

# THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES.

## OFFICERS

David O. Wiebers, M.D.  
*Chairman of the Board*  
Anita W. Coupe, Esq.  
*Vice Chairman*  
Amy Freeman Lee, Litt.D.  
*Secretary*  
Paul G. Irwin  
*President, CEO*  
G. Thomas Waite III  
*Treasurer, CFO*  
Patricia A. Forkan  
*Executive Vice President*  
Roger A. Kindler, Esq.  
*Vice President/General Counsel*

## STAFF VICE PRESIDENTS

John W. Grandy, Ph.D.  
*Senior Vice President  
Wildlife Programs*  
Wayne Pacelle  
*Senior Vice President  
Communications and  
Government Affairs*  
Andrew N. Rowan, Ph.D.  
*Senior Vice President  
Research, Education, and  
International Issues*  
Martha C. Armstrong  
*Companion Animals and  
Equine Protection*  
Katherine Benedict  
*Administration, Information  
Services, and Technology*  
Richard M. Clugston, Ph.D.  
*Higher Education*  
Randall Lockwood, Ph.D.  
*Research and Educational Outreach*  
Robert G. Roop, SPHR  
*Human Resources and Education*  
Martin L. Stephens, Ph.D.  
*Animal Research Issues*  
Richard W. Swain Jr.  
*Investigative Services*

## DIRECTORS

Patricia Mares Asip  
Peter A. Bender  
Donald W. Cashen, Ph.D.  
Anita W. Coupe, Esq.  
Judi Friedman  
Alice R. Garey  
Jennifer Leaning, M.D.  
Amy Freeman Lee, Litt.D.  
Franklin M. Loew, D.V.M.  
Eugene W. Lorenz  
Jack W. Lydman  
William F. Mancuso  
Joan C. Martin-Brown  
Judy J. Peil  
Joe Ramsey, Esq.  
Jeffery O. Rose  
James D. Ross, Esq.  
Mary L. Schapiro  
Marilyn G. Seyler  
John E. Taft  
David O. Wiebers, M.D.  
Marilyn E. Wilhelm  
K. William Wiseman  
John A. Hoyt  
*President Emeritus*  
Murdaugh Stuart Madden, Esq.  
*Vice President/Senior Counsel*

NGO in general consultative status  
with the Economic and Social Council  
of the United Nations

May 30, 2002

Mr. Jonathan Andrew, Chief  
Division of Migratory Bird Management  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Department of the Interior  
ms 634—ARLSQ  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Andrew:

On behalf of The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and its 7.2 million members and constituents, I write to comment on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (FWS or the Service) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for "Resident Canada Goose Management," issued in February 2002 in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's APHIS Wildlife Services (WS). We are joined in these comments by the Fund for Animals (Fund) on behalf of its 200,000 members and constituents nationwide.

The animal welfare and protection community has a long history of involvement with the issue of human-Canada goose conflict resolution and has been active for many years in promoting community-based conflict resolution strategies founded on the strongly held belief that it is unnecessary to kill geese to resolve human-goose conflicts. This DEIS presages, however, not just the liberalization of such killings, but their promulgation at an order of magnitude greater than practiced today. It provides only a superficial examination of human-goose conflicts, management strategies, and their integration into comprehensive approaches that offer the only realistic solutions to the problems people experience with "resident" Canada geese. The inadequate DEIS may reflect the purpose of the FWS proposed action to delegate authority to the various states for setting all management program objectives and goals for the Service, thereby abdicating a major federal responsibility that has been the backbone of protection and conservation of migratory birds in this country for almost a century.

We will continue to actively question and contest lethal control programs not only because that is our mission, but because we feel that the planning, factual, and procedural bases from which control programs are advocated is flawed. As has much of the previous compliance documentation issued by FWS and WS, this DEIS fails to address the central and critical issues in "resident" Canada geese management.

**Promoting the protection of all animals**

2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037 ■ 202-452-1100 ■ Fax: 202-778-6132 ■ [www.hsus.org](http://www.hsus.org)

Our rationale for opposing mass killing programs and advocating positive alternatives has been well established.<sup>1</sup> The HSUS has repeatedly gone on the record<sup>2</sup> to express concern over how compliance issues have been addressed by the Service. We believe our concerns are reasonable and our questions are justified, and that the Service has more often failed than succeeded in addressing them. For that reason, we are adopting a format in these comments that frequently prefaces comments by the statement “**The DEIS must....**” This format indicates where we believe conclusively that the Service has an obligation to specifically and in detail address the question posed. We also give specific, detailed concerns with the DEIS in the section labeled “Detailed Comments.” Our general comments and concerns follow.

*Improper delegation of authority*

**The DEIS fails to address the legal sufficiency of the alternatives.** The proposed action, alternative F, delegates much of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior’s (DOI) decision-making authority under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) to the states. This alternative, as proposed, violates both the language and the spirit of the MBTA and cannot be supported legally.

The United States is bound by the terms of the Conventions between the United States and the participating international governments. Congress implemented the terms of the Conventions in the MBTA. In declaring taking, killing, or poisoning migratory birds unlawful, the Congress clearly gave oversight and decision-making power to the federal government (see 16 USC § 701). Pursuant to the mandates of the MBTA, only the Secretary of DOI, through the established regulatory process, has the authority to suspend the prohibition delineated by Congress and determine when and how migratory birds may be taken, killed, or possessed (Section 703). The federal government alone has the responsibility and mandate to make decisions concerning the welfare and management of migratory birds within the United States. The writers of neither the

---

<sup>1</sup> Grandy, J., and J. Hadidian. 1997. Making our peace with Canada geese. HSUS News Spring: 7-13.

Hadidian, J. in press. Resolving conflicts between people and Canada geese: the need for comprehensive management approaches. Proceedings of the 20th Vertebrate Pest Conference.

Hadidian, J., M. Childs, and N. Perry. 1997. The plight of the Canada goose: an unprotected protected species. Wildlife Tracks Summer : 1-4.

Hadidian, J., M. Childs, N. Perry, and P. Lane. 2000. Resolving conflicts with Canada geese: an animal welfare perspective. Proceedings of the 9th Eastern Wildlife Damage Management Conference, eds M. C. Brittingham, J. Kays, and R. McPeake, 293-99State College, Pa.: Penn State University.

Hazard, H., and D. Feld. 1999. GeesePeace: a community achieves an acceptable balance with Canada geese. Wildlife Tracks Summer: 1-4.

Lawson, N. 2001. Calling a truce with the Canada goose. Animal Sheltering November-December: 1-7.

<sup>2</sup> Hadidian to Schmidt, June 1, 1998; Grandy to Andrew, October 10, 1999; Grandy to Andrew, March 28, 2000.

Grandy and Markarian to Andrew  
May 30, 2002  
Page 3

Treaties nor the MBTA envisioned final decision-making authority to rest anywhere but within the federal government. The individual states do not and cannot play a role in this process.

The empowerment of the states as proposed in alternative F, therefore, would violate the terms under which the United States agreed with other foreign nations to aid in the restoration and protection of migratory birds. Final decision-making authority must remain with the Secretary of DOI, as delegated by the President and envisioned by the foreign nations and Congress. To place the decision making authority in an entity other than the federal government is an abrogation of federal powers and an improper delegation of authority.

#### *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Responsibility*

Even assuming arguendo that the individual states are empowered to make the local site determinations as envisioned by proposed alternative F, responsibility for NEPA compliance remains with FWS. Delegating the agency's authority to the states does not relieve the FWS of its ultimate responsibility to fulfill the requirements of NEPA and other relevant statutes.

This DEIS is insufficient to satisfy NEPA compliance for future actions directed at the control or management of Canada Geese. The DEIS, as written, can only be considered as a document that delineates options for the overall management strategy for Canada geese within the United States. With its lack of scientific data and evidence of specific, significant harm or injury, the DEIS cannot be used to justify lethal control of geese at specific locations. Nor can the states consider this a document that outlines the requirements of delegated authority and the parameters for approval of specific action plans.

A truly programmatic EIS that would consider the various plans of the individual states, with an accurate accounting of the control measures used or anticipated to be used by the states is needed. Without this cohesive approach, any attempt to determine the cumulative effects of the plans is meaningless and falls short of the requirements and goals of NEPA.

#### *Federalism Considerations*

The DEIS states that the proposed alternative F would not have an impact on the states. This assertion is very misleading and inaccurate. Alternative F would impose significant costs and burdens on the states, ranging from increased paperwork to the need for new employees with scientific backgrounds, able to process the need for and type of management of resident Canada geese. With the greater burden would also come increased responsibility to the migratory avian species and the citizens of the state. In addition, alternative F would create a greater likelihood of litigation, as the state would be empowered to make certain decisions currently left to the federal government.

#### *Lack of good and usable information, including scientific research*

**The DEIS must provide a summary of research conducted, contracted, or ordered by FWS that relates specifically to "resident" Canada geese.** No mention appears of this research

beyond the vague statement at II-16 “[f]or the past twenty years the Service and Wildlife Services have actively supported research on “resident” Canada geese.” We ask again, as we asked at scoping, that you provide a list of research conducted, contracted, or ordered by FWS during that 20 year period. This should include a descriptive summary of the number and scope of grant and project contracts, publications, and reports and allocation of other funds and resources to a “resident” Canada goose research program by FWS and WS.

We request this because we believe FWS has invested few, if any, resources in “resident” Canada goose research. We contend that among the types of information that would be critical to an understanding of “resident” Canada geese would be studies on molt migration, philopatry (particularly after nest destruction or egg addling), reoccupation of “problem” sites following lethal controls, local and seasonal movements of flocks (again particularly in response to management actions), effects of habitat modification and management in curtailing human-geese conflicts, and the many issues associated with the ecologically based management approaches<sup>3</sup> that have gone unaddressed in this DEIS.

We also note that the DEIS uses specific examples from studies and sources on such species as the Arctic nesting snow and emperor geese to draw conclusions for “resident” Canada geese. Where these examples are cited, such use must be justified by an explanation of the comparability of data between species and the potential for Canada geese to be different in the parameters discussed. To the average reader it appears that data on other species are being used selectively to support an already drawn conclusion, and when a different conclusion is sought, the DEIS just as readily argues that the species differ from one another to an extent that they are not comparable. We suggest a close and critical review of this. A reader might conclude that the Services is picking and choosing research findings that support its position, even if that research is not applicable.

*Unexplored ecological factors (supplemental feeding)*

**The DEIS should include a comprehensive and critical examination of the role and relationship of supplemental feeding to past and current conflicts with “resident” Canada goose populations.** Supplemental feeding of waterfowl by managed food crops on FWS refuges and state managed game lands is a long-standing and often intensive practice.<sup>4</sup> The practice has undoubtedly contributed in places to the growth of “resident” goose populations. The DEIS should reflect on this issue and identify where supplemental feeding might continue to contribute to the growth and maintenance of “resident” Canada goose populations as well as influence local and/or seasonal distribution of geese. The DEIS should identify and enumerate all federal

---

<sup>3</sup> Conover, M. R. 1992. Ecological approach to managing problems caused by urban Canada geese. Proceedings of the 15th Vertebrate Pest Conference, Eds J. E. Borrecco, and R. E. Marsh, 110-111.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Gates, R. J., D. F. Caithamer, W. E. Moritz, and T. C. Tacha. 2001. Bioenergetics and nutrition of Mississippi Valley population Canada geese during winter and migration. *Wildlife Monographs* 146: 65 pp.

refuges and state lands supporting food crops for waterfowl that may be accessed or used by “resident” Canada geese. The DEIS should also discuss the extent refuge and food plot management for geese might contribute to human-geese conflicts, and the potential consequences for mitigating human-geese conflicts that would result from discontinuing this practice.

*Statistical accuracy*

**The DEIS must identify the statistical certainty of Canada goose population estimates and similar figures.** If data are collected in a way that does not allow for measures such as confidence intervals to be calculated this should be stipulated. It is critical to the public’s understanding that the “resident” Canada goose populations affected be characterized as accurately as possible. Readers need to be aware that actual population numbers vary within ranges depending on the reliability of counts.

It is our belief that “resident” Canada goose populations have been little enumerated by the states, and we ask that the DEIS address this concern. We note apparent inconsistencies in some of the state surveys (e.g., Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and North Carolina in appendix). An explanation of their significance is needed. The substantial swings in Canada goose numbers from one year to the next in state counts and monitoring results should be interpreted. Do these reflect true changes in goose numbers or are they explained by some other factor?

Further, clear distinctions between spring and other seasonal counts should be made and discussed in such a way that readers will fully understand where counts have been admixed, combined, or otherwise taken in ways that do or do not assure certainty that migratory as opposed to “resident” geese have been counted. If the Service can declaratively and definitively say that no “migratory” geese are ever counted in “resident” goose censuses then it should certainly say this plainly. Otherwise, you should provide an explanation as to how error might occur and how large the error might be.

*Canada goose populations*

**The DEIS must clarify what is or is not determinative about geese being “resident” geese.** The DEIS should discuss the potential biological, cultural, and legal significance of the “native” or natural population of *Branta canadensis maxima* extending throughout the historic former range. Clearly there are “giant” Canada geese inhabiting part or all of their former range and exhibiting the tendencies of their forebearers in not expressing strong migratory movements. What is different in a biological or cultural sense between this population and other subspecific populations of Canada geese that show more extreme migratory movements? Clarify what the status of these populations would be relative to “resident” geese as defined in this DEIS given that there are birds adhering to their historic range who are phenotypically if not genotypically comparable to the geese that were present before humans intervened in their fate.

*State management programs*

**The DEIS must provide more detailed information, including analysis and interpretation, on past and current efforts to translocate Canada geese.** Information in the DEIS concerning the nature and scope of state activities is incomplete, excluding information that we expect was obtained through the survey conducted. Why, for example, does the discussion on I-14 through I-15 concerning past management activities not mention that Michigan and Nevada continue relocation as a management component? These states responded to the questionnaire (I-8) and must certainly have identified these programs, one being conducted by the state and the other by WS.

*The existing permit process*

**The DEIS must ensure that the data in Appendix 10 is completed to include all FWS permits issued for Canada geese from 1985 until the present.** The year 1985 is the appropriate starting point because that was the publication date of the paper<sup>5</sup> that is often taken as the first published recognition of an emerging issue with “resident” Canada geese. As an example of incomplete reporting, we note that relocation permits for Region 3 are identified only from 1994, although it is widely known that substantial federally permitted activities occurred before that. This tabulation also lumps as “all” permitted activities among the various states for several of the years tabulated (1994, 1996, 1997, and 1998). These data should be broken out by state. If a systematic and internally consistent breakdown of permitted activities by FWS regions cannot be made, this should be explained and discussed in detail. We are aware of past criticisms of the Service for failing to maintain such records in good order and do not wish to revisit old criticisms. However, readers must be informed that the historic record may be quite incomplete. This may have substantial bearing on what any individual interprets as a need for the proposed action.

Please also include how WS data management and reporting has complied with FWS requirements and in which years reporting was or was not required, or provided or not provided, in compliance with federal regulations. It is important that readers understand whether or not past agency activities have been fully in compliance with federal regulations.

*Numbers of affected birds*

**The DEIS must state in a clear and obvious manner the numbers of geese to be targeted in control actions, and the totals of these numbers must be prominently mentioned in the document abstract and the Executive Summary.** The reader does not find information concerning the actual numbers of geese projected for lethal control until IV-1. The proposed “model” by which various combinations of lethal approaches are estimated is not presented until IV-37. This minimizes a major and controversial component of the proposed plan in such a way that it inescapably suggests the issue is deliberately downplayed. Yet, this matter is the basis of

---

<sup>5</sup> Conover, Michael R., and G. G. Chasko. 1985. Nuisance Canada goose problems in the eastern United States. Wildlife Society Bulletin 13: 228-33.

the controversy that has developed between those who advocate killing “resident” Canada geese and those who see other solutions. The Service must present the public with an up-front accounting of the numbers of “resident” Canada geese proposed for lethal action or control, totaling these by state, flyway, and for the geographic area affected by the proposed action (the conterminous United States).

*Addressing the role of volunteer programs*

**The DEIS must summarize and analyze the contributions and effect of volunteer programs to help communities resolve human-geese conflicts.** The HSUS called for this during scoping comments on this DEIS (Grandy to Andrew 10/14/99, Grandy to Andrew 3/28/00) and finds no effort made to do so. The DEIS does not discuss volunteer efforts in Virginia, Washington, Maryland, and Michigan that have substantially contributed to Canada goose management and conflict resolution. Some programs, as in Michigan, have been underway for four or five years and have involved the removal of thousands of eggs. State reports to FWS have been available to indicate the extent of volunteer contributions. In Michigan, the volunteer program removed an average of 4,300 eggs annually over the past three years and the number of eggs removed has been increasing over time. This has had a substantial influence on the goose population in southeastern Michigan, and it is incumbent on the Service to include data derived from this effort in the DEIS.

*Selection and makeup of alternatives*

**The DEIS should adequately address the scoping comments of The HSUS (Grandy to Andrew 10/14/99, Grandy to Andrew 3/28/00) and fully consider “Permit Revision Alternative,” “Research Alternative,” “Public Education and Outreach Alternative,” “Trap and Transfer Alternative,” and “Community-based Program Alternative.”** Of these only the “Research Alternative” has been addressed (II-16), and that has been superficially and inadequately commented on by the Service—only noting that it has supported research on “resident” Canada geese for some twenty years. We address that statement elsewhere in this letter. The DEIS should consider all the possible alternatives we communicated in good faith during the scoping process, as required by NEPA.

*Incomplete data on costs and administrative procedures*

**The DEIS must provide a complete and sufficient breakdown and explanation of costs of the various alternatives that comprise the range of existing or proposed programs.** The DEIS contains only limited information on the costs of programs and should clearly provide more information. The information on this issue should be adequate for readers to reach reasonable conclusions about the costs and economic burden taxpayers will assume under varying alternatives. For example, there should be detailed information on existing food shelf programs, including round up costs, transportation costs, and processing costs (including slaughterhouse retooling and administrative costs). Costs for other programs likely to be implemented under each alternative similarly need to be presented.

*Purpose and need*

**The DEIS must state clearly and concisely the goal of this proposed federal action.** NEPA and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations require the DEIS to inform readers in unambiguous terms what goal is to be met or what need is to be filled by the proposed action. That is not done in this DEIS. What the reader does find in the Purpose and Needs section are vague and general statements about reducing, controlling, and managing “resident” Canada goose populations and providing a regulatory mechanism to allow far greater latitude than currently is currently found for lethal control of “resident” Canada geese. This section must be clarified.

*Addressing community-based management concepts*

**The DEIS must summarize and examine existing and available information on community-based programs for “resident” Canada geese.** There is virtually no discussion of these, either from a strategic and conceptual or tactical and applied basis. Given that a discussion of community-based management has been a significant part of previous and current environmental compliance documentation<sup>6</sup> issued by the cooperating agency for this DEIS, clearly it should be mentioned here. An in-depth explanation and analysis of the efforts of the Virginia-based GeesePeace™ should comprise a major part of such a discussion.

*Comments on alternatives*

**The DEIS must re-examine its alternatives and re-evaluate arguments and justifications to correct serious flaws in both fact and logic.** We cannot find in the construct or argument for the proposed alternatives reason to believe that the Service has faithfully, diligently, and seriously sought all the alternatives that might fulfill the goal of the proposed action for “resident” Canada goose management, as required by NEPA. Simply, we cannot follow your logic and believe that the average reader would be led to conclude that a serious and exhaustive consideration of possible alternative actions had been made when this was not the case.

To cite one example, alternative C calls for “Non-lethal Control and Management (Permitted activities)” but stipulates that only the permitted activity of nest and egg destruction would be allowed (IV-12). It goes on to discuss “resident” Canada number as theorized in one flyway (based on data that are the subject of concerns expressed separately here) and concludes that “[n]est manipulations are labor intensive, do little to reduce the overall population size, require annual treatments, and are not favored by the general public.” By referencing Coluccy et al. (2001) and Smith et al. (1999)<sup>7</sup> the average citizen would think that the Service is actually on

---

<sup>6</sup> Final Environmental Assessment. 1997. Management of resident Canada goose and mallard duck damage in New Jersey, USDA. USDA-WS, Pittstown, NJ.

Pre-decisional Environmental Assessment. 2002. Canada goose damage management in New Jersey, USDA. USDA-WS, Pittstown, NJ.

<sup>7</sup> Coluccy, J. M., R. D. Drobney, D. A. Graber, S. L. Sheriff, and D. J. Witter. 2001. Attitudes of central Missouri residents toward local giant Canada geese and management alternatives. Wildlife Society Bulletin 29, no. 1: 116-23.

solid ground in making this statement. The statement however, ignores the fact that volunteer efforts make nest manipulations cost-effective, reduce labor demands on state and federal employees, and build community support; facts that are equally true and as defensible as the comments that the Service chose to include. The Service should at least mention that the Coluccy et al. study represents public opinion in one state only and that surveys of public opinion elsewhere may be similar or may differ considerably.

*State and flyway level management*

**The DEIS must explain why the DEIS jumps from state management to flyway management.** The DEIS at times addresses the management of “resident” goose populations as if this were an issue for the individual states (and in its preferred alternative F clearly indicates that this is where it feels the issue lies) while much of the data summarized and discussed are for geese populations analyzed at the flyway level. What are the origin, basis, and concept of flyway waterfowl management, especially as this reflects on the recreational and socioeconomic concerns associated with that management?

The management of the continent-wide population of “resident” Canada geese is dependent on the cooperation of natural resource agencies, which may be one reason why the flyway concept is emphasized in a document that would otherwise be focused on the states. However, the DEIS does not discuss or explain this. The clear impression is left that the Service’s interest in addressing “resident” Canada geese is to fit it, first, within the consumptive use and recreational management concepts of the flyway programs and only secondly to turn to the real heart of matter. The heart of the matter is that highly specific and localized conflicts are occurring between people and Canada geese in settings that do not lend themselves to recreational access. The DEIS should present a much clearer idea of how, when authority is transferred under alternative F, bird populations would be regulated in coordinated programs through information sharing between the states.

*Establishing the need for action*

**The DEIS must clearly establish a need for action.** The reader must be able to understand why the Service has determined a major federal action is needed. The DEIS lacks sufficient documentation to demonstrate that the impacts of “resident” geese on humans or human resources merits the proposed response. We draw attention especially to Table I-2, intended to be a summary of information on complaints. This table presents data in confusingly mixed formats and contains typographical errors. The reader is left without a clear idea of what types of complaints occur or their extent state by state. No attempt is made to establish whether complainants were recorded once or multiple times, if individuals happened to place more than one call into the agency. No attempt to statistically examine or validate any of these data is

made, nor is the potential for misinterpretation (for example, concerning health threats) or misunderstanding (for example, combining complaints about swans, ducks, and geese) discussed.

*Discussion of health issues*

**The DEIS must address more thoroughly and comprehensively the issue of health threats posed by Canada geese to humans.** We applaud the fact that the Service acknowledges for the first time in this DEIS that public health and safety issues have to be determined by public health and safety authorities. However, the discussion of the attendant issues is not sufficient to convey the likelihood of contracting an illness from geese. We have noted in previous comments that the best available science considers the health threat from Canada geese to be real, but minimal or no greater than that posed by other waterfowl species<sup>8</sup>. We note that you have included discussion of the Converse et al. findings and request that you review, use, and cite the Roscoe report.

The DEIS should address health issues more comprehensively through a risk assessment analysis that evaluates the health risk potential from Canada geese in context with other potential sources for the pathogens associated with geese. Other potential sources should include other avian species (e.g. mallard ducks, gulls, herons), other wildlife (e.g. deer, raccoons), domestic animals (dogs, cats), and humans themselves (foodstuffs, sewage, other cultural factors). Readers should be able to understand the environmental health risk associated with geese in comparison to risks from other sources. The point would be to demonstrate the relative risks from a variety of courses to support a better informed decision on the consequences that might follow from association of humans and geese.

The DEIS improperly introduces highly speculative instances that purport to document health risks that seem to have no grounding in either fact or logic. The instance reported at I-13, c. in which an individual in Illinois is said to have contracted histoplasmosis from mowing a lawn where geese feces were present is one example. This speculation so widely contradicts accepted scientific understanding of how histoplasmosis occurs and is maintained in the environment and how it could be transmitted that we can only conclude the Service was on a fishing expedition to look for bad news about geese and human health when it included this.

The DEIS does not adequately address the personal health issues associated with the consumption of Canada goose meat. We accept that the risks may be small, but insist that they are still known to be real and that those individuals at risk for exposure have little or no choice in

---

<sup>8</sup> Roscoe, D. E. 1999. A survey to estimate the prevalence of Salmonella sp., Shigella sp., Yersinia sp. bacteria and Cryptosporidia sp., Giardia sp. protozoa in resident Canada geese (*Branta canadensis*) in New Jersey. D. E. Roscoe. Project Report. New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife.

Converse, K., M. Wolcott, D. Docherty, and R. Cole. 2001. Screening for potential pathogens in fecal material deposited by resident Canada geese in areas of public utility, 315 (AIMS) 5003748 (SIS). National Wildlife Health Center, Madison, WI.

accepting Canada goose meat and are not reasonably and appropriately informed as to what risks might be associated with consumption.

*Proposed action*

**The DEIS must demonstrate that its Proposed Action (alternative F) will achieve the stated Purpose and Need.** This goes to the heart and purpose of NEPA analysis of federal actions. The DEIS must clearly, and in a manner intelligible to the average reader, identify the goal the agency intends to achieve and explain the different ways the goal can be achieved. This DEIS makes no attempt to explain how the proposed action will achieve the goal articulated in the Purpose and Need section. The DEIS does not demonstrate that a reduction in the size of goose populations will result in a corresponding reduction in human-goose conflicts. It does not demonstrate that the preferred alternative F is superior to any other alternative in achieving the agency's goal, justifying the preference for that alternative over others.

*State guidelines*

**The DEIS must define the "guidelines" that states will have to operate under if they accept "empowerment."** The DEIS must stipulate when and how the guidelines will be determined and discuss how NEPA compliance on the guidelines will be accomplished by FWS. The Service should identify how NEPA compliance on specific actions will be tiered to this proposed programmatic DEIS.

*Absence of a clearly defined alternative*

**The DEIS must clearly define the preferred alternative.** The preferred alternative F, as described in the DEIS, simply steps away from federal responsibility without analyzing the potential costs and consequences of this or stipulating what level of federal involvement and engagement would remain to ensure that treaty obligations were met. The preferred alternative is optional. States need not accept the transfer of authority, leaving it questionable as to what role they and the federal agencies will then play. This has to be addressed in the DEIS. It is unclear how the Service proposes to establish the preferred alternative and meet its management objectives through voluntary compliance by the states.

The preferred alternative F must thoroughly explain what will happen in states that do not accept "empowerment." The Service's scoping suggest that fewer than ten of the states will accept alternative F as workable, leaving the majority of the states in some other status, given the optional nature of alternative F. This fails, at many different levels, to be the "comprehensive programmatic plan" it is called. The Service needs to be much more specific about how many states it expects to participate, why it expects them to participate, and what will happen in states that do not participate.

*Incomplete analysis of impacts to the human environment*

**The DEIS must provide a complete analysis of impacts to the human environment.** The DEIS identifies and describes recreational and aesthetic factors as socially significant aspects of

the relationship between people and Canada geese, but does not attempt to describe these in sufficient detail to characterize the range of issues pertinent to the human dimensions of “resident” Canada goose management. Except in passing, little is said of the value that people place on geese, and nothing is said of the potential consequences that mass killing would have on devaluing these birds in the eyes of those who currently place great import on them. This issue has been at least preliminarily addressed in the literature<sup>9</sup> and should be a component of this DEIS. The Service should identify and describe possible changes in opinion that would occur as the public became used to mass killing, desensitized to the nature and type of suffering inflicted on birds in these situations, and generalized that desensitization to other wildlife species and the environment.

The definition of aesthetics as “...truly subjective in nature, dependent on what an observer regards as beautiful” should be referenced to the particular doctrine or school of philosophy from which it is derived. Other doctrines and branches of philosophic inquiry argue that universals are to be found in what humans find to be aesthetically pleasing or attractive. A discussion of the distinctions that exist between the fields of aesthetics and moral theory is warranted, as the DEIS is muddled about these.

It should be the objective of this document to factually place information before the public and the agency decision-maker, including information that identifies and describes the controversy that exists over lethal management by round up and slaughter or round up and gassing of geese. Those methods should be described in sufficient detail to ensure that the reader understands the processes the geese go through. The extent to which differences of opinion exist among some federal agencies, wildlife managers, and some members of the animal welfare and protection community on this management approach must be described. The term “euthanasia” as employed (albeit sparingly) in the DEIS must be qualified, inasmuch as there has been significant criticism in the past over how the term is defined and applied in the context of the lethal activities aimed at “resident” geese.

#### *International treaty concerns*

**The DEIS must address international relationships and treaty obligations that might be affected by the proposed federal action.** The DEIS notes that “[m]igratory birds, including “resident” Canada geese, are a renewable, international, common property resource” but virtually overlooks treaty relationships, the possibilities that “resident” Canada geese make international movements, or that sub-populations of these geese would fall under joint jurisdiction. There are documented movements of “resident” birds between Canada and the United States following

---

<sup>9</sup> E.g., Ankney, C. D. 1996. An embarrassment of riches: too many geese. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 60, no. 2: 217-23.

Hadidian, J, M. Childs, N. Perry, and P. Lane. 2000. Resolving conflicts with Canada geese: an animal welfare perspective. *Proceedings of the 9th Eastern Wildlife Damage Management Conference*, eds., M. C. Brittingham, J. Kays, and R. McPeake, 293-99 State College, Pa.: Penn State University.

failed nesting experience<sup>10</sup> and suggestions that this phenomenon also occurs elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> These should be addressed.

*Impact Analysis*

**The DEIS fails to adequately analyze the full scope of potential impacts of the proposed action as required by CEQ regulations implementing NEPA.** Both direct and reasonably foreseeable indirect impacts must be analyzed. The document is silent on indirect impacts and does not explain why they are not analyzed. Cumulative impacts are dealt with weakly and only for alternative F, not for any of the other alternatives. CEQ regulations require the DEIS to objectively present impact analysis for all alternatives so they may be compared. The absence of impact analysis for all but one of alternatives eliminates the possibility of making that comparison. Impact analysis must specifically address the issue of sustainability (sometimes also referred to as short-term uses of the environment vs. maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity) as required by CEQ regulations. This is insufficiently addressed in this DEIS. Given that the proposed action, if implemented, will ultimately kill hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of “resident” Canada geese, it must have implications for sustainability. Please carefully review 40 CFR 1502.16 for your responsibility as lead agency in these areas.

The DEIS fails to consider here and fails to develop a systematic approach to consider in future NEPA compliance activities the true cumulative impacts of the individual state plans. Since the FWS review of state actions will be after the fact, the agency needs to establish a preliminary review board that will review and determine the effects (direct, indirect, and cumulative) of the various state plans. The current DEIS as written fails to consider this issue or even anticipate or acknowledge the glaring omission of NEPA compliance that is inherent in the strategy to grant actual decision-making authority to the states

*Economic impact analysis*

**The DEIS must present a more thorough and comprehensive review and analysis of the economic impacts of existing “resident” Canada goose management programs as well as the impacts of the proposed action.** The reader should be able to grasp and appreciate the costs of existing programs as well as likely costs under the proposed alternative. With the projected increase in the take and killing of “resident” Canada geese, costs to land and property owners can be expected to increase significantly as both federal and private entities charge for the round up and removal of geese. Large scale efforts of this sort are already underway in Virginia and Washington by WS and the costs of those programs as well as total expense budgets should be

---

<sup>10</sup> Michigan Department of Natural Resources. 2000. Controlling Canada goose conflicts in Michigan: activities conducted under federal permit, 1999. Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, Michigan, USA.

<sup>11</sup> Swift, B. L. 2000. Suburban goose management: insights from New York State. Proceedings of the 9th Eastern Wildlife Damage Management Conference, eds M. C. Brittingham, J. Kays, and R. McPeake, pp. 307-321, State College, Pa.: Penn State University.

given in this DEIS. These types of data are not adequately researched or understood at this time to support a major federal action.

*Round up and killing*

**The DEIS must fully address round up and slaughter and round up and mass killing of “resident” Canada geese and describe these processes so that the average reader may fully understand the basis of the current controversy.** Much of the controversy over the management of “resident” Canada geese revolves around the practices that lead to and constitute the round up and killing of birds en mass. The DEIS must address these practices much more comprehensively than it currently does.

*Mitigation Measures*

**The DEIS must include mitigation measures for all identified adverse impacts.** CEQ regulations state that an EIS “shall include discussion of ... the means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts.” (40 CFR§1502.16(h)). Mitigation measures must be discussed for all impacts even those that by themselves would not be considered significant. All relevant, reasonable mitigation measures that could alleviate the environmental effects of a proposed action must be identified, even if they are outside the lead or cooperating agencies’ jurisdiction. If the Service is claiming in this DEIS that the proposed action will have no adverse impacts it must articulate and support this assertion. Otherwise, discussion of mitigation measures is required in the DEIS.

*Role of Wildlife Services*

**The DEIS must include data and information on the activities and programs of its cooperator, USDA-APHIS-WS.** The DEIS should provide a state-by-state breakdown and summary of the activities of the WS programs, including economic information on how much WS charges its cooperators to provide various services. This table or chart should include the numbers of geese taken annually, the costs of removal, and a description of the removal method.

*Detailed Comments.* The following paragraphs detail comments on specific portions of the DEIS text, identified by location in the document.

Page I-1, Section I-A is confusing and potentially misleading. This statement of purpose and need should be simple and clear. The main statement of purpose here is “[t]his DEIS is a comprehensive programmatic plan intended to guide and direct “resident” Canada geese population growth and management activities in the conterminous United States.” Yet we find in Section IV the declaration that an alternative will not achieve “population stabilization and reduction in line with flyway goals.” The Service is judging alternatives not by how well they achieve the stated purpose of this major federal action as articulated in this section but by how well they achieve another goal not stated there. Either the statement of purpose and need in this section needs to be revised to truly and fully articulate the Service’s goal or the alternatives need to be judged by how well each achieves the stated purpose and need articulated in this section.

Page I-7 (c). Under “Current Regulatory Framework” the DEIS notes that the management of “resident” geese under traditional and special hunting seasons “...provided relief in some areas...” This statement should be substantiated by noting where this occurred and by what means of monitoring or study this conclusion was reached. This DEIS does not critically analyze the existing information on special hunting seasons and establish comprehensively what effect they have had in different parts of the range of “resident” Canada geese. The statement “[t]hese new special permits result in biologically sound and more cost-effective and efficient “resident” Canada goose damage management” must be substantiated by demographic and cost-benefit analysis.

The discussion of special hunting seasons and their effects throughout the document is confusing and contradictory. In places in the DEIS, the data presented suggest that the special goose seasons have not been successful (Appendix 3), but the DEIS does not discuss the consequences of this for the proposed management approach. Further, at page IV-4 the DEIS points out that even though hunting has been greatly expanded over the last 15 years, it has had no visible impact on population numbers “on anything more than a local scale.” This should be discussed more comprehensively with respect to its impact on the preferred alternative.

Page II-8. In describing the estimated costs of to capture and process geese for human consumption the DEIS should identify costs from all programs including those in New York and Virginia.

Page I-9, Table I-2 presents information on Canada geese complaints received by State wildlife resources agencies. It includes a column titled “Damage during most recent one-year period” that appears to try to present dollar values for damage. The information in this column is derived from responses to a very vague survey question that asked only how much damage state agency staff “feels” really occurred. (Appendix 1) This, at best, poor and, at worst, unusable, information should be clearly identified as such.

More generally the section this table supports, Section I-C-2, should be a much stronger statement of why the Service must take action. The support for this major federal action is weak, antidotal, poorly organized, and poorly explained. It does not demonstrate that the Service needs to act.

Page I-18. The Service notes that “[f]lyway population objectives have been incorporated into the DEIS to help define its objectives for acceptable population reduction and management.” We noted in our general comments the problem of addressing “resident” Canada geese at the flyway level in places and the state level in other places in this DEIS. This statement adds further to that confusion and mixes data from the United States and Canadian sources in a way that is difficult to follow.

Page I-20. Each state and province wildlife agency developed its own population objective. All the objectives were combined into the Flyway Council population objectives. These objectives were developed in different ways in different states and province and even represent different concepts in different states and provinces. The Flyway Council population objectives, therefore, combine apples and oranges. While this may be satisfactory for the Councils' purposes, it is not necessarily satisfactory for this DEIS to support a major federal action.

Page I-30 admits the Flyway Councils' population objectives are subjective. However, rather than suggest more objective ways to arrive at numbers the DEIS then only suggests the subjective numbers "should be periodically reviewed and revised." These subjective numbers are inappropriately presented as sufficient justification for implementing the action proposed in the DEIS.

Section I, Tables. All of the several tables presenting each Flyway Council goose population estimates and objectives in Section I need to 'Do The Math' (Tables I-4, I-5, I-6, I-7, I-8, and I-9). Each one should present the difference between estimated populations and population objectives and the percentages of current estimated populations those differences represents. In other words, how many "resident" Canada geese does each flyway want to eliminate? What percentage of the "resident" Canada geese does each flyway want to eliminate?

These numbers should then be summarized in one table for the area affected by the proposed action. The current Table I-4 is inadequate both because it does not 'Do The Math' and because it does not present information for the correct geographic area. Why is Canada included in this table? Why isn't the US information limited to the correct geographic area (or if it is, why doesn't the text make that clear)?

Table I-4. Some of the population estimates are inappropriately precise. How can the Service be sure there were exactly 51,972 geese in the US Pacific Flyway rather than 51,973 or 51,974? These are estimates, obviously, and can not possibly be this precise. The table should present the total current US population (2,691,242) and total US population objective (2,032,673 to 2,148,733 with a difference of 116,060 in that range). Therefore, between 542,509 and 658,569 geese are to be killed, or between 20.2 % and 24.5 % of the current estimated population. Please include that in this table.

Table I-5. Why is Canada included in this table? 464,000 geese or 42.8 % of current estimated population are to be killed in this flyway. This should be indicated in this table.

Table I-6. Why is Canada included in the table? 109,050 geese or 9.9 % of current estimated population are to be killed in this flyway. Please include this in the table.

Table I-7. Why is Canada included in the table? Between 44,700 and 124,700 geese are to be eliminated from the Great Plains population, while the other populations may be allowed to

increase. However, the net reduction in geese for the flyway is 8,417 to 88,417 geese or between 1.8 % and 19.3 % of the current estimated population. Please put that in this table. The current estimated population number for the US only is not presented in the table (457,250) and should be.

Tables I-8 and I-9. Why is Canada included in the table? The indices in these tables are very confusing. All the column titles need to be clearly explained. Indices need to be clearly explained or, preferably, replaced with plain numbers such as used in previous tables. The terms “Restrictive” and “Liberalization Levels” are not adequately explained. Table I-9 additionally has no current population estimates for comparison of the numbers presented. Are these hidden in the unexplained and confusing indices? The DEIS should present the current population estimates plainly with the population objectives and ‘Do The Math.’

At page II-1 the descriptions of management techniques present an entirely traditional commodity-based attitude to geese as merely a resource to be exploited by humans for profit. This is outmoded and neglects attitude shift over the last decades towards valuing elements of the natural environment not merely as commodities, as we note further in our concluding comments. Economic and social science models and techniques have been developed to understand and, to a degree, measure the non-commodity or existence values to humans of elements of the natural environment. The DEIS should address this much more comprehensively.

Page II-2. The discussion of habitat alteration inappropriately dismisses landscape changes. People in the United States currently “find lawn areas near water attractive” because of the social history of the dominate sources of our current human population. This history created cultural bias for a specific landscape derived from romanticized ideals of certain high-status European and particularly British landscape designs. The current US preference for manicured lawns is no more a fixed element of human beings than any other cultural preference, such as a preference for bright colored clothes. People are even more highly adaptable than geese. People find almost any type of landscape attractive; from open prairie to rugged mountains; from lush, dense forest to arctic tundra when that landscape is culturally approved and familiar. Therefore, educating people about the attractiveness of open lawn areas near water to geese will make people find this type of landscaping less desirable and increase acceptance of habitat alteration. As alternative types of landscaping become more common, people will become familiar with them and, therefore, find those landscape types more attractive.

This is only one example of the weak grasp of the human side of the goose-human conflict displayed by the DEIS. NEPA requires analysis of impacts to both the natural and human environment. Regulations specifically enumerate social and economic impacts among the required impacts to be analyzed in every EIS (40 CFR 1508.14). This DEIS does not adequately examine these types of impacts.

Grandy and Markarian to Andrew  
May 30, 2002  
Page 18

Page II-7 includes the statement that “approximately 5 eggs must be removed to have the effect of preventing one adult from joining the breeding population.” The references cited for this statement are studies of Arctic breeding, migrating waterfowl of different genera and species (snow and emperor geese). The DEIS itself emphasizes how much “resident” Canada geese differ from even migratory Canada geese in reproductive success and survival. It should certainly be cautious and even skeptical projecting from these sources on other species to “resident” Canada geese.

If we draw on the DEIS information on “resident” Canada geese presented on Page III-8, approximately 2.25 eggs must be removed to have the effect of preventing one adult from joining the breeding population. Therefore, addling and/or nest destruction programs would be much more effective in limiting “resident” Canada geese population growth than the DEIS suggests. This option for dealing with “resident” geese has, therefore, been inappropriately dismissed by the DEIS.

Page II-9 notes that the alternatives being considered were changed as a result of scoping. However, nowhere does the DEIS (or the Scoping Report in Appendix 6) say how they were changed. We noted that they were not changed to include alternatives we suggested in scoping, nor was any justification given for rejecting the suggestions of The HSUS and other animal interests. A short comparison of the old and new alternatives would allow all of the individuals and interests who participated in scoping to see whether their comments had or had not been addressed.

Page II-11 (a) calls in part for “established non-lethal harassment program as certified by Wildlife Services” but does not explain under what authority WS will certify such programs. This should be explained.

Page II-12. The term “aggressive harassment” is used as if it were a part of an activity or activities that required federal permitting. This should be explained and, in general, euphemisms such as this should not be used.

Page II-16. The statement on FWS sponsored and funded research is not supported as we have indicated earlier in these comments. As we asked in scoping, list all FWS sponsored and funded research on “resident” Canada geese.

Pages III-20 and 21 present a detailed table synthesizing giant Canada goose restoration efforts in the Mississippi Flyway. This is not done for other flyways, nor are these data qualified or described in such a way as to indicate that they may or may not be complete or accurate. This information is not used in any predictive or meaningful sense elsewhere in the DEIS. If it has been included for a purpose, that purpose is so vague that the reader cannot draw conclusion from it.

Grandy and Markarian to Andrew  
May 30, 2002  
Page 19

Page III 24. The Service should explain why detailed winter survey estimates of giant Canada geese in the Mississippi Flyway are presented when it is the spring “resident” Canada goose populations that are the object of the DEIS. No confidence intervals or estimates of error are included with these data, raising issues discussed before.

Page III-29. In Table III-13 and elsewhere in this document there are data for states that suggest downward trends in Canada goose populations. These should be analyzed and discussed much more thoroughly in light of the implied objective of this proposed action.

Page III-32 et seq. Discussion of “wintering” geese occurs here and elsewhere without any real explanation of why the Service is focused on birds that are present in the conterminous United States at given numbers during that part of the year.

Page III-35. Mitchell et al. 1999 does not appear in the bibliography. Provide the complete reference.

Page III-35. The discussion of water quality should be substantiated with better studies and data that reflect all sources of impact, not just geese, so that the reader can reach an informed conclusion about the contribution made by geese to this problem.

Page III-36. The estimate of sidewalk cleanup from Allan et al. 1995 should be quoted in its entirety and compared to other estimates, or the DEIS should indicate that no such other estimates are available or were sought.

Page III-37. The discussion of waterfowl health should address the passage of migrant birds and their potential to transmit disease.

Page III-39. The Service presents data on whooping crane sightings from 1919 to 2000 but does not explain why this is relevant in a DEIS on “resident” Canada geese.

Page III-44 and 45. The purpose of this table is not given and it appears to be nothing more than “filler.”

Page III-73 and following. This discussion is supposed to be on aesthetics but veers off that topic into economics, safety, and health. This appears to be an effort to undercut the value of aesthetics. Those other topics have, or should have, their own sections and should be discussed there. The appropriate place for a discussion of the balance among these issues is Section V, Comparison of Alternatives.

Page III-76. The discussion of humaneness is undercut by bringing in issues of funding and cost. This section should be about humaneness and humaneness only. There are other sections, or should be, on economics including the costs of implementing the various alternatives.

Page III-77, in the discussion on economics the numbers are mostly antidotal, just guesses from state wildlife staff. Also, the numbers vary so widely as to be nonsensical. Doing the math, New York's numbers suggest it costs \$13,333 per goose complaint while Pennsylvania's numbers suggest it cost \$22,727 per complaint and Virginia's numbers suggest is cost only \$409 per complaint. The DEIS needs to address why these numbers vary so widely. As presented, these numbers appear too unreliable to support the need for the proposed action.

Page IV-7. The Service restates the oft-repeated claim that Wildlife Services is "cooperatively funded," meaning it is landowners and not taxpayers who pay for their services. Why, therefore, will WS be adversely affected by demand for more services?

Page IV-11 (3). It is not clear what point is being made in this section, or what purpose is served by discussion of the events of June 2001. The coverage given this event in other media outlet sources should be mentioned. A more complete summary with an explanation of this incident's significant to this DEIS should be given or this discussion removed.

Page IV-12. It is unclear whether the discussion of "administrative" reflects agricultural or other interest. The DEIS should identify whether the "average" costs incurred in South Dakotas for keeping geese off property was for residential or agricultural lands.

Page IV-13. There is no discussion of the advantages of egg removal in paragraph 2, although the issue is raised as if such a discussion is presented.

Page IV-13. The statement based on the Cornell manual (Smith et al. 1999) that "nest manipulations . . . do little to reduce the overall population size" is out of context and misleading. The further statement that favors killing over nest manipulation says "to equal the effect of removing an adult bird from a population, all eggs produced by that goose during its entire lifetime must be removed." This can only be true if every removed goose is killed before it reproduces. Killing a goose does not remove its offspring raised prior to that killing.

Page IV-15. The mention of \$6.38 costs per egg added in one Minnesota study does not mention that such costs are substantially less, and may not even exist at all to the landowner, where volunteer programs are employed.

Page IV-20 (2)(a). The Service should here and elsewhere indicate what information it lacks when discussing issues such as workload and costs. Where it cannot make a statement one way or another, and even where it does but hedges toward what might be only one of many possible interpretations of the same data, it should so state.

Grandy and Markarian to Andrew  
May 30, 2002  
Page 21

Page IV-27 (2)(a). Where speculative comments are made, such as that “resident” Canada geese might be hazed from agricultural to residential areas, the Service should identify the statements as being based on conjecture when it does not have real-world data.

Page IV-31(2)(c). Under “state programs” there is no discussion of the impact to public health agencies from increased demand and requirements for monitoring and testing.

Page IV-33 (5)(a)(1). The Service should explain what is meant by “localized” when discussing “resident” Canada goose populations. Further, (IV-34, (5)(2)) its should explain what is meant by “localized, gradual.”

Page IV-37. F(1)(a). The Service should explain what is meant by “aggressive management,” as well as explain on what basis its claim that this is “warranted and must be implemented.” The concept of “aggressive management” is nowhere defined in the DEIS.

Page IV-38. (b). The “significant reduction” in “resident” Canada goose impacts to soil and water resources should be substantiated, given the number of birds present throughout the affected environment and the known and measurable consequences of the removal of birds at the rate suggested by the Service. No data are given or projected to support this claim which appears, on its surface, to have no actual basis in fact from research or monitoring information.

Page IV-39 (c). The concluding statement concerning habitat for migratory geese should be explained and data from managed feeding areas considered.

Page IV-40. The DEIS should explain how the management of light geese and data and projections from those populations can be extrapolated to “resident” Canada geese.

Page IV-41 (2). The “workload” for “aggressive harassment programs” should be estimated in this DEIS.

Page IV-42 (3). The “workload” for state monitoring programs should be estimated and the impacts to state budgetary and other resources given.

Page IV-43. The Service mentions a “conservation season in August” but does not explain what this is.

Page IV-43. The discussion of management concerns first says (IV-42 (2)) that the states will be required to “track” all “take” resulting from “authorized management alternatives.” Then this is dismissed a few paragraphs later by the statement that the state “may” keep records or “may” grant authority to other entities or individuals without any apparent need to maintain records. These contradictions appear to be not only confusing and misleading but amount to a virtual

Grandy and Markarian to Andrew  
May 30, 2002  
Page 22

abdication of all responsibility and accountability by the Service for the matter of “resident” Canada goose management and resolution of human-goose conflicts.

Page IV-46 (2). Individual costs to the states should be enumerated. Simply referring to Mosser (2000) for an internal report may comply with NEPA requirements but is beyond the ability of the reader to verify.

Page IV-47. The Service should conduct a cost analysis of state operational monitoring programs rather than simply state it does not “envision” the requirement being “overly burdensome.”

Page IV-47 (3). The Service should explain why it concludes conflict abatement costs will be reduced as problem goose populations decrease. If problems are localized and management is ineffective, then costs should remain the same or rise even as total goose populations decrease.

### **Concluding Comments**

The HSUS and The Fund concludes our comments on this “DEIS for Resident Canada Goose Management” by noting that a unique opportunity presents itself for the Service and WS to comprehensively address both the biological and sociological issues surrounding the management of Canada geese labeled “resident” in areas cohabited by humans. Adequate understanding of even what the issues are, not to mention adequate knowledge concerning the biological and ecological bases upon which sound management approaches could be planned are lacking. The proposed approach is an illogical and deficient tact that ignores the reality of sound management planning based on ecological approaches.

The issue of “resident” Canada geese is representative of the significant crossroad we face in our approach to wildlife management. We urge the Service to not take it lightly. Mangun’s<sup>12</sup> is but one voice articulating this by noting that while the pervasive approach to wildlife policy in the United States has traditionally focused on animals solely serving a purpose for human use and enjoyment, our attitudes are changing. Contemporary wildlife policy and management must focus not only on the goals of protecting and enhancing wildlife diversity and the ecological integrity of wildlife habitats, but on the value and sovereignty of habitat and lives as well. Our world is increasingly acknowledging and accepting of a biocentric perspective in which humans are a vital part of and responsible for the preservation of all life. The Service must be a part of that movement, not opposed to it, and this DEIS fails to address this.

To The HSUS, The Fund for Animals, other animal protection and welfare interests, and millions of average Americans, killing animals to resolve the conflicts that we created through our own

---

<sup>12</sup> Mangun, William R. 1992. Fish and wildlife policy issues. American Fish and Wildlife Policy: The Humane Dimension. ed William R. Mangun, 3-32. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Grandy and Markarian to Andrew  
May 30, 2002  
Page 23

actions, and that we sustain because we choose not to adopt environmentally sound, lasting, and humane solutions, is unacceptable. We see many human-goose conflicts as highly localized and seasonally transient phenomena that can be resolved in the short-term with any of a number of tactical approaches. In the long-term, community-based approaches offer the best hope for comprehensive solutions.

The Service can, through this DEIS, step into the new millennium and address wildlife management in all of its biological and cultural complexity. Or it can, as it seems intent to do, simply call for killing and removal as a “solution” to perceived problems. We cannot, and we believe no reasonable person could, read this DEIS without feeling that the Service arrived long ago at a predetermined conclusion about managing “resident” Canada geese. We regret that we must perceive it as so.

Sincerely,

John W. Grandy, Ph.D.  
Senior Vice President  
Wildlife and Habitat Protection  
The Humane Society of the United States

Michael Markarian  
Executive Vice President  
The Fund for Animals