LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 3.1	Primary geographic distribution of greater snow and Ross's geese, and several populations of lesser snow geese	21
Fig. 3.2	Boundaries of administrative Flyways	22
Fig. 3.3	Major Arctic and subarctic geographic features referred to in text	25
Fig. 3.4	Population growth of greater snow geese as measured by photo-inventories during spring migration in the St. Lawrence River valley, 1965-2000	30
Fig. 3.5	Lesser snow goose population estimates from breeding colonies in the eastern Arctic, determined from photo inventories, 1973-97	30
Fig. 3.6	Light (lesser snow and Ross's) goose population estimates from breeding colonies in the central Arctic, determined from photo inventories, 1966-98	32
Fig. 3.7	Lesser snow goose population estimates from breeding colonies in the western Arctic, determined from photo inventories	33
Fig. 3.8	Winter index of greater snow geese in the Atlantic Flyway, 1955-2000	34
Fig. 3.9	Winter index of the Mid-Continent Population of light geese, 1970-2000	35
Fig. 3.10	Winter index of the Western Central Flyway Population of light geese, 1970-2000	35
Fig. 3.11	Winter index of Central/Mississippi Flyway (CMF) light geese	36
Fig. 3.12	Winter index of light geese in the Pacific Flyway, 1955-2000	37
Fig. 3.13	Original coastal marsh wintering range (black shading), extent of initial range expansion, and recent wintering range boundary of light geese in Texas and Louisiana	40
Fig. 3.14	Harvest of greater snow geese in Canada and the U.S., 1967-99	43
Fig. 3.15	Spring population estimates (millions, 1964-2000) and harvest rate indices (1967-99) of greater snow geese in the Atlantic Flyway	43
Fig. 3.16	Winter indices and harvest rates of Central/Mississippi Flyway light geese, 1962-2000	44
Fig. 3.17	Winter indices and harvests of Central/Mississippi Flyway light geese and active adult hunter numbers, 1962-2000	45
Fig. 3.18	Left: Banding locations of CMF light geese (summarized by degree blocks) harvested during conservation orders in the U.S. Right: Recovery locations of light geese harvested during conservation orders in the Central and Mississippi Flyways	47
Fig. 3.19	Negative feedback loop between light geese and their habitat; which leads to habitat destruction	1 49
Fig. 3.20	Example of light goose habitat destruction at La Perouse Bay, Manitoba. Empty pond basin at right was caused by goose grubbing activity. Red plants surrounding dead willow trees are salt-tolerant species	50

Fig. 3.21	Goose exclosure plot at La Perouse Bay, Manitoba. Green vegetation is enclosed by fencing that prevents geese from feeding in plot. Areas devoid of vegetation outside of plot were exposed to goose feeding and are characterized by mudflats and exposed gravel50
Fig. 3.22	Satellite imagery of the cumulative damage at La Perouse Bay caused by light geese during 1973-93
Fig. 3.23	Additional area (hectares) of salt marsh vegetation decline at La Perouse Bay after 1973 when monitoring began. Actual loss of vegetation was determined by comparison of satellite imagery from 1973, 1984, and 1993
Fig. 3.24	Documented decline of semi-palmated sandpiper and red-necked phalarope nests on permanent study plots at La Perouse Bay, Manitoba, 1983-99
Fig. 3.25	Location of whooping crane sightings in the Central Flyway, 1943-9961
Fig. 3.26	Temporal distribution of whooping crane sightings in Nebraska, 1919-2000
Fig. 3.27	Location of recurring avian cholera outbreaks and associated waterfowl migration pathways 63
Fig. 3.28	Frequency of occurrence of avian cholera outbreaks in the U.S
Fig. 4.1	Trajectories of the greater snow goose population resulting from implementation of various harvest rates (expressed as %), in relation to a population goal of 500,000 birds
Fig. 4.2	Projection of additional hectares of salt marsh vegetation that would be lost at La Perouse Bay in the absence of light goose population control