

2012 Deer Management Status Report

Table of Contents

Deer Management Status Report.....	1-11
Exhibit 1	Game Commission Political Subdivisions Guidelines
Exhibit 2.....	Deer Population Cooperative Service Agreement and Survey Findings
Exhibit 3.....	USDA CSA for Deer Management Plan
Exhibit 4.....	Approved Deer Management Plan
Exhibit 5.....	USDA Agreement for Culling and Trapping 1/31/2007
Exhibit 6.....	2007 Game Commission Special Use Permit 2/16/2007
Exhibit 7.....	2007 USDA Agreement for Control of Animal Damage on Non-Private Property
Exhibit 8.....	2007 USDA Firearms Use and Safety Guidelines
Exhibit 9.....	2007 USDA Activities Report
Exhibit 10.....	2008 USDA Culling and Trapping Agreement
Exhibit 11.....	2008 USDA Activities Report
Exhibit 12.....	2008 Recommendations for Long Term Deer Management
Exhibit 13.....	Animal Control Statistics 2000-2011
Exhibit 14.....	Public Meetings on Deer Management Plan and Activities
Exhibit 15.....	Deer Population Survey Proposals 2008
Exhibit 16.....	Information from Other Deer Population Control Organizations
Exhibit 17.....	Q & A and Correspondence To Concerned Residents
Exhibit 18.....	Local Opposition to Deer Culling Program
Other.....	Various Newspaper Articles 2005-2008

Enclosures:

- Managing White-Tailed Deer in Suburban Environments
- An Evaluation of Deer Management Options
- Deer, Communities & Quality of Life
- Learning by Doing: Deer Management in Urban and Suburban Communities

DEER MANAGEMENT IN MT. LEBANON

“A variety of deer management tools both lethal and non lethal are available. Lethal tools are more effective than others but may be unacceptable where social and safety concerns are an issue. Applying a combination of several techniques specifically tailored for each situation can prove to be more successful than utilizing a single tool. Non lethal techniques are best used to supplement not replace deer population management.”-Pennsylvania Game Commission-A Guide to Deer Management In Developed Areas of Pennsylvania.

Overview:

This report is offered to provide the Mt. Lebanon Commission with background information on the deer management options available to municipalities in Pennsylvania. It also provides a history of the deer management efforts in Mt. Lebanon since 2005, and provides the information requested by former Commissioner VanKirk on December 20, 2011. The deer population in Mt. Lebanon did not grow overnight and any plans to reduce the deer herd must include the full tool box of management options to be successful. To quote from Learning by Doing-“The community must discover ways to move a majority of residents towards resolution in determining deer management objectives. This process inevitably depends on meaningful dialogue and relationships between key stakeholders within the community.”

Basic reading for those interested in deer management should include: Managing White-Tailed Deer in Suburban Communities-A Technical Guide, Cornell Cooperative Extension; An Evaluation of Deer Management Options, Northeast Deer Technical Committee, May 2009; and Learning by Doing: Deer Management in Urban and Suburban Communities, Cornell University, 2004. These and other reports are included as attachments to this document.

Who Manages the Deer Anyway?

The whitetail deer (*Odocoileus Virginianus*) is recognized as Pennsylvania’s state animal. The Pennsylvania Game Commission is legally mandated to manage wildlife including deer for the benefit of all Pennsylvania. The Game Commission manages deer to the best of their ability for the deer and the people; who seek them, unintentionally interact with them or experience damage from them. Their primary tool of deer management is recreational hunting. As the stewards of wildlife in Pennsylvania the Game Commission is challenged with minimizing negative effect of deer in developed areas, while maintaining positive benefits that they provide to residents. The Game Commission is directed by law to use hunting as a method of management for whitetail deer where safe and appropriate.

As deer have lost their inhibitions of humans in densely populated areas like Mt. Lebanon, they have taken advantage of an environment that provides sufficient cover and an abundance of food and freedom from natural and human predators (recreational hunters.) Increasing number of urban car-deer accidents, and excessive damage to landscape are the most common problem associated with deer in urban and suburban areas. In addition, concerns of disease associated with an abundant deer population living so closely with humans (for example: Bovine Tuberculosis, Lyme disease) also arise. Perhaps the most challenging aspect of deer management is the issue how to deal with deer in urban and suburban areas.

Deer populations in rural settings are managed exclusively by recreational hunting with the exception of utilizing deer damaged shooting permits for addressing specific situations. However these lethal techniques face several challenges to application in many urban/suburban areas including:

1. Real or perceived safety concerns;
2. Conflicting social attitudes and perceptions about wildlife;
3. Hunting and firearm – discharge restrictions; and
4. Liability or public relations concerns.

The Game Commission has formed a citizen's advisory committee to gather public input on deer-human conflicts and to recommend changes to the commission's deer management strategies. The Game Commission is also developing programs to inform political and community leaders, residents and hunters about deer management options and opportunities in developed areas. In 2007, the Game Commission completed a guide to deer management in developed area (attached). The guide stresses the importance of providing educational material about indirect management strategies (for example: repellants, fencing, habitat, manipulation) and direct management strategies (for example: recreational and control hunting programs, and trap and kill sharpshooting.) The guide encourages suburban and urban areas to develop urban deer management programs that allow communities and residential associations to select a deer management option that is appropriate for their respective area to achieve their goals and objectives. Hunting continues to be the main technique of controlling deer population.

Background-How did we get where we are today:

In the spring of 2006 after receiving many citizen complaints regarding an ever increasing deer population, the Mt. Lebanon Commission requested the staff to explore deer management programs available to municipal governments. Residents had expressed public safety concerns over deer-vehicle collisions, and the threats that large animals could present to pedestrians, home owners and their pets. Residents were also concerned about the damage that deer were doing to private property (trees, ornamental shrubs and flowers). There was also a concern about Lyme disease being spread by deer herds. According to statistics maintained by Animal Control, the number of deer carcass's removed from Mt. Lebanon streets had increased from 34 in 2000 to 49 in 2004, an increase of over 44%. During the same time period Upper St. Clair experienced an increase of 39.7%. The staff collected and reviewed current reports on deer management in urban and suburban communities, discussed deer management with the Pennsylvania Game Commission and contacted other local suburban communities that had implemented deer management programs.

What are other communities doing to manage the deer populations?

In February of 2012 the municipality surveyed 17 South Hills communities to find out what other communities are doing to address deer management concerns. The survey was conducted using an internet survey tool, and four responses had been received as of April 15th 2012. A copy of the survey and responses are enclosed in the cover of this report binder. Because of the poor response rate (23%) it was decided to conduct another survey during the summer of 2012, and the survey forms will be faxed out to the communities through SHACOG.

The following information provides background information on what other Allegheny County communities are doing to address deer concerns. In 1992 the Borough of Fox Chapel established a comprehensive wildlife management program to control the boroughs burgeoning deer population. The key component of that program is the use of qualified archers to remove deer from the borough. The second part of the borough's deer management program involves the use of police officers shooting deer at night at selective sites throughout the borough. The combined deer management program has been successful, reducing the negative impact of over abundant deer as measured by the number of vehicle collisions which declined from 81 in 1993 to a 15 year low of 19 in 2007. The primary goal of the deer population management program has been sustained since 1993.

In 1998 Upper St. Clair entered into an agreement with Whitetail Management Associates to harvest deer through an archery deer hunting/management program. The archery program operated on municipal owned properties and Whitetail Management Associates recruited and trained archers, and the archers received exclusive rights to hunt on particular pieces of property. Whitetail Management started in Fox Chapel, and the mission of the organization is to provide a deer management program that operates under the Game Commission laws at no cost to local municipality's or the general public. In addition to Fox Chapel and Upper St. Clair, Whitetail Management also operates in county owned parks within the municipalities of Bethel Park, Plum Borough and McCandless Township. Whitetail Managements agreements with the county operate in North Park, Settler's Cabin Park, South Park and Boyce Park. Whitetail Management also has an agreement with the Township of O'Hara. Peter's and Scott Township have both explored the possibility of engaging the services of Whitetail Management Associates.

Also in 1998 the Upper St. Clair board of commissioners adopted a motion identifying several deer management initiatives they believed were appropriate for the social and environmental conditions of Upper St. Clair. Since 1998 the following initiatives have been implemented:

- Hiring wildlife biologists
- Developing of communication program in library materials
- Investigating the installation of deer warning and crossing signs
- Test strider lighting system designed to scare deer away from the side of the road
- Deer population survey
- Controlled archery hunts
- Evaluation of a PZP deer birth control program

The USC staff followed up and implemented the commission's recommendations, and also started an archery program with the Whitetail Deer Management Association. However, by 2003 the number of deer accidents rose to 157 from 135 the previous year and the number of deer harvested through archery decreased from 44 to 34. Members of the township staff concluded that the measures listed above were not working and recommend that the commission should consider supplementing existing deer control efforts with a controlled culling (sharp shooting) program along the lines of the one instituted in the Borough of Fox Chapel. The recommendations were included in the 2003 Executive Report on Deer Management Initiatives issued April 26, 2004.

In 2005 United States Department of Agriculture (APHIS Wildlife Services) began their sharp shooting activities in Upper St. Clair and the program has remained in place since then. The objective of the program is to management the deer population at or near 5-8 deer per square mile as originally recommended by the Pennsylvania Game Commission.

Deer removal activities are conducted at night using elevated mobile stands and a suppressed .243 rifle. A hand held forward looking infrared radar (FLIR) unit is used to locate and observe deer in the complete darkness. In addition to the FLIR, night vision and spot lights are used to identify possible obstructions in the line of fire. Deer are taken on public lands and also from private property. Wildlife Services has culled 991 deer from Upper St. Clair since the inception of the program in 2005. Over the same period deer harvested by Whitetail Management Associates has decreased from a high of 53 in 2001 to 8 in 2010. One of the goals of the township was to reduce the number of deer-vehicle collusions to less than 100 per calendar year. Since deer culling activities began deer-vehicle collusions have declined, and there have been less than 100 collusion per year since 2008. Only 73 collusions were reported in 2010 (USDA 2010 Annual Activities Report).

Mt. Lebanon-Whitetail Management Association 2006:

During the summer and fall of 2005, representatives from the Pennsylvania Game Commission and Whitetail Management Associates attended Mt Lebanon Commission Discussion Sessions and provided an overview of how archery hunting could be implemented within Mt. Lebanon's Parks. After hearing the concerns of many residents the commission decided not to pursue an agreement with Whitetail Management Associates for bow hunting.

Mt. Lebanon - USDA Wildlife 2006:

In the fall of 2005 Mark Mansfield, Assistant Manager of Upper St. Clair, attended a commission discussion session and talked about Upper St. Clair's deer managements experiences and answered questions regarding their agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture (APHIS Wildlife Services). Shortly after the discussion session, staff contacted a representative from U. S. D. A. Wildlife and arranged to meet with wildlife biologist, Craig Swope, and representatives from the Pennsylvania Game Commission. The meeting focused on Game Commission's requirements for deer population management. The Pennsylvania Game Commission is responsible for deer management within the state of Pennsylvania and any actions proposed by a political subdivision of the commonwealth must first follow the guidelines laid out in PA 58-147.321 (Exhibit 1). This subchapter of the act regulates the activities of persons who apply for, receive or conduct activities under a deer control permit issued under the authority of Act 58. Political subdivisions can receive a deer control permit if they complete an application in conjunction with the commission and it is submitted by an authorized officer of a political subdivision. The application must contain the following information:

1. A complete map showing the boundaries of the area being considered and indicating the land use within the area. Cover types, hunt able areas, damaged areas, deer concentration areas, safety zones and proposed control areas within the municipal boundary.
2. A deer management plan which contains deer density estimates, and requesting the number of animals to be removed.

3. Each application must substantiate the background and the scope of the deer problem and include alternative approaches to the problem and propose what action is recommended to be taken in the permit.

Deer Survey 2006:

In March of 2006 the commission authorized staff to engage the services of U. S. D. A. Wildlife to conduct a deer density survey throughout Mt. Lebanon. Deer population surveys were conducted between April 21, 2006 - July 27, 2006. The average deer density observed was 15 deer per square mile. Based on an analysis of habitat characteristics, human density, opportunities for recreation harvest and conversations with the Pennsylvania Game Commission biologist, Wildlife Service's recommended that a deer reduction program be initiated to reduce deer density to 3-5 deer per square mile (Exhibit 2).

Deer Management Plan 2006:

In September of 2006 the municipality entered into a contract with U. S. D. A. Wildlife Services to prepare a deer management plan, and to make application for a political subdivision permit from the Pennsylvania Game Commission (Exhibit 3). Wildlife Service's assisted the township in creating a map showing the boundaries of the areas being considered for management activities. The maps indicated the land use areas, cover types, huntable areas, damaged areas, deer concentration areas, safety zones and proposed control areas within the municipal boundary. Using the information collected during the deer density survey as well as other information collected from adjacent townships, Wildlife Service's prepared a draft deer management plan to be submitted with the political subdivision application. The deer management plan was written according to Pennsylvania Game Commission Standards and had all the necessary information for consideration of the application.

Wildlife Service's substantiated the background and scope of the deer problem and included alternative approaches to the problem, and recommended actions to be taken under the permit. On November 27, 2006 U. S. D. A. Wildlife Service's completed the deer management options and recommendation for long term population controls in the Municipality of Mt. Lebanon (Exhibit 4). The plan discussed the deer management problem in suburban communities and indicated that if residents and public officials were willing, the Pennsylvania Game Commission would provide technical assistance to resolve deer-human conflicts in developed areas. It pointed out that there was no active management of whitetail deer being conducted within the municipality, and discussed the results of the whitetail deer density survey study conducted earlier in 2006. In Section 3.0 of the plan various options were discussed, everything from no action to fertility control. Section 3.2 of the plan discussed lethal methods of deer removal, which included capture and relocation, controlled hunting, sharp shooting/culling and capture and euthanasia. Cost estimates were provided for each option. Section 4 of the plan discussed recommendation for long term deer management. Those recommendations included developing educational materials, amending ordinances to allow control hunts, collection of data on the location of deer-vehicle collisions, conducting a deer density survey at least once every three years and the use of political subdivision permits for the Pennsylvania Game Commission, which would permit sharp shooting over bait at night and trap and euthanasia. The recommendation also called for updating the management plan annually and the establishment of a deer management committee consisting of municipal leaders, Pennsylvania Game Commission

personnel and Wildlife Services, and the requirement of submitting annual reports of activities for the evaluation of the deer management committee.

Deer Culling & Trapping 2007:

On January 31, 2007 the municipality executed a cooperative service agreement with the U. S. D. A. Wildlife Services in the amount of \$19,999 (Exhibit 5). The agreement authorized Wildlife Services to conduct direct control deer management activities to reduce property damage, deer-vehicle collisions and reduce disease risk. The agreement permitted Wildlife Services to remove by sharp shooting or by capture and euthanasia. All activities would be conducted between 9:00 p.m. – 6:00 a.m. The agreement permitted one hour of field preparation and investigation and eight nights of operational condition activities.

In early February 2007 the Pennsylvania Game Commission approved Special Use Permit No. 18-2007 (Exhibit 6) authorizing U. S. D. A. Wildlife Services to remove deer from the Municipality of Mt. Lebanon. The agreement was effective February 16, 2007 and ran through June 30, 2007. Shortly thereafter an agreement was executed between U. S. D. A. Wildlife Service and the Municipality of Mt. Lebanon for control of animal damage on non private property (Exhibit 7). U. S. D. A. Wildlife Service met with Mt. Lebanon police and discussed their methods of operation and the selection of shooting areas. Representatives from U. S. D. A. Wildlife Service provided a copy of their firearm use and safety policy (Exhibit 8). The municipality posted copies of the deer management plan on the municipal website and a detailed question and answer document pertaining to the U. S. D. A. Wildlife Service program was also placed on the municipal website. Deer culling commenced on February 28, 2007 and concluded on April 4, 2007. A total of 79 deer were taken.

Deer Culling & Trapping 2008:

In July of 2007 U. S. D. A. Wildlife Service provided an Activity Summary Report (Exhibit 9), and a public meeting was held in August of 2007 to discuss the deer culling program. A group of residents, known as the Coalition for Neighborhood Safety Awareness protested against the deer culling program, and members of the Coalition attended every commission meeting to express their displeasure. In October of 2007 the commission extended the deer culling program from November 1, 2007 through September 30, 2008 (Exhibit 10). Deer culling and trapping commenced on December 6, 2007 and ended on April 18, 2008. A total of 146 deer were culled or trapping and euthanized. The 2008 Activities Report was reviewed at a public meeting in September of 2008 (Exhibit 11). Wildlife Service's received almost 200 signed A-12 agreements for hunting or trapping on private property and the majority of deer (107) were taken from private property.

Where we are now:

In 2008 the municipal commission did not appropriate funding to continue with the U. S. D. A. Wildlife Services program. Some commissioners indicated that they did not feel that the program was safety, and was too costly. In September of 2008 the commission requested pricing for a new deer density survey. Proposals were requested and submitted and presented to the commission, but funds for the survey were not approved in the 2009 Operating Budget. The municipality has not undertaken any deer management activities since April of 2008.

Literature and experience show that there is no quick fix, or one time solution to reduce deer-human conflicts in developed areas. Once deer have integrated themselves into a community, the community must integrate a long term plan to manage them. Deer-human conflicts in developed areas are not easy to solve nor do they appear overnight. Resolving deer-human conflicts requires a long term commitment from residents and public officials to effectively apply available deer management techniques. Public officials and residents must accept long term responsibility to resolve deer-human conflicts.

Some Interesting Facts about Whitetail Deer

According to the 2009-2018 Game Commission Whitetail Deer Management Plan, deer management objectives are no longer defined by deer densities instead deer management objectives are defined by measures of deer health, forest habitat health and deer-human health conflict. In 2008, over 335,000 deer were harvested during the hunting season and over 550,000 hunting licenses were sold to hunters. According to the Game Commission report deer reproduction rates generally are higher in regions with an abundant food supply. Adult females have the highest reproduction rate followed by yearlings, twinning is common in adult females and triplets have also occurred. The average reproduction rate across Pennsylvania is about one embryo per female, per year. The deer mating season in Pennsylvania begins in early September and can last into February. Most adult does are breed in November with fawn breeding extending through December into February. Overall most deer are breed from mid-October through mid-December. Deer vehicle collisions are the primarily source of mortality that occurs during the summer months for yearling and adult deer (Gladfelter 1984, Nixon et al. 1991.) Deer killed during the hunting season account for the most mortality. The annual causes for mortality are as follows:

Hunting	71%
Vehicles	8%
Natural Causes	7%
All Other	13%

Deer tend to be most active at dawn and dusk (Micheal 1970) but activity patterns will vary across seasons and can be affected by environmental conditions; for example, deer tend to be inactive when temperates are very hot or very cold. The size and shape of a deer's home range varies with deer density, sex, landscape conditions and season of the year (Sanderson 1967.) Deer occupying better habitats can fulfill the entire necessary requirement in smaller areas; whereas, deer residing in poorer ranges must travel further distance to find suitable food and cover. Males generally have larger home ranges than females, and home ranges tend to be the largest in the fall and spring (Nelson and Mech 1981.) In Pennsylvania field data indicates adult deer will range within a square mile area most of the time, but this can vary by season (Laubach and Blattenberger 2007.) Females may live their entire life within a short distance to where they were born. The social organization of the whitetail is largely matriarchal with the most common social group being an adult deer, her fawns and her yearling female offspring. Sometimes three or four generations of related does are present in a family hunting group.

Each deer in a herd requires a certain amount of food (energy) and cover to survive and reproduce (Moen 1978.) The impact deer densities have on survival and reproduction is negligible, provided food and cover resources per deer are sufficient to meet their baseline metabolic requirements (McCullough 1987.) When the amount of food available to individual deer is insufficient, deer will have lower body weights and bucks, particularly yearling males, will have antlers with fewer points and smaller beam diameters. Deer food requirements will vary with sex, age and season of the year (French 1955.) During the winter period an average adult deer should have about five pounds of dry weight foliage daily. This equates to half a bushel basket.

An estimated 1.5 deer-vehicle collisions occur each year in the U. S. The average cost of a vehicle repair was \$1,500 which means that total vehicle damaged resulting from a collision with a deer exceeds \$1 billion annually (Conover 1995.) Based on their best known market share in Pennsylvania, State Farm Insurance projected more than 98,000 deer-vehicle claims for all insurance companies in the state between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007. State troopers reported 21 human fatalities resulting from deer-vehicle collisions on Pennsylvania state and federal highway systems between 1996-2001. Deer browsing on ornamental trees and shrubbery, in gardens in suburban and residential areas, is a common complaint and financially impacts home owners each year (Connelly 1987, Conover 1997.) Wildlife damage incurred by metropolitan residents in the United States has been estimated at \$3.8 billion annually. This is in addition to spending \$1.9 billion and 268 million hours trying to solve or prevent the problem (Conover 1997.) Deer like people have preferred foods and will select those they like first after all the preferred plants are gone, deer will move onto those they like less.

Deer Management Techniques

Regulated deer hunting-Regulated deer hunting which include harvesting both antlered and antlerless deer has long been the primary tool used by wildlife agencies to manage deer populations (Wolfe and Roseberry 1998.) According to the Game Commission regulated deer hunting is an ongoing management action, and for it to be effective in managing deer populations it must be done on a regular basis.

Trap and transfer – trapping and transporting a live deer is very stressful to them and results in high mortality both during transfer and after release (Jones Witham 1990.) Also deer captured from urban/suburban areas usually seek out comparable residential locations defeating any justification for this type of program (Beringer et al. 2002, Cromwell 1999.) As a result of the risk of disease, stress and mortality risk and the lack of need for population restoration the Game Commission does not permit the use of trap and transfer as a deer management option.

Fertility Control – research on wildlife fertility control agents is more than four decades old. It has been fueled by the desire to control over abundant wildlife causing conflicts with humans. Changing landscapes and increased interest in non lethal methods of population control has spawned the debate over the traditional wildlife management techniques and the role of wildlife fertility control agents. Some members of the community believe fertility control to be more humane and morally acceptable than lethal management techniques. However, these perceptions

do not take into account the efficacy, practicality or safety of these drugs. According to Pennsylvania Deer Biologist, Jeannine Tardiff Fleegle, current fertility control agents are not timely deer management tools. By the time communities initiate actions to manage local deer populations conflicts are typically at crisis level. The Game Commission points out for a community contemplating the use of contraceptives for deer management a number of questions must be asked. First, do deer impacts exceed safe and acceptable levels? An affirmative answer to this question is a prerequisite for a community to take action to manage deer impact. Otherwise the debate will not focus on the solution but on whether or not there is a problem. Second, can a community suffering unacceptable deer-human conflicts wait ten years for the population in deer-human conflicts to stabilize? If the deer population can be stabilized using fertility control agent's populations still need to be reduced to elevate deer-human conflicts. Is reducing a deer population via deer-vehicle collision acceptable ("From a wildlife conflict resolution viewpoint if you can't stabilize or reduce a deer population with a contraceptive no matter how well it works on treated individuals you can't have a management tool." Rutberg 2005.)

Deer Management Assistance Program – the Game Commission's deer management assistance program allows public and private land owner's the option of using hunters to manage deer on their property. Common deer-human conflicts in developed areas include: increased deer-vehicle collisions and increased exposure to Lyme disease and increased damaged to gardens, ornamentals and landscaping. This approach is used to manage the deer population in developed areas. The Game Commission supports and encourages hunting as a means of managing deer population by annually making hunting opportunities available, increasing hunting opportunities in developed areas and providing deer hunters with tools to increase their success. While traditional hunting is the most economical and efficient way to manage deer population its application is limited in some developed areas because of real or perceived safety concerns, social values and legal constraints. Deanna Kolher 1997. Upon receiving written request for assistances the Game Commission will work with the community to find a solution to its deer problems. For nontraditional management techniques to be utilized the affected community must develop a deer management plan which must be approved by the Game Commission. Examples of nontraditional management techniques include control hunts and sharpshooting. The Game Commission will provide information and education to residents of urban areas to inform them on deer biology, ecology and management. The goal is to provide residents with knowledge to aid in the resolution of deer-human conflicts and acceptance of management techniques.

Where to go from here?- From your readings and from past meetings you know that **deer management** options are hotly debated by conservationists, hunters, animal-rights people, deer watchers, and gardeners. Because of the large amount of damage that excess deer do to horticulture, in addition to the property damage and loss of life from automobile-deer collisions and other safety concerns, policy makers and elected officials have an unavoidable responsibility to exercise appropriate deer management options to control the deer population to be an appropriate size. A regional deer control approach, or wildlife management unit approach offering the entire range of control options from hunting to birth control would be the best approach. However, I don't see that happening until the problem is totally out of control. To locally control the deer population we must follow the current Game Commission Guidelines

and apply for a Political Subdivision Control Permit, which requires a Deer Density Study and a Deer Management Plan.

If the goals are to: reduce the number of deer vehicle collisions; prevent too close dangerous encounters with humans and pets, and to protect property from overgrazing then the most effective option is a controlled program of sharp shooting over a period of several years. Methods of birth control are still experimental and have not been approved for general use by the PA Game commission. Even if they were approved there would not be an immediate drop in the deer population.

If the commission is interested in pursuing a deer control program then I would recommend funding for a qualified contractor (wildlife biologist) to undertake a deer density survey to estimate the deer population within Mt. Lebanon, and determine the biological carrying capacity of the community. Survey method could be spotlight surveys, or fixed winged aerial surveys. In addition to the survey the contractor would provide the municipality with a detailed written report of findings and answer questions during the commission discussion session. The survey would be conducted in August-September 2012 (best time) at a cost not to exceed \$10,000.00. I would also recommending that the Commission provide funding for a Deer Management Report to be completed by a qualified contractor (wildlife biologist) discussing the deer density and carrying capacity and all available deer control methods, effectiveness and associated costs. The Deer Management Report would be based on the requirements of the PA Game Commission and would recommend a long term approach to control the deer population in Mt. Lebanon. The report would be posted on the website, discussed at public meetings, and the Commission would ultimately approve or reject the recommendations of the report. Report to be prepared in October and presented to the Commission in November. Estimated cost \$8,000.00. The approved report and recommendations would be sent to the Game Commission in December and probably approved in January of 2013. Control measures would need to be funded in the 2013 operating budget...amount would depend on measures recommended in the Deer Management Plan and approved by the Game Commission.

If Mt Lebanon Commission decides to pursue some program of culling, contractors other than the USDA are available. Scheduling might be difficult because the other contractors are from out of state. I am sure not sure what the cost would be.

Below is a char put together several years ago to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of various deer control options. The chart is based on Managing White-Tailed Deer in Suburban Environments, A Technical Assistance Guide, a publication of Cornell Cooperative Extension.

Management Techniques		Efficiency & Effectiveness				Note
		Property Protection	Vehicle Accidents	Disease Control		
Non-lethal Methods						
	Ban on Deer feeding	Low	Low	Moderate		Easy to implement hard to enforce
	Plant Unpalatable Plants	Moderate	NA	NA		Deer will eat anything when they are hungry
	Repellents	High	Low	Low		Require constant reapplication
	Fencing	High	Increase	NA		Unacceptable in most communities
	Dogs	High	Low	NA		Unacceptable in most communities
	Road Side Reflectors	NA	Moderate	NA		Deer adapt to lights
	Warning Whistles	NA	Low	NA		Deer adapt to noise
	Warning Signs	NA	Low	NA		Signs become part of background
	Supplemental Feeding	Low	NA	NA		
Population Control Methods						
	Trap and Transport	High	High	High		Costs range from \$400 to \$2,930/Deer
	Trap and Euthanasia	High	High	High		Costs exceed \$300/Deer
	Sharp shooting	High	High	High		Requires trained professionals and strict controls
	Controlled Hunting	High	High	High		Unacceptable in most communities
	Controlled Archery	High	High	High		Requires trained archers and strict controls
Experimental Approaches						
	Fertility Control Agents	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate		Require FDA approval - not currently available outside of controlled test area. No immediate effect.