

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

PUBLIC HEARING

Palatine, Illinois
Tuesday, April 23, 2002
7:00 p.m.
HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS
1550 E. Dundee Road

DISCUSSION REGARDING

DRAFT EIS ON RESIDENT CANADA GOOSE MANAGEMENT

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

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

8 We do want to thank you in advance
9 for taking time out of your evening to come
10 provide comments. This is the second of 11
11 meetings that will be held across the country.
12 There has been one held a few weeks ago in
13 Dallas, Texas, tonight here in Palatine,
14 tomorrow night in Waupun, Wisconsin, which is
15 right near Fond Du Lac; and then Franklin,
16 Tennessee; Bloomington, Minnesota; Brookings,
17 South Dakota; Richmond, Virginia; Danbury,
18 Connecticut; North Brunswick, New Jersey;
19 Denver, Colorado and Bellevue, Washington.
20 And those will all be completed by the end of
21 May.

22 A couple people I would note are
23 here tonight, in case they don't make comments,
24 first I will introduce Ron Kokel here in a few

1 minutes from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
2 Also from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
3 John Rogner. He is with the
4 Chicago Ecological Services Office of
5 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

6 Also Pete Raffley with Congressman
7 Crane's office here in the north suburbs.

8 The process we are going to follow
9 is pretty straight forward.

10

11

12 There has been a draft
13 environmental impact statement prepared by the
14 Service and we want to get your comments on that.

15 Ron Kokel, is a biologist with
16 the Service, is going to give you a brief
17 presentation that outlines the alternatives and
18 show us the preferred alternative and what that
19 is all about.

20 We will move the projector there
21 and set a microphone up here in front. As you
22 came in you got cards, if you want to make
23 comments tonight, we are just going to go over
24 what is on the card there.

1 We ask you to come up front, we
2 will put a microphone up here for two reasons,
3 one is so everybody can hear you; and second so
4 that Carla, our court reporter, can see you and
5 she can read lips, so it helps her to be able to
6 see you speak as well as hear you speak.

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

16 I am going to pass around a
17 sign-up sheet. If would you like to receive a
18 copy of the final environmental impact
19 statement, then go ahead and sign up on this.
20 If you received one before, there are
21 two boxes there, check one or the other box. If
22 you received one before, go ahead and note that
23 so we don't enter your name twice and you get
24 two copies. And if you haven't received a copy

1 before, then go ahead and note that and we will
2 make sure we enter your name in the database to
3 make sure that you get a copy when the final
4 comes out. Ron will go over the schedule for
5 that.

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

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

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

24 On behalf of our director Steve

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

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

20 First, a brief explanation on
21 the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.
22 NEPA requires completion of an EIS to analyze
23 environmental and socioeconomic impacts
24 associated with any federal significant action.

1 NEPA also requires public involvement, that's
2 why we are here, which includes a public scoping
3 period before the draft is issued, and a comment
4 period after the issuance of the draft.

5 We began the scoping process on
6 August 19, 1999, when we published a Federal
7 Register notice that announced our intent to
8 prepare this draft EIS. Then, beginning in
9 February of 2000, we held nine public scoping meetings
10 designed to seek public input into the process;
11 Chicago was one of those meetings. Scoping
12 ended in March of 2000.

13 In response to scoping we received
14 over 3000 comments and over 1250 people attended
15 the nine public scoping meetings.

16 In scoping we found that the top
17 issues of concern were, property damage and
18 complaints caused by resident Canada geese,
19 methods of conflict abatement, sport hunting
20 opportunities, economic impacts of resident
21 Canada geese, human health and safety concerns
22 and impacts to resident Canada geese.

23 NEPA also outlines a specific
24 format for an EIS. First is purpose and need;

1 second is the alternatives that you're going to
2 evaluate; thirdly is the affected environment;
3 and fourth is what are the consequences to the
4 environment of your proposed actions.

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

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

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

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

24 The need for the environmental

1 impact statement is that increasing resident
2 goose populations, coupled together with growing
3 conflicts, damages and socioeconomic impacts
4 have resulted in a re-examination of the
5 Service's resident Canada geese management.

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

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

1 permits.

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

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

19 Alternative D, was expanded hunting
20 methods and opportunities. Under this
21 alternative we would provide new regulatory
22 options to increase the harvest of resident
23 Canada geese. We would authorize additional
24 hunting methods such as electronic calls,

1 unplugged guns and expanded shooting hours.
2 These seasons will be operational during
3 September 1 to 15 and experimental from
4 September 16 to 30. And they would have to be
5 conducted outside of any other open season.

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

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

18 The first depredation order is an
19 airport depredation order that would authorize
20 airports to establish and implement a program
21 which could include indirect and/or direct
22 population control strategies. The intent of
23 the program would be to significantly reduce
24 goose populations at airports. Management

1 actions would have to occur on airport
2 premises.

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

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

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

24 The sixth alternative is our

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

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

18 During existing special hunting
19 seasons we would expand the methods of taking
20 and increase hunter harvest as identified in
21 Alternative D. We would authorize additional
22 hunting methods such as electronic calls,
23 unplugged guns, and expanded shooting hours.
24 These seasons will be operational from

1 September 1 to 15, experimental from
2 September 16 to 30, and they would have to be
3 conducted outside of any other open season.

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

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

22 Also, we would continue the use of
23 all special and regular Canada goose hunting
24 seasons, continue the issuance of depredation

1 and special Canada geese permits.

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

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

21 Effect on the environment. We
22 looked at two things on the effect of the
23 environment: We looked at the biological
24 environment; and after the biological

1 environment we looked at the resident Canada
2 goose populations, water quality and wetlands,
3 vegetation and soils, wildlife habitat, and
4 any federally listed presently endangered
5 species.

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

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

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

22 Under no action what we would
23 expect is the populations of resident Canada
24 geese would continue to grow. In the Atlantic

1 Flyway we would expect about 1.6 million within
2 ten years; in the Mississippi Flyway we would
3 expect about two million in ten years; in the
4 Central Flyway, 1.3 million and the Pacific
5 Flyway 450,000 within ten years.

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

10 Under the preferred alternative,
11 state empowerment, we would expect reduction in
12 populations of resident Canada geese, especially
13 in specific problem areas. We would expect
14 increased hunting opportunities, a significant
15 reduction in conflicts caused by resident Canada
16 geese, decreased impact to property, safety and
17 health; while there would be an initial
18 workload increase, we think long term the
19 workload would decrease, and the alternative
20 would maintain viable resident Canada goose
21 populations.

22 Some of the recent modeling that's
23 been done suggests that to reduce all four flyway
24 populations from about 3.5 million down

1 to the flyway's goals of 2.1 million would
2 require annually for 10 years a harvest of an
3 additional 480,000 resident Canada geese
4 annually over what is now occurring; to take an
5 additional 852,000 goslings annually, the nest
6 removal of 528,000 eggs or nests annually, the
7 combination of an additional harvest of 240,000
8 geese and the take of 320,000 goslings annually.
9 All these would have to occur each year for ten
10 years to reach that goal.

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

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

1 forthcoming next month.

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

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

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

21 And on behalf of the Fish and
22 Wildlife Service, I would like to thank all of
23 you for attending this hearing and particularly
24 for any of those that provide comments.

1 And that's the end of the
2 presentation.

3 MR. CASE: Thank you, Ron. Just to
4 reiterate the process we are going to follow,
5 again it is pretty straightforward. As you came
6 in, you got a comment card. As Ron mentioned it
7 has the addresses if you want to submit written
8 comments and so on. If you would like to make
9 comments tonight, we ask you to come up to the
10 microphone, which we will put out here in just
11 a moment, if you could state your name and
12 spell your last name for us, we would appreciate
13 that. If you are officially representing
14
15 an organization, let us know what that is.
16 We ask that you come up to the
17 microphone for two reasons, so everybody can
18 hear you; and also so that Carla, our court
19 reporter, can see you and make sure that she
20 gets everything down correctly.

21 There is a sign-up sheet going
22 around. If you want to receive a copy of the
23 final environmental impact statement, go ahead
24 and sign up there. If you received a copy of it

1 before, go ahead and note that, check that box;
2 or if you had not received a copy before, go
3 ahead and check the other box, and that way we
4 will know not to send you two copies. So if you
5 want a copy of the final, go ahead and be sure
6 to sign up and check one of those boxes.

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

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

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

20 The proliferation of Canada geese
21 in this area constitutes a serious health
22 problem. I speak from personal experience. I
23 suffer from histoplasmosis, which is contracted
24 by breathing air contaminated by fumes from bird

1 droppings. This disease has seriously damaged
2 both of my eyes and has caused me to lose the
3 major part of the vision in my right eye,
4 despite three major eye surgeries.

5 My surgeon at the Barnes Retina
6 Institute in St. Louis believes that exposure to
7 this bacteria causes further damage even in
8 those who have already contracted the disease.
9 I do not think it is coincidental that each of
10 my recent flare-ups has closely followed
11 unavoidable exposure. I am told by my doctors that two
12
13 percent of the population is vulnerable to this
14 disease; in some it attacks the lungs, in others
15 like myself it ravages the eyes.

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

21 There is no avoiding exposure when
22 the geese are present in such prolific numbers.
23 Even if one cautiously avoids going near them,
24 their droppings are literally everywhere. And

1 the air intake system for the building draws in
2 air from the area extremely heavy in goose
3 droppings. There is no known cure for
4 histoplasmosis. I am participating in a study
5
6 through Barnes Hospital in Saint Louis in the
7 hopes that a cure will be found.

8 Children playing outdoors are
9 particularly vulnerable. Some playgrounds and
10 athletic fields become saturated with goose
11 droppings. The wind carries the bacteria.

12 There is a need to protect people.
13 The only way to do that is to limit exposure.
14 The only way to accomplish that is to reduce the
15 resident Canada goose population. I believe
16 this is best done at the local level. I
17 therefore strongly support Alternative F, state
18 empowerment. Thank you for this opportunity to
19 hear you.

20 MR. CASE: Is that a copy of your
21 comments, if you can, that would be great, then
22 she can check since you have it all written
23 down, so she can check that against it, thank
24 you. Number 2?

1 JANET L. HERBERT: My name is Janet L.
2 Herbert. I'm from Rockford, Illinois,
3 representing the Rockford Park District.

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

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

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

1 September 2003.

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

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

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

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

24 MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 4, 5, 6,

1 7, 8, 9, 10?

2 CHUCK WILLS: Chuck Wills of Lisle,
3 Illinois, W-i-l-l-s.

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

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

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

22 Most goose conflicts involve
23 relatively few geese in well-defined areas
24 affecting few people. Circumstances verse the

1 ever-growing arsenal of non-lethal management
2 options are cost effective, reliable and
3 humane.

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

17 The Service is abrogating its
18 responsibility and mandate, betraying the public
19 trust and intention of the Migratory Bird Treaty
20 Act, and outright downright violating the law.
21 The Service claims that goose populations are
22 expanding, are not migrating, are somehow less
23 worthy than other geese, and are causing public
24 health problems are all gross misrepresentations

1 of the truth. There is no scientific proof that
2 they are a health risk. And I believe that
3 wasn't shown in the EIS in my opinion.

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

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

22 And I would just like to say that
23 most people are opposed to Alternative F, and
24 that the prior periods reflect that. And

1 obviously there is not an emergency by the
2 number of people here, so thank you.

3 MR. CASE: Thank you, number 11?

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

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

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

21 Listed in this are a number of
22 considerations. The physical considerations,
23 and if I may give an example there recently,
24 by recently I mean about two weeks ago, a funeral,

1 people at the cemetery, one of the individuals
2 being attacked and they were concerned about his
3 ear, it took 17 stitches to suture his ear
4 back.

5 Infectious considerations,
6 including bacterial, parasitic and viral
7 considerations, the chemical considerations, the
8 allergic and the hypersensitivity type of
9 problems that we hear of.

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

19 Now, any of us, now excuse me
20 ladies, if any of us took human feces and put it
21 by the doors to our center or to our hospitals,
22 we would be thrown in the clinker, but we are
23 permitted to let the geese, not only permitted,
24 mandated not to do anything about the geese

1 where we are at a health facility. I don't
2 understand where people have gotten the permits
3 to be able to destroy these because we would
4 love to have those permits to destroy and
5 prevent some of this or else move them out of
6 our area.

7 Anyhow, in addition to the falls
8 and fractures; and recently in Oak Brook there
9 was quite an article in the paper, attacks of
10 children, pecking, flapping with their wings,
11 auto accidents, swerving to miss them, hitting
12 other cars, rear-enders, and their carcasses
13 lying on the road, air strikes with as many as
14 20 some people killed in one airplane accident,
15 as I understand and certainly the property
16 destruction.

17 My wife and I enjoy seeing them,
18 but we don't enjoy not being able to get in our
19 home because of them or in the hospital.

20 At any rate this paper explains
21 some of our concerns. We believe very strongly
22 that there should be a way of limiting or
23 preventing them being in the school grounds
24 where children play, in the soccer fields and

1 football fields, other areas where people are.

2 When I took my grandchildren about
3 ten days ago to a park, I couldn't even walk
4 them across the grass to the edge of the water,
5 there was no place they could walk without
6 walking on the goose droppings.

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

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

13 MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 12?

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

19 I looked at two of your options and
20 they kind of caught my eye, one was the airport
21 option. At the DuPage County Airport, they have
22 had many close calls, and in fact one goose was
23 sucked into a jet engine out there, causing a
24 serious situation. I'm sure, and I know that

1 your sister agency, the FAA, is very concerned
2 about that.

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

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

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

23 JOHN CHURILLO: My name is John
24 Churillo, C-h-u-r-i-l-l-o and I'm from Wheaton,

1 Illinois. I also agree with the expanded
2 hunting opportunity. And I agree there is not
3 that many places to hunt. You need to probably
4 expand more of the current public lands into
5 more hunting, current wetlands, forest preserve
6 lands. The airport opportunities are good.

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

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

22 MR. CASE: Thank you, number 15?

23 BRIAN HERNER: My name is Brian Herner,
24 H-e-r-n-e-r. I'm from the Prairie Woods Audubon

1 Society and I live here in Palatine.

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

14 MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 16?

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

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

22 Number two, we want to make you
23 aware of a resolution that the Illinois State
24 Medical Society has passed on April 28, 01, at

1 the annual meeting of delegation. I will
2 read you the resolution. The subject is,
3 Health concerns related to non-migratory
4 Canadian geese:

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

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

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

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

24 Whereas, human health hazards may

1 include injuries resulting from pecks or falls
2 while attempting to escape the territorial
3 birds, auto accidents resulting from birds in
4 the roadways, aviation accidents occurring when
5 planes encounter birds in flight, and possible
6 bacterial infections from contact with the
7 abundant fecal matter in goose feeding areas;
8 thereby be it

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

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

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

24 And it reads: "We are a group of

1 suburban Chicago physicians who are very
2 concerned about the health risk to the general
3 public, our families, and ourselves posed by the
4 exposure to Canada geese droppings.

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

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

23 Approximately 10 to 20 percent of
24 the people exposed to Canada geese droppings

1 could develop hypersensitivity pneumonitis.

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

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

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

20 We ask our elected officials at all
21 levels to protect our citizens as well as they
22 protect the Canada geese. We believe that
23 prevention is always much better than cures."
24 And signed by 50 MD's.

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

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

16 CINDY DUDA: Hello, good evening. My
17 name is Cindy Duda, D-u-d-a. I live in Palatine
18 here. I'm just representing myself as a
19 citizen. I was at the public hearing a couple
20 years ago for the development of the draft EIS
21 and I am thrilled to hear of the Rockford Park
22 District here represented tonight explaining
23 this plan that they have put together for
24 non-lethal control. Of course I recognize

1 this gentleman back here I think from Lisle, and
2 there were quite a few of us here that spoke in
3 regards to trying to implement non-lethal means
4 first.

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

17 MR. CASE: Thank you. Number 18?

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

21 Okay, with that I would like to
22 thank you for attending the meeting. We will be
23 here for a while you have specific questions or
24 comments that you would like to provide. Ron

1 can certainly answer those. We would encourage
2 you if you have additional comments to make,
3 that you have the card with the e-mail address
4 or the mailing address on it and we encourage
5 you to do that.

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

9 (Whereupon the public meeting
10 concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)
2 COUNTY OF L A K E)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I, Carla P. Letellier, a Certified
Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, CSR
No. 084-003315, do hereby certify that I
reported in shorthand the proceedings had in the
aforesaid matter, and that the foregoing is a
true, complete and correct transcript of the
proceedings had as appears from my stenographic
notes so taken to the best of my ability.

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER