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MR. CASE: My name is Dave Case. I'm the facilitator for tonight's meeting, and as you know the purpose of this meeting is to get public comment on the draft environmental impact statement that has been prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on resident Canada Goose overabundance.

We do want to thank you in advance for taking time out of your evening to come provide comments. This is the second of 11 meetings that will be held across the country. There has been one held a few weeks ago in Dallas, Texas, tonight here in Palatine, tomorrow night in Waupun, Wisconsin, which is right near Fond Du Lac; and then Franklin, Tennessee; Bloomington, Minnesota; Brookings, South Dakota; Richmond, Virginia; Danbury, Connecticut; North Brunswick, New Jersey; Denver, Colorado and Bellevue, Washington.

And those will all be completed by the end of May.

A couple people I would note are here tonight, in case they don't make comments, first I will introduce Ron Kokel here in a few
minutes from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Also from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, John Rogner. He is with the Chicago Ecological Services Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Also Pete Raffley with Congressman Crane's office here in the north suburbs. The process we are going to follow is pretty straightforward.

There has been a draft environmental impact statement prepared by the Service and we want to get your comments on that. Ron Kokel, a biologist with the Service, is going to give you a brief presentation that outlines the alternatives and show us the preferred alternative and what that is all about.

We will move the projector there and set a microphone up here in front. As you came in you got cards if you want to make comments tonight, we are just going to go over what is on the card there.
We ask you to come up front, we will put a microphone up here for two reasons, one is so everybody can hear you; and second so that Carla, our court reporter, can see you and she can read lips, so it helps her to be able to see you speak as well as hear you speak.

When you come up, if you could, we would appreciate it if you give us your name and spell your last name so we get the spelling correctly. There will be a public record of the comments, we want to make sure we get everything correct. Spell your last name, where you are from; and if you are officially representing an organization, let us know what that organization is.

I am going to pass around a sign-up sheet. If would you like to receive a copy of the final environmental impact statement, then go ahead and sign up on this. If you received one before, there are two boxes there, check one or the other box. If you received one before, go ahead and note that so we don't enter your name twice and you get two copies. And if you haven't received a copy
before, then go ahead and note that and we will make sure we enter your name in the database to make sure that you get a copy when the final comes out. Ron will go over the schedule for that.

I do apologize in advance.

I don't think it will be any problem, but in the event that anybody gets too long winded and takes up too much time, I may ask you to hurry your comments along so everyone gets a chance to comment. I don't anticipate that's going to be a problem.

So with that I would like to introduce Ron Kokel, wildlife biologist with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to give us a brief slide presentation on the draft EIS, Ron?

MR. KOKEL: Thank you, Dave, and good evening, everybody. Again, my name is Ron Kokel. I'm a wildlife biologist with the division of migratory bird management in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm stationed in Arlington, Virginia.

On behalf of our director Steve
Williams, I would like to welcome all of you to this public meeting. If I could get the first slide, here we go. As Dave indicated, this is the second of eleven public meetings being held across the country for the purpose of inviting public participation and input into our process of developing an environmental impact statement for resident Canada goose management. This EIS was developed in full cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services.

Why are we here? Well, we are here to explain the draft environmental impact statement, its proposed action, and to listen to your comments. The draft EIS considers a range of management alternatives for addressing expanding populations of locally breeding Canada geese, and as such, we are here to listen to you and invite your comments on our recommended management of these birds.

First, a brief explanation on the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. NEPA requires completion of an EIS to analyze environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with any federal significant action.
NEPA also requires public involvement, that's why we are here, which includes a public scoping period before the draft is issued, and a comment period after the issuance of the draft. We began the scoping process on August 19, 1999, when we published a Federal Register notice that announced our intent to prepare this draft EIS. Then, beginning in February of 2000, we held nine public scoping meetings designed to seek public input into the process; Chicago was one of those meetings. Scoping ended in March of 2000. In response to scoping we received over 3000 comments and over 1250 people attended the nine public scoping meetings. In scoping we found that the top issues of concern were, property damage and complaints caused by resident Canada geese, methods of conflict abatement, sport hunting opportunities, economic impacts of resident Canada geese, human health and safety concerns and impacts to resident Canada geese. NEPA also outlines a specific format for an EIS. First is purpose and need;
Second is the alternatives that you're going to evaluate; thirdly is the affected environment; and fourth is what are the consequences to the environment of your proposed actions.

First, what exactly are resident Canada geese? Resident Canada geese are those geese nesting within the lower 48 states in the months of March, April, May or June, or residing within the lower 48 states in the months of April, May, June, July or August.

First, purpose and need. The purpose of the EIS is to evaluate alternative strategies to reduce, manage and control resident Canada goose populations in the continental United States.

Second, is to provide a regulatory mechanism that would allow state and local agencies, other federal agencies and groups and individuals to respond to damage complaints or management caused by resident Canada geese.

And thirdly is to guide and direct resident Canada goose population management activities in the United States.

The need for the environmental
impact statement is that increasing resident
goose populations, coupled together with growing
conflicts, damages and socioeconomic impacts
have resulted in a re-examination of the
Service’s resident Canada geese management.

Alternatives. The draft
environmental impact statement examines seven
management alternatives, Alternative A, no
action; Alternative B, non-lethal control and
management, which will be only non-permitted
activities, Alternative C, non-lethal control
and management which would include permitted
activities, expanding hunting methods and
opportunities under Alternative D,
Alternative E, integrated depredation water
management, Alternative F, state empowerment,
which is our proposed action, and Alternative G,
which would be a general depredation order.

Under the no action alternative
there be no additional regulatory methods or
strategies to be authorized. We will continue
the use of all special hunting seasons, the
issuance of individual depredation permits and
the issuance of any special Canada goose
permits.

Under the second alternative, non-lethal management, which is only non-permitted activities, we would cease all lethal control of resident Canada geese and/or their eggs. Only non-lethal harassment techniques will be allowed, no permits will be issued by the Service and all special Canada goose hunting seasons will be discontinued.

Under Alternative C, non-lethal management activities, which include permitted activities, we would promote non-lethal harassment techniques, we would cease all permitted lethal control of resident Canada geese. There would be no depredation or special Canada goose permits issued, egg addling would be allowed with a permit, and special hunting seasons will be continued.

Alternative D, was expanded hunting methods and opportunities. Under this alternative we would provide new regulatory options to increase the harvest of resident Canada geese. We would authorize additional hunting methods such as electronic calls,
unplugged guns and expanded shooting hours.

These seasons will be operational during September 1 to 15 and experimental from September 16 to 30. And they would have to be conducted outside of any other open season.

The fifth alternative is one that returns integrated depredation order management. This alternative would consist of an airport depredation order, nest and egg depredation order, agriculture depredation order and a public health depredation order.

Implementation of any of these orders will be up to the state wildlife agencies, special hunting seasons will be continued, and the issuance of depredation permits and special Canada goose permits would also be continued.

The first depredation order is an airport depredation order that would authorize airports to establish and implement a program which could include indirect and/or direct population control strategies. The intent of the program would be to significantly reduce goose populations at airports. Management
actions would have to occur on airport premises.

The nest and egg depredation order would allow the destruction of resident Canada goose nests and eggs without a permit; and the intent of this program will be to stabilize breeding populations of resident Canada geese.

The agriculture depredation order would authorize landowners, operators and tenants which are actively engaged in commercial agriculture to conduct indirect and/or direct population control activities on Canada geese depredating on agricultural crops. The management activities would have to occur on the premises.

Lastly, the public health depredation order would authorize state, county, municipal or local public health officials to conduct indirect and/or direct population control strategies on resident Canada geese when it was recommended by health officials that there was a public health threat. Management activities would have to occur on the premises.

The sixth alternative is our
proposed action, termed state empowerment. Under this alternative we would establish a new regulation which would authorize state wildlife agencies or any authorized agent to conduct or allow management activities on resident goose populations. The intent here is to allow state wildlife management agencies sufficient flexibility to deal with the problems caused by resident geese within their respective state.

We would authorize indirect and/or direct population control strategies such as aggressive harassment techniques, nest and egg destruction, gosling and adult trapping and culling programs. We would allow implementation of any of the specific depredation orders that I just went over under Alternative E.

During existing special hunting seasons we would expand the methods of taking and increase hunter harvest as identified in Alternative D. We would authorize additional hunting methods such as electronic calls, unplugged guns, and expanded shooting hours. These seasons will be operational from
September 1 to 15, experimental from September 16 to 30, and they would have to be conducted outside of any other open season.

In addition, we would provide a conservation order which would provide special expanded hunting opportunities during the portion of the Migratory Bird Treaty closed period, that is August 1 to 31, and then open period September 1 to 15. This would authorize additional hunting methods such as electronic calls, unplugged guns, expanded shooting hours, and liberalized bag limits. And these would also have to be conducted outside of any other open seasons.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would annually assess the impacts and effectiveness of the program, and there would be provision for possible suspension of these regulations, that is the conservation order and/or the regular season changes when the need was no longer present.

Also, we would continue the use of all special and regular Canada goose hunting seasons, continue the issuance of depredation
and special Canada geese permits.

The state requirements under the program would be to annually monitor spring breeding populations and to annually report any unauthorized activities.

The last alternative was termed general depredation order. Under this alternative we would allow any authorized person to conduct management activities on resident geese that are posing threats to health and human safety or causing damage. This will be available from April 1 through August 31. It will provide expanded hunting opportunities as described under Alternative D. It would be continued use of special and regular hunting seasons and the issuance of depredation and special Canada goose permits and the authorization for all management activities would come directly from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Effect on the environment. We looked at two things on the effect of the environment: We looked at the biological environment; and after the biological
environment we looked at the resident Canada goose populations, water quality and wetlands, vegetation and soils, wildlife habitat, and any federally listed presently endangered species.

Under the socioeconomic environment we looked at the migratory bird program, which includes a sport hunting program and a migratory bird permit program, social value considerations, economic considerations, which would include property damage of agricultural crops, human health and safety, and cost of the program.

The environmental consequences section forms the scientific and analytic basis for comparison of all the alternatives. It analyzes the environmental impacts of each alternative in relation to each of those categories that I just went over.

And the no action alternative provides the baseline for this analysis.

Under no action what we would expect is the populations of resident Canada geese would continue to grow. In the Atlantic
Flyway we would expect about 1.6 million within ten years; in the Mississippi Flyway we would expect about two million in ten years; in the Central Flyway, 1.3 million and the Pacific Flyway 450,000 within ten years.

We would also expect continued and expanded goose distribution problems and conflicts, increased workloads, and continued impacts to property, safety and health.

Under the preferred alternative, state empowerment, we would expect reduction in populations of resident Canada geese, especially in specific problem areas. We would expect increased hunting opportunities, a significant reduction in conflicts caused by resident Canada geese, deceased impact to property, safety and health; while there would be an initial workload increase, we think long term the workload would decrease, and the alternative would maintain viable resident Canada goose populations.

Some of the recent modeling that's been done suggests that to reduce all four flyway populations from about 3.5 million down
to the flyway's goals of 2.1 million would
require annually for 10 years a harvest of an
additional 480,000 resident Canada geese
annually over what is now occurring; to take an
additional 852,000 goslings annually, the nest
removal of 528,000 eggs or nests annually, the
combination of an additional harvest of 240,000
goose and the take of 320,000 goslings annually.
All these would have to occur each year for ten
years to reach that goal.

Thus, we believe the only way to
possibly attain these numbers is to give states
the needed flexibility to address problems
within their respective states. And the
population reductions would have to be addressed
on a wide number of available fronts. Because
states are the most informed and
knowledgeable local authority on wildlife
conflicts, primary responsibilities and
decisions of the program should be placed with
them.

What comes next? First is the
development of a new regulation to carry out
this proposed action. This should be
forthcoming next month.

Second, the public comment period on the draft environmental impact statement ends May 30 as they had indicated; and thirdly would be the publication of a filed environmental impact statement, our record of decision, and a final rule that we anticipate for this fall.

As I stated, the public comment period is open until May 30, and Dave has already outlined the various methods that you can use to submit your comments. These include any oral or written comments you submit tonight, and any you may subsequently send into us. The address is printed on the back of the card that you received when you got here tonight.

Additionally, we set up an electronic site where you can send e-mail comments and access all other information pertinent to the EIS process, including the environmental impact statement.

And on behalf of the Fish and Wildlife Service, I would like to thank all of you for attending this hearing and particularly for any of those that provide comments.
And that's the end of the presentation.

MR. CASE: Thank you, Ron. Just to reiterate the process we are going to follow, again it is pretty straightforward. As you came in, you got a comment card. As Ron mentioned it has the addresses if you want to submit written comments and so on. If you would like to make comments tonight, we ask you to come up to the microphone, which we will put out here in just a moment, if you could state your name and spell your last name for us, we would appreciate that. If you are officially representing an organization, let us know what that is. We ask that you come up to the microphone for two reasons, so everybody can hear you; and also so that Carla, our court reporter, can see you and make sure that she gets everything down correctly.

There is a sign-up sheet going around. If you want to receive a copy of the final environmental impact statement, go ahead and sign up there. If you received a copy of it
before, go ahead and note that, check that box;
or if you had not received a copy before, go
ahead and check the other box, and that way we
will know not to send you two copies. So if you
want a copy of the final, go ahead and be sure
to sign up and check one of those boxes.

So with that I would like to go
ahead and start, we are going to put the
microphone out first.

If I call your number and you don't
jump up, I'll just go on to the next number,
number 1?

PHILLIP DIMARZIO: My name is Phillip,
DiMarzio, D-i-m-a-r-z-i-o. I live in DeKalb,
Illinois. I work in Saint Charles, Illinois at
the Kane County Judicial Center where there is a
large population of resident Canada geese. I am
here to speak in favor of your state empowerment
proposal, Alternative F.

The proliferation of Canada geese
in this area constitutes a serious health
problem. I speak from personal experience. I
suffer from histoplasmosis, which is contracted
by breathing air contaminated by fumes from bird
droppings. This disease has seriously damaged both of my eyes and has caused me to lose the major part of the vision in my right eye, despite three major eye surgeries.

My surgeon at the Barnes Retina Institute in St. Louis believes that exposure to this bacteria causes further damage even in those who have already contracted the disease. I do not think it is coincidental that each of my recent flare-ups has closely followed unavoidable exposure. I am told by my doctors that two percent of the population is vulnerable to this disease; in some it attacks the lungs, in others like myself it ravages the eyes.

Each morning I look out the window of my office and I see hundreds of unsuspecting people making their way toward the building. The thought that one out of 50 faces serious health risks is disturbing to say the least.

There is no avoiding exposure when the geese are present in such prolific numbers. Even if one cautiously avoids going near them, their droppings are literally everywhere. And
the air intake system for the building draws in
air from the area extremely heavy in goose
droppings. There is no known cure for
histoplasmosis. I am participating in a study
through Barnes Hospital in Saint Louis in the
hopes that a cure will be found.

Children playing outdoors are
particularly vulnerable. Some playgrounds and
athletic fields become saturated with goose
droppings. The wind carries the bacteria.
There is a need to protect people.
The only way to do that is to limit exposure.
The only way to accomplish that is to reduce the
resident Canada goose population. I believe
this is best done at the local level. I
therefore strongly support Alternative F, state
empowerment. Thank you for this opportunity to
hear you.

MR. CASE: Is that a copy of your
comments, if you can, that would be great, then
she can check since you have it all written
down, so she can check that against it, thank
you. Number 2?
JANET L. HERBERT: My name is Janet L. Herbert. I'm from Rockford, Illinois, representing the Rockford Park District.

It is our intent to leave examination of the draft document to those who do not already have a plan to deal with the issues of Canada geese management.

In Rockford's case we implemented a three-part, comprehensive, completely non-lethal plan, using egg depredation to help to begin to stabilize the population. With our partners in this endeavor we turned in an impressive 1150 eggs total in our first year. Following the nesting season, we began to use our border collies to lure birds away from our most used and therefore favorite recreational paths and sites.

The third part of our comprehensive plan is a pilot education program to be launched this spring and summer. We will be attempting to teach children about Canada geese and how they can enjoy them without feeding them. Total success to us will be the placement of these programs in public and private schools beginning
September 2003.

Overall, our community is pleased with our approach. We have tackled the extremely difficult task of trying to deal with geese in a river corridor situation. Because we took these proactive, non-lethal approaches, we have succeeded hands down, in creating a positive and energizing solution which our community has embraced.

We have only one request, whoever asks or grants the permits, we would greatly appreciate if the U.S. Fish and Wildlife would develop and implement an application and standard procedure which would allow the use of county-wide egg depredation permits, thank you.

MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 3, 4?

JEFF KETELSEN: My name is Jeff Ketelsen, K-e-t-e-l-s-e-n, and I live in Palatine, and I would like to say that I'm in favor of the state empowerment program, including the expanded opportunities for hunting, thank you.

MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 4, 5, 6,
CHUCK Wills: Chuck Wills of Lisle, Illinois, W-i-l-l-s.

First off, I would like to say this Alternative F, you talk about broad population strategies, it doesn't make any sense. People who don't want geese, they don't want one goose, so a broad bringing the population down 20, 30 percent makes no sense at all. It has to be site specific, okay.

So I would just like to say I'm here to oppose your efforts to expand use of deadly force. I suggest the problems that some people like to have all these geese, obviously the state of emergency doesn't exist by most people here.

Alternative F, your proposed regulation, is totally unacceptable. I will be negatively impacted if it is implemented. I urge you to adopt Alternative A for a non-lethal management option in the final EIS.

Most goose conflicts involve relatively few geese in well-defined areas affecting few people. Circumstances verse the
ever-growing arsenal of non-lethal management options are cost effective, reliable and humane.

The draft EIS shows that my views, and those of the majority of the prior scoping sessions, as well as the views of prior commentary raised were ignored. 60 percent, 60 percent is never mentioned of the 3,000 comments were opposed to any deadly force, but it is not what the Service wants. The Service dismissed these comments because they were in conflict with the Service’s premeditated goal of turning over its congressionally appointed responsibility to manage geese, to the state wildlife agencies. Legitimate issues raised were ignored.

The Service is abrogating its responsibility and mandate, betraying the public trust and intention of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and outright downright violating the law. The Service claims that goose populations are expanding, are not migrating, are somehow less worthy than other geese, and are causing public health problems are all gross misrepresentations
of the truth. There is no scientific proof that
they are a health risk. And I believe that
wasn't shown in the EIS in my opinion.

No federal emergency exists. A
court challenge is in order and there will a
court challenge of the state act because you are
violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and just
totally abrogating your responsibility.

In conclusion also, I would like to
file a complaint with the Service today against
the Illinois DNR's agent McGaw Prairie
Institute. McGaw has been engaged in
unpermitted egg shaking through Northern
Illinois, under the guise of a productivity
study. They have been unable to produce the
required permits when approached, and are shaking eggs
on private property without consent. I demand to
be investigated because we are a country of
laws, even though you want to change it, it's
not been changed. So it would be appreciated if
looked into.

And I would just like to say that
most people are opposed to Alternative F, and
that the prior periods reflect that. And
obviously there is not an emergency by the
number of people here, so thank you.

MR. CASE: Thank you, number 11?

RAY DIETER: My name is Ray Dieter,
D-i-e-t-e-r, from Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

If I may first thank the Service
for the opportunity to come here and discuss
this problem. I cannot say what I feel is the
best option. The Option F or Number 6, I
believe it was, seems like it may have some
advantages. My goal is not necessarily to rid
us of the geese but maybe control their location
where they are.

If I may first mention I have here
in my hand a paper entitled, "Zoonotic Diseases:
Health Aspects of Canadian Geese." This was
published in the International Journal of
Circumpolar Health, and I will be happy to give
you a copy of this, discussing the health
considerations of the Canadian goose.

Listed in this are a number of
considerations. The physical considerations,
and if I may give an example there recently,
by recently I mean about two weeks ago, a funeral,
people at the cemetery, one of the individuals
being attacked and they were concerned about his
ear, it took 17 stitches to suture his ear
back.

Infectious considerations,
including bacterial, parasitic and viral
considerations, the chemical considerations, the
allergic and the hypersensitivity type of
problems that we hear of.

If I may then go further into some
of the physical concerns. If you look for
example at the Surgicenter where I work, you
can't get in the back door or the front door
during the biggest periods of our Surgicenter
because it is so slippery and there is so much
goose droppings. And if you recall, there is
approximately three pounds of goose droppings a
day.

Now, any of us, now excuse me
ladies, if any of us took human feces and put it
by the doors to our center or to our hospitals,
we would be thrown in the clinker, but we are
permitted to let the geese, not only permitted,
mandated not to do anything about the geese
where we are at a health facility. I don't understand where people have gotten the permits to be able to destroy these because we would love to have those permits to destroy and prevent some of this or else move them out of our area.

Anyhow, in addition to the falls and fractures; and recently in Oak Brook there was quite an article in the paper, attacks of children, pecking, flapping with their wings, auto accidents, swerving to miss them, hitting other cars, rear-enders, and their carcasses lying on the road, air strikes with as many as 20 some people killed in one airplane accident, as I understand and certainly the property destruction.

My wife and I enjoy seeing them, but we don't enjoy not being able to get in our home because of them or in the hospital. At any rate this paper explains some of our concerns. We believe very strongly that there should be a way of limiting or preventing them being in the school grounds where children play, in the soccer fields and
When I took my grandchildren about ten days ago to a park, I couldn't even walk them across the grass to the edge of the water, there was no place they could walk without walking on the goose droppings.

Again, we don't want to eliminate them, get rid of them all, but they have to be controlled.

If Item 7 is the best or if you folks have another item, we do appreciate your thoughts. Thank you very much.

MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 12?

CHARLES WENK: My name is Charles Wenk, W-e-n-k. I'm from Winfield, Illinois. I'm a board member of the DNR advisory board, although I'm not here speaking for the DNR, Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

I looked at two of your options and they kind of caught my eye, one was the airport option. At the DuPage County Airport, they have had many close calls, and in fact one goose was sucked into a jet engine out there, causing a serious situation. I'm sure, and I know that
your sister agency, the FAA, is very concerned about that.

The other option that you propose was the hunting option. And it was gratifying to see all of the points that you made; however, in reality, entire counties of Chicago where the resident goose population is the heaviest, Kane County, DuPage County, Lake County, Will County, there are forest preserve districts, conservation districts and finally hunting programs, and they take up a goodly portion of the land that may be available for hunters to be able to hunt geese. We have a lot of wetlands that are unavailable in this area.

I know that you have a nuisance goose season that precludes the regular season; and if you check the figures on what was taken in the entire counties, you will find that they are very low. Consider although your hunting option is welcome, widespread, it is infective because there is no place to hunt.

MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 13, 14?

JOHN CHURILLO: My name is John Churillo, C-h-u-r-i-l-l-o and I'm from Wheaton,
Illinois. I also agree with the expanded hunting opportunity. And I agree there is not that many places to hunt. You need to probably expand more of the current public lands into more hunting, current wetlands, forest preserve lands. The airport opportunities are good.

The nuisance goose season, as a personal note, I would like to see you change the date from September 1, if you can make it a couple days earlier. Dove season in Illinois is a very popular sport, in fact the most popular sport in Illinois, there are more doves killed than anything, also September 1, and it is always a conflict. And you can find more dove property to hunt than you can find goose property to hunt in this area.

But to recap, I would like to see some expanded hunting opportunities, more on public lands, whether they are federal or state lands, and possibly change the opening day a little, thanks.

MR. CASE: Thank you, number 15?

BRIAN HERNER: My name is Brian Herner, H-e-r-n-e-r. I'm from the Prairie Woods Audubon
Society and I live here in Palatine.

I just want to say that I'm disappointed that it seems to me that the Fish and Wildlife Service took the easy way out by choosing Option F. If they really believe that lethal methods of control are necessary, they should have just gone ahead and chosen that option. They abrogated their responsibility and gave it to the state and in fact I don't trust the state of Illinois do this correctly. I wish that they had more closely looked at an option that would have made lethal control the last resort, thank you.

MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 16?

FRED NOUR: My name is Fred Nour, N-o-u-r, I am from Wheaton. And I'm here to represent the Illinois State Medical Society, I'm a physician.

First, I'm interested that we do support Alternative F, however we feel it might not be enough.

Number two, we want to make you aware of a resolution that the Illinois State Medical Society has passed on April 28, 01, at
the annual meeting of delegation. I will read you the resolution. The subject is, Health concerns related to non-migratory Canadian geese:

"Whereas the Canadian goose is technically a migratory bird protected by international treaties and protection acts; and

Whereas, these geese have capably adapted to life in suburban, metropolitan areas where they are relatively free from natural predators while enjoying the abundant food supplies, short grasses and open waters common around subdivisions, offices, parks, golf courses, et cetera;

Whereas, hospitable habitat has transformed many of the Canadian geese from migratory waterfowl into a resident or non-migratory population; and

Whereas, resident Canadian geese, with their aggressive nature and prolific fecal droppings are increasingly posing health hazards to humans; and

Whereas, human health hazards may
include injuries resulting from pecks or falls while attempting to escape the territorial birds, auto accidents resulting from birds in the roadways, aviation accidents occurring when planes encounter birds in flight, and possible bacterial infections from contact with the abundant fecal matter in goose feeding areas; thereby be it

Resolved, that the Illinois State Medical Society recognizes the potential human health hazards posed by the rapidly increasing resident Canadian goose populations in many developed areas of the state; and be it further

Resolved, that the Illinois State Medical Society support and encourage efforts to control resident Canadian goose populations and remove them from areas where their excessive numbers pose human health hazards."

Then number two, I want to make you aware of a letter that was sent to the Chicago Tribune on Wednesday, March 8, 2000, Section 1, page 20, it is signed by 50 medical doctors, entitled, "Airborne Threat."

And it reads: "We are a group of
suburban Chicago physicians who are very concerned about the health risk to the general public, our families, and ourselves posed by the exposure to Canada geese droppings.

In a recent issue of the Annals of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology, an article by the Chairman of the Department of Allergy and Immunology at Northwestern University Medical School documented that exposure to Canada geese droppings can cause a serious lung disease known as hypersensitivity pneumonitis, popularly known as bird fanciers' disease. We are concerned about evidence that geese droppings enter building ventilation systems, circulate in the air and are inhaled by everyone inside.

We are also concerned about the large numbers of suburban residents who work or live in buildings near ponds or parks inhabited by ever-increasing numbers of Canada geese, and alarmed by the fact that 40 percent of all these people will form antibodies against Canada geese droppings.

Approximately 10 to 20 percent of the people exposed to Canada geese droppings
could develop hypersensitivity pneumonitis.

We are even more concerned about a number of people who will not develop any symptoms until many years later when they develop a permanent and irreversible lung fibrosis.

Canada geese droppings also could be the cause for undiagnosed lung diseases in many other patients. We noted that many of our "sick buildings" are located in areas rich in Canada geese droppings.

We are unable to advise our patients to avoid the cause of their allergy because Canada geese droppings are everywhere in suburbia. We are unaware of any location where we can send our patients that is environment free from Canada geese droppings. The problem will get much worse with the Canada geese population growing exponentially.

We ask our elected officials at all levels to protect our citizens as well as they protect the Canada geese. We believe that prevention is always much better than cures."

And signed by 50 MD's.
And as for you we hope you will act, and you will be decisive and don't repeat the disaster that what would be the Snow geese where the congress had to act to force you to reduce the number. At that time, according to the law that was passed by the Congress in 1999, one-third of the turtles completely destroyed, one-third was an event of almost total complete destruction and the remaining one-third was over grazed. We hope you will not wait until one-third of our population is dead, one-third is very sick and the other third is in danger, thank you.

MR. CASE: Could we get copies of those, that you read, if could leave that. Number 17?

CINDY DUDA: Hello, good evening. My name is Cindy Duda, D-u-d-a. I live in Palatine here. I'm just representing myself as a citizen. I was at the public hearing a couple years ago for the development of the draft EIS and I am thrilled to hear of the Rockford Park District here represented tonight explaining this plan that they have put together for non-lethal control. Of course I recognize
this gentleman back here I think from Lisle, and
there were quite a few of us here that spoke in
regards to trying to implement non-lethal means
first.

I'm not necessarily opposed to the
Alternative F, but I would like to see where
the states are encouraged to maybe equally use
some habitat alteration or modification
techniques along with allowing hunting or other,
you know, the egg shaking and nest destruction.
I would like to see a balance of that because I
think it can be done successfully in many of
these communities. And many of us know that we
created the problem. We have created these open
lawn areas, open water and it would be very easy
to modify their habitat, thanks.

MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 18?

Is there anyone else that didn't
have a chance to speak that would like to
speak?

Okay, with that I would like to
thank you for attending the meeting. We will be
here for a while you have specific questions or
comments that you would like to provide. Ron
can certainly answer those. We would encourage you if you have additional comments to make, that you have the card with the e-mail address or the mailing address on it and we encourage you to do that.

Again, thanks for taking the time and thanks for your concern about Canada geese, thank you.

(Whereupon the public meeting concluded.)
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