

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT FOR DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON RESIDENT CANADA GOOSE MANAGEMENT

March 16, 2004

Executive Summary - On March 1, 2002, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in cooperation with the Wildlife Services program of the United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, published a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on resident Canada goose management. This action was in response to the growing numbers of Canada geese that nest and reside predominantly within the conterminous United States and our desire to examine alternative strategies to reduce, manage, and control resident Canada goose populations in the continental United States and to reduce related damages. The objective of the DEIS was 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 damages by resident Canada geese and to serve as a comprehensive programmatic plan intended to guide and direct resident Canada goose population growth and management activities in the conterminous United States. Public comment was solicited on each of the seven alternatives. A subsequent notice was published on March 26, 2002, identifying eleven public meeting locations at various sites across the United States. Public comments were accepted until May 30, 2002, and from August 21, 2003, until October 20, 2003. In summary, 429 people attended the eleven public meetings and over 2,700 submitted written comments. Written comments were received from 2,657 private individuals, 33 State wildlife resource agencies, 37 non-governmental organizations, 29 local governments, 5 Federal/State legislators, 4 Flyway Councils, 4 Federal agencies, 3 tribes, 3 businesses, and 2 State agricultural agencies. Of the 2,657 comments received from private individuals, 56% opposed the preferred alternative and supported only non-lethal control and management alternatives, while 40% supported either the proposed alternative or a general depredation order.

Background

On March 1, 2002, and March 7, 2002, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in cooperation with the Wildlife Services program of the United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, published a Notice of Availability for a DEIS on resident Canada goose management (67 FR 9448 and 67 FR 10431) (Attachment 1 and 2). This action was in response to the growing numbers of Canada geese that nest and reside predominantly within the conterminous United States and our desire to examine alternative strategies to reduce, manage, and control resident Canada goose populations in the continental United States and to reduce related damages. The objective of the DEIS was 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 damages by resident Canada geese and to serve as a comprehensive programmatic plan intended to guide and direct resident Canada goose population growth and management activities in the conterminous United States. The DEIS evaluated principal seven alternatives. These alternatives were developed and further refined as a result of the public scoping process (see Scoping/Public Participation Report, June 16, 2000). Some of the alternatives contain some or all of the elements of other alternatives or consist of combinations of other alternatives.

Alternative A - No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the status quo would be maintained. No additional regulatory methods or strategies would be authorized. We would continue the use of special and regular hunting seasons and

the issuance of depredation permits and special Canada goose permits.

Alternative B - Nonlethal Control and Management (Non-permitted activities)

This is a nonlethal management alternative with no permitting. Under this alternative, we would actively promote (i.e., either provide staffing and/or funding) the use of non-lethal management tools, such as habitat manipulation and management and goose harassment techniques, and cease the issuance of all Federal permits for the management and control of resident Canada geese. Additionally, special resident Canada goose hunting seasons would be discontinued.

Alternative C - Nonlethal Control and Management (including Permitted activities)

This is a nonlethal management alternative with permitting for those activities generally considered nonlethal. Under this alternative, we would actively promote (i.e., either provide staffing and/or funding) the use of non-lethal management tools, such as habitat manipulation and management and goose harassment techniques. Management activities such as trapping and relocation of geese or egg addling would be allowed with a Federal permit. We would not issue any permits allowing the take of either goslings or adults. Special resident Canada goose hunting seasons would be continued.

Alternative D - Expanded Hunting Methods and Opportunities

This alternative would provide new regulatory options to State wildlife management agencies to potentially increase the harvest of resident Canada geese above that which results from existing special Canada goose seasons. This approach would authorize the use of additional hunting methods such as electronic calls, unplugged shotguns, and expanded shooting hours (one-half hour after sunset). During existing, operational, special September Canada goose seasons (i.e., September 1-15), these additional hunting methods would be available for use on an operational basis. Utilization of these additional hunting methods during any new special seasons or other existing, operational special seasons (i.e., September 15 -30) would be experimental and require demonstration of a minimal impact to migrant Canada goose populations. These experimental seasons would be authorized on a case-by-case basis through the normal migratory bird hunting regulatory process.

All expanded hunting methods and opportunities would be in accordance with the existing Migratory Bird Treaty frameworks for sport hunting seasons (i.e., 107 day limit from September 1 to March 10) and would be conducted outside of any other open waterfowl season (i.e., when all other waterfowl and crane hunting seasons were closed). In addition, we would continue the issuance of depredation permits and special Canada goose permits, issued under 50 CFR §§21.41 and 21.26, respectively. Annual spring breeding population monitoring would be required in participating States to assess population status and provide for the long-term conservation of the resource if existing programs are not adequate. Since Federal harvest surveys are already in place, no additional harvest reporting by the States would be required.

Alternative E - Integrated Depredation Order Management

Under this alternative, any one or all of the strategies (Depredation Orders) listed below could be implemented by the applicable party (in most cases, the State wildlife management agency) if the State elects to participate in the program. The Orders would allow management activities for resident Canada goose populations only and, as such, in order to ensure protection of migrant Canada goose populations, could only be implemented between April 1 and August 31, except for the Nest and Egg Depredation Order which would allow the additional take of nests and eggs in March. In addition to these specific strategies, we would continue the use of special and regular hunting seasons, issued under 50 CFR §20, and the issuance of depredation permits and special Canada goose permits, issued under 50 CFR §§21.41 and 21.26, respectively. In all cases, participating States would be required to annually monitor the spring breeding population to assess population status and provide for the long-term conservation of the

resource if existing programs are not adequate. Additionally, States or other applicable parties (such as airports or public health officials) would be required to annually report all take of resident Canada geese.

Airport Depredation Order

This option would establish a depredation order authorizing airports (or their agents) to establish and implement a resident Canada goose management program that includes indirect (unintended or incidental take of a bird relative to a permitted management action) and/or direct population control strategies such as aggressive harassment, nest and egg destruction, gosling and adult trapping and culling programs, or other general population reduction strategies on resident Canada goose populations posing threats to airport safety. Geese could only be taken under this order in conjunction with an established non-lethal harassment program as certified by Wildlife Services and persons operating under this order would not be allowed to use decoys, taped calls, or other devices to lure birds. Additionally, all management actions would have to occur on the airport premises.

Nest and Egg Depredation Order

This option would establish a depredation order authorizing States to allow the destruction of nests and the take eggs to stabilize resident Canada goose populations without threatening their long-term health. The goal of this alternative would be to stabilize resident Canada goose breeding populations, not directly reduce populations, and thus prevent an increase in long-term conflicts between geese and people.

Agricultural Depredation Order

This option would establish a depredation order authorizing landowners, operators, and tenants actively engaged in the production of commercial agriculture (or their employees or agents) to conduct indirect and/or direct population control strategies such as aggressive harassment, nest and egg destruction, gosling and adult trapping and culling programs, or other general population reduction strategies on resident Canada goose populations when found committing or about to commit depredations to agricultural crops. Geese could only be taken under this order in conjunction with an established non-lethal harassment program as certified by Wildlife Services and persons operating under this order would not be allowed to use decoys, taped calls, or other devices to lure birds. Additionally, all management actions would have to occur on the premises of the depredation area.

Public Health Depredation Order

This option would establish a depredation order authorizing State, County, municipal, or local public health officials (or their agents) to conduct indirect and/or direct population control strategies such as aggressive harassment, nest and egg destruction, gosling and adult trapping and culling programs, or other general population reduction strategies on resident Canada goose populations when recommended by health officials that there is a public health threat. Geese could only be taken under this order in conjunction with an established non-lethal harassment program as certified by Wildlife Services and persons operating under this order would not be allowed to use decoys, taped calls, or other devices to lure birds. Additionally, all management actions would have to occur on the premises of the public health threat location.

Alternative F - State Empowerment (PROPOSED ACTION)

This alternative would establish a regulation authorizing State wildlife agencies (or their authorized agents) to conduct (or allow) management activities, including the take of birds, on resident Canada goose populations. This alternative would authorize indirect and/or direct population control strategies such as aggressive harassment, nest and egg destruction, gosling and adult trapping and culling programs, expanded methods of take to increase hunter harvest, or other general population reduction strategies. The intent of this alternative is to allow State wildlife management agencies sufficient flexibility, within predefined guidelines, to deal with problems caused by resident Canada geese within their respective

States. Other guidelines would include criteria for such activities as special expanded harvest opportunities during the portion of the Treaty closed period (August 1-31), airport, agricultural, and public health control, and the non-permitted take of nests and eggs.

States could choose to implement specific strategies, such as any of the specific depredation orders identified in Alternative E - Integrated Depredation Order Management, under the regulation conditions and guidelines. The Orders would be for resident Canada goose populations only and, as such, in order to ensure protection of migrant Canada goose populations, could only be implemented between April 1 and August 31, except for the take of nests and eggs which could be additionally implemented in March.

Special Canada goose hunting seasons within the existing Treaty frameworks (i.e., September 1 to March 10) would continue to be handled within the existing migratory bird hunting season regulation development process. Like Alternative D, this alternative would also provide new regulatory options to State wildlife management agencies to potentially increase the harvest of resident Canada geese above that which results from existing special Canada goose seasons that target resident Canada geese. This approach would authorize the use of additional hunting methods such as electronic calls, unplugged shotguns, and expanded shooting hours (one-half hour after sunset). During existing, operational, special September Canada goose seasons (i.e., September 1-15), these additional hunting methods would be available for use on an operational basis. Utilization of these additional hunting methods during any new special seasons or other existing, operational special seasons (i.e., September 15 -30) could be approved as experimental and would require demonstration of a minimal impact to migrant Canada goose populations. These experimental seasons would be authorized on a case-by-case basis through the normal migratory bird hunting regulatory process. All of these expanded hunting methods and opportunities under Special Canada goose hunting seasons would be in accordance with the existing Migratory Bird Treaty frameworks for sport hunting seasons (i.e., 107 day limit from September 1 to March 10) and would be conducted outside of any other open waterfowl season (i.e., when all other waterfowl and crane hunting seasons were closed).

Take of resident Canada geese outside the existing Migratory Bird Treaty frameworks for sport hunting seasons (i.e., 107 day limit from September 1 to March 10) would also be available under this alternative. This alternative would create a new Subpart to 50 CFR Part 21 specifically for the management of overabundant resident Canada goose populations. Under this new Subpart, we would establish a Conservation Order under the authority of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act with the intent to reduce and/or stabilize resident Canada goose population levels. The Conservation Order would authorize each State in eligible areas to initiate aggressive resident Canada goose harvest strategies, within the conditions that we provide, with the intent to reduce the populations. The Order will enable States to use hunters to harvest resident Canada geese, by way of shooting in a hunting manner, during the August 1 through September 15 period when all waterfowl and crane hunting seasons, excluding falconry, are closed, inside or outside the migratory bird hunting season frameworks. The Order would also authorize the use of additional methods of take to harvest resident Canada geese during that period. The Conservation Order would authorize the use of electronic calls and unplugged shotguns, liberalize daily bag limits on resident Canada geese, and allow shooting hours to continue until one-half hour after sunset. The Service would annually assess the overall impact and effectiveness of the Conservation Order to ensure compatibility with long-term conservation of this resource. If at any time evidence is presented that clearly demonstrates that there no longer exists a serious threat of injury to the area or areas involved for a particular resident Canada goose population, we will initiate action to suspend the Conservation Order, and/or regular-season regulation changes, for that population. Suspension of regulations for a particular population would be made following a public review process.

Under this alternative, the Service would maintain primary authority for the management of resident

Canada geese, but the individual States would be authorized to implement the provisions of this alternative within the guidelines established by the Service. In addition to specific strategies, we would continue the use of special and regular hunting seasons, issued under 50 CFR §20, and the issuance of depredation permits and special Canada goose permits, issued under 50 CFR §§21.41 and 21.26, respectively. Participating States would be required to annually monitor the spring breeding population to assess population status and provide for the long-term conservation of the resource. Additionally, States or other applicable parties (such as airports or public health officials) would be required to annually report all take of geese under authorized management activities.

Alternative G - General Depredation Order

This alternative would establish a depredation order, allowing any authorized person (State wildlife agency personnel, airport managers, public health officials, agricultural landowners, operators, and tenants, or any other State authorized person or their agents) to conduct damage management activities on resident Canada goose populations either posing a threat to health and human safety or causing damage to personal or public property. Authorized management activities could include indirect and/or direct population control strategies such as aggressive harassment, nest and egg destruction, gosling and adult trapping and culling programs, or other general population reduction strategies. Geese could only be taken under this Order in conjunction with an established non-lethal harassment program as certified by Wildlife Services and persons operating under this order would not be allowed to use decoys, taped calls, or other devices to lure birds. All management actions would have to occur on the premises of the problem area. The Order would be for resident Canada goose populations only and, as such, in order to ensure protection of migrant Canada goose populations, could only be implemented between April 1 and August 31, except for the take of nests and eggs which would be additionally allowed in March.

Additionally, this alternative would provide new regulatory options to State wildlife management agencies to potentially increase the harvest of resident Canada geese above that which results from existing special Canada goose seasons that target resident Canada geese (same as Alternative D - "Increased Hunting"). This approach would authorize the use of additional hunting methods such as electronic calls, unplugged shotguns, and expanded shooting hours (one-half hour after sunset). During existing, operational, special September Canada goose seasons (i.e., September 1-15), these additional hunting methods would be available for use on an operational basis. Utilization of these additional hunting methods during any new special seasons or other existing, operational special seasons (i.e., September 15 -30) could be approved as experimental and would require demonstration of a minimal impact to migrant Canada goose populations. These experimental seasons would be authorized on a case-by-case basis through the normal migratory bird hunting regulatory process.

All expanded hunting methods and opportunities would be in accordance with the existing Migratory Bird Treaty frameworks for sport hunting seasons (i.e., 107 day limit from September 1 to March 10) and would be conducted outside of any other open waterfowl season (i.e., when all other waterfowl and crane seasons were closed). In addition, we would continue the issuance of depredation permits and special Canada goose permits, issued under 50 CFR §§21.41 and 21.26, respectively. Annual spring breeding population monitoring would be required in participating States to assess population status and provide for the long-term conservation of the resource if existing programs are not adequate. Since Federal harvest surveys are already in place, no additional harvest reporting by the States would be required.

In addition to authorizing these new strategies, we would continue the use of special and regular hunting seasons, issued under 50 CFR §20, and the issuance of depredation permits and special Canada goose permits, issued under 50 CFR §§21.41 and 21.26, respectively. Under this alternative, unlike Alternative

F “State Empowerment”, the authorization for all management activities, including the take of geese, would come directly from the Service via the Depredation Order and the authorized person could implement the provisions of this alternative within the guidelines established by the Service. However, nothing in the Order would limit the individual States’ ability to be more restrictive. Persons authorized by the Service under the Depredation Order would not need to obtain authority from the State unless required to do so under State law. The State would not be responsible for any such Service authorized action taken by a person working under the authority of the Order.

The intent of this alternative is to significantly reduce resident Canada goose populations in areas where conflicts are occurring. In all instances, participating States would be required to annually monitor the spring breeding population to assess population status and provide for the long-term conservation of the resource. Additionally, all authorized persons (i.e., States and/or other applicable parties, such as airports or public health officials) would be required to annually report all management activities and take of resident Canada geese.

The DEIS also included an analysis of the potential impacts of each alternative on various resource areas. Resource areas included: resident Canada geese, other wildlife species, natural resources, special status species, socioeconomics, historical resources, and cultural resources.

Public Meetings

A subsequent notice was published on March 26, 2002, identifying eleven public meeting locations (67 FR 13792) (Attachment 3). The eleven public meetings were held on the following dates at the indicated locations and times:

- April 1, 2002; Dallas, Texas, at the Hyatt Regency Downtown, 300 Reunion Boulevard, 7 p.m.
- April 23, 2002; Palatine, Illinois, at the Holiday Inn Express, 1550 E. Dundee Road, 7 p.m.
- April 24, 2002; Waupun, Wisconsin, at the Waupun High School, 801 E. Lincoln, 7 p.m.
- May 7, 2002; Franklin, Tennessee, at Franklin Cool Springs Marriott, 700 Cool Springs Blvd., 7 p.m.
- May 14, 2002; Bloomington, Minnesota, at the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center, 3815 East 80th Street, 7 p.m.
- May 15, 2002; Brookings, South Dakota, at Brookings Area Multiplex, 824 32nd Avenue, 7 p.m.
- May 20, 2002; Richmond, Virginia, at the Comfort Inn Conference Center, 3200 W. Broad Street, 7 p.m.
- May 21, 2002; Danbury, Connecticut, at the Holiday Inn, 80 Newtown Road, 7 p.m.
- May 22, 2002; North Brunswick, New Jersey, at the Ramada Inn, 999 U.S. Route 1 South, 7 p.m.
- May 29, 2002; Denver, Colorado, at the Colorado Department of Wildlife, Northeast Region Service Center, Hunter Education Building, 6060 Broadway, 7 p.m.
- May 30, 2002; Bellevue, Washington, at the DoubleTree Hotel, 300 - 112th Avenue S.E.,

7 p.m.

At the meetings, we accepted either oral and/or written comments. All who wished to present comments were permitted to do so. Approximately 429 people attended the eleven public sessions. A brief synopsis of each meeting follows.

Dallas, Texas

Approximately 29 people attended the Dallas meeting. Participants expressed support for the preferred alternative.

Palatine, Illinois

Approximately 21 people attended the Palatine meeting. Participants expressed support for the preferred alternative, community-based nonlethal control strategies, streamlined permitting, nonlethal management, airport control, and expanded hunting opportunities.

Waupun, Wisconsin

Approximately 38 people attended the Waupun meeting. Participants expressed support for the preferred alternative, increased hunting opportunities, and increased funding.

Franklin, Tennessee

Approximately 9 people attended the Franklin meeting. Participants expressed support for the preferred alternative.

Bloomington, Minnesota

Approximately 28 people attended the Bloomington meeting. Participants expressed support for increased hunting opportunities, the preferred alternative, the no-action alternative, non-lethal methods and strategies, the non-lethal control and management alternative, and a comprehensive non-lethal strategy.

Brookings, South Dakota

Approximately 67 people attended the Brookings meeting. Participants expressed support for the preferred alternative, financial compensation for agricultural damages, increased research, increased hunting opportunities, and spring hunting opportunities.

Richmond, Virginia

Approximately 68 people attended the Richmond meeting. Participants expressed support for the preferred alternative, the non-lethal control and management alternative, the general depredation order alternative, community-based programs, increased hunting opportunities, increased public education, and urban trapping.

Danbury, Connecticut

Approximately 19 people attended the Danbury meeting. Participants expressed support for the general depredation order alternative, non-lethal management, increased hunting opportunities, and the preferred alternative.

North Brunswick, New Jersey

Approximately 97 people attended the New Jersey meeting. Participants expressed support for the general depredation order alternative, the preferred alternative, the non-lethal control and management alternative, community-based programs, increased hunting opportunities, habitat management, and the no-action alternative.

Denver, Colorado

Approximately 13 people attended the Denver meeting. Participants expressed support for the preferred alternative and increased airport control.

Bellevue, Washington

Approximately 40 people attended the Bellevue meeting. Participants expressed support for the non-lethal control and management alternative, the non-lethal control and management alternative with egg addling, community-based programs, and the preferred alternative with changes.

Written Comments

Public comments were accepted from the opening of the comment period on March 1, 2002, until May 30, 2002, and from August 21, 2003, until October 20, 2003. Thus, we considered all comments received between March 1, 2002, and October 20, 2003. Over 2,600 comments were received. Analysis of the comments was separated into major groups: private individuals, businesses, tribal governments, non-governmental groups (NGOs), local governments, Congressional/State legislators, State agriculture agencies, Federal agencies, State agencies, and Flyway Councils.

Private individuals

We received 2,657 written comments from individuals that did not specifically identify representation of a group. Analysis indicated the vast majority of these comments could be broken down into 7 categories. Numbers in parenthesis indicates the number of commenters.

- Oppose Alternative F/Support Alternative A (No Action)/Support Alternative B (Nonlethal Control and Management) - (1,472)
- Support for Alternative C - Nonlethal Control and Management (including permitted activities) (20)
- Support for Alternative D - Expanded Hunting Methods and Opportunities (62)
- Support for Alternative E - Integrated Depredation Order Management (10)
- Support for Alternative F - State Empowerment (Proposed Alternative) (797)
- Support for Alternative G - General Depredation Order (261)
- Other (35)

List of Federal Agencies, Flyway Councils, State Agencies, Local Governments and Associations, Non-governmental Organizations, and Businesses Providing Comments

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Keystone Area Office, Oklahoma
United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services
United States Environmental Protection Agency
United States Geological Survey, National Wildlife Health Center

Atlantic Flyway Council
Mississippi Flyway Council
Central Flyway Council
Pacific Flyway Council

Alabama Division of Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries
Arizona Game and Fish Department
Arkansas Game and Fish Commission
Colorado Division of Wildlife
Connecticut Bureau of Natural Resources
Delaware Division of Fish and Wildlife
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Georgia Wildlife Resources Division
Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Iowa Bureau of Wildlife
Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources
Maine Bureau of Resource Management
Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Michigan Department of Natural Resources
Minnesota Division of Wildlife
Missouri Department of Conservation
Nebraska Game and Parks Commission
New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife
New Jersey Fish and Game Council
New York Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources
North Carolina Division of Wildlife Management
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation
Oregon Division of Wildlife
Pennsylvania Game Commission
South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks
Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency
Vermont Department of Fish and Wildlife
Virginia Wildlife Division
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
West Virginia Wildlife Resources Section
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Wyoming Game and Fish Department

New Jersey Department of Agriculture
Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

U.S. House of Representatives, James Greenwood, 8th District, PA
U.S. House of Representatives, Jim Saxton, 3rd District, NJ
U.S. House of Representatives, James T. Walsh, 25th District, NY
Minnesota State Senate, James Metzen, 39th District
Oregon State Senate, Ted Ferrioli

Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, MI
Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, WI
Wampanoag Tribe of Gayhead (Aquinnah), MA
Berkeley Township, NJ
Borough of Allentown, NJ
Borough of Avon by the Sea, NJ
Borough of Point Pleasant, NJ
Borough of Wharton, NJ
Camden County Department of Parks, NJ
City of Fairbury, NE
City of Mendota Heights, MN
City of Lacy, WA
City of Oshkosh Parks Department, WI
City of Redmond, WA
City of West Allis/Cedarburg, WI
County of Middlesex Department of Parks and Recreation, NJ
Lincoln Airport Authority, NE
Medford Commons Association, Medford, NJ
Middle Township, NJ
Overlook Village Homeowners' Association, Wharton, NJ
Rockford Park District, IL
Stillwater Township, NJ
Town of Chester, WI
Town of Clarkstown, NY
Township of Lakewood Board of Health, NJ
Township of Lakewood Department of Public Works, NJ
Township of Manchester, NJ
Village of Ridgewood Department of Parks and Recreation, NJ
Washington County Park System, WI

Animal Protection Institute
Brandywine Grange #60, PA
Brookings Wildlife Federation, SD
Canada Goose Conservation Society
Citizens for the Preservation of Wildlife, Inc.
Citizens to Save South Valley Park and Whetstone Run, MD
Coalition for Animal Rights Education
Coalition of Connecticut Sportsmen
Coalition to Prevent the Destruction of Canada Geese
Coalition to Protect Canada Geese
Columbia University Action Coalition
Connecticut Farm Bureau

DuPage Environmental Commission, IL
Fox Valley Goose Task Force, WI
Friends of Animals
Friends of Animals and their Environment
Friends of Montgomery Village Wildlife, MD
Fund for Animals
Geese Peace
Humane Society of the United States
Illinois State Medical Society
Lehigh County Farm Bureau, PA
Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
Middlesex County Federation of Sportsmens Clubs, NJ
Minnesota Duck and Goose Callers Association
Minnesota Humane Society
Minnesota Outdoor Heritage Alliance
Minnesota Waterfowl Association
Monmouth Coastal Watershed Partnership, NJ
National Rifle Association
National Wildlife Control Operators Association
New Jersey Animal Rights Alliance
New Jersey Farm Bureau
New York Farm Bureau
Northwest Animal Rights Network
Pennsylvania Farm Bureau
People for Animal Rights
Philadelphia Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.
Prairie Woods Audubon Society, IL
Progressive Animal Welfare Society
Rochester Birding Association
Sierra Club, New Jersey Chapter
South Dakota Waterfowlers Association
South Dakota Wildlife Federation
Susquehanna County Farm Bureau, PA
Wildlife Management Institute
Wildlife Watch, Inc.
Wisconsin Waterfowl Association, Inc.
Yell County Wildlife Federation, AR

Echo Lake Country Club, Westfield, NJ
Florham on the Fairways, Bridgewater, NJ
Maple Glen Church, Maple Glen, PA