

APPENDIX H: Summary of Comments received via Mail or Email during Deer Management Plan Review Period (Jan. 1, 2010-Mar. 26, 2010)

A public-comment period followed a series of eight public meetings that were held throughout the state. This process allowed people to mail or email their comments to the DNR regarding a draft version of the Deer Management Plan. From January 1 through March 26, 2010, the DNR received 615 comments via mail or email. While the majority of comments focused on specific deer management issues, 123 directly addressed the Deer Management Plan:

General Comments on the Deer Management Plan

- Good plan, but not much depth
- I support scientific deer management, long overdue
- We are different than Alabama etc, make decisions for Michigan
- Look at other states and see how they improve their deer herd.
- One size does not fit all
- Clarify if management is statewide, unit or by county
- Great start
- Include urban deer management (3 comments)
- Need to have action
- Thanks for doing a good job listening to the public
- Impressed with plan, support it
- Remove “social issues” from plan
- The plan needs to address the decline in hunters
- It is hard to understand the plan
- How will the RDAT be appointed?
- Commend the DNRE for trying to approve the Deer Management Process
- Disappointed. Have only provided the public with information selectively
- Your communication on internet is good, decision making is not
- Look at Wisconsin’s plan
- Have separate plans for the three regions of the state
- Thank you for listening and putting together a plan that will help the deer herd
- Admirable that public input is sought, as it is difficult
- Appreciate the position DNRE has taken, there is no way you can please everybody
- Applaud efforts to update the plan, and efforts using scientific data to further understand the deer populations
- Too general. Not specific
- Look at the turkey plan
- Support making management plans specific to DMUs. Count numbers are showing the improvement of the quality and balance of the herd. Well done.
- Really need to do a better job of explaining this whole plan because your reasoning has many holes in it
- Needs a timeline

- The plan should address illegal kill
- Follow Ohio's plan (2 comments)
- Thank-you for including the public
- Would like to see new deer population goals per region
- Would like to see a plan for predator control in the plan
- Where does the data come from that outlined population estimates in the plan?
- The plan sounded more like an organization's business plan rather than a plan for wildlife conservation
- The opinions of how animals should be treated is changing
- Regulate at county level, not statewide
- Habitat management on public (state and federal) land is crucial
- Winter habitat is the single most important piece of UP deer survival
- Habitat management must be improved in the NLP
- Should work harder to gather the opinions of the average hunter
- Concerned about people with money making all of the decisions
- Hold public meetings before decisions are made
- Do not want to see management decided on financial reasons but on the quality of the herd
- Management caters to the gun hunters
- Michigan Association of Conservation Districts should partner with DNRE for education and outreach
- Have input forums every year
- People leaving the state to hunt (5 comments)
- DNR being controlled by insurance agencies (5 comments)
- Increase amount of staff to improve quality of herd
- Produce a quality hunting experience considering number of deer and hunters in the field
- Need to change the attitude of the hunter
- Concerned about DNRE partnering with special interest groups
- Have different goals and rules for different state lands
- Limited access to public land
- Tax breaks for farmers who allow hunting on their land
- Improve public access (3 comments)
- Need incentives for private landowners to allow hunting
- In other states farmers can use public land for farming

Comments on Deer Management Strategies

- Would like to see DNRE implement QDM Regulations (12 comments)
- Oppose mandatory QDM (2 comments)
- Upset the DNRE is partnering with QDM
- Would like to see QDM in northern Michigan (3 comments)
- Concerned about DNRE/QDM partnership
- QDM lowers the opportunities for the vast majority of deer hunters
- Increase average age of bucks (2 comments)

- Poor buck:doe ratio (7 comments)
- Manage for health of the herd, not just for recreation
- Increase average age of buck population
- Would like to see a better quality herd

Comments on Urban Deer Management

- Paying sharpshooters when hunters are willing to pay is unacceptable
- Would like to see DNRE work to increase hunting in urban and suburban areas
- Would like to see DNRE work to increase non-lethal management in urban and suburban areas
- Against legislation to over ride city ordinances to prohibit firearms for hunting purposes (2 comments)
- Look at municipalities where hunting is not allowed and find out why
- Find non-lethal control, not all people think of deer as pests or food (2 comments)
- Would like to see immuno-contraceptives used

Comments on meeting locations

- No meetings held in the Muskegon or Kent County area
- Want a public meeting in southeast Michigan (3 comments)
- Grand Rapids and Detroit next time (2 comments)
- Cadillac is not west Michigan
- Would like a meeting in Manistee or Cadillac
- Should have a meeting in the west part of the state