

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	General categories of issues and concerns identified during the light goose EIS scoping process.....	5
Table 2.1	Summary of management alternatives to be analyzed.....	20
Table 3.1	Distribution of legband recoveries for lesser snow and Ross’s geese banded in the western, central, and eastern Arctic by decade, 1950-98.....	24
Table 3.2	Breeding adult lesser snow and Ross’s goose population estimates as estimated from aerial photo inventories, 1966-99 (compiled by R. Kerbes, CWS). Inclusion of estimates of non-breeding adults would increase population estimates by 30%.....	31
Table 3.3	Estimated light goose (lesser snow and Ross’s goose) harvests during regular season and conservation order periods in the Central and Mississippi Flyways (combined) during 1998/99 and 1999/00.....	46
Table 3.4	Compensation paid to farmers in Quebec as a result of crop damages due to grazing by greater snow geese (Filion et al. 1998).....	55
Table 3.5	Locally declining populations of other avian species in the La Pérouse Bay area. Bold indicates a significant decline (Rockwell et al. 1997b).....	59
Table 3.6	Light goose harvest in the U.S during 1997/98, and the proportion of the \$146 million total economic impact generated by light goose hunting distributed among Flyways.....	65
Table 3.7	Peak population estimates for greater snow geese on National Wildlife Refuges in Region 5, 1994-99.....	68
Table 3.8	Refuges in Region 5 that receive snow goose use, and the proportion of each refuge open to hunting (USFWS, unpublished data).....	68
Table 3.9	Average number of annual use/days by light geese on selected refuges in the southern portion of the Central and Mississippi Flyways (USFWS, unpublished data)...	69
Table 3.10	Examples of changes in management on various National Wildlife Refuges (NWR) and impacts on light goose harvest (USFWS, unpublished data).....	70
Table 3.11	Average number of annual use-days by light geese on selected refuges in the Pacific Flyway (USFWS, unpublished data).....	71
Table 4.1	Impacts of liberalization in methods of take (electronic calls, unplugged shotguns) on harvest of lesser snow geese (LSGO), Ross’s geese (ROGO), and total light geese (LSGO plus ROGO) in 1999 and 2000, versus mean harvest for the same calendar periods in late winter/spring 1996-98.....	77
Table 4.2	Estimated impacts resulting from implementation of new light goose (lesser snow and Ross’s geese) harvest regulations in the Central and Mississippi Flyways.....	77
Table 4.3	Estimated impact of authorizing new regulations to increase harvest of greater snow geese in the U.S.....	78
Table 4.4	Projected continental harvest and harvest rate of greater snow geese following implementation of special regulations in the U.S. portion of the Atlantic Flyway.....	80

Table 4.5	Estimation of the number of Central/Mississippi Flyway light geese that would need to be removed on an annual basis by direct agency control in order to achieve a 50% reduction in number of geese.....	85
Table 4.6	Potential economic impact of closure of light goose hunting in each Flyway, based on losses of trip-related expenditures by hunters.....	100
Table 4.7	Potential economic impact of trip-related expenditures during an extended time in which to take light geese in each Flyway.....	102
Table 4.8	Summary of environmental consequences of light goose management alternatives.....	111