

- Grieb, J. R. 1968. Canada goose populations in the Central Flyway—their status and future. Pages 31–41 in R. L. Hine and C. Schoenfeld, eds. Canada goose management: Current continental problems and programs. Dembar Education Research Service, Madison, WI. 195 pp.
- _____. 1970. The Shortgrass Prairie Canada goose population. Wildlife Monograph 22. 49 pp.
- Hanson, H. C. 1965. The giant Canada goose. Southern Illinois University Press. Carbondale, IL. 252 pp.
- Johnson, F. A. and P. M. Castelli. 1998. Demographics of “resident” Canada geese in the Atlantic Flyway. Pages 127–133 in D. H. Rusch, M. D. Samuel, D. D. Humburg, and B. D. Sullivan, eds. Biology and management of Canada geese. Proceedings of the International Canada Goose Symposium, Milwaukee, WI.
- Krohn, W. B., and E. G. Bizeau. 1980. The Rocky Mountain population of western Canada goose: Its distribution, habitats and management. Special Scientific Report Wildlife 229. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 93 pp.
- Manny, B. A., W. C. Johnson, and R. G. Wetzel. 1994. Nutrient additives by waterfowl to lakes and reservoirs: predicting their effects on productivity and water quality. *Hydrobiologia* 279:121–132.
- Mississippi Flyway Council. 1996. Giant Canada Goose Management Plan. Unpublished report.
- Moser, T. J., and F. D. Caswell. In press. Long-term indices of Canada goose status and management. Pages xx–xx in T. J. Moser, K. C. Vercauteren, R. D. Lien, K. F. Abraham, D. E. Andersen, J. G. Bruggink, J. M. Coluccy, D. A. Graber, J. O. Leafloor, D. R. Luukkonen, and R. E. Trost, editors. Proceedings of the 2003 International Canada Goose Symposium, Madison, WI.
- Nelson, H. K. 1962. Recent approaches to Canada goose management. U.S. Department of the Interior. Special Scientific Report Wildlife 66. 21 pp.
- _____, and R. B. Oetting. 1998. Giant Canada goose flocks in the United States. Pages 483–495 in D. H. Rusch, M. D. Samuel, D. D. Humburg, and B. D. Sullivan, eds. Biology and management of Canada geese. Proceedings of the International Canada Goose Symposium, Milwaukee, WI.
- Palmer, R. S., ed. 1976. Handbook of North American birds. Volume 2. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT. 521 pp.
- Rusch, D. H., R. E. Malecki, and R. E. Trost. 1995. Canada geese in North America. Pages 26–28 in E. T. LaRoe, G. S. Farris, C. E. Puckett, P. D. Doran, and M. J. Mac. Editors. OUR LIVING RESOURCES: A report to the nation on the distribution, abundance, and health of U.S. plants, animals, and ecosystems. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Biological Service. Washington, D.C. 530 pp.
- _____, J. C. Wood, G. G. Zenner. 1996. The dilemma of giant Canada goose management. Pages 72–78 in Ratti, J. T. ed. 7th International Waterfowl Symposium. Ducks Unlimited, Inc., Memphis, TN.
- Rutherford, W. H., ed. 1965. Description of Canada goose populations common to the Central Flyway. Central Flyway Waterfowl Council Technical Committee. 20 pp.
- Sheaffer, S. E. and R. A. Malecki. 1998. Status of Atlantic Flyway resident nesting Canada geese. Pages 29–34 in D. H. Rusch, M. D. Samuel, D. D. Humburg, and B. D. Sullivan, eds. Biology and management of Canada geese. Proceedings of the International Canada Goose Symposium, Milwaukee, WI.
- Subcommittee on Pacific Population of Western Canada Geese. 2000. Pacific Flyway Management Plan for the Pacific Population of Western Canada Geese. Pacific Flyway Study Committee. (c/o USFWS) Portland, OR. Unpublished report. XX pp.
- Subcommittee on Rocky Mountain Canada Geese. 2000. Pacific Flyway management plan for the Rocky Mountain Population of Canada Geese. Pacific Flyway Study Committee [c/o USFWS], Portland, OR. Unpublished report. 28 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Waterfowl population status, 2002. U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 37 pp. + appendices.
- Vaught, R. W. and L. M. Kirsch. 1966. Canada geese of the Eastern Prairie Population with special reference to the Swan Lake flock. Missouri Department of Conservation Technical Bulletin 3. Jefferson City, MO. 91 pp.
- Williams, C. S. 1967. Honker: a discussion of the habits and needs of the largest of our Canada geese. D. Van Nostrand Co., Princeton, NJ. 179 pp.
- Wood, J. C., D. H. Rusch, and M. Samuel. 1996. Results of the 1996 spring survey of giant Canada goose survey in the Mississippi Flyway. University of Wisconsin Co-op Unit. 9 pp. (mimeo).

NEPA Considerations

In compliance with the requirements of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(C)), and the Council on Environmental Quality's regulation for implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500–1508), we prepared a draft EIS in February 2002. The draft EIS is available to the public at the location indicated under the **ADDRESSES** caption.

Endangered Species Act Consideration

Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531–1543; 87 Stat. 884) provides that “Each Federal agency shall, in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretary, insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out * * * is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat * * *.” We have initiated Section 7 consultation under the ESA for this proposed rule. The result of our consultation under Section 7 of the ESA will be available to the public at the location indicated under the **ADDRESSES** caption.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) requires the preparation of flexibility analyses for actions that will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, which includes small businesses, organizations, or governmental jurisdictions. The economic impacts of this proposed rule will fall primarily on State and local governments and Wildlife Services because of the structure of wildlife damage management. Data are not available to estimate the exact number of governments affected, but it is unlikely to be a substantial number on a national scale. We estimate that implementation of new resident Canada goose management regulations would help alleviate local public health and safety concerns, decrease economic damage caused by excessive numbers of geese, and increase the quality of life for those people experiencing goose conflicts. Implementation of new resident Canada goose regulations would also help reduce agricultural losses caused by these geese. Our proposed rule would give State fish and wildlife agencies significantly more latitude to manage resident Canada goose populations. Goose populations would be reduced to levels that local communities can support, and agricultural damages from resident Canada geese would be reduced. We have determined that a Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis is not required.

Executive Order 12866

In accordance with the criteria in Executive Order 12866, this proposed action is not a significant regulatory action subject to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review. This rule will not have an annual economic effect of \$100 million or adversely affect any economic sector, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, or other units of government. Therefore, a cost-benefit economic analysis is not required. This proposed action will not create inconsistencies with other agencies' actions or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency. The Federal agency most interested in this action is Wildlife Services. The action proposed is consistent with the policies and guidelines of other Department of the Interior bureaus. This proposed action will not materially affect entitlements, grants, user fees, loan programs, or the rights and obligations of their recipients. This proposed action will not raise novel legal or policy issues because we