



COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMISSION
February 10, 2026
MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The February 10, 2026 meeting of the Community Services Advisory Committee (CSAC) was called to order by Chair Vicki Guinther at 6:30 PM on Wednesday, February 10, 2026 in Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive.

ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present: Vicki Guinther, Robert VanVliet, Hong Qiu, Ann Bohman, Jessica Tobias, Cathy Axcell, Carol Clinton

Committee Members Absent: Rex Pryor

Staff Present: Megan O'Callaghan, Michael Barker, Emily Goliver, Mitchell Ament

Other Guests: Gregory Hitzhusen and Gabriel Karns, Ohio State; Kevin Kasnyik, Metro Parks

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Guinther inquired if there were any corrections to the January 14, 2026 CSAC meeting minutes. [No corrections were requested.]

Mr. VanVliet moved, Ms. Qiu seconded approval of the January 14, 2026 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Tobias, yes; Ms. Bohman, yes; Mr. VanVliet, yes; Ms. Axcell, yes; Ms. Clinton, yes; Ms. Qiu, yes; Chair Guinther.

[Motion carried 7-0.]

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments offered.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENT

Ms. Bohman shared that she had received positive feedback about the Dublin deer postcard that had been distributed to residents. She explained that the picture on the postcard had resonated strongly with community members, generating significant positive responses. Ms. Bohman reported that people had approached her on the street to express appreciation for the card. She noted that while there were multiple ways to communicate, this particular postcard had captured everyone's attention. Ms. Bohman expressed hope that the outreach would yield good statistical results and thanked the committee for their work on this effective communication tool.

OLD BUSINESS

- **Deer Management Recommendation**

Chair Guinther introduced the topic, noting that Ms. Goliver would be presenting on deer management.

Ms. Goliver introduced the evening's guests and their areas of expertise and invited each to provide a brief introduction.

Mr. Gabriel Karns introduced himself as working with The Ohio State University in the School of Environment and Natural Resources. He explained that he had completed both a master's degree and PhD studying whitetail deer ecology. While he noted he had not conducted extensive in-depth research on deer in the past decade, he shared that his initial work at Ohio State involved a post doctoral research project collaborating with the Division of Wildlife to reshape the statewide deer management structure. He mentioned his involvement with suburban and urban white-tailed deer management in and around Columbus.

Ms. Goliver added that the Ohio State capstone project, which committee members were familiar with from recent years, had been led by Mr. Karns and his team of students.

Mr. Gregory Hitzhusen introduced himself as a colleague of Mr. Karns in the School of Environment and Natural Resources at Ohio State. He explained that he teaches the capstone course for the sustainability major and that they frequently work on projects in communities facing various challenges. Mr. Hitzhusen noted that the deer management surveys conducted in Worthington were completed by his students. He shared that his involvement with deer management began partly because he teaches the capstone class, which provided research capabilities. He serves on the Worthington Deer Task Force and, currently, on the Worthington Deer Advisory Council, which gives him continuous involvement in Worthington's deer management conversations.

Mr. Hitzhusen expressed fascination with the survey results and decision-making processes he had observed within the Dublin community. He noted his awareness of Dublin's deer situation and mentioned recent surveys conducted in Gahanna and Columbus. He expressed curiosity about the slight differences and many similarities between survey results across different communities. He explained that while his perspective largely comes from Worthington's experience, his primary expertise lies in environmental ethics and environmental values. He emphasized his particular interest in hunting ethics and human-wildlife interaction questions.

Mr. Kevin Kasnyik introduced himself as working with Columbus and Franklin County Metro Parks. He outlined Metro Parks' long history with deer management programs, which began in the early 1990s. Mr. Kasnyik shared that he started with Metro Parks as a student at Ohio State in the 1990s and began working there full-time in 1997. He has been involved with their deer management program throughout his tenure and been in charge of the program for the past six years. He noted his degree from Ohio State in wildlife management and his status as a commissioned officer. As a manager of park operations, he oversees operations in certain parks and serves as Metro Parks' natural resource manager for the entire district. While acknowledging that deer management represents a small portion of his responsibilities, he emphasized his involvement for the past 25 years.

Ms. Goliver thanked all the guests for joining and provided background on the deer management discussion. She explained that this had been an ongoing conversation since February 2022. She highlighted CSAC's vital role in ordinance 47-23, which was adopted by City Council at the November 27, 2023 meeting as the outdoor feeding ordinance prohibiting the feeding of wild

animals. She noted that the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) had presented at the November 25, 2024 CSAC meeting on the current landscape, statewide programs, and their expertise in deer management. This was followed by further discussion at the February 11, 2025 CSAC meeting, where it was recommended that city staff continue monitoring the regional landscape surrounding deer management. Staff had committed to providing CSAC with updates when new information became available, which was supported by City Council at the May 5, 2025 meeting. She noted that there had been a follow-up at the January 14, 2026 meeting, which Mr. Ament had facilitated in her absence.

Ms. Goliver addressed specific questions raised at the January 14 CSAC meeting regarding whether there was an aggressive deer trend and if pre-2025 data existed. She confirmed that data was available but noted its dependence on resident reports. She presented statistics showing that in 2025, there were 20 dog attacks reported and 35 incidents with deer stalking or chasing humans. In comparison, in 2024 there were only 4 total combined incidents; in 2023, there were 3 incidents. She emphasized this significant increase as an important data point.

Ms. Goliver shared survey data where residents reported deer experiences beyond damage to plants and landscape. She explained that in analyzing narrative responses, there were 120 unique counts of incidents involving pets and deer; 4 unique incidents where pets were reportedly killed as a result of deer interactions; and 45 counts of deer chasing or stalking people.

Addressing health concerns of the deer population, Ms. Goliver identified disease transmission as the primary concern, occurring through direct or indirect contact. She listed the three most common diseases mentioned by ODNR are chronic wasting disease (with no reports yet in Franklin County) and EHD (with confirmed cases in central Ohio), a condition causing wart-like growths on deer faces. She noted that Ms. Ray had reported at the previous meeting that she had received many calls about deer with facial warts; however, ODNR does not track these diseases by specific locations.

Regarding the cost implications of waiting until Dublin reaches biological carrying capacity before implementing a management program, Ms. Goliver explained that costs would ultimately be determined by the number of deer removed. She noted that costs could be higher initially if more aggressive removal was pursued, or the costs could be spread over time with smaller annual removals. She shared insights from Worthington's contractor that removal does not follow a flat fee structure per deer. As programs progress, deer become more difficult to remove as they learn to avoid bait stations and adapt to removal efforts. The organization that the City of Worthington works with factors this increasing difficulty into their cost structure.

Ms. Goliver addressed whether implementing a program sooner would eliminate the need for archery. She explained that archery could serve as a maintenance tactic. Timing of program implementation neither eliminates nor creates the need for archery. It could function as a maintenance program once acceptable population levels are reached or supplement professional sharpshooter programs.

She provided updates on drone technology being developed for deer population assessment, particularly in hotspot areas like Avery Park, to count deer at specific moments in time and track the removal program's success. She emphasized that annual removal numbers would be dictated by program goals and social tolerance levels. Success metrics could include reduction in dead deer pickups and periodic community surveys to track sentiment changes.

Ms. Goliver shared that Worthington had signed a contract with a correctional facility to process deer meat into 2-pound packages for distribution to local food pantries at a cost of \$130 per deer. Dublin staff had reached out to the Dublin Food Pantry to understand their processes and policies regarding accepting such donations.

Regarding survey distribution, Ms. Goliver reported high engagement metrics: the Nextdoor post received 72 interactions (one of their highest); Instagram had 90 interactions; Facebook had 57. She thanked Ms. Bohman for mentioning the mailer, noting it was sent to 18,729 households, and nearly 1,500 QR code scans were tracked. The survey also was promoted through the Dublin video series, weekly newsletters, HOA communications, and media coverage in the Columbus Dispatch.

Ms. Goliver presented the survey results in detail. For background questions, the majority of respondents indicated that they lived within city limits. Prior awareness of the deer feeding ban showed 40% positive, 38% negative, and 22% neutral responses. Regarding deer population levels, 55% indicated there were too many deer, 41% said there was an acceptable number, and 4% said too few. Regarding deer population changes over the past three years, 60% reported it had increased, 34% said it stayed the same, and 6% said it had decreased.

For negative deer experiences, 49% reported plant or property damage; 14% reported deer vehicle collisions or near misses; 19% reported Lyme disease from deer ticks; and others reported aggressive deer encounters. Of those experiencing deer/vehicle incidents, 441 people who had collisions or near misses did not report them to police, which reveals the data collection challenges.

Regarding injury incidents in the past three years, 93% reported no injuries to people or pets, while 7% (227 people) reported injuries had been experienced.

Regarding concerns about deer removal programs, for public safety: 33% of respondents were slightly concerned, 28.5% indicated they were not concerned, and 38% were most concerned. Regarding program costs: 43.5% were slightly concerned, 37.3% not concerned, and 19.2% most concerned. For deer welfare: 30.4% were slightly concerned, 35.7% not concerned, and 34% most concerned.

Regarding management preferences, 41% of respondents indicated they believed there was no need to manage the population, while 59% said the population is increasing and should be managed. Regarding the use of public funds for deer management, 60% supported the use of public funds and 40% opposed. For the use of lethal management methods (assuming safety regulations), 49% supported, 33% opposed, and 18% were neutral.

Comparing the recent survey to the May 2023 survey, the percentage indicating there was an acceptable number of deer decreased from 54.9% to 41.1%, while those saying there were too many deer increased from 42% to 55%. Support for a deer management program increased from 50.5% to 59.3%, while those seeing no need for deer management decreased from 49.5% to 40.7%.

Ms. Goliver presented ward-specific data showing variation across the City. Ward 3 showed 67.3% support for management, while Ward 2 showed 43% support. For lethal management, Ward 4 showed nearly 49% support, and Ward 3 showed 55.7% support. She noted this aligned with complaint patterns and helped identify deer issue hotspots.

Ms. Goliver concluded by requesting that CSAC provide City Council with a comprehensive report on the committee's findings, including everything they have reviewed, survey analysis, the pros and cons of lethal programs, and potential goals for Council consideration.

Committee Questions/Comments:

Mr. VanVliet asked to see the survey response numbers by ward. When the slide was displayed, he recalled that Ward 2 had the least deer incidents, particularly car incidents which were concentrated in the north and east wards. He inquired whether staff had analyzed response types by ward and their concerns about management. He noted that Wards 3 and likely part of Ward 1 showed higher percentages favoring action, while Ward 2 showed less support, which he suggested might correlate with both incident numbers and development patterns. He speculated that Ward 2's more developed southern area might have less green space than the northern wards.

Ms. Goliver responded by showing ward-specific data on deer population management support. She confirmed Mr. VanVliet's observation that this aligned with complaint patterns, particularly aggressive deer concerns in 2025 coming from Ward 3 and Muirfield areas. She explained that the northern part of the City is more built out with denser population, while Ward 2 has more open space, including the West Innovation District and fields where deer can congregate away from heavily-populated areas. This creates more human-deer interactions in areas like Muirfield, where deer are confined to backyards and roadways.

Mr. VanVliet inquired if any deer management recommendation would not necessarily apply uniform concentration throughout the City but would correlate to deer locations based on drone surveillance or current knowledge. Ms. Goliver confirmed this was staff's understanding.

Mr. Hitzhusen added clarification from the City of Worthington's experience, noting they conducted two surveys with community education occurring between them. He explained that there is a common misperception that deer are constrained because humans have built houses over their natural habitat. In reality, suburban development creates an ideal deer habitat with landscaping that provides a continuous food source. He noted deer are ten times denser in neighborhoods than in natural areas. This was counterintuitive even to Worthington's Deer Task Force members. He observed that as people became aware of these population dynamics and why deer problems increase, it helped them understand that humans had actually created favorable conditions for deer, not taken away their habitat.

Ms. Axcell reflected that what resonated most with her was that conditions will not improve on their own. She asked about the "sweet spot" level of City support needed before rolling out a program to ensure good communication and minimal conflict.

Ms. Goliver deferred to Mr. Hitzhusen, who compared Dublin's current 60-40 support ratio to Worthington's initial survey. He noted that Worthington's second survey showed people misunderstood actual management options. Many thought relocation was viable (in reality, it is illegal and results in high deer mortality) or that birth control would work (it also is not legal nor effective in open populations). After community education events were held regarding deer habitat and population dynamics experts explaining that lethal removal is essentially the only effective option for reducing numbers, support for lethal removal increased from Worthington's initial 60-40% to 70-30% or 75-25%.

Mr. Hitzhusen emphasized the importance of addressing reasonable concerns, particularly about safety. He noted some comments were "somewhat hysterical" with fears about hunters endangering children. Education about Ohio's 460 cumulative years of deer removal programs with perfect human safety records helped. He explained that more pets have been harmed by deer than have ever been harmed by deer removal programs, with no accidental pet injuries recorded. Understanding that deer removal programs are statistically safer than recreational sports, like golf, helped calm concerns. He noted that 75% community support looked like a mandate from Worthington citizens. While Dublin currently shows 60-40% community support, additional education about growing populations and increasing costs could shift opinions. He concluded that determining the sweet spot is contextual; it involves understanding the historical sweep from Ohio having almost no deer to now having too many without natural regulation mechanisms.

Ms. Clinton asked Mr. Hitzhusen to outline Worthington's public education program details. He responded that they analyzed survey confusion points and held two events. The first featured John C. Pack from Cleveland Metroparks presenting "Deer 101" on Ohio deer population history, including the eradication of predators from the 1850s to early 1900s, when Ohio had only eleven deer in the Cleveland Zoo, through to current overpopulation issues. This event was held at the McConnell Arts Center with about 100 attendees and was recorded for later viewing.

The second event featured Jeff Westerfield, a state expert on deer removal programs, discussing different management options (lethal and non-lethal), studying 74 Ohio communities with removal programs representing 460 cumulative years of experience. This research revealed the perfect safety record and varying effectiveness levels.

The third education component involved capstone students creating infographics addressing key misunderstandings. These explained that deer transport/relocation is illegal in Ohio (with 80% mortality rates making it inhumane); contraceptive options are expensive and ineffective in open populations (allowed only for research); and detailed how targeted removal works with trained marksmen on elevated platforms using night vision, suppressors, frangible ammunition, and maintaining detailed shot logs. The infographics also explained archery programs.

Mr. Hitzhusen noted that, initially, people opposed firearms and thought archery seemed "nicer". However, after learning that firearms removal is more surgical and efficient, while archery allows hunters to benefit from meat at lower cost, perspectives shifted. The second survey incorporated these infographics, resulting in increased community support. He mentioned additional outreach occurred through articles, including one in the Columbus Monthly that captured the community tensions and misunderstandings involved. He emphasized that education was critical because while people have differences, addressing their unfamiliarity with the issues was beneficial. The education appeared helpful based on the second community survey results showing increased support for removal to levels that could not be ignored as the will of residents.

Ms. Qiu thanked the presenters for their expertise and years of experience. She stated that given Dublin's current deer population level, action is clearly needed sooner rather than later, though sufficient community education is necessary for success. She asked about the appropriate deer reduction level needed for Dublin.

Mr. Kevin Kasnyik responded that there is no clear, specific answer. He explained that it is impossible to fully understand total deer damage, reproductive levels, and movement patterns. Using Glacier Ridge Metro Park since 2021 as an example, he noted they started removal after

seeing loss of biological diversity in plant communities based on 1990s experiences at Sharon Woods and High Banks. He emphasized numerous outlying factors affect decisions, including development and agriculture influences on park habitats. He stressed there is no specific target number, noting their aerial surveys at Glacier Ridge show variable results depending on timing and the fact that deer movement makes numbers imprecise.

Mr. Karns added that when dealing with open populations, biological reality creates source patches. He used the ward map to illustrate that if deer removal was recommended for Wards 1, 3, and 4 but not 2, Ward 2 would become a source patch with deer flowing like water to the "lowest points" in other wards. He emphasized that in population dynamics, females matter while males do not, except when males are involved in negative interactions during certain seasons. He stated that the best research indicates 30-35% of the deer herd must be removed annually just to maintain current levels, with higher percentages needed for actual reduction. He noted that removed deer are obviously gone, but the remaining deer behavior is also influenced by the "ecology of fear" created by effective predators on the landscape. That fear is clearly lacking when we have deer stalking humans. Deer surviving sharpshooting rounds changes deer behavior, however, which average citizens appreciate, even though those deer remain on the landscape.

Ms. Qiu inquired about targeting females (does) specifically during nighttime operations using infrared technology. Mr. Karns confirmed that sharpshooting in suburban environments occurs at close range with minimal ambiguity about target animals. If goals specify 95% female removal, sharpshooters can absolutely meet those metrics. In other contracted work with vehicle-based operations at longer ranges, the percentage of does might be lower. He emphasized that suburban work is highly efficient, selective, and close-range. He added that while sharpshooting discussions are necessary, archery programs can eventually handle maintenance. Archery, also being close-range, can require hunters to shoot only females. While hunters are not as precise as professionals and may accidentally take out young bucks without visible antlers, the rules can still focus heavily on elimination of female deer as the most effective population control method.

Mr. Kasnyik added that any program should be viewed as a long-term commitment with no permanent fix. He emphasized the need to reach maintenance mode. Metro Parks uses archery hunting to supplement activities in certain areas very effectively in appropriate circumstances, though some parks would never allow archery. Their comprehensive program includes archery, sharpshooting, and lottery firearm hunts in rural parks. They previously tried birth control and relocation. He noted their relocation program may have prompted Ohio's ban, as deer mortality was 40% on their property but jumped to 80% once deer left their jurisdiction, leading the state to discontinue this option.

Ms. Goliver clarified that hunting is seasonal, with October through early January the typical timing, when bucks still have antlers allowing for easy identification.

Mr. Kasnyik added that while they target females, they also remove bucks since bucks hit vehicles, attack dogs, rub trees, and eat vegetation equally.

Ms. Clinton asked about implementation timing and next steps, wondering about scheduling public meetings for an October program start. Mr. Hitzhusen explained Worthington's process contracting with the USDA Wildlife Service; it required several months lead time for logistics and scheduling. Worthington conducts removal January through March after hunting season, when the tree foliage is minimal. Different timing is possible based on various factors.

Mr. Kasnyik noted Metro Parks typically starts in late October, which has advantages during deer breeding season when deer are less fearful of activity. Weather always affects timing. There have been programs that ran through March. Starting early has challenges since foliage makes deer harder to see, but closed park systems with single entry/exit points offer more control. Efficiency increases later in the year after leaves fall.

Ms. Axcell asked where Worthington ended up in their second survey regarding support percentages.

Mr. Hitzhusen provided detailed statistics: the first survey showed 54.5% supporting firearms with 39.7% opposing; archery had 60% support with 34.5% opposing. The second survey showed firearms support increased to 73% with opposition dropping to 21%; archery support remained steady at 61% with opposition decreasing to 28%. He noted that for those concerned about deer welfare, targeted removal offers the cleanest kill possible, which appealed to those worried about wounding with archery. However, he acknowledged modern archery technology has greatly improved, making old concerns about wounded deer less valid. The shift showed even stronger firearms support after education occurred.

Ms. Tobias inquired about evidence of successful programs and helpful goals.

Mr. Hitzhusen explained that deer management statewide is based on complaints rather than population counts, balancing farmer complaints about too many deer against hunter complaints about too few. Worthington's success metrics included: reduction in citizen complaints about deer conflict (tracking calls, emails, and surveys); reduction in police deer removal counts; reduction in deer-vehicle collisions; and population index measurements using drone surveys and police spotlight counts during night patrols. He emphasized they are not setting specific population numbers but looking for trend indicators.

Mr. Hitzhusen highlighted a quintessential comment from gardeners stating that after 35 years of gardening in Worthington, the last 5-10 years made it impossible to grow anything, even deer-resistant species. The goal is to achieve a better balance, allowing activities like gardening while acknowledging that although most people enjoy seeing deer, increasingly, they are viewing them as nuisances, especially given Dublin's recent aggressive deer issues. He emphasized measuring multiple factors while seeking a general community sense of better harmony with the deer.

Ms. Qiu shared her personal experience of giving up vegetable and flower gardening after 2-3 years because deer began eating everything, including previously deer-resistant plants. She looked forward to gardening again.

Mr. Karns joked about rock gardens, then emphasized that goals are crucial for measuring success. He warned that with Worthington's outlined goals, the education burden never stops because public expectations for immediate results must be managed. He stressed focusing on trends rather than single data points, avoiding excitement over first-year reductions or disappointment over slight increases. He noted reporting rates might temporarily increase as awareness grows before management effects catch up. He emphasized that wildlife management is 90% people management through setting expectations rather than managing wildlife itself.

A committee member asked about Metro Parks' improvements with the deer issue since 2021. Mr. Kasnyik confirmed they had experienced improvements at Glacier Ridge, including reduced complaints within the park, fewer aggressive attacks (though one person provoked an attack and

posted it on YouTube), and reversal of damage to spring wildflowers in woodlots. He noted increased ODNR complaints from areas outside the park and rising deer-vehicle collisions. External changes significantly affected their situation, including multiple nearby developments converting agriculture to subdivisions.

Mr. VanVliet asked about regional approaches when Dublin implements something while neighboring communities do not. He wondered about regional planning beyond individual municipal efforts.

Mr. Kasnyik responded that Metro Parks helps many municipalities with their deer problems, removing many deer whose ranges extend beyond park boundaries. He noted deer movement through corridors and development patterns, stating everyone will eventually have problems.

Mr. Hitzhusen added that Worthington jokes about deer running to Clintonville once removal begins. Clintonville residents attended Worthington's task force meetings seeking coordination. He noted that ODNR Wildlife Management Supervisor Gary Comer advocates for regional coordination, which he supports. He observed different alarm levels across municipalities based on survey differences. He mentioned Columbus's recent survey with 3,500 responses (2,500 from Clintonville), showing results more like Worthington's second survey than Dublin's first. In Clintonville, there is tension between a small group opposing any deer killing and a larger group seeing deer as destructive. The Olentangy River corridor presents clear issues. He noted Dublin might be less affected by some corridors. Worthington's open population means deer removed from areas along the Olentangy River are quickly replaced. When deer feel pressure from sharpshooters, they move to areas without removal programs. He suggested this will catalyze quicker action in neighboring areas like Clintonville as Worthington's deer migrate there. He mentioned an Ohio State environmental professionals network meeting attempting to start collaboration conversations between municipalities. He expressed belief that coordination would benefit everyone.

Ms. O'Callaghan, City Manager, confirmed regional conversations occur among city managers and mayors through various groups. She first raised deer management two years ago to lukewarm response, with only Worthington's Robin Stewart staying to discuss. She has since heard from Bexley and others showing increasing interest, though resident feedback and program thoughts vary by community. She noted challenges include no overarching entity for contracting or funding responsibilities. She emphasized ongoing regional conversation and education collaboration, crediting contacts like Robin Stewart (whom she speaks with every few days) for process guidance and emphasizing education importance. This led to this evening's conversation.

Mr. VanVliet asked about Dublin laws or ordinances requiring modification for discussed activities. Ms. Goliver explained the City Manager has authority to permit hunting by wildlife officers on public property without ordinance updates.

Ms. O'Callaghan clarified this refers to current ordinances but emphasized she would not act unilaterally without seeking City Council discussion. She asked Ms. Goliver to address the USDA permitting process used by Worthington.

Ms. Goliver explained that if Council directs pursuit of lethal management, they would work closely with USDA Wildlife Services to determine appropriate properties at which to permit the removal, emphasizing not every property is suitable. Safety is the top priority requiring comprehensive

review. The process includes property review and ODNR permitting, requiring a deer management plan submission. Metro Parks and Worthington have submitted plans that Dublin has reviewed. Plans must specify permit numbers sought and undergo significant work determining properties for lethal activities with close USDA and Dublin Police review.

Ms. O'Callaghan added that several contracting processes would need Council authorization, noting that there are many moving parts before implementation.

Mr. Hitzhusen detailed Worthington's process after receiving the community's mandate and their City Council approval. Wildlife Services used maps to instantly identify deer corridors, high concentration areas, and suitable green spaces. Their task force identified 5-7 likely spots, which Wildlife Services quickly confirmed. They implemented a resident application process for property consideration. Of 30-40 applications, only 3-4 were approved, due to safety requirements including adequate space and raised platform capability. He noted more people wanted deer removed than could participate. He explained archery programs might be more effective for dispersed deer behavior influence since targeted removal, while efficient, can occur at fewer sites. If archery programs pursued deer more broadly across neighborhoods, it could affect deer behavior more effectively. He emphasized that public acceptance heavily depends on meat utilization. Many survey respondents indicated opposition if the meat was wasted but support if it was used productively. Having meat processed for food pantries was crucial. He noted deer hunters' frustration about professionals removing deer resulting in the hunters being unable to procure meat for their families. He discussed a responsible hunting culture, sharing his experience teaching environmental values where vegans and hunters find common ground through discussions about respect for animals and providing protein for families and neighbors. He noted future archery programs allow community members to take pride in providing Dublin deer for their families. While Worthington focuses on targeted removal currently, regulations must change for archery hunting. He emphasized meat utilization makes a huge difference in public acceptance.

Mr. Kasnyik strongly endorsed Mr. Hitzhusen's points, noting Metro Parks did not implement archery until 2015, twenty years after starting their deer management program. They have never regretted it and have expanded it almost annually since.

Ms. Clinton asked about creating a comprehensive CSAC report addressing all issues. Ms. Goliver presented an outline for the report structure, noting extensive material from multiple conversations. She proposed drafting the report for the committee review, allowing individual members to provide feedback to avoid group discussion violations. Members could individually send notes for preparation of a final report for City Council presentation. She noted that the report would cover the time period from February 2022 forward.

Ms. Clinton asked about the timeline for public education and report sequencing. Ms. Goliver explained the goal of getting information to Council soon after extensive CSAC interaction. The report would include the City of Worthington's program overview and education information for Council feedback.

Ms. O'Callaghan confirmed Ms. Goliver's explanation, emphasizing the intent to share Worthington experience details and propose thoughts on Dublin education efforts. She noted there is no immediate concern about a timeline for implementation. This is information sharing about CSAC's extensive study on deer management and suggested considerations for Council awareness.

Ms. O'Callaghan asked the guests if they could share any lessons learned from Worthington's process.

Mr. Hitzhusen reflected that based on ODNR's feedback comparing it to other communities, Worthington conducted impressive but possibly excessive surveying. However, he felt good about taking the problem seriously and listening to community concerns through surveys. He praised Dublin's postcard to 17,000 residents ensuring everyone's chance to participate. He emphasized the need to listen to reasonable concerns and avoid mockery of misunderstandings about deer behavior, recognizing that most people are not deer ecologists. He stressed the need to take the education effort seriously to address reasonable fears and misperceptions. He mentioned Worthington's lawsuit where someone sought an injunction against deer culling within 1,000 feet of their home. Neighbors complained that the plaintiff had been feeding deer illegally. During the 10-day injunction, 3-4 pets were wounded by deer within a block, showing the hazard created by feeding deer while claiming removal would endanger pets. He emphasized respecting diverse perspectives to avoid barriers from unaddressed fears. He advocated for community building through proactive conversations hearing everyone's views. He noted the lawsuit was dropped after revealing the illegal deer feeding, though the judge initially issued the injunction from an abundance of caution despite the weak case and known safety record. He emphasized the need for more conversations with concerned people to build community goodwill and understanding and to avoid forums where fears are inflamed. He noted that while the media can help, it often seeks sensational controversy for clicks. In the process, he learned about different reporters' approaches ranging from click-seeking to actual community understanding.

Ms. O'Callaghan noted the timing around holidays affected the media's coverage. She asked about regional approaches, sharing that she'd heard varying expert perspectives on effectiveness. She recalled ODNR representatives previously stating Dublin programs would be ineffective without a regional approach, but she has since heard contrary opinions about individual municipal program effectiveness.

Mr. Karns suggested Mr. Kasnyik was best positioned to answer given Metro Parks' isolated parcels. If the regional requirement was valid, Metro Parks should never see benefits from their deer population control program.

Mr. Kasnyik strongly disagreed with the reported ODNR position, stating more programs make everyone's efforts better, cheaper, and easier. He praised Worthington's initiative and differentiated between regional approaches and municipal programs. He felt current state oversight is adequate, noting the state will not solve local problems but communities can work together. He emphasized learning from each other's experiences and stressed the long-term commitment required, warning it is a value-driven issue requiring thick skin. He expressed surprise at the 70-30% survey splits and noted their 1990s surveys showed similar results. He shared relief about not having social media in the 1990s, showing slides of 300 news articles from when they started. He emphasized never making everyone happy or checking every box.

Mr. Hitzhusen added that regional coordination could provide better processing deals through economies of scale. He shared an anecdote about attending a deer field dressing class where half the attendees were prospective hunters and half were locavores seeking local organic meat. He discussed Americans' disconnect from food sources and gardeners' satisfaction compared to hunters' pride in providing food, including taking life. He wondered about high school involvement

in processing education. He described Maui Nui Venison in Hawaii, where invasive axis deer threaten rare species. They sell venison while incorporating Hawaiian hunting traditions - after high-tech sharpshooting, each deer is traditionally carried out on shoulders, then goes through USDA inspection. This blends traditional culture with ecological management and food safety. He suggested this profound respect for landscape and wildlife could reverse opposition to killing animals into respecting them through meaningful use. He proposed creative community roles in ongoing monitoring and management activities.

Mr. Kasnyik emphasized ancillary benefits including protein donations to Mid-Ohio Food Bank. He mentioned delivering truckloads of meat that disappear within a week due to high protein demand. Metro Parks donated over 18,000 pounds of meat this culling season. Other benefits include research support for Ohio State and USDA APHIS, tick research, antler donation for zoo animal enrichment, and student educational benefits extending beyond just deer removal.

Chair Guinther asked for final questions or comments. Hearing none, she thanked the guests for their valuable time and expertise, and thanked Ms. Goliver for bringing the issue forward and drafting the report.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

STAFF COMMENTS

There were no staff comments.

ROUNDTABLE

There was no Roundtable discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.



C.S.A.C. Chair



Judith Beal (gm)

Assistant Clerk of Council