certain interests on the CFF, and the need for a wider range of opinions. One topic of interest, and the CCE Facilitator and CFF members shared information and articles about other deer management experts (Appendix G) were invited to give presentations, DFO solely providing information about deer and deer management techniques, instead of summaries of four meetings and tentative agendas of six meetings. Instead of direction and progress achieved by the CFF, DEC and CCE discussed.

First few CFF meetings, DEC commented on past successes with CFFs in other programs. "I was very skeptical of the CFF approach, or might imply favoritism in writing. DEC and CCE were conscious of communucations that might lead DEC and CCE responded by reinforcing the purpose of the CFF verbally and solution.

had already been made, and that DEC had decided bowhunting was the only viable" option. Another indicated the decision for deer management in DW 96 was against deer--the only good thing about deer was killing and information was against deer--the only good thing about deer was killing and stated, "no speakers presented the redeeming characteristics of deer, all the member was the potential for workable solutions does not appear too promising in DW 96." Another member stated, "From what I learned at the first meeting, the potential building to resolve a highly-pyramidical, political, and emotional issue. As members to agree and to solve the problem, and the effectiveness of consensus--DEC, members were also skeptical of DEC's motives, the capability of CFF in the CFF approach. However, despite these positive comments about DEC and
CIF member with similar interests (i.e., member of CIF affiliated with "Monroe"
also the new member
would participate to attend (e.g., other sportswarm's groups). Also, the new member
would set a precedent for allowing others who had not previously
participated in the CIF. The CIF organizers were concerned that permitting a new member to
participate in the CIF's grassroots organization which was formed simultaneously to the CIF's
DC and DFC considered but decided against inviting a member of "Save Our
CIF, DEE and DFC considered but decided against inviting a member of "Save Our
members' perspectives differed as to the proportion of community residents whom
of the deer herd, whereas those preferring no action were under-represented. Other
members believed the CIF favored those wanting some action to reduce the size
that the concerns of landowners/residents were either over- or under-represented. A few noted
indicated some interests were either over- or under-represented. A few noted
representation of interests (Appendix H). About one-third of the respondents
After the second meeting, members expressed a mix of opinions about
appreciably the CIF.

rather people are the cause of deer—people conflicts) would not have changed
member supporting a "pro-deer" viewpoint (i.e., deer are not the problem, but
that the composition of the CIF was appropriate, and that adding another
participation of a wildlife protectionist on the CIF. One member indicated
anti-management, anti-hunting, or anti-trap and transfer of deer, despite the
commented that the CIF needed to reflect more than only "the negative impacts
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Counting the number of deer would help substantiate CFF recommendations. A deeper concern for the lack of public support of the CFF and its representation of a wider range of interests on the CFF was a possible reason for members’ preoccupation with the number of deer.

After the CFF approach concluded, this perceived need to count the number of deer surfaced both during and knowing what level of damage was tolerable to the community. Nevertheless, CCF emphasized that knowing the exact population size was less important than on one or more indicators, such as a reduction of property damage. DEC and direct members toward basing preferences for the size of the deer population of data to indicate the number of deer in the DWU. DEC and CCF attempted to throughout the process CFF members expressed frustration over the lack of public, governmental bodies and DEC.

Questioned the extent of support that CFF recommendations would receive from authority in relation to particular deer management options. Members also decisions are made, and on the governmental bodies and their boundaries of questions explored the political process through which deer management benefits and concerns that people had about deer and deer management.

If the second meeting, the need for clarity shifted to understanding the recent consensus. Once consensus-building was under way by the latter part meetings, members needed more explanation about the definition and process of different types of information (Appendix I). During the first and second as the meetings progressed, CFF members requested clarification of options to the CFF.

County Alliance for Wildlife Protection,” who could then pass on their.
But some members remained skeptical about the ability of the CFT approach to

...some interesting information...

At the next meeting, we need to continue discussing reasonable decisions, not a lot of rhetoric. I think we are reaching a

of different interests. I think we are reaching a mix. The consensus process worked pretty well with the mix.

In the process:

several were more optimistic about the CFT approach, and expressed ownership.

After members reached a consensus concerning the deeper population size,

distribute the CFT recommendations to local government officials.

and announce the CFT's recommendations and indicate DEC's support, and

arrange a press conference

with member organizations and other interested citizens; arrange a press conference for CFT members of community organizations, hold an informational workshop for CFT members of community organizations, hold an informational workshop for CFT, meet upon invitation with

government decision-makers. Future agreements for action developed by local

the community for the task force recommendations and

to build support of the task force constituency and

DEC members reviewed DEC's communication strategy at the seventh meeting. DEC

government decision-makers, agreed on a communication strategy (Appendix D), the goal of which was:

presenting a communication strategy, addressed CFT members' concern for improving public support by

the task force. To get the population behind what the task force is doing. To get the population behind what the task force needs a wider

representation...to get the population behind what the task force needs a wider

and agree to a solution, but it may not sell to the public.
In response to these criticisms, DEC and CCE updated information regarding a

urban area across the state in the future. DEC needs
DEC will be faced with similar issues more and more in
DEC has not taken the lead for particular options.

endorse DEC's decision?

Understanding the public's impression that DEC is distant.

Changing the public's impression that DEC would improve its image. By
from the group. The member speculated that DEC would improve its image by
move the task force forward in reaching a consensus and bringing about a decision

Several members were very impressed with the skills of the CCE facilitator to

publication. From a different viewpoint.
conservationist magazine (A New York State DEC
The DEC people are real nice. I now read the

doesn't allow archery hunting.
much because of county ordinances. The Iroquois

The problem is DEC has its hands tied and cannot do
interactions with DEC staff improved their public image.

regarding suburban deer management issues. Responses indicated personal

improved their understanding of DEC and their reasoning for agency actions

For some members, the CFF served as a policy education tool that

especially in the Iroquois situation.
something of value that is going to result from this.
the issue has been talked about for years. Is there
The politics involved in this issue are complex, and

stated.

included the controversial nature of the issue and its complexity. One member

build consensus toward implementation of a deer management technique. Reasons
For stakeholders interests in the community (90%), a few mentioned their role
management policy (22%), respondents perceived their role as spokespersons
problem through consensus or public acceptability (33%); and setting the
the community (33%); determining if a problem existed and if so, resolving the
attending the first CF meeting. Expectations included gathering input from
perceptions of the CF and their role as CF members prior to or shortly after
CF members were mailed a questionnaire asking their expectations and

Expectations results

members was that DEC and CCE listened to their concerns.
Even though DEC and CF members joked about the incident, the message to CF
meeting, DEC responded an interview to CF member had requested the change.
the next meeting, when members asked about the change in mean at the next
During an interview, one member jokingly suggested a change in refreshments at
became aware of DEC's responsiveness to feedback from telephone interviews.
However, there was one instance in which many CF members
expert speakers, or distributing additional information based on suggestions
altering the emphasis of a presentation, rewriting a meeting agenda, adding
suitable. Often, without members' knowledge, DEC and CCE changed plans, such as
Many of the responses of DEC and CCE to CF members' remarks were
researcher, who also presented information to members at a CF meeting.
initiated a community-wide seminar about immunocoercion by a prominent
statements about specific technical issues investigated by the CF. One CF member
variet of alternative deep management techniques, and presented position
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was to share ideas and lend expertise to the process (20%), as well as to think about the facts critically (10%).

Perceptions About Deer

Before attending the CTF meetings, most respondents (90%) expressed one or more concerns about deer in their area (Table 3). Most indicated concern about property damage that deer cause to plants and the ecological landscape. After members had met for three meetings and recommended a deer population level, most members indicated they enjoyed the presence of deer but worried about problems deer may cause (78%). A few (22%) did not enjoy the presence of deer at all, and regarded them as a nuisance.

Educational Role of CTFs

Findings indicated CTFs played an educational role for CTF members in learning about deer biology, management, and policy-making. After setting a deer population objective, all respondents (100%) agreed or strongly agreed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns About Deer</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deer damage to plants or crops</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deer exceeds carrying capacity for the land</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many deer causing ecological damage to the park</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for deer-vehicle accidents</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Lyme disease</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor health of the deer herd as indicated by small size</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future plans of DEC for managing the deer</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Percent of members reporting concerns about deer in their area.
About 88% indicated that most of the information supported DEC's viewpoint. The dissenting member stated that the:

- Citizen involvement in deep management decisions
- DEC's methods for determining deep populations
- Factors to consider in deep management
- Participation on the task force
- Deep population denisties, and methods for estimating deep populations
- Deep management policies and procedures

DEC's deep management policies and procedures were described as:

- Too difficult and boring
- Not usable
- Not unbiased
- Neither biased nor unbiased
- One-third readable
- Sufficiently understandable
- Complete

Three-quarters of the respondents indicated that they had an opportunity to review the materials and that the materials were complete. Seven respondents (70%) responded that the CTF increased their understanding of the materials, of which 89% agreed strongly that taking part in the CTF increased their knowledge about deep management.

Other than hunter harvest records, respondents remarked that additional information needs were maps describing

Predictions. Some extent in one or more of the following topic areas:

(73%) All respondents reported that the materials helped increase their knowledge. However, some respondents thought the materials were uninteresting, while others thought they were interesting.

Half (50%) indicated that the materials were neither biased nor unbiased, and half (50%) indicated that the materials were difficult and easy to read (83%). One-sixth (17%) thought the materials were just the right length, with one-third of the materials being neither too long nor too short.

Seven respondents (70%) responded that the CTF increased their understanding of deep management.
indicated that three statements—informing policymakers, keeping informed of respondents, and rendering only half of the responses usable. These responses were asked whether statements that corresponded to the issue attributes of the policy education issue evolution model (Ham, 1989).

After the last CFT meeting, members reported how their opinions had changed with respect to an issue we developed (Appendix E, item 3) to assess whether or not the CFT had been true or false before and after their participation on the CFT. The direction for this item was mistranslated by several evolution model participants.

Information pertinent to participation on the CFT; however, one respondent (12%) indicated all of the information was new.

Technical information was understandable to the average person (75%), and helping respondents understand the technical aspects of deer management. Most information was extremely (50%) or moderately (25%) adequate for making recommendations about deer management (88%).

Most or all of the information was fair and understandable (86%), and relevant for information supported particular views, the majority of respondents indicated CFT member (most-29%, half-14%, some-57%), given that respondents believed CFC (all, 77%, some-34%, none-34%), or the views of a particular respondents were mixed about the volume of information that supported the views.

The credibility of NYS DEC and Cornell Department of Resources (15) challenged in my mind.

...
proposals, and assessing reactions of stakeholders in the DMU—had changed as a result of participation on the CTF. One respondent indicated his or her interest in learning about the issues and formulation of ideas had been affected by participating on the CTF. Another indicated all the statements were true before and after participating, but the degree to which they were true had changed. This is a particularly hard question to answer as I had formed ideas, was aware of some alternatives—but not all—beforehand, was aware of some consequences—but not all—that I would later influence policymakers—but not to the degree that I did after the meeting. So while it looks like there was no change before and after, there was a change and it was a MATTER OF DEGREE.

Based on these few valid responses, it appears that, regardless of which participants were in a particular point of the issue-evolution cycle, the CTF approach provided participants an opportunity to learn about deer management policy. After they had set the deer population objective, we asked CTF members the importance of understanding several factors prior to recommending a deer population size. To compare the relative importance of factors, we calculated a mean score for each factor (Table 4). Knowledge of the effect of deer population sizes on crop damage and deer habitat were most important to respondents. CTF members placed less emphasis on knowing the politics of management, such as DEC's authority to manage the herd, the role of CTFs in policymaking, and limitations on implementing management techniques. Of least importance were the alternatives and consequences of various deer population levels on recreational benefits and the tourism/business industry.
Table 4. Mean score of CIF members indicating the importance of deer management factors in recommending a deer population level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives and consequences of various deer population levels to crop damage</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of the number of deer to the condition of habitat</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives and consequences of various deer population levels to deer-car accidents</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of the number of deer to human land-use trends</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives and consequences of various deer population levels to shurb and garden damage</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for determining the size and health of the deer herd</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for controlling the number of deer</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of DEC's authority to manage the deer herd</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the task force in deer management decisions</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations on management (i.e., number of deer that can be harvested given current number of hunters and legal harvest quotas per hunter)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives and consequences of various deer population levels to tourism/business benefits</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives and consequences of various deer population levels to recreational benefits</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scores ranged from 1 to 5 and were calculated so that a higher score indicated more importance.

* A missing value for tourism/business and recreational benefits was not averaged into the mean score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Mean response of CTF members' comparison of the costs and benefits of alternative deer population sizes.

A higher score indicated more importance.

*Provide revenue for businesses from recreation and tourism*
*Reduce the risk of Lyme disease*
*Provide deer a place to live despite problems they may cause*
*Provide venison for people to eat*
*Provide recreational opportunities for hunters*
*Provide deer for people to see*
*Reduce starvation of deer during the winter*
*Reduce deer damage to homeowners, shrubbery and gardens*
*Reduce the risk of deer–car accidents*
*Economic losses to farmers from deer damage to crops and orchards*
that "DEC's management policies are biologically sound." Fewer indicated a
opinion from disagreeing to being undecided or agreeing with the statement
of the local deer population was accurate. A few respondents changed their
capabilities to estimate deer populations, but later believed that DEC's estimate
of the deer population objective, many members were undecided about DEC's
with the public, management techniques, and personnel (Table 6). Before the
questionnaires, perceptions of CFT members changed about DEC's communication
CFT meetings. In the time period between the first and second
Wildlife biologist were attentive to interests that members reflected at the
meeting, were less critical of the agency. All respondents indicated that DEC
Respondents to the second questionnaire, mailed after the third CFT
(10%) underestimation of the value of deer for uses other than recreational hunting
populations (20%), lack of communication with the public (20%), and
associated with promoting hunting as the only method to control deer
organization, lacking absolute deer management authority (30%), plus
(10%). Weaknesses were DEC's position as a political entity-controlled
and accessibility of personnel (20%), and solicitation for citizen input
strategies used to control the deer population statewide (60%), the abilities
DEC's strengths and weaknesses, respondents listed more strengths (12)
management was very good (33%). However, when asked their perceptions of
deer in their area was poor (45%) or fair (22%), compared to those indicating
CFT meeting tended to be critical of DEC. Most indicated DEC's management of
Changes in Opinions About DEC and Deer Management
thought, and that listening to other stakeholders had influenced his or her own realization that the problem with deer in DW 96 was worse than once thought. A new realization about the deer population (78%). However, one member indicated their opinions about the deer population had not changed. MIDWAY THROUGH THE CFF, MOST RESPONDENTS REPORTED THEY HAD NOT CHANGED.

Some, but not all, respondents.

enthusiasm of DEC personnel about their work with deer was more evident to the enthusiasm of DEC's Information Base for Planning Deer Management Programs. The practicality of the CFF meetings. En addition, actual change in opinion was detected after attending a few CFF meetings. In addition, when members initially agreed to participate on the CFF, almost all were 100% satisfied.

In addition, the percentage of deer on people, because a high percentage of CFF members held these opinions prior to attending the CFF, little change was expected that the CFF was more effective in its efforts to regulate deer harvests, and in permitting sales. About people and the welfare of deer than collecting money from license and attending the meetings, more respondents believed DEC was more concerned with hunting interests. After but one respondent believed DEC was responsive to hunting interests after attending a few CFF meetings, and all CFF members assessed the responsiveness of DEC to various stakeholders.

Respondents.

attending the meetings. Most respondents indicated that DEC biologists were well qualified to manage deer, and that DEC personnel and their work were more visible to the public than DEC staff, most respondents believed that DEC biologists were well qualified to express opinions about deer management. After interacting with CFF members, almost all respondents agreed to participate on the CFF, almost all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 6, percent response of CCL members to agency image items before and after setting deer population objectives.
One missing response for the "before" category was not calculated in the percent response (n=9).

Indicating strong agreement or disagree were combined with the agree or disagree categories. Responses were on a scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Percent Response (Sum)</th>
<th>To Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agency Image Items**

- DEC is interested in minimizing negative impacts of deer on people.
- DEC is sincere in its efforts to regulate deer population.
- DEC disregards the views of local people.
- Many deer management decisions made by DEC disregard the views of local people.
- DEC personnel in my area are not visible enough for me to know about their work with deer.
- DEC personnel in my area are not enthusiastic about their work with deer.
- DEC personnel in my area are not enthusiastic about their work with deer.
- DEC does not provide information for planning.
- DEC's estimate of the local deer population level is not accurate.
- DEC's estimate of the local deer population level is not accurate.
- DEC is more concerned about the welfare of the deer herd than it is about money from the deer herd.
- DEC is more concerned about the welfare of the deer herd than it is about money from the deer herd.
- DEC is more concerned about the welfare of the deer herd than it is about money from the deer herd.
excellent way to involve a variety of people in deep management decision. The majority (75%) of respondents rated CTS as a good, very good, or excellent. The assessment of the CTF approach also indicated that extended time required for discussions and reaching consensus were satisfied with the CTF approach. M.T. most members (69%) were satisfied with the CTF approach, this member felt that the low efficiency of CTS warranted consideration of the population decrease. The population probably take another 9 hours to decide how to decide upon which the DC projects will be used. A member felt that we all knew better and that the appropriate deer let the DC priorities decide the appropriate deer.

(Table 6). The dissatisfaction member commented, should be discontinued and expressed dissatisfaction with the CTF approach decisions and gathering information, only one member (II%) responded that CTS while only one-half (56%) of the respondents preferred CTS for making and that citizens should not be authorized to set deep population levels, that DC should make the decision for setting the deep population objective, the decision based on informal contacts with people in the DW. More agreed with the public (II%), none preferred that wildlife biologists make any input from the public (II%), another that DC biologists decide independently without meeting (II%), and another that DC biologists decide independently without meeting (II%).

(Table 6). CTF meetings, half (56%) preferred the CTF method, one-fifth sociological information for deep population decisions in DW 96, Midway. CTF members were asked which technique they preferred for collecting, comparing, Public Involvement Approaches.
One member stated:

of the CTF (Table 8). Most (88%) felt there was adequate input from a

Respondents rated the diversity of stakeholders interests and composition

environmental (good-12%, very good-39%, excellent-12%).

(25%) or poor (12%) way to resolve deer management issues in suburban

technique, about one third of CTF members believed the CTF approach was a fair

fair-11%, good-22%, very good-22%). After recommending a deer management

Respondents were satisfied with DCS’s management of deer in DMA 96 (poor-44%,

organization (78%) and DCS’s Information presentation (55%). Fewer

indicated the CTF meetings were very good or excellent in terms of their

Respondents were also asked to rate the CTF meetings. Many respondents

Midway through the meetings, after setting a deer population objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>PERCENT RESPONSE AFTER RECOMMENDING DEER MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Respondents’ assessment of the CTF approach as a means to involve

people with a variety of interests in deer management decision

making. Then as a means to recommend a management technique.

supportive of CTF as a way to recommend a deer population objective rather

had recommended a deer management technique. It appears more members were

making (Table 7). No members rated CTF as fair or poor until after the CTF
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Suggestions were made that more public input should be incorporated by members, even if the option expressed by any or all members of the task force listed to the open exchange of opinions that occurred was important, especially to one member, who commented:

The open exchange of opinions and opinions about solving the deer population problem.

otal respondents felt that the composition of the CFF encouraged open exchange of opinions. Ghosts of viewpoints in through the stakeholders. I think each community person had a viewpoint.

The missing response was not calculated in the percent response (n=7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Responses to offers of membership in the CFF after recommending a deer management technique.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETINGS OF CITIZEN TASK FORCE</th>
<th>MASS MEDIA</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>PERCENT RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After the task force meetings.</td>
<td>Not at any time before, during, or after the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Meeting 7, the last task force meeting</td>
<td>Management techniques when agreeing on deer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management 7 when agreeing on deer</td>
<td>Management techniques when discussing deer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 4-6 when discussing deer</td>
<td>Population objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3-2 when agreeing on deer</td>
<td>Population objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2-1 when discussing deer</td>
<td>Before the first meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Respondents’ preferences for involvement of the mass media, town and county government official, and people in the community during different stages of the CIT approach.

Table 10. When recommending a deer population objective, all but one CIT efficiency, stability, and wisdom of the CIT approach. and its recommendations were assessed.

Table 10. Respondents assessed several statements concerning the fairness, and of people in the community to some extent during all CIT meetings.

Table 10. Meeting, of government officials when discussing deer management techniques, process (Table 9). Most preferred involvement of the media after the last CIT education/impromptu sessions.

Conducting a non-faced community survey, and by holding public
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10:** Respondents' agreement with statements about the CTF approach midway through the meetings and the task force meetings. The task force recommendation (about a deer population objective) was decided fairly. The task force recommendation should be used in the future for the citizen task force approach should be represented at the task force meetings. The viewpoints of people most affected by the management of the deer population were well articulated. The task force needs more time between meetings for review and deliberation. The task force needs to review the priorities of some interests at the expense of others. The task force process was well received but some were dissatisfied with the process. Most participants were so satisfied with the process, before too many decisions were made. The task force represents the early citizen involvement in setting deer population objectives. The number of meetings and length of discussion were adequate for arriving at a consensus.
The release of task force recommendations coincided with deadlines for government decision makers.

Implementing the task force recommendations. I would be willing to renegotiate in another year after additional data are gathered.

The task force should be reconstituted next.

The social and political context within DWP

The recommendations are feasible in light of discussions.

All task force members were given a chance to be involved in discussions.

Recommendation.

The task force was responsive to those people who were most affected by the assignment on the task force was given the opportunity to express his or her viewpoint.

DWP would have recommended.

The task force’s recommendation differs from what the majority of people living in the agency disagree. Before percent response (Sum) To questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>IMAG ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations, but that some people had gained more than others. Almost all of the respondents (63%) indicated everyone gained something from the recommendations (Krishnan 1987). Perceptions of CTF members implied not all members benefitted equally from participating on the CTF (Table 1). About two-thirds accomplished that benefitted their stakeholder interest (Russkind and extremel (38%) way for citizens to make well-informed recollections.

The stability and wisdom of the outcomes initially appeared to be well-based in the recommendations. The stability of the recommendations appeared to be high, as respondents indicated that the CTF did more harm than good for the time involved in reaching a decision was unsatisfactory to one member (see

express different viewpoints and a chance to be included in discussions. But respondents indicated that members had been given an adequate opportunity to need for deliberation. After the first CTF meeting (Table 10), all
were adequate, although one member could not decide whether more time was population objective. CTF members were unanimous in believing that meetings were mixed about the efficiency of the CTF approach. After setting a dear and hunters in an area primarily composed of suburban homewoners. Opinions and comments represented (Table 10), one indicated that the
member believed that the CTF recommendation was decided fairly and the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Response (Sum)</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Results of the Task Force**

```
AGREEMENT WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CLF AS A WHOLE

- 25 people agreed
- 12 people strongly agreed
- 75 people agreed
- 12 people strongly disagreed
- 0 people disagreed

**Table II.** Responses to the statement: "The CLF approach addresses CIFS' assessment of CIFS as a "win-win" or "mutual gains" approach after recommending a dear management technique.

- 25 people agreed
- 12 people strongly agreed
- 75 people agreed
- 12 people strongly disagreed
- 0 people disagreed

**Conclusion:**

Although a little slow, I think the group is working well toward a consensus. The consensus approach is a key to my satisfaction. Through the meetings, members who were satisfied with CIFS midway agreed that the CLF approach was more effective. Members who were satisfied with CIFS mid-way had achieved a consensus, although they had some disagreement about the definition of consensus. The consensus had been achieved at the expense of allocating some interests. The consensus among diverse interests in the community, but all agreed (100%) that the statement that the CLF had achieved was true. Other items in the questionnaire substantiated these findings. Most respondents (75%) agreed with the statement that the CLF had achieved something. Eighty-three (83%) indicated some members compromised more than others. Many agreed that
```
decisions to others.

achievement for some, while it was an ineffective mechanism for making
appeared to be synonymous with increased satisfaction, success, and
Members' perception of the DNU 96 CTF and its ability to reach consensus

recommendations which occurred after the press
of the backbiting and attempts to undermine the CTF
Reaching a unanimous agreement should eliminate most
articles and books I researched.
That's the classic definition of consensus as per

recommendation. Reasons for supporting this definition were:

Two others (25%) defined consensus as all members agreeing with the
would reduce friction.
community at large, one would hope that consensus
Since task force members are supposed to represent the

posting.
task force to be accomplished without undue delay and
A simple majority decision would allow business of the

on a CTF (25%) indicated:
Those supporting a definition of consensus as the majority of members serving
have to be changed to accomplish anything.
and assess other points of view. Consensus thus would
more than one person unwilling or unable to listen to
members are unwilling to speak for. If a task force had

```
- Facilitate reaching decisions which task force

involved in
```

but... it worked ok for the process we were
some circumstances you could make it all but 2 of all
how you choose members, size of group, et cetera. Under
This is such a difficult question -- it all depends on

consensus, a few members commented:

When asked to select a preference from a list of alternative definitions of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT RESPONSE (SUM)</th>
<th>CITIZEN TASK FORCE STMTS ABOUT PARTICIPATION ON THE TASK FORCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree or strongly agree</td>
<td>disagree, strongly disagree, disagree, undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>I feel that I participated effectively in the task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>I wish I had been more involved in the task force discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The task force discussions did a good job of protecting the interests of the people in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Task force members did a good job of protecting the interests of the people in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Respondents' agreement with statements about being a CTF member.

Several respondents agreed or strongly agreed that a total of 200 people contacted in the DMM midway through the CTF meetings. Most respondents indicated that all or the majority of those contacted shared a similar opinion about the work of the CTF community. The number of people contacted ranged from 5 to 100 people. Respondents (88%) indicated that they discussed the issue with people in the

Performance of CTF Members
Attracting some interest groups, but caused state and local government
the CTF. Most agreed that the CTF achieved consensus at the expense of
outcomes of the CTF

Common School of Management, to lead the meetings and set the ground rules.
member did recommend using a professional facilitator, such as one from the
Although all were favorable about the facilitator techniques used, one CTF
members were asked to negotiate an agenda and take another meeting on
If you want to try another format, it will take weeks.

Ground rules, indicated:
the meetings. One CTF member, who preferred that the facilitator set the
either to set the ground rules or assist CTF members in setting the rules for
All CTF members were supportive of involving a third-party facilitator
Recommendations would be implemented by wildlife biologists.
Many were undecided (37%) about whether the CTF
management agency, and wildlife biologists avoided answering some questions
desired, participating in the CTF decreased their confidence in the wildlife
the CTF toward recognizing the deer population objective that the agencies
meetings. Two respondents indicated DEC and CCF had tried to persuade
through the process, all believed that CCF provided capable leadership at the
more favorable toward DEC's and CCF's performance than their own. Likewise
the deer population objective (Table 13). For the most part, respondents were
been involved in CTF discussions at the meetings (33%) and to participate more effectively in CTF discussions (44%).

Assessment of DECs and CCF's involvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>63%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>63%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>63%</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the next few years, the agency’s deer population objective will be to get the task force to recommend a wildlife biologist level desired by the DEC.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way communication with the people participating in the task force has increased my confidence in those who manage deer in MY DWU.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the wildlife biologists avoided answering some questions asked by task force members, the task force members who participated in most of the discussion.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cooperate Cooperative Extension provided capable leadership for the meeting.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent Response (Sum) | 0% | 75% | 63% | 25% | 12% | 25% | 100% | 75% | 63% | 25% | 12% | 25% | 100% | 75% | 63% | 25% |

**Organizers’ Agreement with Statements about DEC’s and CCE’s Involvement in CI’s**

Table 13. Respondents’ agreement with statements about DEC’s and CCE’s involvement in CI’s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response (n=8)</th>
<th>Disagree strongly or disagree</th>
<th>Strongly or undecided</th>
<th>Agree strongly or undecided</th>
<th>Percent response (sum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Respondents' assessment of outcomes from the CFF.

Members of the public about deer and dear management. Whether the CFF achieved consensus, built community relations, and educated one or two members were undecided or disagreed with other CFF members on officials to be more attentive to people's opinions about deer (Table 14).
people in the community about the CFT approach and outcomes. CFT members who
besides influencing state and local governments, CFT members informed
from the CFT in its decision making.
was displeased with the degree to which government officials relied on input
initiated. One member who was opposed to portions of the CFT recommendations
government officials were pleased with the sequence of events that the CFT had
Those who supported the recommendations of the CFT and subsequent actions of
opinion.
anything about public safety, impose damage, or public
officers/statues, they don’t have to do
quick fix that won’t fix anything. Also, government
no scientific basis, no data: it’s [it’s] just a
County and Town [government] plan to [it] with
initiative that would have been impossible otherwise.
initiative expressed a management approach within the various branches of government and to some degree
another issue managed [issue] interest and among
[the CFT helped bring about a more meaningful]
towards resolution of this year issue.
...[the CFT caused] movement of local officers
+ they could not be held accountable for any decisions
+ they could say “the public has spoken” therefore,
+ which could be presented to the legislature and
about. Instead management together in one publication
[the CFT brought all the diverse opinions and plans]
...the discussion about the issue increased to the point
+ increased security to automobile users, and lessen
+ increased security to automobile users, and lessen
...the discussion about the issue increased to the point
+ most important outcomes were... the coming cutting
+ where politicians were willing to take action...
+ population in Fremont. Some comments were...
+ county, and state governments toward taking actions to manage the deer
96 citizen task force was its influence (positive and negative) on town,
Several CFT members commented that the most important outcome of the DMI

Biological techniques to assess the deer population: with DEC. The local organization began training people in the community about

Since attending the CCF, one member reported a cooperative effort had begun

and never spoken to any legislative body before.

From board meetings.

Attended all county legislative meetings dealing with deer management legislation and troodontite, etc."

Inhibition of dear, public safety presentations in sponsored events, etc... Lecture on reproduction, etc...

[Attended] government meetings. My own organization's...=

...Interviews for henn papers, etc.

Speak out.

Attended county legislative meetings to

district. Called to mayor and police chief [from My

Wrote to editor and to county legislators from My

Three CCF (75%) voiced their opinions about the CCF through various mechanisms:

Interviewed by a newspaper or television reporter about the CCF. Three

Rallied on the CCF. One-third (33%) of the members reported being

285 people who were not associated with the interest group that the member

In addition, members estimated that they communicated individually with

and (5) notifications via phone committee.

Newsletters and reports; (4) presentations at meetings; (3) distribution of meeting minutes,

2,115 organizational members about the CCF by: (1) letters to the membership;

were connected with grassroots citizen affinitiess (88%) reported informing
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stakeholders are chosen would have been appropriate.

...permit more press at the beginning...to how

...some responsibility...to choosing.

...due deep...a small...to...results...been different...differently

...involved...to participate in the task force. Obviously

...will always be conflicts about how groups are

...valueable part of the nature experience.

...consider wildlife and their natural environments as a

...countryside ...for another environment...groups with

...for representing the human society...of countryside

...such as homeowner groups near downtown Eastman

...applicable for resolving urban/suburban deer

...The city/county...representation from groups more.

...not rural.

...represented in this task force, as DNR...urban and

...represented in the task force, after agricultural interests were...Free farmers, other agricultural interests were...are for in...County, farmers, other agricultural interests were...for representing the human society of countryside

...support consensus. Having only one organization as...agreed that the deer herd

...increased, providers they agreed that the deer herd

...more deer or animal activities should have been

...would be asked to participate on CTPs:

...improvements for future CTPs in other suburban areas. Comments focused on who

...when the CTP approach was completed, several respondents (63%) suggested

...maximizing its communication efforts.

...improving CTPs.

...educating and training community volunteers who will then educate others about

...dear biology and data collection techniques, examples include an agency can

...also help improve attendance and educational programs.

...therefore, to date, about 26 deer have been measured.

...information to look for heavy metals in the kidney and

...students are being involved in deer/related studies.

...police chief, animal control offices and parks

...provided equipment...to read deer in movements.

...were not monitored...to deer study, etc., and

...DNR staff brought 2 deer...to show...how to take age,
A dear management plan.

Provided members a record of progress toward reaching consensus and developing
10th of CII recommendations. When viewed in hindsight, meeting minutes
meeting, which were useful later when interacting with the public about the
members. Meeting minutes were a record of the incremental steps made at each
being able to review the accomplishments of past meetings was important to CII

members with minutes to the meeting:

to express interest in the CII process. One respondent recommended providing
Even though the CII had completed its objectives, respondents continued

1992). Interests representing non-traditional and difficultly subphalan,
CII included a significant number of stakeholders.
ecological balances particularly in Roodenburg. This
homomorphs and drivers was affecting natural
unique and serious deer problem which was plaguing
from that of the previous CII. Recognizing the
interests, the make-up of CII was quite different
rather than reflecting traditional rural deer

expressed opposition in support of the selection process for the CII members:

After the DWA-6 CII had completed its task, others in the community
risk and statistic experts.

Society of Rochester and Monroe County, Insurance companies, children, and
Society, park users, animal rights groups (e.g., Save Our Deer), the Humane
association, environmentalists and ecologists, stakeholders (e.g., Audubon
that were not included in the DWA 96 CII, such as homeowner and neighborhood
In the questionnaire, respondents (20%) identified stakeholder interest groups
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The DEC in cooperation with CCE implemented a public involvement strategy, the CFF, in rural DMMs in 1990. In the DMM 96 CFF, DEC asked to state and local policymakers and the community.

to develop and recommend deer population objectives and management techniques.

CFFs are a public involvement approach in which citizens in the community can choose whether or not to involve the public in recommending deer management techniques. In this report we provided results from evaluating a wildlife management agency decides to manage suburban deer herds, agencies.

Once in suburban environments in a variety of ways (Kruzer, 1991, MCMullen, and Parker, 1992, MCMullen and Nielsen, 1994, MCMullen, and Nielsen, 1992), several wildlife management agencies have addressed deer management.

DISCUSSION

Facilitate implementation of the recommendations.

Others were willing to continue meeting with government officials to percents ownership in the CFF and its recommendations. This member and respondent believed he or she had gained expertise that could be shared, and his implementation of the CFF recommendations. But it was obvious that his view, he or she was hesitant to support further involvement because arrangements for implementing the recommendation had progressed well.

Discussing it, etc. We could have had some talk on timing, locations, etc. — which are going very well without our having

I'm not sure they were needed - and if it is probably the legislative bodies do this. But I

We didn't have recommendations for implementation.

I recommend deer management techniques.

Another member expressed interest in continuing the CFF's involvement with local government officials in developing a plan to implement the recommendations.
Communications within the CF and to the public at large involve implementation, and (5) magnetifying and improving from people in the community, (6) definition of consensus, (7) continued identification and selection of stakeholder participants, (2) data collection model. be modified for use in suburban environments in at least three ways: (1) based on the evaluation of the CF in DNI 96, we recommend that the CF intensity was associated with the lethal removal of deer.

In comparison to rural CFs, a greater degree of emotionality neighborhoods. In comparison to rural CFs, a greater degree of emotionality techniques posed for people living in close proximity to deer in residential nortraditional techniques. Members also considered the degree of danger that difficulty was scientific uncertainty pertaining to the efficacy of impact because of legal limitations or ethical considerations. Another impact because of legal limitations or ethical considerations, but techniques. In other words, a technique could be biologically feasible, but and regulations that placed restrictions on alternative deer management management techniques was assessed, such that members identified a web of laws those of their rural counterparts. The political practicability of deer the issues that suburban CF members addressed were more complex than that acceptable or practical management options. The information learned and exchanged, and then to assess and form attitudes during the nine-month duration of the CF (eight meetings total) to synthesize additional three to four meetings. It appeared that members needed the time identifying deer management techniques and reaching consensus. Required an recommended deer population objectives in two or three meetings. In DNI 96, objectives. CFs held in rural locations typically reached consensus and members to recommend deer management techniques in addition to deer population
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participate who became aware of the CFF after its initial meeting. Based on
meeting should be considered. This would provide an opportunity for people to
The potential benefits of allowing new members to join after the initial
Community.

Aly others should be invited to reflect accurately the interests present in the
initially to discuss the CFF approach and review the membership to decide if
CFF meeting for members' input. A facilitator could convene CFF members
adovertisements in newspapers, sending direct mailings, or holding an initial
through contacting key community leaders, holding public meetings, designing
identity shareholders that may be overlooked such as obtaining nominations
identify a list of shareholders present in the DWW. Examples of ways to
policy makers and the community at large. Initially the facilitator and agency
reduce the potential for creating a plan that will be acceptable to
By a member serving on the CFF, overlooking any shareholder interest can
We recommend that any and all shareholders in the community be reflected
considered in future suburban CFFs.

technical advisors. We recommend that their involvement in either capacity be
Monroe County and the Audubon Society, were not involved as members nor
Nongovernment organizations, such as The Humane Society of Rochester and
advisors, keeping them apprised of the progress of the CFF as it was underway.
initially. An effective way to involve government officials was as technical
effective in minimizing the political nature of the deep population issue
initiating the CFF to citizens and not including government officials was
participate on CFFs is needed for CFFs in suburban locations. In DWW 96,
more stringent criteria for identifying and selecting shareholders to
Identification and Selection of Shareholders Participants
Bringing resolution to deep management issues in DWU 96, members perceived first meeting several members were pessimistic about the ability of the CFF to polarized interests prior to implementation of the CFF. Therefore, at the long-standing controversy about deep management in Loundeogoll

Definition of consensus.

Analyzing the data.

and implementing the survey instrument, printing and mailing costs, and the disadvantages are the extended time and costs associated with developing instruments and conducting interviews with a sample of people in the community. Implementing a survey, for example, CFF members can develop telephone surveys plan into the CFF model that involves participants in planning and organizers of future suburban CFFs may want to consider building a research.

Desired "sensitizing" approaches to obtaining input from the community. Members of the suburban CFFs, however, indicated that they rural community. Members of the suburban CFFs, however, indicated that they because they may have perceived that opinions were more homogenous in the process in which they contacted friends and neighbors for input, perhaps collect opinions from people in the community about the deep population size CFF members in DWU 96 expressed dissatisfaction with the process used to collect data about opinions of people in the community.

The suburban community.

be necessary to include more than ten to reflect adequately all interests in appears that ten members is the optimal group size of a CFF; however, it may results from evaluating CFFs held in rural settings (Stout et al., 1993).
Community. The perceived consequence of not reaching consensus was that recommendations based on a consensus from a variety of people in the management plan to be implemented. The CTE provided government officials with instead, government agencies were required to work in collaboration for a CTE.

In the suburban CTE, no single agency had authority over decisions—

Recommended regarding the size of the deer herd.

Each instance, DEC's decision reflected what the majority of CTE members disagreed with others (Stout et al. 1993). The consequence was that DEC made instances, consensus was not achieved in rural CTEs because one or two members with the deer population objective (Gussick and Cunshank 1987). In a few recommendations. In rural areas, consensus was defined as all members agreeing the suburban CTE was defined as all but one member agreeing to the increase the probability that a consensus could be reached, consensus in reaching consensus was equated with bringing resolution to the problem.

Optimistic about reaching consensus on deer management techniques, some members were more reaching consensus on a deer population objective, some members were more after decisions pertaining to deer management in Ireland. For example, after gathering knowledge about how they and their interest groups could affect policy. CTEs recommended and (2) a sense of empowerment to create change by:

At each CTE meeting, members progressively gained (1) on membership in the root of human-deer conflicts.

Emphasized that the behaviors and actions of people, not deer, were at the man deer was the cause of their deer-related concerns, while others about deer management issues. Some members believed that the presence of too consensus would be difficult to reach because of seemingly disparate views.
It is uncertain whether this barrier of counterattacks might have been avoided had the CFF worked toward a unanimous consensus for all recommendations. By taking pipe bombs on their property (Smith and Littles 1993), later, two households in support of the deer-management plan were threatened by a court injunction which delayed implementation (Alltazas 1994), before the plan was implemented, however, those opposed to the CFF recommendations convened and developed a deer-management plan based on the CFF recommendations. Despite the continued debates about the CFF recommendations, government agencies continued with a rebuttal of its own that favored the CFF. A minority report of the dissenting member, who subsequently issued a minority filling the CFF definition of consensus, the CFF report did not contain the opinions of the dissenting member, who subsequently issued a minority filling the CDF definition of consensus. The CFF report did not contain the dissenting member's agreement to continuing deer over past, most of the CDF, with the exception of the short-term techniques and management techniques for long-term and long-term deer population objectives and management techniques for short-term objectives, could not agree.

In the CDF, all members achieved a unanimous consensus about the short-term objectives. Government agencies would take no action on recommendations which CFF members did not agree.
implement the CFT plan as it was recommended. In particular, there has been a
cutting dear at half sites. However, the government task force did not fully
implementation of the CFT's recommended short-term solution, selectively
The government task force accomplished a great deal in planning the

Recommendations.

Following the CFT to work on details for implementing the CFT's
been distributed in the community. A government task force was formed
opinions to decision makers in the community after the CFT recommendations had
indicated they continued attending local government meetings and voicing their
community, the work of the CFT was completed--or was it? CFT members
Once the CFT plan was communicated to government officials and the

Continued Involvement in the Implementation Phase

that could have jeopardized implementation of the CFT's recommendations.
recommendations were contentious and why to avoid an aftermath of disputes
agreements were not unanimous, the final report could have identified which
create mutual gains for all Interests on the CFT and in the community. If
agreeing to a recommendation would have forced members to work harder to
been reached in a timely manner. however, defining consensus as all members
dissatisfied with the CFT approach if a consensus, however defined, had not
could agree. It is possible that more CFT members would have been
more time for CFT members to develop recommendations in which all members

Attaining to reach a unanimous consensus probably would have required
been reached and engendered greater community support.

As agreement by all CFT members, a different set of recommendations may have
 foster complete agreement in the larger community. Had consensus been defined
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The perceived responsiveness of the agency and facilitator to the needs of CFF members, the agency, and the facilitator about deer and dear management also occurred between participants and the public. Internally, much communication occurred between CFF members, the agency, and the facilitator about deer and dear management. The contacts of the CFF meetings, but also between CFF members, the agency, and the facilitator also occurred not only within the contacts of the CFF meetings that those who implemented CFFs need to be sensitive to communications that are meaningful and improving communications with the community.

Organizations that interact with influential members of also created a network for agencies to interact with influential members of advocates for legislation supporting agency actions. Linking with volunteers increase volunteers' understanding and knowledge about wildlife. Some became data collected by volunteers provided base-line research, and served to technicnicians who assisted the agency with monitoring and research activities. Management agencies. Horner (1993) reported volunteers became skilled. Volunteer efforts have several lasting benefits for wildlife. Horner (1993). In DMW 96, DC trained volunteers to assess the health of car- killed deer. Volunteer efforts have several lasting benefits for wildlife management is the effective use of volunteers to monitor wildlife populations. Another example of how CFF members can continue to be involved in deer management plans and to maintain rapport with the CFF members.

Participate in dear management activities to bring continuity to the dear that CFF members be invited to attend subsequent planning sessions and recommended by the CFF. When acting on the CFF recommendations, we advise implementation of immunocompression techniques, the long-term solution to lack of support for continued investigations and research leading to.
between suburban residents and policymakers. The recommendations of the CIL
alternative deer management techniques on the CIL improved communications
Regularly aggregate involving local community leaders in discussing
areas where citizens may have little knowledge of DCC, other than as a

Developing a communication strategy is especially important in suburban

In which the CIL approach was the cornerstone (Stout and Knuth 1994)

communicating with the public at large, DCC developed a communication strategy
rather than the positive gains of the CIL. To address this need for
community at large. The mass media trended to focus on points of contention
information exchange and consensus-building that occurred on the CIL to the
the challenge was to magnify the
dear and deer management in the community. The challenge was to magnify the

Conversely, the CIL approach served as a vehicle for DCC and other
the CIL’s ability to build a feasible and applicable recommendation.

Communications with the public and policymakers was an important part of

In direct response to members’ input.

members, organizers could indicate when meeting content or format was changed
speaker at the meeting. To improve perceived responsiveness of organizers to
realize that organizers were responding to other members’ input. Members who
interviews. Members who did not indicate a need for feedback indicated an expert speaker to the
members, for instance, organizers may invite an expert speaker to the
It was not obvious that the format of a meeting was based in part on feedback
how input from members was used to adjust the meeting’s content or format.
would have stalled.

divided along party lines. But for one vote, the recommendations of the CFF
deer management issue (Anonymous 1992b). County government officials were
coverage about local elections included the stance of contractors about the
firearms and budgets required approval of local government boards. Newspaper
management plan became political issues in DWA 96. Laws about discharging
CFF than in rural CFF's. Legislative actions associated with the deer

The political nature of deer management was more evident in the suburban

Recommending solutions to deer management issues.

way to incorporate minority opinions and keep those stakeholders involved in
ultimately will be settled in court (Amy 1993). The challenge is to find a
using a public involvement approach for a decision that in some instances

the definition of consensus used on the DWA 96 CFF, and the legitimacy of
implementation of the CFF's recommendations. Such action calls to question

managing deer resulted in a court injunction that temporarily delayed
CFF's recommendations was precursory. The dissemination of one CFF member about
CFF members completed their final report, the ensuing implementation of the
environments could yield vastly different outcomes. At several points after

of the DWA 96 CFF, the repetition of the CFF approach in other suburban

investigation. Although some community action did result from recommendations

The utility of CFFs in suburban environments needs further

Conclusion About Application of CFFs in Suburban Environments

Consent of the general public.

would have been stymied without support from local policymakers and the latent
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time is devoted to identifying common concerns and underlying values of
risk is that (1) the CFF may divide rather than unite members if not enough
approach, we believe it is better that the CFF not be implemented at all. The
Without one or more people devoting such time commitments to the CFF
implemented.

officials and coordinating efforts to ensure the CFF recommendations are
CFF recommendations. These actions may include meeting with local government
well as investigating in the subsequent actions required for implementation of the
devote time to planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating the CFF, as
members. The facilitator and others involved in the organizing a CFF need to
content and format, while remaining flexible to change based on input from
Implementing the CFF must be attended to details associated with meeting
from the facilitator, CFF members, and the agency. Those involved in
The CFF approach requires a substantial commitment of time and energy
Finding common ground.
responsiveness to positions of the majority and minority alike, and work towards
provide all partners involved an opportunity to express opinions, be open and
the facilitator in preparing a CFF. It is very important that the mediator
suburban deep management issues may not be necessary, but would greatly assist
for mutual gain of stakeholders and the community at large. Background in
members with regard to deep and deep management, and (2) alternative solutions
skilled facilitator can lead members to explore (1) underlying values of
environment where there is high potential for conflict among stakeholders. A
mediation skills of the facilitator. The ability of the facilitator in
Another variable that greatly affected the CFF approach was the
environment. substantial in facilitating the coexistence of deer and people in a suburban

If willing to commit the time and energy required, the rewards could be

costs and potential benefits of implementing a public involvement approach.

1. 1994). Wildlife management agencies and cooperators should assess the

provide public input for the deer management decision-making process. (Stout et

community to decide. Several public involvement approaches can be used to

particular suburban community is for the wildlife management agency and the

whether a public involvement approach, such as a CLL, is appropriate for a

tool in suburban environments where deer management actions are needed.

Despite these potential pitfalls, the CLL approach is an appropriate

Limitations and boundaries.

were not given the opportunity to advise CLL members of their legal

policymakers, or (2) the CLL recommendation will be ignored by policymakers

based on poor information or lack of interaction with appropriate

members, (2) CLL members may recommend an ineffective or ineffective approach

- Democrat and Chronicle, September 2.

Anonymous, 1992b. Independent candidacies discuss the issues. Rochester

Anonymous, 1992a. Battle of Times: dream as dear and people collide


Altersas, T. 1993b. A 100-close encounter with doe turnsball-and-shot for

Altersas, T. 1993a. Ball-shot fight goes to court. Rochester Democrat and
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APPENDIX A

Examples of Proposals for Managing Deer in Irondequoit
Hobby and Craft

 repeal of the 1988 law that forbade the sale of
 knives for hunting purposes.

 The measure, which was introduction
during the 1988 legislative session, was
 defeated in the Senate but passed in
 the House.

 The author has asked the public to
 consider different ways of controlling
 the knife trade.

 The author also notes that the
 bill had the support of the
 National Rifle Association.

 (continued on page 4)

 Printers' Marks
To make the solution acceptable, the attention was at an impasse.

Agreed! There were too many unanswered questions about public safety and how hunting in the park and the town might allow deer to escape. The Town was considering deer control, which could help on the day the issue arises rather than be there when the conflict happened. A better solution would be to come up with a plan for deer management that would benefit everyone.

Environmental concern was discussed about the "Iroquois" deer and the deer on the property of the town, the county, and the Department of Environmental Conservation.

Concern for all Monroe County residents.

"Deer tend to take up the property of the park," but there is a question that the deer are not typically a problem for a handful of people. The deer have become a big problem by eating shrubs and trees, and commercial gardens, and several buildings have been destroyed. Residents were incorrectly assuming that deer were frequent on our property, and the park was seen as a frequent deer destination.

Advised the problems could be addressed by deer on the Smokey Mountain Park and the Iroquois deer. The committee was formed in July 1990 to address the problem.

Presented June 1979

TOWN OF IROquois

PROBLEM IN DURAND EASTMAN PARK AND THE DEER

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALLEVIATING THE DEER

P.O. Box 6780 - Rochester, N.Y. 14617

Iroquois Deer Action Committee

74
conference at Camp Eastman, a typically overgrown, wooded area.

Commitment to ecology, which we highlighted by holding our press conference at the park and the open space within our town. It is our duty to educate, protect, and conserve deer and their habitats do nothing for the welfare of the deer. Deer do not care for food, water, or shelter, they survive on available resources.

Passive protection, in the belief that a reduction in the number of deer would be a necessary part of their natural cycle, we began examining the problem. It became apparent to us that a reduction in the number of deer would be a necessary part of their natural cycle.

allowed to destroy the ecology upon which other ecosystems and plants depend.

The deer have adapted to their environment, but we firmly believe that deer cannot be destroyed as easily. IDAC members have been popularized by television and movies. They are gentle, peaceful creatures which have been peaceably and implemented quickly. However, dear and another need to be destroyed by the public and implemented quickly. If there were a problem, since the destruction of dear is a serious problem, why has our membership, now consisting of 60 concerned citizens, believed

our members, now consisting of 60 concerned citizens, believed
reduction:

IDAC needed these criteria for evaluating methods for deer population

Evolution

programs. Today's meetings mark the beginning of this phase.

programs and to assist with the implementation of any such
deer problem and to assist with the implementation of the
our goal was to make specific recommendations for alleviation of the

conservation departments.

the support, direction, and active participation of their state
reduce deer numbers, often in non-traditional ways, and mostly with

are the Homosassa County. In many areas, programs are in effect to

attract. Other countries are facing the same tough decimation

much of the United States, both in urban/suburban and rural

unrests of our situation. Deer are proliferating astronomically in

throughout our research, we have been struck by the lack of

researchers, and many New York State officials.

mental rights representativeness, conservationists, university

departments in seven other states. We gathered input from hunters and

from all over the country. We have conversed with conservation

with a representative of DEC. We have talked to wildlife biologists

methods. IDAC members met with top town and county officials and

IDAC has been different in reexamining all possible deer reduction
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permitted "to take any wildlife at any time whenever it becomes a
problem." However, IDAC has learned that DEC can issue
a "safari permit" to take some wildlife. The problem is that hunting is the only possible answer
even more desirable and efficient way to reduce the
population of deer and the problem they cause as quickly, humanely
and effectually as possible.

The purpose of the IDAC are to try to reduce the
circumstances, but it is not acceptable here. That is not a
diminishment of humaneness.

There are also a public perception that how hunting may be humane.

That such a hunt would be expensive. IDAC believes that the

be achieved. Public sentiment on the safety issue may be innumerable.

are not acceptable. The assertion with specially qualified marksmen, we do not accept their

be able to be conducted safely, one with a short season and

Although IDAC

The following methods were judged unacceptable.

The following methods were judged unacceptable.

1. Hunting

The following methods were judged unacceptable.
The net effect seems to be an increased waste of a public resource. This method has been described a "competent poisoning," for instance, has been declared a destructive method except for killing deer which do not involve appointing
cost to the public. The humane society has volunteered to cremate them at no
destroyed. The humane society has volunteered to cremate them at no
be fit for humane consumption, as the carcasses would have to be
county to overpopulation, deer with deer guns. The meet would not
we reject the proposal of the humane society of Rochester and Monroe

3. Exhantize and Cremate

Etate-ide.

worry that they are treating control of the size of the deer herd
deer. Deer are prolificating throughout New York, and DEC officialstate
mortality. However, there are no place to take large numbers of
have been developed which are more effective with very low
relocated internal, and reintroduced to up to 20,000 deer. New techniques
a new location is extremely expensive, often exceeding 10,000 per
the traditional technique of transporting and transporting deer to

2. Tep and Transpare to the Wild

Hunting.

change in where Lew is required to alter approaches other than
capturing, trapping, poisoning and netting." It would seem that no
defined as hunting, shooting, hunting, killing, trapping, poisoning. Further, the word "take" as
of as the department may direct." Further, the word "take" is
the public health or welfare, wildlife or taken shall be destroyed
nuisance, destructive to public or private property, or a threat to
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In addition, our research indicates that using the drug Ropin on Euthanasia (1986).

IDAC rejects deer contraception. Population reduction by this method would depend solely upon attrition. This is essentially equivalent to no action. Furthermore, scientists involved in contraception research tell IDAC that this approach is not intended to reduce populations of deer, merely to control them at acceptable levels. The deer population would have to be reduced substantially by other means before treatment could begin. This leaves the community facing the same question which IDAC has been addressing all along: what is the best way to reduce the size of the deer herd?

1. Deer Contraception

4. Deer Contraception

Contraception may someday be suitable for long-term herd stabilization. However, deer contraception technology is not available for use with wild, free-roaming herds. It is essential that, by then,
Monroe County Parks Department, and State Division of Wildlife. DEC
public resource. However, repeated requests from IDFC, the
department to receive information that this would be "prudent"
the deer to proceed enterprise, that these might be a legal impediment to donating
DEC has indicated that these might be a legal impediment to donating

The method is relatively inexpensive and has proven effective.
borne by the deer farmers. These experts are available and willing.
their cost to be used as bait. The trapper would cost to the
one-time cost to the county for construction of traps, and ongoing
relocated to deer farms in New York State. The would be a
looser of deer. (Ironically, the New Jersey deer are being
employed specifically in New Jersey by these same experts with few
step and tramp does not involve tranquilizers and has been
slaughtered humanely at some future date. The technique for this
unless the varmint industry. The progeny of these deer would be
and remove the deer to farm to serve as breeding stock for an
New York deer farmers, licensed by DEC to raise white-tailed
two New York deer farmers, licensed by DEC to raise white-tailed

1. Trap and Trimmer to Deer Farmer

Montourcoted locations. Our recommendations are as follows:
attacted, focusing deer reduction activities in specific.
easily
the county and the town. All would attract deer to designated parts
they can be used stingly or in combination, and are suitable for both
IDFC to recommending three methods of deer population reduction.

acceptable methods

ecoogy and the realities of suburban coexistence.
the deer population be at a level consistent with the natural
provided with Albany at their request.

of their regulations, IDAC has shared information about the
researcher's and Mr. masseters. New York can benefit from the degrad
that appears in the report don't make a current occurrence in Illinois.
The worth of note
protocols were carefully designed and followed. It is worth noting that
indicated to IDAC that such a plan probably could be arranged if the
a representative of the agriculture and markets department in Albany
although donating venison to charity has not been done in New York,

with dressing the meat.

with dressing the meat.

to do the trap and transfer, and there would be costs associated
transfer to deer farms, for the deer farmers would have to be paid
however, the cost to the public would be significantly higher than
pest control. Rather, it needs them for the public good.
the poor, to zoos, or to the penal system. This proposal does not
be trapped as above, and then slaughtered for food to be donated to
indicated willingness to entertain a proposal to allow the deer to

In discussion with the Monroe County Parks Department, DEC has

Charity

2. Trap and transfer to a slaughterhouse and donate the meat to

increase.

the need arises to monitor them, the cost of the program would
IDAC does have concerns about possible vandalism to the traps. If
end and joggling which indicates that this may be feasible.
precedent in other ventures such as commercial fishing, trapping,
has yet to cite any law to support this position. There are
residential and commercial plantings.

Town ecology, danger to motorists, and additional destruction of
begin this fall in order to anticipate further damage to the park and
alleviate the problem caused by too many deer. The program must
undertake direct and immediate deer population reduction plans to
IDAC believes it is essential that Monroe County and the Town of

Summary

Excess deer would be donated to the needy.
be partially offset by educating them to keep a website for HSN and supporting agent from the
number of agent could be depleted by DEC, with financial assistance from the
of DEC may not have sufficient personnel or present, but
do they not have an obligation to be lenders in controlling their
organization and supervision. Since DEC controls the deer, it is
IDAC will support this method only if DEC is directly involved with

finding safe and effective methods of deer population reduction.

If you refer to the map reference that appears to not the issue here, rather it is
so far, DEC has rejected the proposal as not being appropriate. It is a

problem in education whether to one in education or one

infringement, and humane, where deer overpopulation has become a
proven to be extremely effective, humane and cost effective in Wisconsin.
and then about them from elevated stands. The method has
population is to bait the deer in to selected, elevated bait
by far the most ethical, forward approach to reducing the deer

3. Bait and Shoot
The unexpected abundance of deer browse following the March ice storm may have provided temporary relief from deer pressure. However, we must not be lulled into thinking this gives us longer to make a decision. The increased food available to the deer now will merely produce an increase in the number of fawns next spring.

IDAC recognizes that no plan will be acceptable to everyone. However, we believe that the conclusions, which we are presenting after ten months of intensive research, best meet our criteria of effectiveness, harmlessness, timeliness, safety, and cost. They represent the culmination of nearly two decades of discussion. There is nothing to be gained and much to be lost if we wait any longer to start removing deer.

IDAC recommends three possible approaches, to be used singly or in combination:

- Trap and transfer to deer farms
- Bait and shoot by DEC agents
- Trap and slaughter

Although none of these solutions is currently sanctioned by DEC, only internal policies need be altered to permit use of these methods. Deer population reduction which are appropriate for a suburban setting.

IDAC recognizes that population reduction goals cannot be accomplished in only one year. Repeated annual application of these methods may be necessary for three to five years. To monitor progress, there must be regular evaluation of success through an annual deer census, deer/car collision data, numbers of homeowner complaints, and documented park regeneration.
have been doing throughout the last ten months.

to the DEC, the governing bodies, the press, and the public as we
other parts of the country, and to make the information available
information about deer problems and population control methods from
of deer reduction plans. Of course, we will continue to acquire
acceptance of our recommendations and work with the implemenation
how our committee began the really hard work. We must ensure

cost.

adventures of an ongoing, annual beast with a significant annnual
however, it is important to note that contraception must be
continue removing deer in order to maintain metapopulation
for deer contraception efforts. This would eliminate the need to
research and the technology is available, our science can become a active
contraception as that, when reasonable to bear population levels are
IDAC recommends that continued attention be given to research on
Although the outline was proposed in June, 1996, when the C.F. recommendations were made, the following results have been achieved:

- Improved whitetail deer population
- Increased public awareness of deer management
- Enhanced recreational opportunities
- Improved predator control
- Increased hunting success

The six-point plan includes the following:

OUTLINE

I. INTRODUCTION
II. PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE POPULATION PROPOSAL
III. VEGETATION STUDY AND EDUCATION PROGRAM
   - Scientific study as part of deer-gathering/research
   - Wildlife contact program - information programs
   - Information programs
   - Information programs
   - Information programs
   - Cutting edge technology
   - Counting winter feeding
   - Deer population study - Three year segment program

IV. DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN
   - Public awareness media campaign
   - Cutting edge technology
   - More deer, less deer-hunting sites
   - Reduced and more comfortable hunting
   - Public safety - Immediate implementation

V. CULTURAL CARVING CAPACITY
   - Volume control
   - Disposal of materials and services
   - Private funding
   - Corporate sponsors
   - Private funds, such as:

VI. WILDLIFE CONFLICT: IMMUNOCONTRACEPTION
   - Monitoring and control
   - Management of deer population
   - Implementation of deer population
   - Controlled government funding of individual

VII. EFFECTIVE FINANCING - To support government funding of individual
   - Management of deer population
   - Implementation of deer population
   - Controlled government funding of individual

VIII. CONCLUSION
   - Summary of findings
   - Recommendation for continued support
   - Future recommendations

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS
   - Need for continued support
   - Future recommendations

X. APPENDIX
   - Additional information
   - References

XI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
   - Acknowledgments of contributors

XII. BIBLIOGRAPHY
   - List of references
Appendix B

Minutes, Selected Agendas, and Correspondence

Pertaining to the CTF Meetings
Agenda

Meeting #1: January 13, 1992

Citizen Task Force

NYS Deer Management Unit 96

Next Meeting: February 18 at 7 pm (no dinner)

Adjourn by 9:30 pm

Human Dimensions Research Unit, Inc.
Becky Stoul, Research Support Specialist, Department of Natural Resources
Cornell University Evaluation Project

11

Paul Crites
Media News Releases

10

Task Force Publicity—Discussion of Publishing Names of Task Force Members via

9

Paul Crites

Task Force Assignment—Due Next Meeting

8

Questions and Discussion by Task Force Members

7

Biological, Social, and Economic Impacts and Administrative Constraints—
Panel Discussion: Alternatives and Consequences of Various Deer Population Levels—

6

Jim Fodde, Senior Wildlife Biologist, Bureau of Wildlife, Department of
Deer Management in DNR 96: Taking a look at the Deer Population

5

Rochester

Frank Litchfield, Senior Sanitarian, Monroe County Department of Health

4

Incidence of and Potential for Deer-Related Diseases in Monroe County

3

Andrew Frawley, Deputy, Monroe County Sheriff's Department, Rochester

2

Deer-Related Accidents in Monroe County

1

Tommy Pollock, Monroe County Department of Parks, Rochester

Concerns About Deer in Monroe County Parks

Environmental Conservation Law

Larry Myers, Regional Wildlife Manager, Bureau of Wildlife, Department of
The Role of the DNR 96 Citizen Task Force in Deer Management Decisions

Break for Dinner: Compliments of the Bureau of Wildlife

Cooperative Extension, Inc.

Registration

Paul Crites, Extension Associate, Department of Natural Resources, Cornell
When contracting a stakeholder for their opinions, explain the purpose of the task force.

If a DLU stakeholder recruiting another interested consultant you record his/her population in their area.

If people who are not stakeholder in the DLU contract you listen to their comments, but explain that recommendations from this task force will have little effect on the deer population and those recommendations from stakeholder activities within the DLU. Contact only those participants in outdoor recreation activities within the DLU. Contract at least 10 people, at least 5 per task force.

To obtain the widest variety of opinions, try to contact either by telephone or in person the widest variety of opinions. Try to contact either by telephone or in person.

Directions: The purpose of this guide is to suggest a way to collect opinions from stakeholders.

Guide for Task Force Members Gathering Stakeholder Opinions

CITIZEN TASK FORCE

NEW YORK STATE DEER MANAGEMENT UNIT 96
The following questions ask about stakeholders' preferences for a deer population level. To best reflect your stakeholders' views, consciously avoid asking questions in a leading or value-judged manner. Ask the questions using the same words and tone of voice each time you ask someone's opinion. Act unbiased and open-minded to the person's comments.

(a) In your opinion, is this year's deer herd too high, too low, or about right? (increasing/decreasing/stable/don't know)

(b) In your opinion, is this year's deer herd too high, too low, or about right? (increasing/decreasing/stable/don't know)

(c) Over the next 5 years, do you think the deer herd in your area should increase, decrease, remain stable, or don't know? (increase/decrease/remain stable/don't know)

(d) Why do you think the deer herd should increase, decrease, remain stable? (increased/decreased/remain stable)

(e) If you think another question would better reflect your stakeholder interest, discuss with the facilitator the possibility of adding or changing a question.

(f) Before the second meeting, think about and reflect upon the opinions you gathered. Make an assessment of what deer population level you think your stakeholders would recommend.

(g) When summarizing your findings to the task force, describe generally how you contacted people, how you received the responses, and your recommendation. In consideration of these opinions, be prepared to communicate this in about a 5-7 minute presentation.
From your discussion, summarize the stakeholder interests of the person contacted (e.g.,

dairy farmer, ornithologist, had a deer-car accident a month ago):

(\textbf{d}) Why do you think the deer herd should \textit{(increase, decrease, remain stable)}?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textbf{d}</th>
<th>don't know</th>
<th>remain stable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% decrease</td>
<td>% increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how much?</td>
<td>how much?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decrease or remain stable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(\textbf{e}) Over the next 5 years, do you think the deer herd in your area should \textit{(increase, decrease, remain)}?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textbf{e}</th>
<th>don't know</th>
<th>about right</th>
<th>too low</th>
<th>too high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stable</td>
<td>decreasing</td>
<td>increasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(\textbf{f}) In your opinion, is this year's deer herd in your area \textit{(too large, too small, about right)}?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textbf{f}</th>
<th>don't know</th>
<th>stable</th>
<th>decreasing</th>
<th>increasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(\textbf{g}) Name, address and/or telephone number of person contacted:

\textbf{Directions:} Complete one worksheet for each stakeholder you contact. Ask each stakeholder questions (a) through (d).
There was an opinion that the task force's exclusion of their desired deep population would not be documented.

The idea would be that the short-term goal (≥5 years) would be discussed. The short and long-term goals were discussed. The idea was to remain tactical while the population would continue to be able to remain tactical while documentation the

This was considered the discussion on the need for data on how many deer currently exist in DMU 96 and how healthy they are. A better decision can be made if the current health of the deer can be documented.

There was a general discussion on the need for data on how many deer currently exist in DMU 96 and how healthy they are. A better decision can be made if the current health of the deer can be documented.

There was an opinion that it was not necessary to have a complete park and people that can easily and use the park are in fact a complete park was a concern that people think of DMU 96. The idea of the initial has a single population (and the ability to use

If the deer could be the problem of deep populations exist in conjunction and basically in the

Wetlands. First, resolve who has authority to do something so that we won't be spending our time on the red tape. Another thought is that the DC is not responsible to do something about the problem in the

Concerns were raised about the ability of the committee to be useful in solving the problems that

Each issue and produced recommendations.

Following a report from each member on their constituent opinions the task force discussed

A second priority related to deer management public perception was seen in a sample of 100 residents. This survey is repeated to the committee activities. That is different.

There were two initial quetions prior to individual reports. One item was that last month's data

T. Pollock, J. Proule, T. Rockwell, J. Simmer, B. Smith, and A. Van Dam.

Attendance:
Consensus Summary of 02/18/97 Meeting

1. DMU 96 will be divided into north and south parts, north being all of Kiosk and Route 10A points west of Route 10A.

2. DMU 96 population recommendations will be divided into short (<5 years) and long-term goals.

3. Population trend between stable and a maximum 5% decrease.

In the DMU 96 south section, it was agreed for the short-term that the deer population would remain between stable and a maximum 5% decrease.

Affiliate organizations, population problems in Kiosk would be more easily supported by the residents and their other issues such as the lack of a decision to address the deer and deer habitat issues. Concerns about the public's perception of knowledge and the public were more knowledgeable about deer accident statistics. Concerns were also expressed about the lack of a decision to address those issues. Opinions exist that it was necessary to make a decision, although some citizens had not expressed it any other idea was effective.

While some felt the need for absolute numbers of deer was necessary, others felt numbers were not...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>% Pop Change</th>
<th>Primary Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary of Stakeholder Contacts</td>
<td>CITE Member: Susan Moolkey, Heteromas Corp.</td>
<td>50-75% decrease (minority, 20% stable population)</td>
<td>Habitat destruction, personal injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Carpenter, Archery Instructor</td>
<td>5-80% decrease</td>
<td>Property and habitat destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Blevins, Brightwood Meadowbrook Homeowners Assoc.</td>
<td>10-50% decrease</td>
<td>Stability of nature, health of deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Lehman, Monroe Co. Farm Bureau</td>
<td>30-50% decrease</td>
<td>Crop damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Ophardt, WNY Apple &amp; Cherry Growers</td>
<td>50-75% decrease</td>
<td>Property damage, financial loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Baker, Monroe Co. Alliance for Wildlife Protection</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Stability of nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Smiley, NYS Forest Owners Assoc.</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Property damage, decreasing deer population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Krebs, Forest and Deer Damage Action Committee</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Health of deer, deer-car collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dick Elies, Organized Sportsmen</td>
<td>20-50% decrease</td>
<td>Car accidents, ecosystem damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tam VanDenInderman, Resident &amp; Master Gardener</td>
<td>50-75% decrease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Discussion:

a. Short (1-4 years) vs. Long (5-10 years) Term Deer Population Objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce deer population</td>
<td>1. Reduce population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase data gathering</td>
<td>2. Maintain lowered numbers separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Look at parts of DMU 96 separately</td>
<td>3. Look at parts of DMU 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Types of information needed</td>
<td>4. Types of information needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aerial census</td>
<td>5. Aerial census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Habitat impacts</td>
<td>6. Habitat impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Divide DMU 96 into Two Parts:

1. DMU 96-N: All of Irondequoit, everything west of Irondequoit north of Rt. 104
2. DMU 96-S: Rest of unit (primarily south of Rt. 104)

c. Recommended Deer Population Objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Type</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMU 96 Location</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>no change/5% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Case Study: Video Tape - Focus on State Park Deer Management.

4. Deer-Snowning and Public Education:

- DEER-SNOWNING

3. Public Meeting:

2. Announcement:

1. Agenda Items:

- Task Force Summary - 17 March 1992

CITIZEN TASK FORCE DMU 96, GREATER ROCHESTER AREA
Discussion

Appropriate techniques become available.

Information regarding population size was the predicted long-term strategy when

The change involved in local and state regulations also appeared to be

In summer, the deer moved to the Town of Greece, and Larry Myers

community members noted the mass movement is available and agreed to provide the

and were not applicable for reaching the deer population objective. Discussion then


3. Primos for Deer Removal, Short-term DMW 96 North – Larry Myers, NSDEC

2. Guest Speaker – Dr. Phil Robbins, NY Cooperative Fish & Wildlife Research Unit

1. Report on Night 1/7 Meeting.

Announcements: S. Berlin R. Blenis, I. Comer, P. Crafts, T. Foge, D. Hedges, M.

1. Report on Night 1/7 Meeting.

Announcements: S. Berlin, R. Blenis, I. Comer, P. Crafts, T. Foge, D. Hedges, M.

1. Report on Night 1/7 Meeting.

Announcements: S. Berlin, R. Blenis, I. Comer, P. Crafts, T. Foge, D. Hedges, M.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>BENEFITS OR COSTS PER DEER WHO PAYS</th>
<th>HIDDEN COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hunting</td>
<td>License fees</td>
<td>Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passive Management</td>
<td>Venison from Sterilize</td>
<td>Farmer Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trapping</td>
<td>$200 to $800</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fencing or Repellents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reproductive Inhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEC management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supplemental Feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEC management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sharpshooters</td>
<td>$74 to $235</td>
<td>DEC management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The agenda for tonight’s meeting is to review options for suburban deer management and discuss potential recommendations for meeting the short-term goal for the north area of deer management unit (DMU) 96.

Dr. Mike Richmond of Cornell University was a guest speaker on “Options for suburban deer Management.” He followed an informational booklet supplied to Task Force members earlier.

Dr. Richmond began his overview by stating that suburban deer management problems are not uncommon. Members of the Task Force recently read examples of similar experiences. Generally, deer are appreciated early in the people/deer relationship. Then, after a few years, people choose the deer enroch on a desired suburban lifestyle. Experts agree that there currently is no ideal method to deal with deer management situations. It is a complex issue.

**Option 1.** Manage through hunting. This is the only method that literature can point to as part of a viable solution.

**Option 2.** Passive or non-management approach. The benefit here is that the cost is low, but the deer herd may exceed its carrying capacity due to a lack of predators.

**Option 3.** Trap and transfer or kill. The benefit here is that no injury from hunting could occur, which is a concern in a high density area, but the questions that remain are where do you put them?

Trapping and killing the animals would be beneficial if you can find a way to use the meat, but it is difficult to give the meat away in an acceptable form (i.e., without butchering it). The detrimental effects of trapping is that the animals are wild and hard to handle, and the cost is considerable.

**Option 4.** Build fences and use repellents. Barrier fences are preferred over a 5-foot strand electric fence. While fencing at least 8’ tall can protect one’s yard, the problem might leave a lot in total. Fencing at a minimum 8’ tall electronic fence is viewed as ugly, and expensive. Repellents work well when weather conditions are right, but they break down.

Barrier fences and use repellents.
Option 6.
Provide supplemental food to increase the carrying capacity. This effort may be effective for a year, but it would enhance the rate of growth rather than reduce it, creating a larger problem in the long term. Some individuals use this option to save their ornamentals.

Option 7.
A question of using sharpshooters to sterilize deer was raised. Sterilization in this manner is unavailable at this time, primarily due to the absence of a single dose drug. Sharer range shooting would be necessary and it would be difficult to protect (or target) vital areas.

Option 8.
Introduce predators. This is not an option for DMTU 96 because predators would not stay in the area. The largest predator at this time is the car bumper.
Following the options discussion, Larry Myers, DEP, gave an updated report on deer collisions. The Task Force then identified information for a table of the options, their costs/revenues, who pays and hidden costs. Hidden costs for most options included safety, public education, park regulation and administration. The comment was made that the authority to make a decision and the responsibility to pay and implement a decision must be balanced.

The issue of the sport of hunting versus a deer management action to reduce deer was also raised. It must be stressed that they are not hunting for sport.

Local government and legislators should understand that addressing the need for a deer population reduction is not a one time deal and management efforts will need to occur and be evaluated on a regular basis, perhaps annually.

After discussion of the various options the Task Force arrived at a preferable deer management option that all members felt had potential for implementation. The Task Force preferred the use of lowest cost sharp shooters as the quickest, humane, and effective way to reach the short-term goal of reducing the herd in the Inland portion of DMU 96 north where hunting is prohibited. For the long term, reproductive inhibition was preferred when available. The means of measuring the effectiveness in the number of deer-car accidents in the short term, and the quality of the habitat and the herd in the long term.

The Town of Greer which permits archery hunting, constitutes the remainder of DMU 96 north. Archery hunting deer management permits will be increased to meet the need for this unit.
would reflect that solution. If there is a removal possibility, someone will be hurt, it is likely the county

minded in accordance with a particular solution. The solution should be very low in cost and high

options and perspectives. The county would like to see people in the community more

result of 1992 education: an introduction course (which people feel underemphasized)

resolution of the problem includes: government assistance (1), a new county executive (a)

proposed solution. Finding a resolution will be difficult at least. Reasons that have affected

in DWNY 96 North. Particulars, associated with the Cranberry Park, in the Town of

is not unlike our specific options, but some are potentially more achievable.

action. These management problem are considered personnel as a salary issue. The county

enforced for a playground near East County in Hopkinson Park, which should help in solidifying

enforcement options in the regulations last year. The county feels that the deep population

- Tom Foltz - The county administration submits a 20-page report on deep population

cooperation between town, county, and the government, and CTS representation.

Lenny Myers - The problems exist in DWNY 96 North include: (1) nearness to

PANEL MEMBERS COMMENTS:

Cheryl Hoskinson - New Town of Hopkinson, Supervision, was an intimate part of the decision, but it has emerged

effective communication with all affected governmental agencies and citizens in the

result of a resolution may potentially affect

legal aspects surrounding the deep population issue. A resolution may potentially affect

understanding and appreciation for the complexity of environmental, social, political and

for candidate questions. Answers and comments by all participants. The candidate

decrypt problems existing in DWNY 96. The following discussion with CTS members allowed

each of the panel members gave 10 - 15 minute overview of their perspective of the

such a discussion

Town of Hopkinson, Supervisor, was also present as technical advisor. Sam Lapides,

memories: City of Rochester Park, representative, and Gary Persons, Chief of the

The Citizen Task Force (CTF) was made aware of a panel of government

representatives with less to do management in DWNY 96.

The Citizen Task Force Summary - 12 May, 1992

Citizen Task Force DWNY 96 Greater Rochester Area
passed and passed council. Tests and attended orientation meetings should participate.

If the Council does not pass the bill, the bill should be supported. Only members who have
taken a position on the issue are considered. The number and quality of the issues identified are
safety of the Council’s and the City’s health. The number and quality of the issues is the
basis of the Council’s and the City’s health. The number and quality of the issues were

Beway Hameline - Of particular interest to the Town of Digby and the Province was the

assess the forming of a public consensus.

Community health dramatically depends on positions on what to do. The Council needs to
develop and set the community’s health. The decision may not approve the solution if people in the

Even if the Council could arrive at a solution that all inspections could agree was cost-

expenditure is shown instead.

The Council needs to respond to the decision to be handled quickly.

The legal costs to the government in determining the decisions as to which the government has a

individual is high. Especially if someone does a request of action on the decision

Content - Number mentioned that program costs are in issue. However, the costs to

PRELIMINARY TOPICS DISCUSSED:

meeting

- addressing near certainty options that have been agreed to supply to the City at the last

Following the panel presentations, Sandy Baker distributed a handout and graph

- introducing was the recommended near certainty options for the several

Funding for the decisions would be necessary to implement a change in the spectator

- first, the decision would be necessary for maintaining the parks and recreational changes

- afterward with the community since the 1990s for maintaining city parks and recreational changes

- Education - Covenants are a social mechanism. The City of Rochester Parks

- A worthy activity and the Town of Digby would like to continue to be involved.

- The City’s interest in a plan for future development as part of the solution in increase. But other alternatives may be necessary in the future, the

- The City’s interest in a plan for future development as part of the solution in increase. But other alternatives may be necessary in the future, the

- An important factor is that the Town of Digby is interested in developing a policy for developing a policy for developing a

- Higher incidence of near certainty options.

- Similar to pedestrian. Digby is also in the early stages of developing a

- Sandy Ewing - The deep population is growing in Digby and is perceived as a
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deep management discussions.

CTF members listened the panel members and appreciated their openness during the

the town does not consider the deer population to be a major issue.

informed that the town of Fond du lac was an exception, and were concerned

leaders should set policies and provide clear leadership. The task force was very

come from Fond du lac, where the problem is more acute. Others indicated all community

dear problem in the town of Fond du lac. Some people believe the task force should

A question arose concerning local government leadership in proposing a solution to the

Government decision-makers

in a way that emergency action is real or proposed. Public perception influence

be taken into account when the CTF develops recommendations. Whether the fear of false

Public perceptions about the safety of recreational bow hunting or sharps shooters must

then recommendations made by the CTF could be implemented.

decision, and government officials are willing to take action. Some negative public reactions

decision makers need to make a specific decision about a particular course of action. Public education is

feasibility of options - A lot of "what if" questions were discussed, including the

because this is a multiple number

number of deer-removals for DNR 90 recommendations by the CTF is based on car kills

less frequently than deer-car collisions. The larger

that deer-hunting accidents occur less frequently than deer-car collisions. The larger

if no action is taken to resolve the issue, then management of the deer herd

population exists, whether it's damage to personal property or increased insurance

Deer-Car Accidents and Coasts - Coasts associated with maintaining a high deer
Dear Mr. Myers,

I'm writing to follow up on our conversation about the Task Force on Extension and Development. As you know, the Task Force has been working on several key recommendations that will guide our efforts in the coming months.

Firstly, I wanted to confirm that we have made progress on the recommendations related to the strategic goals. The Task Force has identified several areas for improvement, including:

1. Increasing engagement with external partners
2. Enhancing programmatic offerings
3. Improving communication and collaboration across the organization

The Task Force has been working on these recommendations for the past few months, and we believe we are on track to implement them by the end of the fiscal year. I would be happy to provide you with a detailed report on our progress.

Secondly, I wanted to update you on the status of the budget request for the next fiscal year. Our team has been working closely with the finance department to ensure that our budget request aligns with the strategic goals of the organization. We have submitted our budget request to the executive committee, and we are awaiting their feedback.

Finally, I wanted to thank you for your continued support of the Task Force. Your guidance and input have been invaluable, and we appreciate your commitment to the success of our organization.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

CC: L. Myers, NSDEC
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[Your Name]
Citizen Task Force
Facilitation, DMV 96
Extension Associate and
Paul D. Curtis, Ph.D.

Sincerely,

Thanks again for all your efforts -- I'll see you in late August.

I recognize the local political support needed to carry through with the recommendations. Organizational leaders in early September, the DEC public involvement plan should help
the August meeting. I would like to discuss final copies of key government and
within the Greater Rochester community. We can discuss any additional changes at
our
I hope you will be satisfied with the final recommendations and give them full support.

Sincerely,

I have completed revisions to the draft Task Force Recommendations, and am sending

Dear (CIT member),

3 August, 1992
6. Adjourn 9:30 pm

5. Other Activities - P. Crites

4. DEC Public Involvement Plan for DMV 96 - J. Rockwell

3. Break

2. Review Final DMV 96 CTP Recommendations for NYSDOC,

1. Meetings with Town & County Government since 23 June - I. Myers

Agenda Items:

- Monroe County CCE Office, 249 Highland Ave.
- Meeting #7 Agenda - 27 August 1992, 7:00-9:30 pm
- Citizen Task Force, Greater Rochester Area

NYSDER MANAGEMENT UNIT 96
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Citizen Task Force
Prechaum, DVM 96
Assistant Extension and
Paul D. Curtis, Ph.D.

Sincerely,

Communications, please note that we have developed an agenda that includes a tour of the facilities and a meeting with the team. I have attached the agenda for your review.

Several NYSDEC members expressed interest in attending the tour. Please let me know if you have any questions.

I look forward to seeing you on September 16th.

Sincerely,

Deborah T. Rockwell, NYSDEC

cc: L. Meyers, NYSDEC

I, September, 1992
Peter Bush

Peter Bush, Moderator

Rick Blums

Close of Conference

Questions from the Press

Task Force Remarks

Lynn Metcalf

Introduction Rick Blums, Task Force

Further Task Force Remarks

DEC Remarks

Introduce Larry Myers

Beach Stack, Assistant

Facilities Planning and

Economics Council Coordinator, etc.

Peter Bush

Opening Remarks

2:15 pm Sep. 4, 1992

Dundrum Est. Park

Press Conference Agenda

Dear Management Unit #109 Citizen Task Force
Appendix C

Questionnaire 1
Thank you for your assistance!

Confidential and will never be associated with your name.

Please complete the questionnaire at your leisure.

The state of New York provided this study to help improve the deer harvest.

We would like to learn about your hunting experiences. On deer, deer population

This questionnaire is part of a study to assist the New York

Commer University
Agricultural and Life Sciences
New York State College of
in the Department of Natural Resources

Human Subjects Assurance

Research conducted by the

Task Force Members

DMV 96 Citizen

A Survey of
Preparing for the task force meetings...

5. What additional information, if any, would assist you in...

- In these areas...
- Participation in the task force...
- Citizen involvement in deer management decisions...
- Determining deer populations...
- Department of Environmental Conservation's methods for...
- Management policy and procedures...
- Department of Environmental Conservation's deer...
- Factors to consider in deer management...
- Deer biology...

(Complete one that applies)

In which of the following areas have these materials helped...

- Increase your knowledge?
- [ ] All that apply?

4.

3.

2.

1.

The materials about deer and deer management were...

- Easy to read...
- Interesting...
- Boring...
- Unused...
- Ununderstandable...
- Incomplete...
- Complete...

It appears this person thinks the programs are slightly...

Example: Televising programs about will ile are...

In the number between the two words which most closely...
Programs.

DEEC has excellent information

area is not selective.

DEEC’s estimate of the local

license and permit sales.

then it is about money from

the welfare of the deer herd.

DEEC is more concerned about

DEEC are biologically sound.

DEER management policies of

my area.

DEEC policies are well

the public.

management programs to

DEEC has not made an adequate

decision for setting a

DEC should make the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rate how well you think DEC manages deer in your area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Please estimate the number of days you spent in or near the deer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population in the state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Please list what you perceive are some of the DEC's strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and weaknesses concerning management of the deer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Are you a member of an organization that is interested in deer management?
   - Yes
   - No

17. In what ways have you made your opinions known? (check [ ])
   - Signed a petition relating to deer or a deer management issue.
   - Voted for or against a political candidate primarily because of his/her views on deer or deer management issues.
   - Contacted my State Senator or Assemblyman.
   - Contacted a DEC Wildlife Biologist or other DEC employee.
   - Donated money to a political lobbying group that supports my views.
   - Written letters to the editor to be printed in an area newspaper or magazine.
   - Inquired my political input.
   - Joined a conservation or environmental organization to tell them my input.

18. What is your occupation?
   - Other

19. Do any members of your immediate family hunt deer?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

20. If you hunted deer in 1991, did you hunt in deer management unit 56 located primarily in Monroe County?
   - Yes
   - No
Thank you for your cooperation. Please refrain from using any proprietary information or copyrighted materials.

Other special interests related to deer (please specify):
- Type of agriculture:
- Comprised of feeding deer hunters
- Enjoy feeding deer near my residence
- Please fruits and vegetables for my household
- Own ornamental shrubs around my home
- Drive a car or truck

Characteristics (check all that apply to you):
- Occupation or interest in deer hunting
- Affected by the size of the deer herd
- Whose activities affect the deer population

20. Listed below are descriptions of ways in which people might be affected by the size of the deer herd. Whose activities affect the deer population?

- City or town with a population of 100,000 people or more
- City or town with a population of 25,000 to 100,000 people
- Village or small city with a population of 6,000 people
- Village or small city with a population of 2,500 people
- Rural—not a farm
- Rural—farm

19. When the following best describes the population of the

- (a) between the ages of 6 and 16
- (b) between the ages of 17 and 64
- (c) over age 65
- (d) one item in column "a" and one item in column "b"
Appendix D

Questionnaire 2
THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

Task Force of this evaluation, please call Bodey Smith at (607) 255-2628.

We appreciate your continued assistance and patience in helping us evaluate the Citizen Task Force process. Your commitment is important to the future of effective deer management in New York.

Your answers may have changed as a result of participating in the task force. To answer the questions again, because in some instances you may have changed your mind. This is important as we consider changes to the questionnaires.

Your assistance is needed so the task force process may be evaluated and improved. Your feedback is crucial for the future of deer population objectives for DMU 96 and the future of deer population objectives for DMU 96.

Research conducted by the Human Dimensions Research Unit in the Department of Natural Resources.

DMU 96 Citizen

Follow-up Survey of
CONTINUE WITH QUESTION (3) 

Obtain comments? (Check [ ] one) 

Yes—W.P. from approximately how many people did you obtain comments from people living in the DMI as input to the task force? 

No (skip to question 5) 

Please answer the following questions related to the Citizen Task Force:

1. From your experience as a task force member, please indicate or suggest feelings or decisions that were input to the task force. 

2. Did you obtain comments about getting a deer population level clean and garden damage  

3. Have we considered the number of deer present in the DMI? To each of the following question, indicate how important you think it is for you to understand the role of the deer in the task force. 

4. Do you think the opinions expressed by the people you thought everyone I contacted had a different opinion. 

5. There were two or more minority opinions among the people I contacted. 

6. A majority of the people I contacted shared a similar opinion. 

7. All of the people I contacted shared a similar opinion. 

8. How similar were the opinions of the people from whom you obtained comments? 

CONDUCTED? 

A minimum of how many additional people need to be contacted? 

More stakeholders in the DMI. 

The people I contacted were adequately represented by your stakeholder group. To adequately represent your stakeholder group, you think more people in the DMI should have been contacted. 

A minority of the people I contacted shared a similar opinion. 

A majority of the people I contacted shared a similar opinion. 

All of the people I contacted shared a similar opinion. 

3. How similar were the opinions of the people from whom you obtained comments? 

4. Do you think the opinions expressed by the people you thought everyone I contacted had a different opinion. 

5. There were two or more minority opinions among the people I contacted. 

6. A majority of the people I contacted shared a similar opinion. 

7. All of the people I contacted shared a similar opinion. 

8. How similar were the opinions of the people from whom you obtained comments?
100 points total

cause
Provide deer a place to live despite problems they may face

cause
Provide revenue for businesses from recreation and tourism

cause
Provide recreation opportunities for hunters

cause
Reduce economic losses to farmers from deer damage to crops and orchards

cause
Reduce deer damage to homeowners' shrubbery and gardens

cause
Reduce the risk of Lyme disease

cause
Reduce the risk of deer-car accidents

cause
Reduce starvation of deer during the winter

8. As a result of participating in the task force, did your opinion change about the deer population in your DNR area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Were there any particular feelings about deer in my DNR, nuisance,
| | |
| no particular feelings about deer in my DNR | |
| do not enjoy the presence of deer | |
| enjoy the presence of deer | |

10. Generally, how do you personally feel about the deer in your DNR? (Check [ ] one)
| do not enjoy the presence of deer AND do not worry about problems | |
| enjoy the presence of deer AND do not worry about problems | |
| enjoy the presence of deer BUT worry about problems | |
| [ ] | |

6. During the task force meetings, many records were collected and reviewed. How important are the records below to the people involved?

| | |
| --- | |
| [ ] | |

7. [ ] Represented at the task force meetings

6. Were the DEC Wildlife Biologist's attitude to the interests you represent?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEC is interested in minimizing negative impacts of deer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC is interested in managing deer population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many deer management decisions are made by DEC despite the views of local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC personnel in my area are not visible enough for me to know about their work with deer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC personnel in my area are not visible enough for me to understand their role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC has excellent information programs for planning deer management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC's estimate of the local deer population level in my area is not accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC is more concerned about the local deer license and permit sales than it is about money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC is more concerned about the local deer license and permit sales than it is about money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC needs to listen more to the needs and concerns of nonhunting interests in the deer herd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC needs to listen more to the needs and concerns of nonhunting interests in the deer herd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC's current policies are well explained to manage deer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC's current policies are well explained to manage deer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC's current policies are well explained to manage deer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC should make the public aware of deer management programs to explain its deer population objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC should make the public aware of deer management programs to explain its deer population objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens should have the right to review decisions for deer population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens should have the right to review decisions for deer population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC needs to listen more to the needs and concerns of nonhunting interests in the deer herd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC needs to listen more to the needs and concerns of nonhunting interests in the deer herd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC needs to listen more to the needs and concerns of nonhunting interests in the deer herd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEC's management of DE in your area</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interests involved in DE decision-making</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task force approach as a way to get people involved</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Your Impressions About the Task Force Meetings**

1. Based on your experience as a task force member, please assess the following: (circle one response for each statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer another method (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in the DEU should be surveyed more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE decision-making should be based on a few people's views about DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE decision-making should be based on a few people's views about DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE decision-making should be based on a few people's views about DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE decision-making should be based on a few people's views about DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Appraisals for the Task Force Member**

10. Considering your experience as a task force member, the following statement is agreed upon by the letter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE decision-making should be based on a few people's views about DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE decision-making should be based on a few people's views about DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE decision-making should be based on a few people's views about DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE decision-making should be based on a few people's views about DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Willingness to Cooperate**

The common cooperative extension task force organizes and coordinates meetings.

SD A U D SD
1.3. Has the task force process (up to the point that the task force
recommended a deep population level) been satisfactory to

You?

Yes
No

The citizen task force approach

Most participants were

dissatisfied with the task

process.

A consensus was reached for aiming at a

length of discussion were

The number of meetings and

would have recommended

of people living in the DMU

did not meet the majority

The task force's recommendation

others

in terms of the expense of

blamed the wrong people

The task force by design was

at the task force meetings,

advice was well represented

by deep population

The viewpoints of people most

were decided by

about a deep population objective

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Undecided
Agree
Strongly Agree
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY.

TO RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, place it in the return envelope and deposit it in any mailbox. Return postage has been provided.

In the space below, please write 16. If you would like to make any additional comments, please write
DMU 96 Citizen Task Force Members

A Follow-up Questionnaire of
Thanks in advance for your input.

Dear Task Force,

You are welcome to endorse additional pages for your comments. Please take a few moments to answer the following questions, then mail the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. This is the last contact I expect to have with you regarding the DMV 96 task force.

Please feel free to make comments in the margins of the back pages. The questionnaire is not intended to express your opinions to me about the Task Force's work. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me. This questionnaire is intended to provide input to the Task Force's recommendations at the press conference in August. Once more, I would like to find out what you think about the DMV 96 Citizen Task Force.

Member:

Buck
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1. What is your opinion about the information (e.g., research articles, input from technical advisers) presented to the DMU 95 Citizen Task Force? Please circle one of five word choices about the amount of information (all, most, half, some or none).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information presented to the DMU 95 Task Force:</th>
<th>Amount of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. DMU 95 Task Force was fair and unbiased.</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. DMU 95 Task Force supported the views of DEC.</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DMU 95 Task Force supported the views of a</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person to understand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DMU 95 Task Force was too complex for the average person to understand.</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. DMU 95 Task Force was more than I had time to read between meetings.</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. DMU 95 Task Force was familiar to me before participating on the task force.</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. DMU 95 Task Force helped improve my understanding about deer and deer management.</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. DMU 95 Task Force was relevant for making recommendations about deer management.</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How sufficient was the information presented at the meetings in helping you understand the technical aspects of deer management? (Check one.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely sufficient</th>
<th>Moderately sufficient</th>
<th>Somewhat sufficient</th>
<th>Not at all sufficient</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3. We would like to understand how being a member of the task force from January-August, 1992 has affected the way you view deer management in DMU 96. Recall how you viewed deer management issues in DMU 96 before participating on the task force. Compare this with how you view deer management issues after participating on the task force. (Place a 'T' for true or 'F' for false in each blank to indicate whether or not the statement was true before or after you participated on the task force.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before participating on the task force</th>
<th>After participating on the task force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of deer management issues in DMU 96.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in learning about deer management issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believed that something needed to be done to resolve deer management issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formed ideas about how deer management issues might be resolved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware that alternative management plans existed to resolve deer management issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the consequences of implementing alternative management plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to influence policy makers about deer management issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept informed about the alternative deer management proposals that policy makers discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed the reactions of people in DMU 96 who were affected by alternative deer management plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. For what reasons (s) did you choose to define consensus as the item you checked in question 6 above? (Please explain what type of method you have in mind)

| I suggest using a method other than consensus (as defined in the options above) to reach agreements on a task force. (please explain what type of method you have in mind) |

To achieve consensus, all members must agree with the recommendation.

Gate was deemed at the DMU 96 task force.

To achieve consensus, all but one member need to agree with a recommendation.

60% needs to agree with the recommendation.

To achieve consensus, the majority of members agreeing on a task force (more than 60%).

5. Reaching an agreement by consensus can be defined in many ways. Which of the following statements describes the best way for a task force to define consensus in reaching a decision about the deer herd? (check one)

Another format should have been used (please explain):

To chairperson, or to ask a third-party facilitator.

Task force members should set the ground rules and decide whether a member

Ground rules of the meeting.

With assistance from a third-party facilitator, task force members should set the

rule for the task force meetings, as was used in DMU 96.

A third-party facilitator, like Cornell Cooperative Extension, should set the ground

options would you have preferred? (check one)

If you had a choice for organizing the task force meetings, which of the following:

The DMU 96 Citizen Task Force was initiated by DEC and Cornell Cooperative Extension. Primarily the facilitator set the ground rules for the task force meetings.
7. What are your opinions about the fairness and efficiency of the task force? Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the letters that best reflect your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Members of the task force were selected in a way that:</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Everyone on the task force was given the opportunity to express his or her viewpoint.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Some task force members were overly influenced by other members' opinions.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The task force was responsive to those people who were most affected by the recommendation.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. All task force members were given a chance to be involved in decisions.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Members would have benefited from extending the task force by one or two meetings.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The viewpoints of people most affected by deer population decisions were well represented at the task force meetings.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h. My stakeholder interest may have been better served if the task force
had decided on its own instead of participating in the "gameplan"
with decision makers.

i. The release of task force recommendations coincided with deadlines for government
decision makers.

j. The task force used poor judgment in making its recommendations.

k. The recommendations were unrealistic in light of the social and political context within DMU 96.

m. The task force should be reconstituted next year to gather additional data.

n. I would be willing to renege on previous commitments if something goes wrong.

o. The results from the task force recommendations are better than others.

p. ...some people gained more than others.

q. ...everyone gained something.

r. The task force recommendations were decided fairly.

s. The citizen task force approach should continue to be used in the future for
dealing with management decisions.
8. Based on your experience as a task force member, how would you rate the task force approach? (Circle one word choice for each statement.)

   poor  very good  excellent
   fair  good

...to get people with a variety of interests involved in deer management decision making?
...to resolve deer management issues in suburban environments?
...for citizens to make well-informed recommendations?

9. Do you think the task force approach needs to be improved?

   Yes
   No
To what degree do each of the statements listed below reflect the outcomes from the DMU 96 Citizen Task Force? Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the letters that best reflect your opinion.

**THE TASK FORCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Achieved consensus among diverse interests in the community.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Built positive relationships among diverse interests in the community.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Widened the &quot;communications gap&quot; between diverse interests in the community.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Caused state and local government officials to listen more to people's opinions about deer.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Caused state and local government officials to make hasty decisions about the future of the deer herd.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Educated members about deer and deer management.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Educated the public about deer and deer management.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What other outcomes occurred that were not listed above? (Please explain.)

12. What do you believe is the single most important outcome of the DMU 96 Citizen Task Force?
15. Do you believe some interests were left out of the DMU 96 Citizen Task Force?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at any time before, during or after the Meeting 1, the last task force meeting</th>
<th>After Meeting 1, the last task force meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management techniques in deer</td>
<td>Management techniques in deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2 when agreeing on deer</td>
<td>Meeting 4-6 when discussing deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population objectives</td>
<td>Population objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 6 when agreeing on deer</td>
<td>Meeting 7-2 when discussing deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the first meeting</td>
<td>Meetings of Citizen Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of Citizen Task Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, at what point during the process should the following interests be brought into the task force? (You may check more than one box for each interest.)

- Disagree

14. How might more public input be incorporated into the task force approach?

- Agree

13. One possible criticism of the task force approach was the lack of input from people in the community, do you agree or disagree with this criticism?

- Disagree
As part of this study, we hope to identify any communications that took place related to informing others about the task force.

16. Were members of your organization(s) informed about the task force?

17. Did you communicate individually with people about the task force, other than through a newsletter, press release, or other method.

18. Were you interviewed by the media (either by a newspaper, magazine, television, or radio report) about the task force?
Thank you for your input.

Other comments you wish to make. Please use the space below or attach additional pages to the questionnaire for any

NO □

YES—If yes, please describe the deer-related event:

Participated or attended since the first task force meeting on January 13, 1992?

Besides the task force, are there any additional deer-related events in which you

NO □

Participated. If yes, please describe other communication activities in which you

Publicized, or in any other way communicated about the task force to the
general public?

Did you voice your opinion at local government meetings, write letters to the

19.
Appendix F

Results from Telephone Interview #1
Summary of Comments About Meeting 1

DMU 96 FEEDBACK FROM TASK FORCE MEMBERS
been conducted in a place with this much sentiment and emotion. (n=1)

The emptiness about the worthiness of the 10 pieces of paper we should rely--

public. (n=1)

identity reasonable solutions and agree to a solution but it may not sell to the
areas of the state, but it will not work, there. DEC and the task force may

no idea about what to base our position. (n=1)

We still have no idea how many are in the DML, and have

specific number of deep in the DML 96 deep population. (n=1)

DEC does not survey the deep population, and does not know the

Lack of data about the size of the deep population in DML 96 (n=2)

not represent the majority either. (n=1)

Adding an animal to wildlife habitat will not change the task force--they do

one more person to the task force will not change the representation.

the community do not think but we do to see deep in the parks. Adding

the problems we are concerned, the majority of members were concerned

The task force was struck. The majority of members were concerned

(n=1)

The lack force may be a problem here. The lack force needs a where

representation of anti-management and anti-hunting. More people have

This is not equally least impressive. But in my opinion, a lack of

The lack force lacks representation from a group that I know of that is

Lack of representation of all interests on the task force (n=3)

Nothing was least impressive. (n=5)

 Least impressive

as a rule. (n=1)

members in their feelings concerning managing deep and using hunting

Only one group had a difference of opinion with the other task force

the number of people from crowd that were members (n=1)

Composition of the task force (n=2)
How do you feel about the presentations? Did you learn anything new?

(a) presentations
Very good (n=4), well done (n=3), good (n=1), fairly good (n=1)

The speakers were articulate and knowledgeable. (n=1)
No speakers presented the redefining characteristics of deer, all the information was against deer—the only good thing about deer was killing and eating them. (n=1)

DEC’s presentation needed to pertain to the suburban deer herd in DMU 96; for example, starving deer may be present in the Adirondacks, but this has nothing to do with deer in our area—was DEC being manipulative in presenting information about starvation or was it just innocent? (n=1)

DEC’s presentation was the weakest—he focused on only one park instead of the charge of the task force, which was to consider all the parks in DMU 96. (n=1)

The presentation by the Health Department was of marginal interest to the task force. (n=1)

(b) learning new information

Nothing new—I knew previously about deer and deer management. (n=5)

Some information was redundant, but was necessary for background, nothing was exciting. (n=1)

I learned some specific statistics, but most was not new. (n=1)

I was not familiar with the issue before attending the task force. (n=1)

Specific numbers of and increase in deer-car accidents in Monroe County. (n=3)

October/November/December months are peak time for deer car accidents. (n=1)

The Monroe Co. Sheriff’s Department uses deer whistles. (n=1)
We need data about the size of the deer population. At the first meeting, we learned

(1) I would like more information about rape and transfer of deer.

(2) The question is, is the problem that there are too many deer in DNLG 96.5 or is it
about the high number of deer and accidents and that people are concerned about

We need data about the size of the deer population. At the first meeting, we learned

(1) I would like more information about rape and transfer of deer.

(2) The question is, is the problem that there are too many deer in DNLG 96.5 or is it
about the high number of deer and accidents and that people are concerned about

We need data about the size of the deer population. At the first meeting, we learned

(1) I would like more information about rape and transfer of deer.

(2) The question is, is the problem that there are too many deer in DNLG 96.5 or is it
about the high number of deer and accidents and that people are concerned about

We need data about the size of the deer population. At the first meeting, we learned

(1) I would like more information about rape and transfer of deer.

(2) The question is, is the problem that there are too many deer in DNLG 96.5 or is it
about the high number of deer and accidents and that people are concerned about

We need data about the size of the deer population. At the first meeting, we learned

(1) I would like more information about rape and transfer of deer.

(2) The question is, is the problem that there are too many deer in DNLG 96.5 or is it
about the high number of deer and accidents and that people are concerned about
A part of me suspects the decision to bow hunt has already been made by DEC. (u=1)

DEC is getting some positive feedback from implementing the task force process. I think for input through a newsletter: (u=1)

I will hold out the assignment sheets to anyone I come across, and ask my constituents this DWU is unique in that much of the DWU does not allow hunting. (u=1)

The newspaper had a nice write-up about the task force. (u=1)

Additional Comments and Observations:

Some type of government representation is needed on the task force. (u=1)

We need more scientific information at the first meeting about deer in general, e.g.

Becky Stolz and Barbara Knuth, Evaluators

Prepared by
Appendix G

List of Affiliation of Technical Advisors and Speakers

Participating in the CTF Meetings

and Distributed Information
Town of Irondequoit Supervisor

Town of Greece Police Officer

Town of Brighton Supervisor

New York Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Cornell University, Ithaca

Monroe County Sheriff's Department

Monroe County Legislature Chair

Monroe County Department of Parks

Monroe County Department of Health

Immunocommunication Scientist, Eastern Montana College

Conservation, Citizen Participation Specialist, Regional Director, Avon Division of Fish and Wildlife, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, University, Ithaca

Department of Natural Resources, Human Dimensions Research Unit, Cornell

Cornell Cooperative Extension, Ithaca

City of Rochester Parks Representative

and Bureau chief

Regional and Central Office Wildlife Staff, Supervisor, Managers and Biologists,

Bureau of Wildlife, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation,

LIST OF AFFILIATION OF TECHNICAL ADVISORS AND SPEAKERS
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Vehicle-killed deer report tags for towns in ONY 992. (Table.)

Number of complaints in which a permit was issued, not including deer struck by vehicle-killed deer report tags for towns in ONY 992. (Table.)

Potential generation of white-tailed deer.

Several generations: C. M. and Rosalind Gottlieb. 1999. Diagram of the reproductive


Focus on deer management. 1999 update. Albany, NY.


dates and regulations.

New York State. 1999. Big Game Hunting. New York State Department of

Environmental Conservation. Guide with license information, season,

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 1999. A survey of

deer hunters in New York State. (Brochure). Albany, NY.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 1990. New York’s

deer management program. (Brochure). Albany, NY.


1990. (Table.)

Bureau of Wildlife, 1991. 1990 deer take by county and town. (Brochure.)


1990. (Table.)

DISTRIBUTED INFORMATION
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Meeting 3:


Meeting 2:

Ithaca, NY.

Meeting: A summary of task force participants. Cornell University:


Monroe County Parks, Rochester, NY.

Department of Health, Rochester, NY.


Meeting 1:

Results from Telephone Interview #2

APPENDIX H

INDEX
The stakeholders interests on the task force are not a balanced representation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Interests</th>
<th>Task Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some interests were underrepresented</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some interests were overrepresented</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The animal lovers were overrepresented, although there is only one on the task force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recommendation to divide the DHW into 2 units may resolve the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not wish to elaborate at this point</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I do not wish to elaborate at this point | (n=2) |
- Some interests were overrepresented | (n=4) |
- Hunters | was compatible with the representation | (n=1) |
- The task force was somewhat divided between endowment's residents and the bigger issue | (n=1) |
- The task force was somewhat divided on the ideological issue, but it is one of the biggest issues | (n=1) |
- I think the task force was evenly distributed between endowment's residents and some | |
- The representation of Interests and concerns were fair and reasonable | |
- I think that some Interests and concerns were overrepresented or underrepresented | (n=3) |
- Do you think that some Interests and concerns were overrepresented or underrepresented, or that some Interests and concerns were not represented at all | (n=1) |

The task force was divided on the ideological issue, but it is one of the biggest issues. I think the task force was evenly distributed between endowment's residents and some hunters. The representation of Interests and concerns were fair and reasonable. I think that some Interests and concerns were overrepresented or underrepresented, or that some Interests and concerns were not represented at all.
### Do you feel the interests and concerns you represented at the task force meeting were fairly considered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes (n=7)</th>
<th>No (n=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Paul wants more because he pushed for a small percent of decline in the deer population. (n=1)

### Everyone listened to my presentation and was attentive, but I don't know if my concerns were fairly considered. (n=1)

### What modifications, if any, would you recommend for this meeting or the next meeting? (n=1)

| No modifications are necessary for this meeting or the next meeting. (n=2) |

### At the next meeting, we need to continue discussing some interesting information that had been kept from us until nearly the end of the meeting. We are approaching this problem from the wrong end. The facts and figures about how many acres of land suitable for deer and the number of deer supported per acre of land quantify evidence that was slippage into the discussion as an aside. We need to pursue this at the next meeting. (n=1) |

---

**Rules and Guidelines (n=2)**

Clearer guidelines need to be given to task force members for collecting responses from the public. Reports of findings from the task force members had nothing in common. It was difficult to compare the findings, like comparing apples and oranges. For example, one member may have collected 100 responses, another talked to 3 people who did not understand what he/she was representing.
The representation of forest owners on the task force needs to be reconsidered. Many forest owners live in DMU 96, but their property is outside the unit. Perhaps the forest owner on the task force could be a representative in another unit. Or he could stay with the DMU 96 task force, and learn and listen to task force discussions. I don't know how task force members were selected to serve for this unit. (n=1)

More clarification is needed on the rules for attending the task force, and those rules should be followed. For instance, I understand members would NOT be allowed to send a substitute if unable to attend a meeting. (n=1)

Reaching a Consensus (n=3)

More clarification is needed about what "operating by consensus" means. We talked about several issues, but there was no attempt to reach a consensus. The facilitator needs to "police" the members more frequently to see how close we are to reaching an agreement. (n=1)

We need some incentive for people to make a decision. The meeting in general is going very well considering the factions involved. (n=1)

Some people were more vocal than others. [Paul] needs to go around the room and let more people get involved in the discussion or finalize a decision. (n=1)

Outcomes from the Process (n=4)

Because this is a very political issue, ultimately it will take some educational effort to inform people about the deer population. No one likes the prospect of starving deer, even if they are eating us out of house and home. (n=1)

This is a different unit than most. The problem is DEC has its hands tied and can do nothing because of county ordinances, i.e., Irondequoit doesn't allow archery hunting. But we have got to try. (n=1)

The hang-up with this process is, what's going to come out of this work? The question was asked at the meeting, but I don't think it was answered adequately. The politics involved in this issue are complex, and the issue has been talked about for years. Is there anything of value that is going to result from this, especially in the Irondequoit situation? (n=1)

We don't know what action DEC will take from this, and I am concerned because we may recommend an unconventional recommendation. (n=1)
As a British prime minister once said, "there are lies, damn lies, and statistics." We can statistic this to death but we need to bite the bullet and make a recommendation. We know that deer are overpopulated in this area. (n=1)

Everyone is waiting for information from the deer count by helicopter, but I don't think the court will take place this spring. It must snow at least 4 inches and it's too late in the year for much snow (snowfall improves visibility for spotting the deer). (n=1)

The issues of reducing the deer herd versus the target deer population hung up the process. Task force members could not make an informed decision because they don't know the implications of reducing the deer population. (n=1)

It struck me that there was much discussion about how to manage deer, the statistical approaches, etc., when in fact the statistical data hasn't been proven. The meeting should be less technical. The population size of the deer herd on reducing the actual number of deer-car accidents—none of this is proven. We need to focus on this is what we hope to do and how to do it instead of the statistics to support an argument. (n=1)

Paul is doing a good job on the consensus process. (n=1)

I am being mailed some information from a nonprofit organization that used tranquilizers to kill deer on the spot. Yet the meat is edible for donating to the poor and needy. The tranquilizing solution undergoes an enzyme decomposition within 6 hours of injection that makes the meat edible. (n=1)

I have been to deer meetings for so many years that this is old hat. (n=1)

It was a very lively meeting, and some things said made sense. (n=1)
Results from Telephone Interview #3

APPENDIX I
Disappointed that the attendance has dropped. (n=1)

Nothing is least impressive. (n=3)

Least impressive:

The task force is reaching an intelligent decision and is a worthwhile activity. (n=1)

I think we are reaching a reasonable decision, not a lot of rhetoric. (n=1)

The consensus process worked pretty well with the mix of different interests. (n=1)

The task force is reaching an intelligent decision and is a worthwhile activity. (n=1)

Impressed that some people who preferred their remarks with not wanting any disagreement but in a friendly manner. (n=1)

Remembered and open-minded about clear and deep management. The group can
dear like we coming around to the group. I think these people are being
impressed that some people who preferred their remarks with not wanting any
disagreement but in a friendly manner. (n=1)

Paul as a facilitator and how he has worked with a consensus model. (n=1)

Reaching a consensus and bringing about a decision from the group. (n=1)

How Paul is able (in his own quiet way) to move the task force toward in

Surprised that the task force could change people's minds about wildlife

Most impressive:

The task force process.

So far, what have been the most impressive and least impressive aspects of the

Response to the question:

The task force process. The tasks of the task force members, because some members provided more than one
total number of task force members, because some members provided more than one
tasks. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
tasks. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
described below. The total number of responses for each question may be greater than the
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I don't have a clear understanding about what type of commitment the government organizations (DEC and town governments) will have for carrying out the process. (n=1)

The amount of time it takes to move the process along. It requires many meetings to make small steps. (n=1)

The task force members appeared to have a biased perspective that will not change. For instance, if they have an agriculture background, their perspective about deer from an agriculture viewpoint is not going to change.

Presentation by Mike Richmond from Cornell University about deer management options.

If, on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 is very fair and balanced and 5 is very unfair and unbalanced, how would you rate the following aspects of the last meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rating</th>
<th># respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion by task force members at the meeting.

Written materials distributed at the meeting and between meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rating</th>
<th># respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How could the presentation, discussion by task force members or written materials be improved?

No suggestions (n=1)

Presentation:

The presentation could have been more formal. It would have been better if the presenter would have used some visual aids. The presenter just talked off-the-cuff. (n=1)
and finding out if they actually will accept the recommendation and take action. (n=1)

What may or may not be impressive is the next meeting with the government officials.

Open to creative solutions. (n=1)

DEC has not taken the lead for particular options. DEC will be faced with similar

There is a need for more creativity to address the issue. (n=1)

Process. (n=1)

Legislators ask task force members so that they would have some ownership into the

If task forces are formed in other locations in the state, I would suggest adding

A different viewpoint. (n=1)

The DEC people are real nice, I now read the Consensus/Consent Magazines from a

Additional Comments:

The materials are of good quality, but the information is biased. (n=1)

Wouldn't have the problem that we currently have. (n=1)

The materials are biased toward hunting as the solution to the problem. (n=1)

The materials are the most current information. (n=1)

The materials need to be updated. For instance, the 4-page article from 1988

The material options was a little out-of-date when discussing fertility controls. (n=1)

The data about conservation needs to be updated. The part about deer

We had received it before the meeting. (n=1)

The materials are very timely, and should be distributed before the meetings.

Materials:

People on the task force are open-minded. (n=1)

People are coming into the task force process with a preconceived idea about

The only weakness is the possible exclusion of environmental activists and

Task force discussion:
Please change the references to something other than doghouses. (n=1)

This last meeting was the best meeting that I have attended. (n=1)

Helicopter count (n=1)

Task force brought into the idea that there were more deer than indicated by the helicopter counts by comparing the data. The number of deer hit by cars. The members are more open than DEC. DEC decided what the expert said about the park. The task force has not solely focused on hunting. Task force is interested in habitat and endorsed DEC's decision. DEC would like hunting in the area to undergo some and endorsed DEC's decision. DEC included in an unbiased way. We need up-to-date information that is presented in an unbiased way. We just need information that is presented in an unbiased way. (n=1)

Process (n=1)

Interesting is me that we might be excluding people who would want input into the process. It would be disastrous by the media as the process is going on. Media happens when issues are debated piece meal in the paper. Or if the small aspects of media happens, I think this is a positive aspect of the task force. Instead of what I have a question. What is the media internationally excluded from this process? Don't
DEC will continue to meet with government officials in DWI 96 responsible for implementing a Deer Management Action in the Town of Fond du Lac.

1. Local Government and Task Force Support Efforts

A. Local Government and Task Force Support Efforts

DEP COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES

Other individuals and groups with general interest

Local Government officials

The residents and landowners in DWI 96 directly affected by the current deer population.

are directly affected or concerned about deer management in DWI 96.

The membership of organizations and interest groups by Task Force members who

are directly affected or concerned about deer management in DWI 96.

The primary publics interested include:

Public Identification

To keep the media, elected officials, and concerned citizens informed.

To provide education and information on local deer management issues.

Communication Objectives

To continue collaboration with and flexibility of local governments.

Communication Goals

To build support of the Task Force members and the community for the Task Force.

Problem Goals

To provide DEC with deer population objectives for DWI 96, and to foster action to resolve

the following plan is a strategy of action for DEC and the Task Force in a combined effort to meet

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

DWI 96

For Review and Comment by the Citizen Task Force

DEP PROPOSED DRAFT

July 23, 1992
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By Government officials:

A. Officially present their recommendations to the press;

2. DEC will arrange a press conference with the Task Force.

1. DEC will provide written materials and plans public and media events in accordance with a higher visibility of the Task Force, their recommendations, and their role in the deer management process.

C. Encourage high visibility of the Task Force and their recommendations:

4. DEC will hold an informational workshop on the Task Force on their recommendations which will include a presentation by the Task Force on their recommendations;

3. DEC will update the Task Force on their recommendations and continue their key messages in the community.

2. DEC officials encourage Task Force members to invite DEC staff to their distribution meetings where key topics will be addressed at Task Force meetings.

1. DEC will produce at least three informational articles for general distribution and distribution of these articles will be through the Task Force and the media.

96. Where deer populations are increasing, increase and improve the information in the community about deer management:

B. Supports communication in the Task Force process:


3. DEC would like to support a deeper management strategy that is achievable to both the Task Force, which reflects a diversity of interests in the Task Force.

2. DEC highlights the work accomplished by the Task Force 96 Task Force.
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6. DCW will receive the final recommendations and issue a public response supporting the process.

Recommendations:

- DCW would like to schedule the next discussion in conjunction with the Task Force activity, and the
- other interested groups or individuals.

DCW would prepare an executive summary of the Task Force recommendations.

4. c. The key issues for selecting specific actions:

- a report from the Task Force members on the Task Force process, the
- details of the DM VW 96 deep parking (by community and portfolio phases);
- the statistics and key facts about DM VW 96 and their factors are considered when

b. examples of subsidence deep problems in other areas and how they were

a. an updated deep management slide show (by DCW).

Indicating:

- would provide an overview of subsidence deep problems and solutions
- would provide a similar summary supporting a proposed action and the Task
- force to provide a similar summary supporting a proposed action and the Task
- force in addressing DM VW 96 concerns. The Workshop
- would become better acquainted with deep management in subsurface areas, and learn
- purposes is to provide Task Force members of the results of the Workshop and other interested citizens.

DCW will coordinate a three-hour public Workshop on deep management. The

3. Force process:

- be available for questions and discussion on the Task Force process and the
- feedback recommendations and