



# 2015 Deer Population Goal Setting

---

## Deer Permit Area 169

### Team recommendation:

**Increase population by 50%**

### Support for recommendation:

Consensus by 80% supermajority: 8 "Support", 4 "OK", 2 "Do Not Support", 2 "Abstain" (1 via absence)

### Factors cited by team members in their recommendation:

- Current deer population is low
- Deer harvest has significantly declined
- Hunter success in this permit area was the lowest in goal block
- Population needs a substantial increase
- A 50% increase will move the population in the right direction
- The wolves need more food
- Non-hunters support a 50% increase
- A 50% increase will have little agricultural impact
- Public input from meetings and online questionnaires strongly supports a population increase
- Most landowners buy property to hunt
- The majority of hunters and landowners would like to see increases
- This area has the least amount of agriculture in the goal block and no cities of significant size, minimizing the social impact

### Factors cited by team members as concerns related to this recommendation:

- Prefer a 100% increase
- An increase of 117% would restore the deer population to levels set in the previous (2006) goal setting process
- Youth
- More wolves than deer being seen by deer hunters
- Non-hunters also report not seeing deer
- Current levels are sustainable for the amount of habitat available; increases will put excess pressure on what habitat is left
- Prefer No Change, current population appears close to low end of target set in 2006
- Harvest below 1 deer/sq. mile in 2014 would suggest a need to increase by >50%.
- A 50% increase may require closing the season given changes in habitat
- Need to use the best available science to determine goals

# 2015 Deer Population Goal Setting

---

## Deer Permit Area 172

### Team recommendation:

**Increase population by 50%**

### Support for recommendation:

Consensus by 80% supermajority: 3 "Support", 9 "OK", 3 "Do Not Support", 1 "Abstain" (via absence)

### Factors cited by team members in their individual preferences:

- High hunting pressure
- Low deer densities
- High hunter dissatisfaction
- Low hunter success rates
- Little demonstrated agricultural impact
- The majority of hunters and landowners would like to see increases
- Reported crop damage is minor-to-moderate
- Input at public meetings and from online questionnaires strongly support a population increase
- Most landowners buy property to hunt
- Harvest density is low when compared to hunter density

### Factors cited by team members as concerns related to this recommendation:

- Prefer an increase of >50% (75-90%)
- Prefer a 25% increase
- A 50% increase in deer populations will expose thousands of people to Lyme disease since this is a major recreation and population area
- Concerns about landscaping damage
- Earlier years with conservative management had only slightly higher population estimates
- Need to use the best available science to determine goals
- This area, despite declining success rates, continues to get more hunters; we need to see post-population-crash results

# 2015 Deer Population Goal Setting

---

## Deer Permit Area 184

### Team recommendation:

**Increase population by 50%**

### Support for recommendation:

Consensus by 80% supermajority: 1 "Support", 11 "OK", 3 "Do Not Support", 1 "Abstain" (via absence)

### Factors cited by team members in their individual preferences:

- Public input suggested at least a 50% increase in the deer population
- Buck harvest has declined significantly
- A 50% increase is within the bounds of our ability to manage
- Hunters will accept this level of change
- Input at public meetings and from online questionnaires strongly supports a population increase
- Most landowners buy property to hunt
- The majority of hunters and landowners would like to see increases

### Factors cited by team members as concerns related to this recommendation:

- Prefer an increase of >50% (75-108%)
- Prefer a 25% increase
- Need to use the best available science to determine goals
- Modeled trend in population appears stable, but doesn't align with public input
- Deer population has declined after severe winter of 2013-2014; the perception is that the population decline is due to predation
- A 50% increase in deer populations will expose thousands of people to Lyme disease since this is a major recreation and population area
- This area has a major transportation corridor, an increase would subject more people to deer vehicle collisions

# 2015 Deer Population Goal Setting

---

## Deer Permit Area 197

### Team recommendation:

**Increase population by 50%**

### Support for recommendation:

Consensus by 80% supermajority: 5 "Support", 7 "OK", 3 "Do Not Support", 1 "Abstain" (via absence)

### Factors cited by team members in their individual preferences:

- Deer population has declined significantly since 2011
- Low deer densities
- Low hunter success rates
- Low harvest levels
- Input at public meetings and from online questionnaires strongly supports a population increase
- Most landowners buy property to hunt
- Strong hunter and non-hunter support for a 50% increase in the population
- Team discussion suggests a 50% increase is a good starting point for change
- Subsistence harvest is important for tribal hunters
- Very heavy forest in this area; few people/cities
- Previously set goal of 5 deer per square mile is very low
- Low agricultural impacts in this area

### Factors cited by team members as concerns related to this recommendation:

- Prefer an increase of >50% (75-97%)
- Loggers and hunters would like to see an even greater increase in the population
- This is a National Forest and tribal area; it must be managed differently with lower deer numbers
- This area is almost half wetland habitat and very susceptible to deer over-browsing
- This area has a major transportation corridor, an increase would subject more people to deer vehicle collisions
- A 50% increase in deer populations will expose thousands of people to Lyme disease since this is a major recreation and population area
- Need to use the best available science to determine goals

# 2015 Deer Population Goal Setting

---

## Deer Permit Area 210

### Team recommendation:

**Increase population by 50%**

### Support for recommendation:

Consensus by 80% supermajority: 4 "Support", 8 "OK", 3 "Do Not Support", 1 "Abstain" (via absence)

### Factors cited by team members in their individual preferences:

- Harvest has significantly declined since 2011
- Strong hunter and non-hunter support for a significant increase in the population
- DNR's population model showed a 5-year drop in estimates
- This will be a reasonable increase over 3-5 years
- A 50% increase would set deer numbers back to a point where more than 1 deer could be harvested by each hunter (managed/intensive strategies)
- Buck harvest has decreased by 34%

### Factors cited by team members as concerns related to this recommendation:

- Prefer an increase of >50% (75-82%)
- Prefer a 25% increase
- Concerned about increased crop damage to farmers; this permit area has the most agriculture of all permit areas in this zone
- Because this area experienced a moderate winter in 2012-2013 and a severe winter in 2013-2014, the 2015 spring population should be evaluated before a 5-year goal can be set
- This area has a major transportation corridor, an increase would subject more people to deer vehicle collisions
- The population trend is down and would be on target if not for the past hard winter

# 2015 Deer Population Goal Setting

---

## Deer Permit Area 298

### Team recommendation:

**Increase population by 50%**

### Support for recommendation:

Consensus by 80% supermajority: 8 "Support", 5 "OK", 2 "Do Not Support", 1 "Abstain" (via absence)

### Factors cited by team members in their individual preferences:

- Low deer densities
- Low hunter numbers
- Low hunter success rates
- Low harvest levels
- This area supports state and tribal harvest
- Tribal harvest levels are unknown
- This area has few human population centers therefore impact will be low on communities
- Based on public input, 50% would be a good goal
- A 50% increase is consistent with the previously set goal
- This is the lowest harvest level in years and the last goal setting process wanted a population increase

### Factors cited by team members as concerns related to this recommendation:

- Prefer an increase of >50% (75-218%)
- 10 deer per square mile is high but sustainable
- The success rate in this area is about 25% which is socially acceptable
- Need to use the best available science to determine goals