

2016 Sunrise Beach Deer Survey

The City of Sunrise Beach mailed 1092 Deer Surveys to property owners. 369 surveys were returned as their results are shown below. There were nine yes-no questions plus space for comments for each question. The Yes-No questions and their results are shown below. Some respondents did not answer all questions. Appendix A includes comments for each question plus overall comments.

1. Do you support conducting an annual driving survey to estimate the size of the deer population? (no cost)
Yes 299 **No** 57
2. Do you support conducting a deer opinion survey of property owners annually to have an understanding of current feelings about the various deer issues including population size and management actions? (\$550 mailing cost)
Yes 149 **No** 196
3. Do you support the development and distribution of educational information about the effects of feeding the deer and the reasons to adhere to the existing “no-feeding” SRB city ordinance? (No Cost)
Yes 299 **No** 59
4. Do you support the City of SRB obtaining a Texas Parks and Wildlife Department depredation permit (deer harvesting) for the SRB airport for public safety reason? (\$250 application fee).
Yes 236 **No** 108
5. Do you support asking SRB neighboring ranchers to consider increasing doe hunting on their properties? (No cost)
Yes 307 **No** 47
6. Do you support asking Agricultural Land property owners with greater than 10 acres within the city limits of SRB to consider allowing gun and shot gun hunting on their properties if the city changes the restricting ordinances and implements appropriate safety and management protocols? (No cost)
Yes 256 **No** 97
7. Do you support engaging Orion Research and Management Services (a 501 (c) (3) non profit organization) to help with deer population control in the form of harvesting and to participate in disease research? Orion has submitted a formal proposal including actions, methods, cost and the responsibilities of Orion and the City of Sunrise Beach (Please read at www.cityofsunrisebeach.org) (Cost: \$300/deer harvested)
Yes 94 **No** 250
8. Do you support changing the SRB city ordinances prohibiting fire arm discharge and hunting within the city limits to be allowed under certain narrow and specific circumstances (re items 4, 6, and 7 above)? (No cost)
Yes 149 **No** 196

9. Do you support the use of property tax money to help cover costs that might be incurred if item #7 above is implemented? (For example harvesting 50 deer would cost \$15,000)

Yes 86 **No** 265

Appendix A: Question Comments and Overall Comments

Comments Question 1:

1. Population will not change much each year. You are counting deer on more than 1000 food plots.
2. I think the last count was not accurate. There is 200 deer in my neighborhood.
3. Every day is different
4. Only if the count would result in ACTION!
5. It would have been of interest for SRB residents if you included the deer count of the last survey.
6. What good would that do. We live in deer country.
7. Spend all monies on getting rid of ALL deer
8. I don't see a problem that needs solving by more govt.
9. Done before - Officer Paul Kirksey gathered info but no action taken by council
10. But I don't think it is accurate
11. "Why, what does it change"
12. Leave the deer alone
13. Publicize past results
14. People who live in SRB should decide
15. We already know there are too many deer present.
16. Because the survey does not show what the deer haters want then they will not believe it. They thought we should use drones. Maybe the person who did not believe should have helped.
17. Seems like a waste of time. We all know too many deer
18. tx Parks & Wildlife are responsible. They dictate the laws that allow harvesting (except #8)
19. We should set a limit on the number of deer that the area can support.
20. Time out of our lives -- deer come and go as we all do & in SRB before us. Gas money wasted.
21. "But it is a big waste of time, deer move around don't ya know?"
22. "If we don't know the quantity now, should do this before any decision is made"
23. Known to be overpopulated
24. Get rid of the Deer
25. Do it every other year

Comments Question 2:

1. Useless
2. Every 2 years
3. Why count on 1000 food plots?
4. How about 3 years??
5. I would say every two years
6. No way
7. Open meetings would be better for all
8. I do not believe feelings would change much on an annual basis -- concerns stay the same. Once every 5 years would be sufficient.
9. Don't think we need to do it every year but perhaps every 2-3 yrs
10. Every 2-3 years should be sufficient
11. A survey of owners should be done at 5 yr increments
12. Too frequent
13. "Deer will come to food; i.e., Sunrise Beach"

14. Use survey monkey; web based
15. ?
16. Too expensive
17. Annually is too often; every 5 years
18. I doubt that many people in the general public know enough about this issue to have an informed opinion
19. Not annually
20. "Again, less govt is more. I don't think we need to worry about the deer."
21. Should be done on-line as well - no need for mail to be used
22. "Need informed opinions of professionals, not popular opinion of uninformed residents"
23. Whatever city council and mayor believe is possible within budgetary restrictions
24. Email would be cheaper
25. Waste of money
26. My handicapped daughter love the deer in our neighborhood
27. Every 3-5 years
28. Perhaps every 3 years
29. Waster of time and money. We have an ordinance -- enforce it. Stop feeding the deer!
30. People who live in SRB should decide
31. Perhaps every few years
32. "Perhaps an ""on-line"" survey to save on postage cost"
33. Just take action; you have my vote.
34. Waste of money -- we all know deer (lots) are here!
35. Not until tickets are given out for feed deer
36. You could conduct a google based survey for considerably less
37. Opinions unlikely to change. Perhaps every 3 year or so
38. Don't know if annually is necessary -- maybe every 2-3 years
39. Should promote onging community discussion re issue
40. Not sure it needs to be done annually
41. Conduct the opinion survey every other year
42. "Maybe not every yea, but sporadically yes"
43. 3 year intervals sufficient
44. Use one and out on it!
45. Initial survey was done & not necessary to do every year
46. \$40 ridiculous from tax dollars. Need spend on street repairs
47. Who pays
48. At least once more to assess changes in opinion
49. Not annually/bi-annually
50. N/A
51. Every 5 years
52. "Not sure, annuals seems excessive. Every 2 years would be better"
53. Annually seems a little redundant. Maybe every 5 years.
54. Maybe only every other year -- then \$250/yr
55. Would support every other year survey
56. Ask for email addresses

Comments Question 3:

1. Needs to be expanded what residents are feeding is not the problem
2. You can already do this on your website
3. Enforce the current ordinance
4. Only if placed online
5. Online would be great!
6. I did not know deer corn contains chemicals and that too much causes big problems.
7. No opinion
8. Enforce the ordinance
9. Ticket violators
10. The current ordinance explains is well enough
11. Exactly what you are doing here
12. Not a real issue
13. Should be available from UT/A&M agrilife (sic) extension offices
14. Enforce ordinance
15. Substantial fines for feeding deer. Use money to pay mailing cost and fee for #2
16. "Since there is already an ordinance against feeding deer, find those that do."
17. "Property owners, including me, are nowhere near as knowledgeable about management as TPW Biologist"
18. Info was available since early 2000 - the fools feeding the deer don't give a flip about the deer or neighbors
19. "Fine the people feeding the deer, no excuses"
20. What is criteria for harvesting after permit is issue?
21. "But how is there ""No Cost""? How would you distribute?"
22. Material available for TPWD - yes and others - distribute it. Do we really need to explain reasons for adhering to existing SRB ord??
23. Ordinance should be overturned
24. We are not stupid
25. Doesn't see to help the ones who feed the deer!
26. Definitely!
27. Is there enforcement of this ordinance. Fines collected s/b dedicated to effort.
28. "Not sure, would depending on survey results"
29. We all know its bad to feed the deer. The residents that continue to do will continue know (sic) matter what!
30. "Everybody should already know, so if no cost distribute."
31. Fine the offenders

Comments Question 4:

1. N
2. Unsure; who does the harvesting deposition of mean?
3. "Yes, because the airport serves the whole community through the emergency airlift and that safety is affected by deer."
4. Less agencies involved the better
5. Necessary
6. Volunteer Donation
7. No opinion

8. Population should be controlled
9. ?
10. SRB experienced hunters should be allowed to conduct the harvest
11. Please
12. I wish we had even more deer. No govt. help needed
13. Not sure
14. Cost?
15. Fence the airport -- dangerous
16. But not if its going to cost the city \$300/deer to harvest
17. Waste of time. Remove 20-30 deer - new herd will replace them
18. Let airport users pay the fee!
19. Not until the criteria & procedure for harvesting is published and discussed first.
20. Need more info. Why does SRB need permit for SRB deer?
21. People who live in SRB & use the airport should decide
22. Allow hunting to control population
23. too vague -- not enough detail to make a positive decision
24. Must be a better solution
25. If all of the people that live in immediate area of airport agree
26. Only if fee is collected by airport users
27. We have been very fortunate so far -- need to avert any tragedies if possible
28. If only for airport
29. Airport user should pay half
30. Would have to have a clearer idea of tangible benefit of doing so.
31. We should include harvesting for safety on the roads in Sunrise Beach
32. If safety is at issue
33. Mandatory -- Kill or catch & release
34. ? - #8 residents hunting?
35. This is a horrible idea. The deer are part of our community. I enjoy them. You would be killing innocent animals
36. Or TPWD management permits
37. Not by using nets!
38. This will reduce the deer population for the whole city for minimum costs
39. Has anyone experience any safety issues?
40. If not further cost only
41. Want to know more about situation at airport before I respond. Are planes landing on them?
42. ?
43. Would support a different method to improve safety at airport
44. Not sure
45. but only at airport; not in the neighborhood
46. Allow SRB residents to harvest the deer using appropriate safety measures
47. I think the people using the airstrip should be responsible for the cost

Comment Question 5:

1. Best Idea!
2. Its their choice
3. Why just the doe? Seems to be more than enough buck around that some of them could be hunted down.

4. No opinion
5. May help
6. Do not want an increase of shooting in SRB
7. ?
8. SRB residents who are experienced hunters should be allowed 1st opportunity
9. Keeping population down is beneficial for the deer
10. I would rather have more deer and less hunting
11. Not sure
12. People who live in SRB should decide
13. Yes to bow hunting; No to shot gun hunting
14. Considering getting a permit for these individuals including interview for them
15. That is where SRB deer multiple -- please ask
16. Year around
17. Possibly. Won't they shoot the best leaving the less desirable??
18. NC
19. As long as they stay away from shooting into SRB property owners
20. if it will affect our city's deer population

Comments Question 6:

1. Absolutely not
2. Too dangerous! Been there (in Llano)
3. This should not be allowed every year and would have to be carefully monitored. My yes answer is with reservations.
4. No opinion
5. Only support bow hunting. Shotgun slugs are too dangerous inside city limits
6. As long as it is controlled RP&WD
7. Too risky as I have seen idiot bow hunters. If harvesting is only option need to use professionals.
8. Not long ago I see an injured deer in SRB with an arrow still lodged in it -- it ran before I could report it. Cruel to animals.
9. ?
10. This should allow SRB residents 1st opportunity to hunt on their land before opening it up to others.
11. Not within city limits; even on > 10 acres
12. Too many stupid people around with no common sense in hunting
13. Bow only
14. I'm not a hunter; so why a shotgun instead of a deer rifle?
15. Not needed
16. Absolutely not!
17. Deer should be terminated
18. Rifle ok as long as safety issues followed -- direction of shot away from populated areas. In addition we could offer an amount to reimburse landowner for the processing cost if deer donated to a program hunter for hungry program (+- \$50)
19. I would like to participate as I hunt with both bow and shotgun
20. "Not this again, No Never!"
21. "If they have high fences to keep the deer contained in area after shot so don't have deer in arrows in neck, legs, etc."
22. "Downside is if they do not allow #8, then may have higher influx of deer to neighborhoods"

- 23.
24. People who live in SRB should decide
25. Too dangerous for those of us who live on properties adjacent to the 10 acres
26. N
27. No bow -- rifle or shot gun. Too many deer are wounded by bow and suffer a long death
28. Bow & arrow only
29. Should be seasonal
30. Bow only
31. "This makes total sense, but could also limit to just bow hunting."
32. Bow only -- no shotgun or firearms
33. "There must be strict guidelines to prevent wounded deer coming into the neighborhood, and ""wild"" shots endangering people."
34. Good idea!
35. "Is shotgun for birds or deer? Could not support ""Leases"" for hunting/"
36. Bow only
37. Keep all deer hunting out of the city limits.
38. Please do
39. Absolutely yes to the bows - no to guns.
40. Ten acres is to (sic) small people shoot at property lines would be like next door neighbor
41. Not safe
42. Bow hunting only
43. How can this be safe? More dangerous than the deer
44. Not sure
45. Bow hunting only
46. "This would be free for residents. Only bow hunting, no shotgun"
47. Unsafe regardless of restrictions
48. believe deer would be wounded rather than killed using bow/arrow or buckshot
49. "really don't want to hear guns going off, otherwise ok"

Comments Question 7:

1. "But, how would we pay for it?"
2. Don't understand the \$300 per deer; sounds awfully steep
3. Too expensive
4. Terrible Idea!
5. Not at that cost
6. But limit the number of deer harvested for disease research primarily.
7. After the first year I would like an estimate on how many more deer would have to be harvested.
8. Waste of money
9. No one has ever set a goal on the deer population
10. Have you considered trapping; relocating as an option to harvesting?
11. ?
12. ?
13. \$300 per deer is too costly
14. Harvesting can be done by SRB residents (experienced hunters). The meat can be donated.
15. Too expensive
16. "Not sure, seems like a lot per deer"
17. We need a harvesting BADLY!!!

18. \$300/deer is too costly if significant numbers are harvested!
19. We can do it ourselves!!
20. It sounds too expensive
21. Thank you for the information provided on the website.
22. Non-profit doesn't = no cost
23. Not sure
24. Have to contribute
25. Seems good approach
26. Up to city taxpayers and officials
27. No more than 20 deer
28. "Not without restrictions on quantity of does vs bucks, & cost is way to high per deer"
29. Too expensive
30. Trap and remove only
31. Need more information on populations. Pros/cons of harvesting
32. Allowing hunting is \$0 expense to city
33. Too expensive
- 34.
35. Seems very expensive. What is benefit to SRB? Stop feeding the deer!
36. Too costly
37. Cross-bow hunting on runway with self removal
38. Y
39. Where does the deer meat go
40. Let neighbors harvest for free
41. Too much money!
42. We need to give tickets to residents feeding deer
43. "I would like to know more of what other smaller cities are doing; ex: Fair Oaks Ranch, TX"
44. How much is for harvesting and how much for research. What is research going to prove? What actions?
45. Not sure -- admittedly \$300 per deer seems pricey
46. Too expensive!
47. There are less costly alternatives
48. Depends on #9 below
49. This seems way overpriced. Who gets the venison?
50. "Ridiculous. What is being done with the ""harvested"" animals"
51. Population reduction can be done at airport for total cost of \$250.
52. \$300 each deer. Property owners cannot afford and will not pay
53. To (sic) many deer -- repopulate too quickly
54. Can you publish the proposal for review before engaging services and then call for opinion!
55. "Unsure this will be a long-term, cost effective solution."
56. "This is hard to answer. I would think the first years harvest would be quite expensive since we are so over-populated. How much is the expected cost for the first year, then the estimated cost each year to maintain a suitable balance?"
57. May be cost prohibitive
58. \$300/deer seems awfully high
59. If they want our deer (Orion) for research -- they should pay SRB for supplying the deer
60. "The cost seems high. I am not opposed to paying to harvest, but would want more info about total numbers to harvest, total cost, need for repeating in the future, and any possible cheaper alternatives."

61. Seems high cost
62. Surely there is a more cost effective option. \$300 per is too much.
63. \$300 is outrageous amount
64. Too many other needs in the city
65. \$300 per deer -- wow! Stop feeding
66. the cost -- need improvements on our roads
67. cost too much and deer would repopulate quickly
68. ?

Comments Question 8:

1. Y
2. We have printed ourselves into a corner with this ordinance. Properly supervised shooting areas will put the fear of man back into them. They will go away.
3. "4 & 6 only, not 7"
4. S.A.A.
5. With consideration of the location
6. "It seems the most viable solution. If people are trained and certified in safety measures, our entire community would benefit."
7. Narrow and specific circumstances most important!!!
8. No opinion
9. How many years would it take?
10. "Many hunters would pay a small fee to hunt inside city limits, especially around the airport"
11. As long as it is controlled RP&WD
12. SRB experienced hunters only
13. no use of firearms or hunting in city limits
14. "Bow only; many SRB bow hunters available - # 6, 7, & 8"
15. Deer over projectiles is my preference
16. Up to city
17. Absolutely not!
18. "Not this again, No Never!"
19. "If by officials, not residents."
20. Too dangerous to allow discharges in city limits
21. Maybe - maybe not. Where is this ordinance? Can't find it. Stop feeding the deer!
22. People who live in SRB should decide
23. Deer do not like noise from gun blasts and fire crackers. Allow Both!
24. Absolutely not!
25. Yes for 4 and 6; no for 7
26. I'd need to know more about the proposed safety concerns/issues.
27. "Houses are too close, and this would endanger neighbors."
28. Bow hunting only
29. Do not kill our deer!! They are part of what we love in SB.
30. Considering getting a permit for these individuals including interview for them
31. Hell No!
32. As long as there is careful vetting of these hunters and their record of using firearms
33. "Currently allows the shooting of pest (snakes, skunks, etc.) Keep it that way."
34. Need more specifics on the policy
35. #6 ONLY
36. Hunting in our streets is not acceptable

37. Do we have to change Ordinance -- Could there just be an exception to accommodate the project covering certain dates?
38. "Again, absolutely with bows. Not with guns"
39. I believe this would be more of a safety issue than the deer.
40. Not sure
41. Only #6 above for bow hunting
42. As stated above it is unsafe more now that when it was banned
43. Bow
44. Not sure
45. We enjoy the deer
46. "really don't want to hear guns going off, otherwise ok"

Comments Question 9:

1. Our budget is too tight
2. Absolute not
3. Need more info
4. For the cost 50 deer doesn't scratch the surface. We need to harvest 300+
5. Possibly; depending on driving survey outcome
6. Too expensive -- my kids would do it for free
7. Have all hunters contact property owners
8. Horrible idea!!
9. The cost is exorbitant! There would be 50 more deer the next season.
10. "Committee should convey approximate financial impact to individuals (i.e., tax rate). Should be fairly minimal."
11. "Would not think 50 would be needed for disease research, but perhaps half that number"
12. So long as property taxes are not increased as a consequence!
13. To many over 65 exemptions; burden on just a few owners
14. "I believe that working on 4, 5, & 6 will begin to address the problem. \$300 per deer harvested seems excessive to me. Thank you for all that you do!"
15. If someone can do it for less; why so much (outrageous cost)? How many deer do we have that need harvesting? There seems to be a lot & lots of fawns this year too.
16. Waste of our \$s
17. "No money should be spend on deer control! If we have money for this, give it back to the taxpayers."
18. Not sure
19. Happy to contribute to the fund.
20. Orion proposal seems best
21. Up to city
22. No more than 20 deer
23. Cost/deer is too high
24. Too expensive
25. We should have trained volunteers hunt/harvest the deer and they process their own deer or dress the deer and donated the meat to a feed bank.
26. "Absolutely, deer are a health hazard"
27. Need more information on population and situation
28. Allowing hunting is \$0 expense to city
29. Ridiculously expensive!!!

30. Stop feeding the deer!
31. Not cost effective
32. Too costly. One bullet per deer costs less
33. Definitely no
34. Really? Hire more cops instead
35. Will not change anything when you have 500 deer
- 36.
37. Tax money should be used for various community improvements; not for deer harvesting.
38. 50 deer would not put a dent so why bother.
39. That is ridiculous!!!
40. Are you kidding me? We don't need guns near the lake with children and families.
41. Let concerned & interested neighbors harvest
42. Way too much money!
43. I have read the Orion Research proposal. Hopefully their services can be implemented in our community. May we could have a couple of fund raisers to help defray the cost.
44. "We know who feeds the deer and what time they do it. Give them a ticket everytime. No money should be spent until we stop the feeding to see that works. May a \$300 find and tell them it will be used to ""harvest"" a deer."
45. I would like to know costs and how much they would be able to reduce. Cost/benefit analysis before making a decision.
46. "Should be taken care of by 4,5,6."
47. "I have counter 50 deer on a 30 min jog, so this could get very costly. But I understand that the deer are beautiful, but a nuisance. I'm probably going to close in my year (fence) because they are destroying my shrubs and plants."
48. "Would have to have a better, clearer understanding of what the tangible benefit to the city would be."
49. "Again, same answer. Is there a less expensive avenue?"
50. Cost to high!!
51. I am willing to help.
52. Options? Need more information.
53. The deer belong to the state of Texas; should seek funds from the state not tax property owners
54. We do not support cruelty to animals. We have heard about the deer round up and it is horrible
55. I don't support killing of innocent animals that are part of our community.
56. "Again, what is done with harvest"
57. Taxes in Llano County & Sunrise Beach are already high!
58. Let the hunters from the neighborhood do the harvesting
59. Definitely not - No. Please no higher taxes
60. "Unsure this will be a long-term, cost effective solution."
61. "This is hard to answer. I would think the first years harvest would be quite expensive since we are so over-populated. How much is the expected cost for the first year, then the estimated cost each year to maintain a suitable balance?"
62. Only if there is a cap on total cost will I support this.
63. "Let property owners harvest the deer, and I would suggest using money instead to start a community pantry center and meat locker for residents on fixed income, the need, and in time of need."
64. Maybe looks at a fee based on annual harvest to keep out of tax line.
65. Again \$300/deer is expensive and removing 50 deer would have minimal impact.
66. Can't answer -- not any information about city budget

67. Orion should pay SRB for supplying research animals
68. Absolutely not
69. "The cost seems high. I am not opposed to paying to harvest, but would want more info about total numbers to harvest, total cost, need for repeating in the future, and any possible cheaper alternatives."
70. That seems way to much
71. Would support a less expensive method
72. Tax money should be used for road & redigging culverts First
73. Too many other needs in the city
74. Please!!
75. \$300/deer. Harvesting 50 deer won't put a dent in the problem so the cost to harvest an adequate number of deer would be outrageous
76. Don't think it will produce meaningful results
77. NO
78. ?

Overall Comments:

1. Spouses are not being counted. Corn feeding has little to do with our deer population. The deer are drawn to this area because of the oasis. There are over a 1000 food plots (septic fields and lush landscapes) which attracted them to our area first. When there is nothing in adjoining ranches to eat or drink they will move to the oasis.
2. Thanks for the time and effort you have put into this
3. The deer will be healthier if we don't feed them!
4. Unfortunately, the deer feeding ordinance is frequently ignored. I know of two such cases nearby. It is difficult to report a neighbor w/q creating ill will in the neighbor. As much as we might encourage adherence to this policy, it must be supplemented with more proactive policies as proposed here. A few deer are nice but overpopulating has created a nuisance and health hazard.
5. Leave the deer along -- they were here first! We are using their home lands! Nature will take care of them.
6. Implement the controlled hunting in town. Charge hunters a fee to offset the additional cost of law enforcement monitoring the program. Why would you pay an outside company to remove deer and move them out of town where will be hunted anyway. I'm sure there are residents who believe shooting deer is cruel, but the condition of many of the deer I see when in town is cruel. The over population for the amount of food leaves the deer in terrible condition. This year with the rain has been better but still not ideal. Even in the rural areas surveys are done & extra permits are given to reduce the deer population to healthy levels. I am a part time resident and sad when in town and see condition of most deer.
7. Save the deer. No killing (cruel)
8. Our time and money should be spent on making Sunrise Beach not look like a trailer park.
9. Would be of interest to know the population distribution of both does and bucks on the Beach. Is that info available? Would be of interest to know all of the factual information the Wildlife Management committee has gathered since inception of the committee in August 2015. With more facts it would be helpful to really understand the magnitude of the deer overpopulation issue and be able to respond to future surveys more appropriately. Also - it would of interest to know the results of this survey. Our goal should be to do what is best for the deer and the residents/citizens who co-habitat within our great, small city of SRB.
10. I think deer add a feeling of serenity and beauty to our area.

11. Repeal Ordinance 238
12. Controlling the deer herd may result in raising taxes -- that is ok with me.
13. The only solution is to completely fence the city.
14. I am an avid hunter and understand population control. Please contact Hollywood Park in San Antonio re their relocation program; has been very successful and our remaining deer population are very healthy. I also understand the difficulty in addressing this issue as there is no way you will please everybody! Good luck and keeping the fight.
15. Fix our roads -- this is where any extra dollars should go as priority #1. Slow the speed limit to reduce accidents with deer. Post watch for deer signs
16. You will ignore this and do what you darned well please. Want to save life -- give us decent water to drink. The present water causes internal stones.
17. We are part-time weekenders. We do not see any deer at our house. We have never feed deer (purchased home in 1994) when we did see them on our property. We have no plants for deer to eat -- so we do not want to spend tax dollars on getting rid of deer. Thanks for your time on this matter.
18. I am 100% in support of anything that can done to not only control, but totally eradicate if possible all of the deer in our city and neighborhood. The population is out of control and the deer are a nuisance. There are many reasons to do exactly what you are proposing: 1. They poop everywhere, 2. The eat all of the landscaping, 3. Dangerous when rutting, 4. Danger to drivers, 5. Fleas, 6. Disease. The next door neighbor feeds them every day so the problem is even larger for us. I tried everything to try to stop her feeding to no avail. Good luck in your endeavor.
19. The residents at xxxxxx consistently feed the deer on weekends. They have had 25-30 deer on their property at times. The take pleasure in have the deer eat out of their hands. Please do something about the increasing deer population. They are getting out of hand. Yes, they are beautiful, but too many bring potential disease to our city.
20. Many of us moved to the hill country because of the deer and wildlife we see all around us. My family loves to see the deer up close. As an avid hunter, I am aware that harvesting deer is good for the deer population to stay healthy. Therefore I am in favor of harvesting the deer in SRB for their sake. What I am not in favor of is developing a plan to run them off or get rid of them. I realize some people consider them a nuisance. I suppose most people thought the same about the Indians back in the 1800s, and look what America did to them. Shame on us. I support a deer harvesting program for SRB with specific restrictions, but I feel there are enough experienced hunters who live in SRB that can handle it without spending money on an outside agency to do it. The opinion survey should include asking the SRB residents who would like to participate in the harvest.
21. Maybe a Please Do Not Feed the Deer notice on the SRB event sign periodically will help too. Even fines/warnings assessed for feeding the deer might help.
22. Have TPW move the deer to another area.
23. Charge a small fee to bow hunter/shot gunner for harvested game. Allow taking of inferior/cull bucks.
24. Our handicapped daughter loves to see them. We bought in Sunrise Beach because of the deer.
25. Deer corn contains chemicals - this has not proven. When I butcher a deer have found lot of fat.
26. Will the cost be covered by the use of property taxes or is each homeowner responsible for the \$550? Will the cost of \$250 be covered by the property taxes or is each homeowner responsible for cost of 250? If approved will homeowners be notified of properties that agree to this & be provide contact info these area to inquire about hunting? Will the cost be covered by the property taxes or is each homeowner responsible for cost of \$300. Should homeowners expect

an increase in property taxes if all above is approved? We agree to all above if the cost comes out of property taxes and not the responsibility of homeowners to split cost out of pocket, if not we do not agree to the following #2,4,7,9

27. So why not invest the money for our city in out ways: no lime disease in Llano City that originated here; no reported accidents in SRB to City Police in 2 years -- the police report is fact.
28. I would support #4, 7, 9 if the city committed to aggressively enforce the No-Feed ordinance
29. Increase fines for putting out corn or feed. Use revenues to reward snitchers (whistle-blowers)
30. The city has many issues which are much more important than deer messing up someone's landscape. There is not a property owner out here that did not know they were here BEFORE they purchased their property. In fact, I'm willing to bet the beautiful deer was probably a reason they came here. Let's use out time, resources, especially our property tax money which supports the city for other things that are more important and much more sensible. If the deer are a hazard at the airport we build a fence. That is the only thing worth discussing here. We also need to ask if we really need an airport. There is one in Kingsland that could be utilized.
31. Lakefront will bear disproportionate burden!
32. Side note: I have friends that owns a big ranch. He gets management permits from TPWD for harvesting overpopulation. All the hunters had the deer processed and passes on to the hungry people for charity.
33. I bought my house in Sunrise Beach because of the wildlife! The deer should be left along. They were here first!
34. If the deer are truly a danger at the airport take care of that problem. Other than the airport, the city should not be spending tax money on controlling the deer.
35. Move if you don't like deer. They do not bother us -- erected fence to keep out of plants & flowers. Just go outside to run away (sic). Love the wild life especially deer (one reason moved here). See people driving around (not counting) but enjoying SRB deer. Like country living.
36. And fine the offender
37. Orion's protocol seems a little excessive for our purposes. Shoot them, take to a processor, give away. The rest is non-essential.
38. Have a bow contest, charge to enter, winners get to get deer. Win Win Win
39. Stop feeding
40. Regarding questions 7 & 9, on the surface a harvesting cost of \$300 per deer appears high -- 50 deer at a cost of \$15,000. So the obvious question is how many deer need to be harvested now, and then each succeeding year to control the population, and what is the estimated cost to achieve that control I feel certain that harvesting only 50 deer will not put a dent in the over-populations problem. If this is the case, what do you get in return for the \$15,000? I support controlling the deer population and deer health, but I need a more complete macro picture that quantifies the problem and the cost to control the problem before I can make an informed decision.