## University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers

**Graduate School** 

1971

# Biology of white-tailed deer on winter ranges in the Swan Valley Montana

Peter Richard Hildebrand The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

## **Recommended Citation**

Hildebrand, Peter Richard, "Biology of white-tailed deer on winter ranges in the Swan Valley Montana" (1971). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 6463. https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/6463

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

Biology of White-tailed Deer on Winter Ranges

in the Swan Valley, Montana

Bу

Peter R. Hildebrand Univ. of Manitoba, B. Sc. A. 1967

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

> Master of Science in Wildlife Biology

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

Approved by: slie 10-Board of Examiners Chairman,

Dean of Graduate School

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UMI Number: EP37264

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP37264

Published by ProQuest LLC (2013). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway P.O. Box 1346 Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

.

## FINAL REPORT

## RESEARCH PROJECT SEGMENT

State of <u>Montana</u>

Project No.: <u>W-98-R-10</u>

Job No.: BG-5.01

| Name: | Big | Game | Research | • |
|-------|-----|------|----------|---|
|       |     |      |          |   |
|       |     |      |          |   |

Title: <u>Biology of White-tailed</u>

Deer on Winter Ranges

in the Swan Valley, Montana

## Period Covered: April 1, 1969 to December 31, 1970

Prepared by: Peter R. Hildebrand

Approved by: Thomas W. Mussehl

Date: October 6, 1971

Wynn G. Freeman

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was financed by the School of Forestry, University of Montana, and the Montana Fish and Game Department under Federal Aid Projects W-120 R-1 and R-2. The U. S. Forest Service provided a bunkhouse on the study area.

By this means I thank the many people whose help and cooperation made the study possible.

Dr. James A. Bailey gave many helpful suggestions in the early stages of the study and helped with initial field work.

Dr. Bart W. O'Gara and fellow students Dennis Billings, Dennis Flath, Bill Gabriel, Gerry Gill, Steve Shaffer, Joel Stone and Per Wegge helped with deer collections and the winter mortality surveys.

Dr. Bart W. O'Gara of the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit provided the materials used in collecting and autopsying specimens. Kenneth Greer of the Wildlife Investigations Laboratory, Bozeman, provided help and facilities in the food habits analyses of rumens.

Dr. George Blake, Dr. John Harris, Dr. Bart W. O'Gara and Mr. Tom Mussehl read and offered suggestions on the thesis.

A special note of thanks go to Dr. W. Leslie Pengelly who gave generously of his time and advice on the thesis, and to my wife Eileen for her encouragement and patience in the typing of many drafts of the manuscript.

iii

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

,

|      |  | Page |
|------|--|------|
| LIST | OF TABLES                                    | vii  |
| LIST | OF FIGURES                                   | ix   |
| Chap | ter  |      |
| 1.   | INTRODUCTION                                 | 1    |
| 2.   | DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA                    | 3    |
|      | Location                                     | 3    |
|      | Land Ownership                               | 3    |
|      | Topography                                   | 3    |
|      | Geology                                      | 4    |
|      | Climate                                      | 4    |
| 3.   | HISTORY OF GAME, GAME HARVESTS, AND LAND USE | 6    |
|      | · Population Surveys                         | 6    |
|      | Game Harvests                                | 7    |
|      | Range Conditions                             | 7    |
|      | Land Use                                     | 9    |
| 4.   | METHODS AND MATERIALS                        | 11   |
|      | RANGE STUDIES                                | 11   |
|      | Browse Utilization                           | 11   |
|      | Track Counts                                 | 11   |
|      | Climate                                      | 12   |
|      |  | 14.  |

|    |                    | Page |
|----|--------------------|------|
| •  | DEER STUDIES       | 12   |
| ,  | Harvest            | 12   |
|    | Mortality          | 12   |
|    | Food Habits        | 13   |
| ,  | Productivity       | 13   |
|    | Condition          | 14   |
|    | Parasites          | 14   |
| 5. | RESULTS            | 16   |
|    | RANGE STUDIES      | 16   |
|    | Browse Utilization | 16   |
|    | Track Counts       | 17   |
|    | Climate            | 21   |
|    | DEER STUDIES       | 22   |
|    | Harvest            | 22   |
|    | Mortality          | 26   |
|    | Food Habits        | 28   |
|    | Productivity       | 30   |
|    | Condition          | 33   |
|    | Parasites          | 36   |
| 6. | DISCUSSION         | 37   |
|    | RANGE STUDIES      | 37   |
|    | Browse Utilization | 37   |

•

| Page                         |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Track Counts                 |  |
| Climate                      |  |
| DEER STUDIES                 |  |
| Harvest                      |  |
| Mortality                    |  |
| Food Habits                  |  |
| Productivity                 |  |
| Condition                    |  |
| Parasites                    |  |
| 7. MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS |  |
| 8. SUMMARY                   |  |
| LITERATURE CITED             |  |
| APPENDIX                     |  |

.

.

## LIST OF TABLES

| Tab le |  | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 1      | <b>Correlation between twig diameter and length in serviceberry</b><br>and mountain maple  | 16   |
| 2      | Percent of browse leaders utilized on four areas in the Swan<br>Valley from 1948-1969  | 18   |
| 3      | White-tailed deer use of various habitat types on the Swan<br>Valley winter range, as determined by track and trail counts<br>from January through March, 1970 | 19   |
| 4      | Test of significance of difference between white-tailed deer<br>track counts by habitat types from January, February, and<br>March, 1970                       | 19   |
| 5      | Mean monthly temperature and snowfall from 2 gareas in the Swan Valley   | 20   |
| 6      | Comparison of 1969-70 temperature and precipitation data between Lindbergh Lake, Swan Lake, and the study area   | 21   |
| 7      | Accumulated snow depths (in inches) in the upper Swan Valley during winter, 1969-1970  | 23   |
| 8      | Age composition of white-tailed deer harvest in Swan Valley, 1953-1969   | 24   |
| 9      | Percentages of bucks, does, and fawns in Swan Valley white-<br>tailed deer harvest, 1951-1969  | 24   |
| 10     | Average dressed weights and calculated live weights (in pounds) by age class of deer from Swan Valley, Montana, collected during 1969 hunting season           | 25   |
| 11     | Comparison of white-tailed deer winter mortality in the Swan Valley winter range between 1968-1969 and 1969-1970   | 26   |
| 12     | Age distribution of white-tailed deer by types of mortality<br>on the Swan Valley winter range, 1969-1970 (sample size in<br>parenthesis)                      | 27   |
| 13     | Percentages by volume of browse, forbs, and grass in rumens of white-tailed deer on Swan Valley winter range, 1970   | 28   |
| 14     | Comparison of percent rumen content of Swan Valley white-<br>tailed deer between 1958 and 1970   | 29   |

.

vii

.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

| 15          | Reproduction of female white-tailed deer collected from the Swan Valley during the winter, 1969-1970  | 30         |
|-------------|---|------------|
| _ <b>16</b> | Productivity of white-tailed deer from the Swan Valley com-<br>pared to other fertility levels reported in the literature<br>(sample sizes in parenthesis)                        | 31         |
| 17          | White-tailed deer fawn/adult ratios from the Swan Valley, 1935-1970   | 32         |
| 18          | Comparison of kidney fat indices and femur fat contents of Swan Valley white-tailed deer, January to May, 1970  | <b>3</b> 3 |
| 19          | Comparison of the percentages of fat in femur marrow samples<br>between road killed and collected white-tailed deer from the<br>Swan Valley, 1970 (expected value in parenthesis) | 34         |
| 20          | Comparison of percent compression of femur marrow and femur fat content (ether extraction) of Swan Valley white-tailed deer, January to May, 1970                                 | 35         |
| 21          | Track Counts by Cover Types, 1970   | 78         |
| 22          | Trail Counts by Cover Types, 1970   | 79         |
| 23          | Food Habits During January, 1970  | 80         |
| 24          | Food Habits During February, 1970   | 81         |
| 25          | Food Habits During March, 1970  | 82         |
| 26          | Food Habits During April, 1970  | 83         |
| 27          | Food Habits During May, 1970  | 84         |
| 28          | Counts and weights of fetuses from female white-tailed deer collected in the Swan Valley  | 85         |
| 29          | Weights, measurements & condition indices from Swan Valley<br>white-tailed deer   | 86         |
| 30          | Chemical analyses of femur marrow from white-tailed deer .  | 87         |
| 31          | Comparative condition indices of Swan Valley white-tailed deer  | 89         |
| 32          | List of plant names and abbreviations   | 91         |

## viii

.

## LIST OF FIGURES

| Figur | e .  | Page |
|-------|--|------|
| 1     | Map of study area showing location of weather station, snow stations, and track-count transect lines | 68   |
| 2     | Twig length-diameter relationships for serviceberry  | 70   |
| 3     | Twig length-diameter relationships for mountain maple  | 72   |
| 4     | Scatter diagram of percentage femur fat plotted against kidney fat indices of 25 white-tailed deer   | 74   |
| 5     | Map of study area showing mid-winter distribution of white-tailed deer                               | 76   |

۰.

.

-

### Chapter 1

#### INTRODUCTION

The white-tailed deer (<u>Odocoileus virginianus</u>) has long been an object of particular interest because of its abundance, its almost continent-wide distribution, and its ability to adapt to a wide variety of conditions (Pengelly, 1961).

These inherent qualities have made the white-tailed deer the most sought after big game animal in the United States, and also "makes them the most susceptible of all to game management" (Taylor, 1956).

Winter ranges are generally considered to be the result of snow conditions that cause the movement of deer from their summer range to wintering areas in the relatively snow free lower elevations (Dixon, 1934). These winter ranges are usually areas of greatly restricted acreage compared to the summer range and the result is concentration of the deer and often deterioration of winter ranges due to overuse of the existing and available forage. This has led to the establishment of winter range as the principal limiting factor to big game (Olsen, 1938).

In summer, the Swan Valley white-tailed deer are found along the entire Valley from the summit of the Clearwater-Swan River Divide to Swan Lake, and also along the entire width of the Valley floor from the Mission Mountain Range on the west to the Swan Mountain Range east of the River. With the onset of snowfall in early winter, these deer converge into a small narrow belt along the Swan River from the Condon

Ranger Station to Goat Creek and in the Lion Creek Canyon. Much smaller concentrations occur in the Squeezer Creek Canyon.

Extensive logging operations have been conducted in the Swan Valley since 1955. The main objective of this study was to assess present conditions in the biology of white-tailed deer in the Swan Valley and how these conditions may have been affected by logging operations.

The specific objectives of the present study on the Swan Valley, white-tailed deer were:

1. To determine the percentage of browse utilized by deer on their winter range for comparison with earlier studies.

2. To investigate their habitat preferences as related to cover types.

3. To examine their food habits for comparison with a similar earlier study.

4. To evaluate their reproductive performance for comparison with other white-tailed deer herds.

5. To evaluate their physical condition for comparison with that of white-tailed deer on other ranges.

6. To obtain harvest data on the 1969 hunting season for comparison to earlier seasons.

7. To estimate winter mortality during the winters of 1968-69 and 1969-70.

8. To search for the presence of the brainworm (<u>Pneumostrongylus</u> tenuis) in white-tailed deer.

## Chapter 2

### DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

## Location

The upper Swan River Valley, in which the study area is located, extends from the Swan-Clearwater Divide north as far as the southern edge of Swan Lake. It is bounded on the east by the Swan Range and on the west by the Mission Range. The Swan River bisects the entire area and is parallel to Highway 209.

The winter range of white-tailed deer in the upper Swan Valley extends from Goat Creek south as far as Dog Creek with isolated patches along the River near Rumble and Buck Creeks. This portion of the Swan Valley comprised the major portion of the study area.

#### Land Ownership

The U. S. Forest Service (Flathead National Forest) and the Burlington Northern Railroad Company (B.N.) own about equal portions (alternating sections) of the upper Swan Valley. These comprise about 80% of the total area and the remaining 20% is approximately 10% state land (Montana State Forestry Department) and 10% is owned by private individuals or groups. Sixty-three percent of the land used by whitetailed deer in winter is privately owned; B.N. owns approximately 28% of the winter range, and other private holdings amount to about 35%. The U. S. Forest Service controls about 25% and the remaining portion (12%) is state owned.

### Topography

The Swan Valley is approximately 40 miles long and ranges from 6

to 10 miles wide. The bordering Swan and Mission Ranges have elevations of 7000 to 10,000 feet. Elevations in the Valley range from 3,070 at Swan Lake to 4,200 at the Swan-Clearwater Divide. Much of the area has been glaciated in the past and the knob and basin topography of the Swan Valley resulted from the action of glaciers as they melted. <u>Geology</u>

In the Mesozoic and Cenozoic eras, the sediments deposited in the Proterozoic, Paleozoic and Mesozoic eras were subjected to tremendous stresses, folded, broken by great faults, and elevated into the present day mountain ranges in western North America. The Swan Range was formed by such a fault early in the Cenozoic era (Deiss, 1958).

The mountains were almost covered by vast ice sheets during the Pleistocene, and the constant freezing and thawing and glacial movement created the cliff cirques and rugged scenery. The valleys were glaciated and the rock debris was carried to the lower valleys and left when the ice melted.

#### Climate

Complete, year-round climatological data has been available for 10 years at Lindbergh Lake and for 7 years at Swan Lake. The average snowfall at Lindbergh Lake is 147 inches and 141.4 inches at Swan Lake.

Annual temperatures range from  $-40^{\circ}F$ . to  $100^{\circ}F$ ., but these extremes are uncommon. The average maximum temperatures during November and December are from  $30^{\circ}F$ . to  $40^{\circ}F$ . In January (the coldest month) the maximum mean temperatures are around  $30^{\circ}F$ . and rise into the mid- $30^{\circ}F$ . range in February. In March the maximum mean temperatures are in the

low  $40s^{\circ}$  F. and in April they rise into the  $50^{\circ}$  F.range. Swan Lake is generally a few degrees warmer then Lindbergh Lake. The growing season is about 149 days.

## Chapter 3

HISTORY OF GAME, GAME HARVEST, AND LAND USE

## Population Surveys

According to Bergeson, (1943) very little historical information on Swan Valley game herds was available and what was available was often contradictory. He suggested that the white-tailed deer reached a population high between 1900 and 1915. Large scale logging was at its peak in 1917 (on private land holdings), and it was the opinion of the local people that this reduced cover to such an extent that the deer population suffered. Bergeson also believed that the introduction of the buck law coupled with the reduction of the mountain lion were responsible for a steady increase in the deer population.

During the winter of 1934-35, the U. S. Forest Service conducted strip census counts along the entire Swan drainage and estimated that there were 4,975 white-tailed deer in the Swan Valley. The next winter, a similar study indicated a population of 5,676 deer and the F. S. authorities suggested that an either sex hunting season be initiated. They also believed that the deer population of the Goat Creek area should be reduced by 500 animals.

The first study conducted on the Swan Valley deer herd under the "Federal Aid to States in Wildlife Restoration Act" was undertaken by the Montana State Fish and Game Department. Bergeson (1943) established strip census routes and estimated a population of 5,511 deer in the Valley. Bergeson (<u>op. cit.</u>) also stated that the Swan Valley was capable of supporting more deer than it did. He mentioned localized areas

where the range was being overbrowsed but said that these were negligible considering the large amounts of unutilized browse found even in areas of heavy deer concentrations. Rognrud (1949) later stated that the carrying capacity of Swan Valley was probably less than 6,000 deer. This figure was based on the appearance of overutilized localities in the Valley and his estimate of a population of 6,096 deer.

Census operations were repeated in 1950, 1951, and again in 1955. The 1951 survey indicated a population of 5,785 deer. In 1955, the survey showed a decrease to 2,022 deer attributed mostly to undesirable census conditions. Rognrud (1955) did, however, believe that there was evidence that white-tailed deer were not as numerous as in previous years. A similar but somewhat less intensive survey in 1958 estimated a deer population of 4,500 deer in the Swan Valley.

#### Game Harvests

The buck law was introduced in 1931. This, plus the reduction of the mountain lion, was believed responsible for the increase in the whitetailed deer population between 1931 and 1943. Very little information is available on harvests before 1952, Since then, checking stations have been operated periodically. The either sex deer season in the Swan drainage came into operation in 1951. Harvests since then have varied tremendously and the reported numbers taken depend upon hunting conditions and the intensity of checking station operations.

## Range Condition

Bergeson (1943) said, "The majority of the winter range in the Swan Valley can be considered as underutilized, since large areas of available browse are either underutilized or comparitively unutilized.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

To be sure, small localized areas of overbrowsing are to be found notably along trail #42 between Dog and Falls Creek, and Pony Creek; but in the light of available browse which is completely unutilized bordering these small localized areas this overutilization cannot be considered as serious."

Six years later Rognrud (1949) said that "important white-tailed deer winter ranges in the Swan Valley are beginning to have deteriorating range condition to measurement of utilization". During the winter of 1948-49 Casebeer and Rognrud (1949) conducted browse surveys on three white-tailed deer wintering areas in the Swan Valley. Their results indicated severe, over-browsed conditions in the Lion and Goat Creek areas. The range use on the area above Holland Lake was spotty and generally light. They proposed that 150 doe permits be issued every other year.

In 1958, four transects were established in the upper Swan area to measure browse utilization and conditions in some of the key winter ranges. Trend data from these key areas, namely, Goat and Lion Creeks, the Napa area, and Woodward Meadows, are now available. The amount of utilization that these areas received differed from year to year and was apparently due to variations in winter conditions. In some years, such as 1950 and 1952, some of these areas received such heavy use that the State Fish and Game Department conducted artificial feeding programs.

During the 1946-1954 period, the big game ranges in the Swan drainage were salted periodically in an attempt to relieve grazing pressure by big game on their winter ranges during spring and early summer. Records show that aerial drops of salt were made in the upper Swan and Mission Ranges in 1946 and 1947. In 1948, a total of 1,800 pounds were dropped at Condon and Swan Lake. The following year a total of 3,000 pounds were dropped. Approximately 12,000 pounds were dropped in the Swan drainage in 1952 and 1953. The last record of a salt drop was in 1954 in the upper and lower Swan and Mission Ranges. Land Use

In 1933, it became Forest Service policy to allow no outside stock to graze on Forest Service land. However, there were a limited number of livestock that did graze on sections of private land located within the Forest boundary. Bergeson (1943) claimed that no appreciable damage was caused by livestock and that conflicting usage by domestic stock and wildlife was held to a minimum. In 1958, the U. S. Forest Service issued grazing permits for 276 cattle.

Private lands in the lower Swan Valley were logged about 1919. Limited cuttings occurred between 1919 and 1945. Since 1945, the logging industry has grown and in addition to increased cuttings on private land, timber sales were made on Forest Service land starting around 1955. In regard to the effects of these loggings, Rognrud (1949) said, "The increasing acreage of logged-over lands in the Swan should add to the white-tailed deer forage and range."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Numerous small farms are and have been present along the River in the past, but these are now merely places on which to live and income is supplemented with work elsewhere.

Other land uses in the past as well as the present include recreation (hunting and fishing), dude ranches, trapping, and summer homes.

#### Chapter 4

#### METHODS AND MATERIALS

## RANGE STUDIES

The ecology of the white-tailed deer in the Swan Valley was investigated by analyzing range use, food habits, productivity, and conditions in relation to the winter range.

#### Browse Utilization

Utilization on the winter range was determined by measuring branches of serviceberry (Amelanchier alnifolia) and mountain maple (Acer glabrum) as described by Lyon (1970). This technique involved the measurements of the twig diameter at the initiation of the current year's growth and the length of the current year's growth. These values were used in calculating a regression equation for both plant species. The equations were then used to predict the pre-browsing length of the measured browsed twigs. Two diameter measurements were taken at right angles on each twig and averaged to obtain the mean diameter. Twig length was measured from the tip of the terminal bud to the basal bud scar. The individual plants measured were selected by the technique described by Cole (1958).

## Track Counts

White-tailed deer track counts were conducted on the winter range in order to determine habitat preferences and the extent of the upper Swan Valley white-tailed deer winter range. Twenty-four transects were run between the Holland Lake road (Missoula County) and Goat Creek (Lake

County) (Figure 1). All transects ran from Highway 209 due east for one mile, and west as far as the Swan River. The writer conducted all transects and recorded tracks and trails crossed and the habitat types in which they occurred. All distances were pace distances.

## Weather Observations and Measurements

A thermograph was set up approximately 5 miles north of Condon and operated from January until the end of May, 1970. Eight snow stations were located throughout the white-tailed deer winter range and weekly snow depths were recorded. These data were used in interpreting deer movements and changes in physical condition, habitat use, and food habits.

#### DEER STUDIES

#### Harvest

During the fall hunting season of 1969, two checking stations were set up on Highway 209, one at Lost Creek and another at the Beaver Creek road. All vehicles leaving the Swan Valley must pass one of these stations. Both checking stations were operated on weekends throughout the hunting season.

On each animal checked through the station, the following information was recorded: carcass weight (noting the extent to which the animal was field dressed), species, sex, and the general area where each animal was taken. Lower jaws and brains were collected with the hunter's consent. Mortality

Winter mortality of the Swan Valley deer herd was investigated during late spring of 1969 and 1970 by running 22 transects between Dog Creek and

Goat Creek in Lake County. Each transect consisted of a strip 100 feet wide, which ran in an east-west direction from one mile east of Highway #209 west to the Swan River. All dead deer found within these strips were recorded, and the data were converted to deer losses per square mile.

During the winter of 1969-1970, highway-killed, white-tailed deer were examined to determine sex and age of the animals. Reproductive data, rumen samples, femurs, and standard measurements were also taken whenever possible.

#### Food Habits

Food habits of the white-tailed deer were determined by rumen analysis. These rumens were obtained from 6 road-killed animals and 26 animals collected under permit from the Montana Fish and Game Department. Two-quart samples were preserved in 10% formalin and sent to the Montana Fish and Game Department, Wildlife Investigations Laboratory at Bozeman for analysis. At the lab, a 1 quart sample from each rumen was washed through a 1/8 inch mesh screen to remove the small particles. The remaining material was separated by species and identified by me with the aid of a study area plant collection. The segregated portions were blotted dry with paper towelling and volumes measured by water displacement to the nearest .5 cc in a graduated cylinder. Material measuring less than .5 cc was recorded as being present in "trace" amounts.

## Productivity

The reproductive tracts of 35 female deer were examined in order to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

study the degree to which reproduction might be affected by range conditions or other environmental factors. Fetuses were counted for comparison with those from other white-tailed deer herds. The number of embryos or fetuses were counted and the weight and crown-rump length of each fetus was measured.

Fawn:adult counts were made periodically from the beginning of February until the end of April in order to compare fawn:adult ratios with fetus:adult ratios.

## Deer Condition

The physical condition of the white-tailed deer was measured throughout the winter in order to determine seasonal changes and to compare the Swan Valley deer with other herds. Standard measurements taken from collected deer were weight, body length, hindfoot length, height at the shoulder, heart girth, and weights of kidneys, kidney fat, hearts, heart fat, livers, and spleens. Kidney fat indices were calculated and expressed as the weight of kidney fat as a percentage of the kidney weight (Riney, 1955). A complete femur was taken from 28 road kills, 21 collected animals, and 1 carcass found intact in the study area, and the percent compression was measured by the technique described by Greer (1968). A sample, of each femur marrow collected, was analyzed at the Chemistry Station Analytical Laboratory, Bozeman, to determine the percent of femur fat.

## Parasites

A total of 93 deer obtained from hunters, highway kills, and collections, under permit, were examined for the presence of the meningeal roundworm (<u>Pneumostrongylus tenuis</u>). Obvious internal and external parasites were also noted.

.

.

.

-

Chapter 5

## RESULTS '

## RANGE STUDIES

#### Browse Utilization

Stem length and diameter measurements of unbrowsed mountain maple and serviceberry twigs from a partially logged area were used in calculating prediction equations (Table 1). The plotted lines and their 95% confidence limits are shown in Figures 2 and 3.

Table 1. Correlation between twig diameter and length in serviceberry and mountain maple.

| Species        | Equation            | r/  |
|----------------|---------------------|-----|
| Mountain Maple | Y = -119.2 + 115.7X | .92 |
| Serviceberry   | Y = -87.5 + 85.7X   | .92 |

1/ the correlation between twig length (Y) and twig diameter (X).

The unbrowsed mountain maple twigs which were examined had a mean diameter of 2.62 mm and a mean length of 178.2. mm. The browsed mountain maple twigs had a mean length of 143.4 mm and a mean diameter of 3.74 mm. Inserting the browsed diameter measurements into the prediction equation and averaging them gave a predicted length of 308.9 mm. This indicates that utilization on mountain maple was 53.6%.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Similarly, unbrowsed serviceberry twigs had a mean diameter of 2.59 mm and mean length of 134.60 mm. Browsed serviceberry twigs had diameter and length measurements of 3.05 mm and 76.9 mm. On an immediately adjacent uncut area, these browsed measurements were 3.38 mm and 26.5 mm. The predicted browse length was 173.6 mm in the logged area and 202 mm in the uncut area. These values produced utilization levels of 54.6% and 86.9% in the cut and uncut areas respectively.

Browse utilization surveys have been conducted by the Montana Fish and Game Department since 1948 (Table 2). These survey results indicate a general reduction in browsing intensity in the Napa area, constant use in the Woodward block, and increased utilization since 1960 in the Goat and Lion Creek areas.

#### Track Counts

Six habitat types: (1) mature timber (53.2%). (2) immature timber (3.0%), (3) grassland (5.8%), (4) stream bottoms (12.8%), (5) clear cuts (10.3%), and (6) partial cuts (14.9%) constituted the percentages shown of the total transect lines sampled to obtain track and trail counts. Table 3 shows the number and percentage of deer tracks and trails encountered in each habitat type in approximately 24 miles of transect lines. A summary of each transect line is shown in Tables 20 and 21. The location of each transect is shown in Figure 3. These results indicate that 77% of the deer tracks and 83% of the deer trails were observed in the mature timber which constituted only 53% of total sampled habitat types. The distribution of deer tracks by habitat types are significantly different.

| YEAR | Serviceberry | 'Mountain Maple |      |            |  |
|------|--------------|-----------------|------|------------|--|
|      | Goat Creek   | Lion Creek      | Napa | Woodward   |  |
| 1948 |              | , 82            |      | ,<br>,<br> |  |
| 1951 |              | 50              |      |            |  |
| 1958 | 84           | 85              | 54   | 86         |  |
| 1959 | 39           | 48              | 55   | 63         |  |
| 1960 | 46           | 68              | 79   | 88         |  |
| 1961 | 35           | 25              | 1    | 5          |  |
| 1962 | 60           | 58              | 32   | 89         |  |
| 1963 | 38           | 43              | 24   | 55         |  |
| 1964 | 57           | 84              | 21   | 77         |  |
| 1965 | 74           | 83              | 64   | 88         |  |
| 1966 | 78           | 51              | 17   | 34         |  |
| 1967 | 84           | 79              | 38   | 60         |  |
| 1968 | 78           | 76              | 9    | 59         |  |
| 1969 | 85           | 85              | 12   | 78         |  |
|      |              |                 |      |            |  |

Table 2. Percent of browse leaders utilized on four areas in the Swan Valley from 1948 - 1969.

1/

.

1/ Montana Fish and Game Department annual reports, 1948 - 1969.

•

~

Table 3. White-tailed deer use of various habitat types on the Swan Valley winter range, as determined by track and trail counts, from January through March, 1970.

| түре   | Number<br>of      | Percent of total observations of each type |                    |                |                  |              |                |  |
|--------|-------------------|--|--------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|--|
|        | observa-<br>tions | Mature<br>Timber                           | Immature<br>Timber | Grass-<br>land | Stream<br>Bottom | Clear<br>Cut | Partial<br>Cut |  |
| Tracks | 860               | 77   | 1                  | 0.3            | 9                | 2            | 11             |  |
| Trails | 151               | 83   | 1                  | 1              | 6                | 5            | 4              |  |

Table 4. Test of significance of difference between white-tailed deer track counts by habitat types from January, February, and March, 1970.

| Habitat Type    | 0 <u>1</u> / | <sup>E</sup> <u>2</u> / | ( <u>0-E</u> ) <sup>2</sup><br>E |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Mature timber   | 660          | 458                     | 89.1                             |
| Immature timber | 5            | 25                      | -16.0                            |
| Grassland       | 3            | 50                      | 44.2                             |
| Stream bottom   | 81           | 110                     | 7.6                              |
| Clear-cuts      | 16           | 89                      | 59.9                             |
| Partial-cuts    | 95           | 128                     | 8.5                              |
|                 |              |                         | X = 225.3*<br>d.f. = 5           |

- \* Significant at the 0.01 level.
- 1/ The observed number of track counts.
- 2/ The expected number of track counts assuming the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the distribution of track counts by habitat types.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

۰.,

(p.  $\langle$  .01, Table 4). A chi-square analysis of trails in each habitat type also indicates that the distribution of trails are significantly different (p.  $\langle$  0.01).

#### Climate

The winter of 1969-1970 was characterized by mild temperatures except for a brief cold spell in December. The average monthly maximum and minimum temperatures at Lindbergh and Swan Lakes were a few degrees above normal (Tables 5 and 6). The temperatures on the study area were very similar to those at Lindbergh and Swan Lakes (Table 6).

Table 5. Mean monthly temperature and snowfall from 2 areas in the Swan Valley.

| MONTH                                  | No. of days in<br>which temp.<br>was above 32°F. | Maximum<br>Temperature | Minimum<br>Temperature | Total snow-<br>fall in<br>Inches | Maximum<br>Depth on<br>Ground |
|--|--|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ************************************** | LL_SL<br>1/2/                                    | LL/SL                  | LL/SL                  | LL/SL                            | LL/SL                         |
| NOVEMBER                               | 24.7/28.1  | 38.7/41.7              | 22.2/25.2              | 18.3/12.8                        | 12.5/ 6.4                     |
| DECEMBER                               | 14.6/14.7  | 31.2/31.4              | 15.3/17.6              | 31.0/38.4                        | 22.6/22.3                     |
| JANUARY                                | 14.1/17.6  | 29.4/31.5              | 12.0/17.3              | 40.8/49.4                        | 34.5/40.3                     |
| FEBRUARY                               | 22.3/23.4  | 37.3/38.8              | 17.2/19.2              | 23.7/23.5                        | 37.0/42.3                     |
| MARCH .                                | 27.5/28.4  | 42.8/44.6              | 17.9/20.1              | 24.5/13.5                        | 38.5/35.0                     |
| APRIL                                  | 29.8/30.0  | 51.3/55.1              | 27.1/28.5              | 8.7/ 3.8                         | 24.3/16.3                     |

1/ Lindbergh Lake, 1959 - 1970 average.

2/ Swan Lake, 1963 - 1970 average.

20

| MONTH    | No. of days in<br>which temp.<br>was above 32°F. | Average<br>Maximum<br>Temperature | Average<br>Minimum<br>Temperature | Total<br>Snowfall<br>in inches | Maximum<br>Depth on the<br>Ground |
|----------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|          | LLS.ASL  | LL/SA/ <b>S</b> Ł                 | LL/SA/SL                          | ll/SA/SL                       | LL/SA/SL                          |
| November | 27//28   | 40.7//42.9                        | 23.1//25.2                        | 4 // 5                         | 2// 2                             |
| December | 17//15   | 33.1//33.5                        | 17.4//21.4                        | 18.6//36                       | 13//20                            |
| January  | 14/12/17   | 29.3/36.6/29.7                    | 13.0/23.5/14.8                    | 51.0//61                       | 29/27.7/44                        |
| February | 25/26/26   | 38.7/39.9/38.6                    | 18.0/19.1/20.9                    | 32 //20                        | 35/29.7/44                        |
| March    | 28/28/29   | 40.1/41.2/42.8                    | 17.5/18.0/20.3                    | 20 //15.5                      | 19/29.8/41                        |
| April 4/ | /30/   | / 45.7/                           | /27.5/                            | //                             | /25.1/                            |
| May 4/   | /31/   | /64.7/                            | /35.9/                            | //                             | /0 /                              |

Table 6. Comparison of 1969-70 temperatures and precipitation data between Lindbergh Lake, Swan Lake, and the study area.

1/ Lindbergh Lake

 $\underline{2}$ / Study Area

----

3/ Swan Lake

4/ No data for Lindbergh Lake and Swan Lake.

٠

Lindbergh and Swan Lakes received a total of 125.6 and 137.5 inches of snow, respectively, from November until the end of March. Data were not available for April but temperatures were generally mild and only small amounts of snow fell. These results indicate an average winter at Swan Lake, but total snowfall at Lindbergh Lake was probably from 15 - 22 inches below normal. Data from a local resident who lives near the Swan River at the Lake - Missoula County line, suggested that approximately 103 inches of snow fell on the winter range during the winter of 1969 - 1970.

The accumulated snow depth on the winter range was approximately 9 inches in mid-January and reached a maximum depth of 30 inches during the first week of March (Table 7). Figure 1 shows the location of 8 snow stations on the study area, and data from these stations indicate a general northward increase in accumulated snow depth.

## DEER STUDIES

### Harvest

The data gathered by the operation of two checking stations is summarized in Tables 8 and 9. Results shown in Table 8 suggest that the percentage of animals 4 1/2 years and older, taken by hunters, has decreased since 1960.

The percentage of bucks, does, and fawns in the harvest varied from one year to another (Table 9). The number of bucks and fawns taken increased by 15.7 and 39% from the 1951-1959 average whereas the doe kill decreased by 44.8%.

|           |      | JANUARY | ť    |      | FEBR | EBRUARY MARCH |      |      |      |      | APRIL |      |      |      |    |
|-----------|------|---------|------|------|------|---------------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|----|
| STATION # | 16   | 23      | 30   | 6    | 13   | 20            | 27   | 6    | 13   | 20   | 25    | 1    | 8    | 15   | 22 |
| 1         | 1.9  | 7.0     | 10.5 | 10.0 | 9.4  | 10.4          | 14.1 | 14.6 | 10.5 | 9.0  | 9.3   | 9.3  | 8.5  | 1.4  | 0  |
| 2         | 5.0  | 7.9     | 8.7  | 9.3  | 9.6  | 9.3           | 14.5 | 17.0 | 12.0 | 8.9  | 9.5   | 10.5 | 4.4  | 1.5  | 0  |
| 3         | 7.5  | 14.1    | 17.6 | 18.6 | 18.8 | 17.3          | 24.8 | 25.1 | 21.0 | 18.3 | 18.6  | 19.8 | 15.5 | 10.4 | 0  |
| 4         | 9.6  | 16.1    | 19.0 | 18.8 | 20.5 | 18.8          | 25.5 | 26.6 | 18.8 | 17.3 | 17.5  | 17.4 | 12.4 | 6.3  | 0  |
| 5         | 11.4 | 21.9    | 27.7 | 27.2 | 29.0 | 24.0          | 29.7 | 29.8 | 26.2 | 24.3 | 26.7  | 25.1 | 21.4 | 14.7 | 0  |
| 6         | 6.6  | 19.0    | 15.9 | 15.9 | 16.5 | 14.3          | 14.4 | 15.1 | 10.1 | 7.6  | 7.4   | 6.0  | 2.1  | 0    | 0  |
| 7         | 9.5  | 15.9    | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.9 | 18.3          | 19.6 | 21.9 | 18.4 | 15.9 | 13.9  | 10.6 | 7.9  | 2.3  | 0  |
| 8         | 11.8 | 21.0    | 25.6 | 23.9 | 24.9 | 19.6          | 25.1 | 24.1 | 19.1 | 15.6 | 16.9  | 13.8 | 7.6  | 1.3  | 0  |
|           |      |         |      |      |      |               |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |    |
|           |      |         |      |      |      |               |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |    |

Table 7. Accumulated snow depths (in inches) in the Upper Swan Valley during winter, 1969-1970.

| YEAR       | Age class by percentage |       |       |       |        |      |  |  |
|------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|--|--|
|            | 1/2                     | 1 1/2 | 2 1/2 | 3 1/2 | 4 1/2+ | SIZE |  |  |
| 1953       | 9                       | 33    | 24    | 5     | 29     | 21   |  |  |
| 1957       | 30                      | 14    | 13    | 17    | 26     | 164  |  |  |
| 1958       | 18                      | 47    | 6     | 12    | 17     | 68   |  |  |
| 1959       | 21                      | 18    | 16    | 7     | 38     | 57   |  |  |
| <u>1</u> / | 19.0                    | 28.0  | 14.5  | 10.3  | 27.5   |      |  |  |
| 1962       | 23                      | 36    | 14    | 9     | 18     | 22   |  |  |
| 1969       | 31                      | 26    | 14    | 15    | 14     | 78   |  |  |

Table 8. Age composition of white-tailed deer harvest in Swan Valley 1953-1969.

1/ 1953 to 1959 average.

Table 9. Percentages of bucks, does, and fawns in Swan Valley whitetailed deer harvest, 1951-1969.

| YEAR              | BUCKS | PERCENT OF HAR'<br>DOES | VEST<br>FAWNS | SAMPLE<br>SIZE |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1951              | 38    | 40                      | 22            | 91             |
| 1953              | 51    | 23                      | 26            | 66             |
| 1954              | 45    | 25                      | 30            | 132            |
| 1957              | 38    | 45                      | 17            | 297            |
| 1958 <sup>′</sup> | 45    | 36                      | 19            | 199            |
| 1959              | 32    | 48                      | 20            | 193            |
| 1/                | 41.5  | 36.2                    | 22.3          |                |
| 1962              | 63    | 26                      | 12            | 43             |
| 1969              | 49    | 20                      | 31            | 78             |

1/ 1951-1959 average.

The average dressed weights of fawns and adults are summarized in Table 10. These results suggest that deer weights increase with age until the animal is at least 4 1/2 years old with males weighing more than females.

|    | <u></u> |        | MALES             |                           | FEMALES |                   |                              |  |  |  |
|----|---------|--------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Ag | e Class | Samp1e | Dressed<br>Weight | Live<br>Weight <u>1</u> / | Sample  | Dressed<br>Weight | Live<br>Weight<br><u>1</u> / |  |  |  |
|    | 1/2     | 10     | 65.6              | 86.1                      | 7       | 61.0              | 80.3                         |  |  |  |
| 1  | 1/2     | 10     | 114.5             | 147.1                     | 2       | 107.5             | 138.4                        |  |  |  |
| 2  | 1/2     | . 3    | 161.3             | 205.6                     | 3       | 116.0             | 149.0                        |  |  |  |
| 3  | 1/2     | 4      | 162.5             | 206.2                     | 3       | 118.3             | 151.9                        |  |  |  |
| 4  | 1/2     | 5      | 181.8             | 231.2                     | -       | -                 | -                            |  |  |  |
| 5  | 1/2+    | 3      | 175.0             | 222.7                     | _       |                   |                              |  |  |  |
|    |         |        |                   |                           |         |                   |                              |  |  |  |

Table 10. Average dressed weights and calculated live weights (in pounds) by age class of deer from Swan Valley, Montana (collected during 1969 hunting season).

1/ Calculated from regression line

Y = 4.15 + 1.2487 X where Y = 1 ive weight, and

X = dressed weight (Severinghaus, 1949b).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The results of the dead deer survey indicate that there was no apparent difference in the number of winter killed deer between the winter of 1968 - 1969 and 1969 - 1970 (Table 11). The data indicates that 24.2 deer died per square mile on approximately 22 square miles of range sampled during the winter of 1968 - 1969. The following winter mortality dropped to 23.1 deer per square mile.

Table 11. Comparison of white-tailed deer winter mortality in the Swan Valley winter range between 1968-1969 and 1969-1970.

|                 | 1968                                 | - 1969        |                                     | 19                                   | 69 - 1970     | )                                   |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| TRANSECT<br>NO. | No.<br>dead deer<br>(in<br>transect) | Arca<br>acres | No.<br>dead deer<br>per<br>sq. mile | No.<br>dead deer<br>(in<br>transect) | Area<br>acres | No.<br>dead deer<br>per<br>sq. mile |
| 0               | 0                                    | 28.8          | 0                                   | 3                                    | 29.4          | 65.3                                |
| 1               | 1                                    | 28.7          | 22.3                                | 3                                    | 31.6          | 60.7                                |
| 2               | 0                                    | 32.4          | 0                                   | 0                                    | 29.6          | 0                                   |
| 3               | 1                                    | 27.1          | 23.6                                | 0                                    | 27.5          | 0                                   |
| 4               | 4                                    | 32.6          | 78.5                                | 0                                    | 8.6           | 0                                   |
| 5               | 1                                    | 31.1          | 20.6                                | 1                                    | 31.8          | 20.1                                |
| 6               | 2                                    | 35.4          | 36.2                                | 0                                    | 33.8          | 0                                   |
| 7               | 1                                    | 34.0          | 18.8                                | 4                                    | 29.1          | 88.1                                |
| 8               | 2                                    | 39.6          | 32.3                                | 0                                    | 30.0          | 0                                   |
| 9               | 2                                    | 37.7          | 33.9                                | 0                                    | 33.2          | 0                                   |
| 10              | 0                                    | 30.1          |                                     | 1                                    | 31.9          | 20.1                                |
| TOTALS          | 14                                   | 357.5         | 266.2                               | 12                                   | 316.5         | 254.3                               |
| Average         | # dead dee                           | er/sq. mi     | . 24.2                              |                                      |               | 23.1                                |

The high number of fawns occurring in the sample of 56 road-killed deer suggests that fawns are more susceptible to this type of mortality than adults (Table 12).

Table 12. Age distribution of white-tailed deer by types of mortality on the Swan Valley winter range, 1969 - 1970 (sample size in parenthesis).

| METHOD      |         |         | Sample  |         |         |      |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
|             | Fawns   | 1 1/2   | 2 1/2   | 3 1/2   | 4 1/2+  | Size |
| Harvest     | 31 (23) | 26 (20) | 14 (10) | 15 (12) | 14 (11) | 76   |
| Road Kills  | 45 (25) | 16 (9)  | 14 (8)  | 11 ( 6) | 14 ( 8) | 56   |
| Collections | 15 ( 4) | 19 ( 5) | 15 ( 4) | 12 ( 3) | 39 (10) | 26   |
| Summary     | 33 (52) | 22 (34) | 14 (22) | 13 (21) | 18 (29) | 160  |

1/ Collected under permit from Montana Fish and Game Department.

#### Food Habits

The results of the analyses of the contents of 33 rumens are shown individually by month on Table 23 through 27, and are summarized in Table 13. These results indicate that the forage utilized by deer consists mainly of browse, both conifers and shrubs. The latter constituted a mean of 49% of all rumens examined and the former 21%. Forbs, grasses, and lichens accounted for 22, 8, and 1%, respectively, of the rumen contents.

Table 13. Percentages by volume of browse, forbs, and grass in rumens of white-tailed deer on Swan Valley winter range, 1970.

| MONTH    | Sample<br>Size | Conifer<br>Browse | Shrub<br>Browse | Forbs | Grass and<br>Grasslike<br>Plants | Other<br>Lichen |
|----------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| January  | . 8            | 18.0              | 76.6            | 4.4   | 0.8                              | 0.1             |
| February | 10             | 48.7              | 38.4            | 2.9   | 7.8                              | 2.2             |
| March    | 5              | 20.2              | 51.4            | 12.8  | 13.8                             | 1.6             |
| Apri1    | 6              | 15.0              | 66.8            | 9.2   | 9.0                              |                 |
| May      | 4              | 0.5               | 13.0            | 80.3  | 6.0                              | .3              |
|          |                |                   |                 |       |                                  |                 |

Browse was the most frequently used winter food. In February, conifers were used heavily and in January, March, and April shrubs provided the major food supply. Grass-like plants were utilized to a fair degree from February until the end of April. In May, when green forbs appeared, they formed the major food source for the Swan Valley white-tails. The most abundant individual plant species observed in deer rumens during the winter of 1969-1970 was Oregon grape (<u>Berberis repens</u>). It constituted 21% by volume of the total rumen contents and was observed in 61% of all rumens examined. Douglas-fir (<u>Pseudotsuga</u> <u>menziesii</u>) had a frequency occurrence of 76% and formed 12% by volume of total rumen content. Grasses had the highest frequency (82%) and constituted 8% of total rumen content.

Although the samples are too small to permit definite conclusions, it appears that the winter food habits of the Swan Valley white-tailed deer herd, as determined by rumen analysis, do not appear to have changed appreciably in the 12 years between 1958 and 1970 (Table 14). The only exception is grasses which constituted 4% of rumen.

| MONTH   | Sam<br>Si | ple<br>ze | Con<br>Bro | ifer<br>wse | Ot<br>Br | her<br>owse | Fo   | rbs  | Grass<br>Grass<br>Plan | and<br>like<br>ts | Othe<br>Licl<br>ete | er<br>hen,<br>c. |
|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|----------|-------------|------|------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|         | 1958      | 1970      | 1958       | 1970        | 1958     | 1970        | 1958 | 1970 | 1958                   | 1970              | 1958                | 1970             |
| January | 2         | 8         | 30         | 18          | 49       | 77          | 14   | 4    | 7                      | 1                 | Tr                  | Tr               |
| Februar | у З       | 10        | 35         | 49          | 57       | 38          | 5    | 3    | 3                      | 8                 | Tr                  | 2                |
| March   | 2         | 5         | 24         | 20          | 73       | 51          | 2    | 13   | 1                      | 14                | Tr                  | 2                |
| April   | 2         | 6         | 20         | 15          | 70       | 67          | 5    | 9    | 5                      | 9                 | Tr                  | Tr               |
| May     | -         | 4         |            | 1           |          | 13          | -    | 80   |                        | 6                 |                     | Tr               |

Table 14. Comparison of percent rumen content of Swan Valley whitetailed deer between 1958 and 1970.

1/ 1958 sample from Montana Fish and Game Department annual report, 1959-1960.

contents in 1958 and increased to 8% in 1970. Forbs, grasses, and lichens were observed in the rumen during each month of observation in 1958 and again in 1970.

#### Productivity

The reproductive data collected from 35 does indicated an average pregnancy rate of 57.1% for all age classes, 100% for yearlings, and 88.2% for adults. The 3 1/2 year age class was most productive and of 13 female fawns examined, none appeared to be pregnant (Table 15). The mean fetal rate for pregnant does was 1.60.

Table 15. Reproduction of female white-tailed deer collected from the Swan Valley during the winter, 1969-1970.

| Age<br>Class | No. of Females | Number Pregnant | Fetuses | Fetuses/Female |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|
| Fawns        | 13             | 0               | 0       | 0.0            |
| 1 1/2        | 51/            | 5               | 6       | 1.20           |
| 2 1/2        | 5-1/           | 4               | 6       | 1.20           |
| 3 1/2        | 5              | 5               | 9       | 1.80           |
| 4 1/2        | 5              | 4               | 8       | 1.60           |
| 5 1/2        | -              | -               |         |                |
| 6 1/2+       | 2              | 2               | 3       | 1.50           |

1/ Includes female that aborted (presence of caruncles on uterine wall).

Comparison of the Swan Valley females with other populations (Table 16) suggests that the Swan Valley does, especially fawns, are less productive than doe, white-tailed deer from other areas.

30

-.

|  | Fawı                | CO)<br>ns            | NCEPTION<br>Year       | N RATES %<br>lings | Ad                      | ults                 | Fetuses/<br>Female<br>Fawn | Fetuses/<br>Adult<br>Female | Fetuses<br>per<br>Female |
|--|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Illinois <u>1</u> /  | 41.3                | (160)                | 95.5                   | (110)              | 96.7                    | (362)                | 0.41                       | 1.81                        | 1.39                     |
| Maine 2/   | 24.1                | (54)                 | 80.8                   | (78)               | 95.9                    | (74)                 |                            |                             |                          |
| Massachusetts <u>3</u> /                                     | 58.8                | (17)                 | 92.0                   | (50)               | 98.8                    | (86)                 | 0.59                       | 1.74                        | 1.61                     |
| Manitoba <u>4/</u><br>Whiteshell<br>Turtle Mtn.<br>Duck Mtn. | 0.0<br>25.0<br>30.0 | (10)<br>(16)<br>(10) | 90.0<br>100.0<br>100.0 | (10)<br>(7)<br>(7) | 100.00<br>97.5<br>100.0 | (36)<br>(39)<br>(24) | 0.00<br>0.31<br>0.30       | 1.70<br>1.85<br>1.77        | 1.39<br>1.45<br>1.41     |
| Michigan <u>5</u> /  | 58.5                | (70)                 | 100.0                  | (29)               | 93.3                    | (45)                 |                            |                             |                          |
| Swan Valley, Mont.   | 0.0                 | (13)                 | 100.0                  | (5)                | 88.2                    | (17)                 | 0.00                       | 1.45                        | 0.91                     |

Table 16. Productivity of white-tailed deer from the Swan Valley compared to other fertility levels reported in the literature (sample sizes in parenthesis).

Roseberry and Klimstra (1970).

Banasiak (1961).

Shaw and McLaughlin (1951).

 $\frac{1}{2}/\frac{3}{3}/\frac{4}{5}/\frac{1}{5}$ Ransom (1967).

Ryel and Fay (1961).

٠

•

;

A doe collected on May 20, 1970 was not gravid, but large caruncles on the uterine wall indicated that she had been pregnant.

Fetal counts and weights taken from 14 does are recorded in the appendix (Table 28).

#### Fawn:Adult Ratios

The classifications of 327 white-tailed deer during this study indicated a fawn:adult ratio of 45 fawns:100 adults. These results were compared with those from the Swan Valley from 1935 to 1967 (Table 17). Table 17 indicated wide fluctuations in these ratios from one year to another.

| YEAR              | ADULTS | FAWNS | UNCLASSIFIED | FAWNS/100 ADULTS |
|-------------------|--------|-------|--------------|------------------|
| 1935              | 19     | 56    | 1,122        | 294              |
| 1936              | 49     | 21    | 1,522        | 43               |
| 1941              | 17     | 20    | 6            | 117              |
| 1943              | 45     | 56    | 17           | 124              |
| 1949              | 188    | 68    | 115          | 36               |
| 1950              | 214    | 87    |              | 41               |
| 1955              | 61     | 42    | 74           | 69               |
| 1958              | 167    | 99    | 139          | 59               |
| 1959              | 207    | 68    |              | 33               |
| 1960              | 77     | 30    |              | 29               |
| 1961              | 19     | 8     |              | 42               |
| 1962              | 80     | 33    |              | 41               |
| 1963 <sup>·</sup> | 59     | 31    |              | 53               |
| 1964              | 234    | 90    |              | 38               |
| 1965              | 188    | 108   |              | 58               |
| 1966              | 33     | 17    |              | 52               |
| 1967              |        |       |              | 51               |
| 1970              | 225    | 102   |              | 45               |

Table 17. White-tailed deer fawn/adult ratios from the Swan Valley, 1935-1970. 1/

1/ Montana Fish and Game Department annual reports, 1935-1967.

# Physical Condition

The kidney fat indices and the femur fat contents generally decreased from January to the end of May. The summarized results are shown in Table 18 with individual results recorded in Tables 30 and 31. However, variations among both indices of the same sex and age class were high, even within the same month.

| SEX & AGE |        | Kidney Fat Index |      |     |      |      | Femur Fat<br>1/ |      |      |      |
|-----------|--------|------------------|------|-----|------|------|-----------------|------|------|------|
|           | J      | F                | М    | A   | М    | J    | F               | М    | A    | М    |
| Fawns (M) | 100.8  | 28.8             | -    |     | -    | -    | 45.1            | 36.1 | -    |      |
| Fawns (F) | 68.5   | 27.7             | 7.2  | -   | 8.9  | 84.5 | 82.4            | 58.1 | 44.6 | 0.4  |
| Bucks     | · 19.1 | 17.9             | -    | -   | 10.0 | 85.8 | 75.4            | 58.2 | 24.2 | 11.6 |
| Does      | 83.6   | 43.8             | 23.1 | 9.6 | 8.1  | 91.9 | 92.8            | 39.7 | 5.5  | 21.6 |

Table 18. Comparison of kidney fat indices and femur fat contents of Swan Valley white-tailed deer, January to May, 1970.

1/ Ether Extract.

Fawns generally had higher kidney fat indices than adult bucks but lower than adult does. The limited data on adult males suggest that the kidney fat indices were approximately 19% in January and remained below that level during the duration of the study. It appears that the condition of adult females peaked in December - January, and declined until the end of May when the project terminated.

Despite high variations between individuals of identical sex and age classes, the femur fat content (ether extract) generally followed

the same downward trend established by the kidney fat indices. These results, however, indicate that fawns were in poorer condition (lower femur fat content) than adults. The femur-fat content of adult bucks was lower than that of adult does in January and February but higher in March and April.

The femur-fat content of road-killed deer was compared to that of collected deer. The sample is too small to permit definite conclusions, but the results indicate that the road-killed deer had a higher femurfat content than those collected under permit (Table 19).

Table 19. Comparison of the percentages of fat in femur marrow samples between road-killed and collected white-tailed deer from the Swan Valley, 1970 (expected value in parenthesis).

| MORTALI<br>TYPE                   | TY<br>Fawns               | 1 1/2                    | AGE<br>2 1/2             | 3 1/2                    | TO<br>4 1/2+                | TALS                 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Road<br>Kills<br>Collect<br>tions | 53.1(53.2)<br>-38.2(38.0) | 41.0(46.9)<br>39.2(33.5) | 71.4(59.1)<br>29.8(42.2) | 68.1(56.0)<br>28.1(40.0) | 43.7(62.1)<br>62.8(44.4)    | 277.3<br>198.1       |
| TOTALS                            | 91.3                      | 80.2                     | 101.2                    | 96.2                     | 106.5<br>$x^2 = 2$<br>d. f. | 475.4<br>27.0<br>= 4 |

Femur-fat contents were graphed against the kidney fat indices of 25 white-tailed deer (Figure 4). The results indicate (with one exception) that the kidney fat index decreased to an index of about 20 without an appreciable change in the fat content of femur marrows.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

After this point was reached, the fat content of femur marrow decreased sharply and had wider ranges than when the kidney fat index remained above 20.

A comparison of the compression of femur marrows and the ether extraction showed that marrow having 0% compression had a range of 82.9 to 97.5% fat content and averaged 89.9% (Table 20).

| Percent   |     | Percent Fat<br>Ether Extraction |      |       |       |  |  |
|---|-----|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|--|--|
| Compression Sample   0- 13   1-5 5   6-10 5   11-15 1 |     | Average                         |      | Range | Range |  |  |
| 0-  | 13  | 89.9                            | 82.9 |       | 97.5  |  |  |
| 1-5   | 5   | · 81.6                          | 75.9 |       | 90.8  |  |  |
| 6-10  | 5   | 55.6                            | 39.7 |       | 64.3  |  |  |
| 11-15   | 1   | 60.0                            |      |       |       |  |  |
| 16-20   | . 4 | 47.8                            | 33.5 | ,     | 56.9  |  |  |
| 21-25   | 6   | 17.1                            | 1.9  | ~-    | 44.7  |  |  |
| 26-30   | 5   | 12.5                            | 2.9  |       | 33.1  |  |  |
| 31-35   | 3   | 1.2                             | 0.4  |       | 2.9   |  |  |
| 36-40   | 3   | 19.3                            | 0.2  |       | 40.1  |  |  |
| 41-50   | 2   | 10.2                            | 0.3  |       | 20    |  |  |
| 51-60   | 1   | 0.2                             |      |       |       |  |  |

Early stages of decreased fat content were discerned by a 1 - 5% compression, with an average fat content of 81.6%. As the percentage of compression increased beyond 20%, the range of femur-fat content doubled. This suggests that the compression technique has limitations when 20% compression is reached.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 20. Comparison of percentage of compression of femur marrow and femur fat content (ether extraction) of Swan Valley white-tailed deer, January to May, 1970.

# Parasites

Examinations of brains from 93 white-tailed deer of all ages and both sexes failed to reveal a single specimen of the brainworm (<u>Pneumostrongylus</u> <u>tenuis</u>). Behrend and Witter (1968) found that 84% of all white-tailed deer they examined in Maine harbored the parasite.

Eight of twenty-six deer examined (30%) were harboring the liver fluke (<u>Fascioloides magna</u>). One animal had an abscess the size of a grapefruit just under the skin in the right flank. Dr. Nakamara, Department of Zoology, University of Montana, Missoula, examined the abscess, and tentatively identified it as containing caseous lymphadenitis (Corynebacterum ovis). Chapter 6

#### DISCUSSION

# RANGE STUDIES

#### Browse Utilization

Techniques used in determining browse utilization vary from estimating overall percentage (Cole, 1958), or length utilization (Dasmann, 1951), to before and after browsing measurements of marked twigs (Dasmann, 1948).

Various definitions of the term "twig" are available in the literature. Telfer (1969) used twig to mean that part of a branch distal to the point where branch diameter would, if air dried, equal the largest diameter observed for the stub of a browsed branch of that species. By this definition, a twig could contain growth produced in several growing seasons. In this study, a twig refers to that portion of the plant produced during the last growing season, and is often referred to as the current annual growth. Utilization refers to the reduction, by browsing, in length of current annual growth.

The regression analysis, used in analyzing the relationship between twig diameter and twig length, suggests a linear relationship. Scatter diagrams for my data provide further evidence that the relationship is linear.

37

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lyon (1970) stated that the relations of twig weight and length to twig diameter varied significantly from site to site, by size of plant, and by location of twigs on the plant; but he reported that in practical applications, the variations between the latter two could be circumvented by randomizing the sampling procedure. He also stated that a distribution of 65 measured twigs could predict the population mean with  $\stackrel{+}{-}$  10% of the sample mean and that these predictions would be correct about 95% of the time.

Site is the variable that cannot be randomly stratified. Therefore, I calculated my own regression equations for serviceberry and mountain maple for a partially logged portion of the Lion Creek area (Table 1). These equations yielded utilization values of 53.6% on mountain maple and 54.6% on serviceberry. Lyon (1970) found that at 60% utilization of serviceberry, the estimated utilization (using the regression equation) within 10 percentage points is relatively Therefore, in my opinion, the estimated percent utilization of high. serviceberry in the Lion Creek Canyon area is a good estimate of actual utilization. Stickney (1966:205) showed that when 100% of all twigs are browsed, utilization is approximately 60%. Since the percentage of serviceberry twigs which were browsed approached the 100% level, and the browse surveys revealed 54.6% utilization, my results are comparable to those of Stickney (1966).

An examination of my regression equations shows that for serviceberry and mountain maple twigs having the same diameter, the length of mountain maple produced is 33.7% greater than for serviceberry. Since

the utilization values are quite similar (53.6% for mountain maple and 54.6% for serviceberry), it appears that mountain maple forms a greater portion of the browse diet of deer than serviceberry. This is based on the assumption that the browsing was exclusively by deer; since I observed no elk or elk tracks in the area during the winter, I think the assumption is valid.

The mean diameter of browsed twigs of serviceberry and mountain maple are greater than those of unbrowsed twigs. This, in my opinion, reflects deer use and indicates either that a preference for larger twigs exists, or that larger twigs are browsed because they are more readily seen. In spite of these differences between the means of browsed and unbrowsed twigs, the regression equation is still a good indicator of utilization because the ranges in individual diameters of browsed twigs falls between the ranges in unbrowsed twig diameters used in calculating the regression equation.

The differences between serviceberry utilization on the logged and unlogged areas probably reflects differences in habitat preferences. The partially logged area lies between Lion Creek and the south-west facing slope of the unlogged Lion Creek Canyon. In the winter, "travel lanes" were abundant in the logged areas; these trails connected the creek bottom with the relatively snow-free uncut portions above. Relatively few tracks left these trails in the partially logged area. This would explain the difference in utilization between the two areas. The logged areas, however, also are on southwest facing slopes and were snow-free before the remaining portion of the valley. Deer probably used these

logged areas in late winter or early spring, prior to moving to their summer range. This could explain the degree of browsing on the logged area.

Using Lyon's (1970) combined equation for all sites, utilization percentages of 66 and 90 for serviceberry on the cut and uncut areas respectively were obtained. The equation derived for this study yielded percentages of 54.6 and 86.9 respectively. In both cases, Lyon's equation over-estimated utilization, but the difference decreases with an increase in utilization. These results agree with those of Lyon (op. cit) indicating that at low to moderate utilization levels, a regression equation derived for a particular site will predict the true utilization better than a combined equation for all sites. Although the equation used in estimating serviceberry utilization in the uncut area was derived from data of the logged area, the similarity in utilization levels in the uncut area between my equation and that of Lyon (1970) suggests that the estimate is fairly accurate and indicates a difference in utilization levels between the cut and uncut areas.

### Track Counts

The distribution of deer tracks and trails (Tables 3 and 4) indicates that the deer wintered almost exclusively in uncut areas and that clearcuts were very lightly used. Literature on the effects of timber stand removal on wildlife is numerous and the generally accepted beliefs are aptly summarized by Krefting (1962); "The best and most far-reaching method yet devised for improving deer habitat is the use of various cutting practices. When logging is accomplished on a rotation basis, it produces

a variety of different age classes of trees and this usually results in a maximum amount of food, and cover."

Logging generally increases the amount of browse produced on an area (Beall, 1962; Krefting, 1962; Lay and Taylor, 1943; Morton and Sedam, 1938; and Westall, 1954). Their studies show an increase in the amount of browse following logging, but they do not relate the amount of browse produced to the amount of browse available to wildlife during the winter. Since the condition of the winter range is generally accepted as the major limiting factor, the amount of browse available to the animal on its winter range is an important factor.

Reynold's (1962 a) Colorado studies showed an increase in vegetation and in deer use following logging, but he stated that the study area was on deer summer range. His other study (Reynolds, 1962 b) reflected relatively equal use of clearcuts by deer up to a distance of 700 feet from the forest edges. His results were based on pellet group data and may reflect spring, summer, or fall rather than winter use. I observed numerous pellet groups in the Swan Valley clearcut areas, but my track count results indicated that these clearcut areas were not used by deer during the winter. However, as soon as the snow disappeared from these cutover areas, the deer moved into them. This would account for the presence of the deer pellet groups.

Limited literature is available regarding detrimental effects of logging practices. Swift (1953) stated that even though cutting was beneficial to the creation of deer habitat in Wisconsin, the restriction of cutting of coniferous cover species within deer yards was an important

consideration as those species were valuable as cover. Pengelly (1963) believed that large scale clearcuts at higher elevations often did not contribute to the amount of winter deer ranges, and he recommended that the clearcuts be small and scattered. Hosley (1956) made reference to a Maine deer study that indicated that if islands of conifers were left in large cuttings, the deer will use the areas around these, but since I observed no clearcuts with islands of conifers in them, I do not know whether this type of behavior occurs in the Swan Valley.

Krull (1964) believed that during the severe weather of midwinter, deer moved into uncut areas because of the shelter they provided, but prior to and after this time use was greater on cut areas where food was more plentiful. The absence of deer tracks in the Swan Valley clearcuts is, in my opinion, partially caused by increased snow depth in these areas. The fact that snow depth is greater in clearcut areas than in surrounding uncut areas was shown by Berndt (1965).

# <u>Climate</u>

Data on winter temperatures during 1969-1970 suggest a relatively mild winter since, despite a total of 63 inches of snowfall by the end of January, the maximum accumulated snow depth was only 28 inches. An additional 20 inches, which fell during February, increased the snow depth by only 2 inches while 20 inches of snow in March accompanied a decrease of 3 inches.

Although the data on snow stations (Table 7) are based on a small sample, I believe they represent a typical pattern. Station numbers

1 - 5 inclusive were located in open areas whereas 6 - 8 inclusive were placed in timber, and the latter are therefore not representative of the actual accumulated snow depth. The northward increase in snow depth (Table 7 and Figure 1) is, at least partially, caused by a rain shadow created by the Mission Mountains. The elevations of this network of mountains are much higher in the southern portion of the area and gradually decrease as they extend further north. This would explain what is generally called a "snow belt" which lies roughly between Goat Creek and the town of Swan Lake.

Severinghaus and Cheatum (1956) mention the migration of whitetails from the divide between the Clearwater and Swan River drainages, south down the Clearwater and north down the Swan River. My data indicate that in so doing, they are moving to an area of greater snowfall.

#### DEER STUDIES

#### Harvest

Data on the age composition and the percentage of bucks, does, and fawns harvested (Tables 8 and 9) indicate wide ranges between 1951 and 1969. These differences are at least partially caused by differences in hunting conditions and by variation in the intensity of checking station operations. The 1969 hunting season was characterized by a lack of precipitation and mild temperatures making hunting difficult. Since younger, less-experienced deer are more vulnerable (Taber and Dasman 1958, and Taber and Rognrud 1959), these age classes in the kill

were probably more highly represented than they existed in the population, particularly during the early part of the hunting season. During a single weekend of checking station operations in mid-November, the kill of adult bucks (2 1/2 years and older) outnumbered the remaining kill of 2 to 1. This ratio may not represent the actual ratio of the kill for that weekend since hunters are more likely to stop and report a buck than a doe, but it is indicative of an increase in the buck kill during that weekend, and is probably caused by the onset of the breeding season. If I had not operated a checking station during that weekend, the percentages of bucks in the harvest would be much lower. The fawn:doe ratios based on hunter kills are discussed in the reproduction section of this report.

Since the intensities of past checking stations are unknown, the variabilities in sample numbers probably reflects hunting conditions, checking station intensity, and population trends, but the relative importance of each is unknown.

In spite of the biases discussed above, the data in Table 8 suggest that the percentage of old animals in the population has decreased since 1951. This trend may be the result of the introduction of an either sex season in 1951 and increased hunting pressure in the past 20 years. The high recorded kill from 1957 to 1959 is partially attributable to the presence of two continuously operated checking stations in the Swan Valley during those seasons. Montana Fish and Game reports for this period describe the winters from 1957 to 1960 as being mild to unusually mild. Increased reproduction and good hunting conditions also may have

contributed to the high reported kill.

Field dressed weights of hunter killed deer were generally higher during this study than those reported for Montana white-tailed deer by Mackie (1964), with the Swan Valley fawns weighing an average of 6 pounds more. Adult deer from the Swan Valley also appear to be slightly heavier, although limited data on them prevents definite conclusions. However, when compared to Minnesota fawns (<u>Erickson et. al</u>. 1961), the Swan Valley male and female fawns averaged 9.7 and 11.3 pounds less than the Minnesota males and females (See discussion section on reproduction).

#### Mortality

Variations in the number of dead deer per square mile found between transect lines during the dead-deer surveys (Table 11) prevents statistically valid conclusions. However, this type of information can be of value in determining trends in the population and in the habitat.

Data collected on the dead-deer surveys indicate no major difference in mortality between the two winters of this study. However, an examination of climatological data indicates that during the winter of 1968-1969, the area was characterized by below normal temperatures and above normal precipitation, whereas, during the following winter, temperatures were normal to slightly above normal and precipitation was at or slightly below normal.

Although data are limited and too variable to permit definite conclusions from being drawn, they suggest that winter mortality is relatively high during a normal winter.

#### Road Kills

Data on the road-killed deer suggest a fawn:adult ratio of 83:100. However, the fawn:adult ratio I observed during the winter was 45:100. This indicates that the fawn:adult ratio observed from road-killed deer is not representative of the actual age ratio and suggests a higher mortality rate in the fawn sizes. This may be partially caused by deer behavior since during their first winter, fawns generally stay with the does (Hawkins and Klimstra, 1970). I observed that does crossing the highway generally led and their fawns would follow, often by several hundred feet. Motorists seeing a deer crossing the highway probably assume that there is only one, and/or concentrate on the deer crossing the highway and don't see the approaching fawn, which may be trying to join its mother because something, such as an automobile, disturbed it. Food Habits

According to Hosley (1956) the type of food utilized by deer is dependent on several factors. First, there are marked regional differences. Plants utilized by deer in Florida are different from those used by deer in western Montana since few species are available in both areas. Second, a plant may be favored in one area and yet, almost untouched in another region because of the presence of a more palatable species. Third, the density of a deer population determines what plant species ranks as number one in an area. As the population builds up, the most palatable species disappear first, followed by others in order of decreasing desirability. If overpopulation reaches a critical stage, the animals

have available in quantity only foods of low nutritional value. Lastly, differences can also occur from winter to winter since during a season of light snow deer can feed on low growing plants that would be unavailable under normal conditions.

In the Swan Valley, white-tailed deer (Table 13) rely heavily on browse during winter and utilize grass in spring. This pattern of forage utilization is typical of northern deer (Hill, 1956). The increased use of browse results from the reduced availability of low growing plants due to snow conditions as well as to a higher nutrient content in browse. The type of conifer browse preferred by white-tailed deer in the Swan Valley is Douglas-fir. Adams' (1949) studies of Montana whitetails indicated that deer preferred ponderosa pine to Douglas-fir. Nellis (1964) and Knoche (1968) reported similar findings for mule deer. My results show that lodgepole pine had the same frequency of occurrence and a higher percent of total rumen content than ponderosa pine; this indicates that lodgepole pine is also preferred to ponderosa pine. Since the density and distribution of these conifers on the study area are relatively unknown, it is impossible to say whether results on conifer use reflect food preferences or are merely indicative of higher densities and greater distributions of Douglas-fir and lodgepole pine. Both are more numerous on the study areas than ponderosa pine.

The plant species most heavily utilized by deer during the winters of 1958-59 and again in 1969-70 was Oregon grape. This low growing plant may not occur so frequently in the diet of deer when snow is deep. The winter of 1969-70 was relatively mild, with light snowfall

and this probably accounts for the high occurrence of Oregon grape in the diet. Serviceberry and mountain maple are considered excellent deer foods, although they comprised only a small portion of the diet during this study. This may be explained by the fact that they are not abundant in all areas.

Forbs and grasses were utilized throughout the winter of 1969-70, which was mild with below normal snow depths. Grasses formed only a minor portion of the diet in January and February (4%) but in spring (March, April and May) their use increased to 10%. My winter results on grass-use are similar to those of Allen's (1965) whitetail studies in eastern Montana. He recorded an average volume of 6% grasses in deer rumens during the winter, but his spring observations showed an average volume of 43%.

Green forbs appeared in late April and immediately became a major item in rumens. One rumen collected on May 6 contained 97% forbs of which dog tooth-violet (<u>Erythronium grandiflorum</u>) constituted 80%.

Lichens (<u>Allectoria spp</u>) appeared in all months of the study in 1970 and for similar months in 1958, but generally only in minute quantities; however, one rumen contained 21%. These results do not support past local theories that <u>Allectoria spp</u> was a basic winter food for deer in the Swan Valley. Studies by Norris (1943) revealed that succulent grass would pass through the stomachs of ruminants in less than 10 hours, whereas coarse forage, such as straw, could be found in the stomach up to 4 days after an animal was fed. He concluded

that stomachs could show large percentages of coarse browse, which had been eaten over a period of days, suggesting that browse is the chief diet while in reality rapidly digested succulent forage may have been consumed in larger amounts.

<u>Allectoria spp</u> or "tree moss", as it is locally known, is a very small and hairlike plant and because of its size, could be rapidly digested. Because of its size, it is also possible that "tree moss" could get "lost" among the rumen contents, since most rumens examined contained it even though the individual specimens were so small that separation from other plants was impossible. Based upon this characteristic and the findings of Norris (1943), tree moss forms a greater proportion of the diet than the results indicate. On the same basis, conifer browse may constitute a lower percentage than revealed by my findings.

### Productivity

Although the data are too limited to show definite conclusions, they strongly suggest that the fetal rates of the Swan Valley deer are lower than reported in the literature (Table 15). My results indicate a pregnancy rate of 57.1% for all age classes as compared with 67% by Roseberry and Klimstra (1970; calculated from data in Table 1). They reported a 97.1% pregnancy rate for yearlings and adults, compared to 91% for this study. The mean fetal rate of 1.60 for gravid does from this study were lower than reported for Manitoba by Ransom (1967) and for Illinois by Roseberry and Klimstra (1970).

It is also lower than reported for mule deer on the National Bison Range in Montana (Nellis, 1964) and similar to the rate reported for the Rattlesnake mule deer in Montana (Knoche, 1968). The absence of breeding among the Swan Valley female fawns is in direct contrast with the evidence reported in the literature (Table 16). Roseberry and Klimstra (1970) reported that 41.3% of Illinois fawns were gravid. The incidence of breeding among fawns has been shown to vary widely in different parts of the range of white-tailed deer and within smaller regions according to quality of habitat. In New York, pregnancy rates ranging from 3.4 to 32.3% (Cheatum and Severinghaus, 1950) and 4.2 to 36.2% (Morton and Cheatum, 1946) have been reported for areas offering poor to excellent deer habitat. Ransom (1964) stated that reproduction in fawns was a good indicator of range quality and varied from 0 fetuses per fawn in poor habitat to 1.25 in good range.

On the basis of no apparent reproduction by fawns in the Swan Valley, it appears that the Swan Valley winter range is in poor condition. Cheatum and Severinghaus (1950) suggested that fawns in northern New York failed to reproduce because of poor post natal nutrition resulting in poor over-all physical condition; fawn weights supported this explanation. Cheatum and Severinghaus (<u>op. cit</u>) also believed that a vigorous winter would adversely affect not only the developing embryos but also lactation. An inadequate quantity and quality of milk would have a retarding effect on the growth of the fawns.

The winter of 1968-69 in the Swan Valley was considered severe. Pregnant does surviving the winter probably were in poor condition and lactation probably placed a further drain on these does. Unless lush summer range was available, they may have had a reduced reproductive potential in the ensuing 1969 rut (Verme, 1965 and 1969). This could explain the low fetus rates for adult does in this study.

As discussed above, the physical condition of fawns is of prime importance if they are to breed as fawns. Cheatum and Severinghaus (1950) used weights as indicators of physical condition. Erickson <u>et al</u> (1961) reported that approximately 20% of the Minnesota whitetails bred as fawns. Average dressed weights of fawns collected during the first half of November were 75.3 and 70 pounds for males and females. Fawns collected during the same time of year in the Swan Valley averaged 65.6 and 61 pounds dressed weight for males and females, indicating that Minnesota fawns were considerably heavier than those in the Swan Valley. These data also suggest that fawns in the Swan Valley may not have been physically mature by the onset of the breeding season.

Cheatum and Morton (1946) and Roseberry and Klimstra (1970) found that the peak of fawn breeding occurred 4 - 5 weeks later than the peak for adults. Therefore, it is possible that I missed some embryos in January; since I did not examine their ovaries, I cannot conclude that fawns did not breed as fawns although the absence of embryos and fetuses in the March and April samples suggests that breeding did not occur.

Leopold <u>et al</u>. (1951) stated that a sample of 50 deer, if classification is made with considerable care, is adequate to indicate accurately

the composition of a deer herd and will not vary by over 5% from the results of a much larger sample. Since any doubtful classifications were omitted from the sample, I feel that the fawn:adult ratio indicated is accurate.

The ranges in fawn:adult ratios are at least partially caused by winter conditions. Fawns are generally considered to be more susceptible to winter mortality than adults. A mild winter followed by another mild winter would probably reflect a high fawn:adult ratio, since during the first winter does would fare comparatively well and produce healthy offspring which could in the ensuing mild winter comprise a substantial proportion of the population. Conversely, two consecutive severe winters, or even a severe winter followed by a normal one, would probably produce low fawn:adult ratios. The unusually high ratios found in 1935 (Table 17) are, in my opinion due to the inability of the U. S. Forest Service recorders to distinguish between fawns and adults because including ova losses, prenatal mortality, and postnatal mortality (such as hunting), the value produced would far exceed the biotic potential of white-tailed deer.

There are numerous data available on the ratio of adult males to adult females. Morton and Cheatum (1946:246) list ratios of adult males to adult females for various ungulate species ranging from 38 adult males:100 adult females to 100 adult males:100 adult females. Combining the adults of known sex and age classes of deer found in the 1969 deaddeer survey and from known road-killed deer, the adult male:adult female ratio is 81.8 males:100 females. Assuming this ratio to be representative

of the actual ratio in the population (based on a sample of 22 adult females and 18 adult males), the fawn:adult ratio of 45:100 adults could be estimated as 81.8 fawns:100 does. This figure is probably a better estimate of the actual ratio in the population than the figure of 153 fawns:100 does collected from hunters, since hunter biases do not affect the former ratio to the same degree.

Sex ratios high in females are sometimes blamed for lowered breeding potential in the Adirondacks but the general consensus is that in deer, a ratio of one male to 3 or 4 females is sufficient for breeding of all females (Morton and Cheatum, 1946). A ratio of 81 adult males:100 adult females is more than adequate from this standpoint.

### Physical Condition

An initial comparison of the kidney fat index between the Swan Valley white-tails and those reported by Taber <u>et al</u>. (1959) for mule deer in Montana, indicate that the seasonal cycle of condition is similar for both deer herds. Bucks had lower kidney fat indices than does and fawns, having declined rapidly during the rut (Nellis, 1964; Taber <u>et al</u>., 1959). Nellis (1964) and Cooperrider (1969) stated that physical condition of Montana mule deer does on the National Bison Range and on Rock Creek declined in condition from January until March, levelled out in April and increased slightly in May. My results indicated that the Swan Valley white-tailed does declined in condition, at least until the end of May.

Since Harris (1945) and Cheatum (1949) found that marrow fat is the last fat reserve to be used by deer, I obtained the percentage of

fat in femur marrow from 49 deer to determine whether further deterioration in condition had escaped detection by the kidney fat index method. In comparing the femur fat content of bucks and fawns, both were at approximately the same level in January, but condition of fawns dropped faster and remained below the buck level for the duration of the winter, except April. This is in direct contrast to the kidney fat index, which indicated bucks to be in poorer condition than fawns.

The marrow fat content of does was higher than that of bucks during January and February but dropped below the buck level in March and was even lower in April, apparently because of the additional energy required by the gravid does. This also contradicts the kidney fat index method which indicated that bucks were in poorer condition than does throughout the winter. A comparison of femur fat content between the Swan Valley white-tailed does and the Rock Creek mule deer does (Cooperrider, 1969) suggested that the white-tailed does were in poorer shape than the mule deer does even though the winter was milder in the Swan Valley.

A comparison between the femur fat content and the kidney fat index of 20 was reached. These results were similar to those of Ransom (1965) although he found that below an index of 30, the femur marrow content dropped sharply. Since the fat content of femur marrow is accepted as a good indicator of physical condition (Harris 1945, Cheatum 1949, Riney 1955), it must be concluded that kidney fat indices do not reflect condition as well as the femur fat once the kidney fat index drops below 20. Figure 4 also shows that the kidney fat indices did not decrease

to 0 but remained at a level of 5 or higher.

The latter results appear to conflict with statements made by Harris (1945) and Cheatum (1949). Harris claimed that femur fat is not mobilized until all other fat reserves have disappeared and Cheatum stated that the fat content of femur marrow did not fall below 50% until fat within the body cavity was exhausted. My results for white-tailed deer agree with those of Ransom (1965) who reported that small amounts of fat were present on the kidneys of white-tailed deer during the final stages of starvation.

The third method used to assess physical condition was the compression of femur marrow (Greer, 1968). This method appears to be fairly accurate as an indicator of conditions as long as compression of femur marrow remains below 20%. Beyond this point, there is too much variability in the fat content of femur marrow (Table 20). Greer's (1968) results on elk showed that the variability of femur fat was greatly increased when a 15% compression was attained and therefore are quite similar to those of this study. Greer (1968) stated that broad categories of 10 or 20% fat content may be adequate to indicate an animals condition and in Greer's (1969) paper, he proposed that 0-20, 20-50, 50-80, and 80-100% fats were generally indicative of poor, fair, good, and excellent conditions respectively. On that basis, it appears that the does of Swan Valley were only in fair condition in March and in poor condition in April. Bucks and fawns were in fair condition in April and in poor condition in May.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Some of my samples were frozen for 4 months before being analyzed and, therefore, it is quite probable that the fat content is lower than the results indicate. Greer (1968) stated that some marrows frozen for extended periods before chemical analysis may give a 5-10 percent higher fat content than a fresh sample.

Comparisons of the femur fat content between deer collected under permit and road-killed deer indicate that the road-killed deer were in better condition physically than those collected under permit. However, since femur fat content values were not available for both males and females of all age classes in the two types of mortality, and because differences occur in the femur fat content between sexes and age classes, no definite conclusions can be made.

### Parasites

The absence of the brainworm in 93 white-tailed deer strongly suggests that this parasite is not present in the Swan Valley population. Behrend and Witter (1968) found an 84% occurrence in Maine. Evidence was not found for high levels of parasites and these apparently do not limit deer in the Swan Valley.

### Chapter 7

# MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Figure 5 shows the mid-winter distribution of white-tailed deer during the winter of 1969-70. The portion of winter range paralleling the Swan River is quite accurately indicated on the map and is based on data from track counts and from inspection with the aid of a snowmobile. Those portions of the winter range in the Lion and Squeezer Creek Canyons are only approximations, but, in my opinion, quite realistic.

Approximately equal portions (80%) of the upper Swan Valley are controlled by the U. S. Forest Service and the Burlington Northern (Northern Pacific) Railroad Company. The remaining portion is about equally divided between the Swan River State Forest (10%) and private individuals or groups (10%). However, only 25% of the winter range is controlled by the U. S. Forest Service. Approximately 12% is controlled by the State. The major portion (63%) is privately owned with B. N. controlling 28% and other private landowners in control of 35%.

According to Rognrud (1949), logging on private land reached its peak around 1915-1919. Since clearcutting was not popular at that time, this type of timber removal was probably restricted to clearing land for homesteads. Most commercially cut areas were selectively logged. This probably provided enough cover and at the same time increased available browse and thus was probably at least partially responsible for the increase in the deer population reported in the literature.

57

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Since 1955, clearcutting has been conducted on a wide scale in the Swan Valley with a consequent decrease in total winter range equal to the acres logged on what formerly constituted winter range.

Consider for example, the area between Barber and Goat Creeks and extending 3 miles east of the river. Of this total area, approximately 45% has been logged to such a degree that, based on my track count results, it is no longer suitable as winter range. In essence, this has reduced the available winter range in this area by almost 50% and forced the white-tails to winter elsewhere. This might explain the present range conditions in areas such as the Lion Creek Canyon.

The apparent preferences of white-tails for valley bottoms, particularly along streams, pose serious problems in their management, since almost all of this habitat is privately owned and much of it is grazed by cattle. Furthermore, white-tails prefer cover to food and will use heavy cover in spite of insufficient forage (Carter 1951, Pengelly 1961, and Webb 1948). Carter (1951) also stated that snow depth was a primary factor in limiting winter range use by white-tails and was second only to cover.

Therefore, it seems safe to say that the status of the Swan Valley white-tailed deer will depend primarily on the land use practices on mostly private land adjoining the Swan River and to a lesser extent Lion Creek. Logging on these areas at a rate equal to or faster than that at which natural succession will provide new winter ranges will add to the already severely reduced carrying capacity of the winter range.

#### Chapter 8

# SUMMARY

During the winter of 1969-70 an ecologic study of white-tailed deer was conducted in the Swan Valley of western Montana. The objectives were to analyze food habits, reproduction, physical condition, and factors affecting habitat preferences and distribution. Comparison of the 1969-70 winter weather data with a 10-year average revealed that the winter was milder than normal with above average temperatures and below average snowfall.

Food habits were studied by the analyses of deer rumens. Rumen analyses indicated that the two most important species of plants in the diet of white-tailed deer were Oregon grape and Douglas-fir. Nonconifer browse was the most important type of food followed by conifer browse. Total browse constituted over 60% of rumen contents. In spring forbs were the major type of food utilized by deer. The utilization of grasses in spring also increased considerably.

Browse utilization studies were conducted to compare browsing levels in logged and unlogged areas. The utilization of serviceberry was found to be much higher in the undistrubed than in the disturbed areas.

Reproductive rates were calculated from fetal counts and were lower than any reported from other white-tailed deer herds. Not a single female fawn examined was pregnant.

Physical condition of deer collected from January through May

was similar to the conditions found in other Montana herds. The number of deer harvested annually has varied tremendously; however, the percentage of deer in the 4 1/2+ age class has been reduced since the 1950's. Deer weights were similar to those of other Montana white-tailed deer, but fawns were considerably lighter than those of other states.

Habitat preferences were investigated by conducting track count transects throughout the winter range. The distribution of track counts by habitat type differed significantly, and was considered to reflect a comparably greater use of uncut areas during the winter. The major conclusions of the study are:

- Reproductive rates, condition indices, and browse surveys indicate that the present winter range is overpopulated.
- (2) White-tailed deer prefer the mature timber habitat type and avoid clearcut areas during the winter. The net result of cutting to date is a reduction in winter range equal to the amount of cutting conducted on what formerly constituted the winter range.
- (3) The white-tailed deer, in migrating to their winter range move to an area of greater snowfall.

LITERATURE CITED

.

.

.

•

.
- Adams, L. 1949. The effect of deer on conifer reproduction in northwestern Montana. J. Forestry 47(11):909-913.
- Allen, O. A. 1965. Food and range use habits of white-tail deer on Missouri River bottomlands in northcentral Montana. M. S. Thesis. Montana State Univ., Bozeman. 41 pp.
- Banasiak, C. F. 1961. Deer in Maine. Maine Game Div. Bull. 6. 159 pp.
- Deall, M. in Krefting, L. W. 1962. Use of silvicultural techniques for improving deer habitat in the Lake States. J. Forestry. 60(1): 40-42.
- Behrend, D. F., and J. W. Witter. 1968. <u>Pneumostrengylus tenuis</u> in white-tailed deer in Maine. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 32(4):963-966.
- Bergeson, W. R. 1943. Swan River deer study. (unpubl.) Montana Fish and Game Dept., Helena. Quart. report. 5 pp. mimeo.
- Berndt, H. W. 1965. Snow accumulation and disappearance in lodgepole pine clearcut blocks in Wyoming. J. Forestry 63(2):88-91.
- Carter, R. L. 1951. An environmental analysis of winter game range in western Montana. M. S. Thesis, Montana State Univa., Missoula, 88 pp.
- Casebeer, R., and M. Rognrud. 1949. A browse utilization study of big game winter range within the Flathead National Forest of the continental management unit. (unpubl.) Montana Fish and Game Dept., Helena, Quart. report. 37 pp. mimeo.
- Cheatum, E. L. 1949. Bone marrow as an index of malnutrition in deer. New York State Conserv. 3(5):19-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and G. H. Morton. 1946. Breeding season of white-tailed deer in New York. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 10(3):249-263.
- , and C. W. Severinghaus, 1950. Variations in fertility of white-tailed deer related to range conditions. Trans. 15th N. Am. Wildl, Conf. p. 170-190.
- Cole, G. F. 1958. Range survey guide. Montana Dept. Fish and Game, Helena. 22 pp.

- Cooperrider, A. Y. 1969. The biology and management of the bighorn' sheep of Rock Creek, Montana. M. S. Thesis. Univ. Montana, Missoula. 93 pp.
- Dasmann, W. P. 1948. A critical review of range survey methods and their application to deer range management. California Fish and Game 34(4):189-207.

- Deiss, C. 1958. Geology of the Bob Marshall Wilderness. pp. 8-19. In Guide to the Bob Marshall Wilderness, U. S. Forest Service, Missoula, Montana. 36 pp.
- Dixon, J. S. 1934. A study of the life history and food habits of mule deer in California. California Fish and Game 20(3-4):181-282 and 315-354.
- Erickson, A. B., V. E. Gunvalson, M. H. Stenlund, D. W. Burcalow, and L. H. Blankenship. 1961. The white-tailed deer of Minnesota. Tech. Bull. 5. Minnesota Dept. Cons. 64 pp.
- Greer, K. R. 1968. A compression method indicates fat content of elk (Wapiti) femur marrows. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 32(4) 747-751.
- \_\_\_\_, 1969. Femur marrow reveals the condition of game animals. Montana Fish and Game Dept., Helena. Game Research Sect. 7 pp.
- Harris, D. 1945. Symptoms of malnutrition in deer. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 9(4):319-322.
- Hawkins, R. E. and W. D. Klimstra. 1970. A preliminary study of the social organization of white-tailed deer. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 34(2):407-419.
- Hill, R. R. 1956. Forage, food habits, and range management of the mule deer. Pp. 393-414. W. P. Taylor (Editor), The Deer of North America. Stackpole Co., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and Wildl. Mgmt. Inst., Washington, D. C. 668 pp.
- Hosley, N. W. 1956. Management of the white-tailed deer in its environment Pp. 187-259. W. P. Taylor (Editor, The Deer of North America: Stackpole Co., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and Wildl. Mgmt. Inst., Washington, D. C. 668 pp.
- Knoche, K. G. 1968. The ecology of the Rattlesnake Creek, Montana mule deer winter range. M. S. Thesis. Univ. Montana, Missoula. 152 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1951. Some deer range survey methods. California Fish and Game 37(1):43-52.

- Krefting, L. W. 1962. Use of silvicultural techniques for improving deer habitat in the Lake States. J. Forestry 60(1):40-42.
- Krull, J. N. 1964. Deer use of a commercial clear-cut area. New York Fish and Game Jour. 11(2):115-118.
- Lay, D. W. and W. P. Taylor. 1943. Wildlife aspects of cutover pine wood land in eastern Texas. J. Forestry 41(6):446-448.
- Leopold, A. S., T. Riney, R. McCain and L. Tevis, Jr. 1951. The Jawbone deer herd. California Div. Fish and Game, Game Bull. 4. 139 pp.
- Lyon, J. L. 1970. Length and weight-diameter relations of serviceberry twigs. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 34(2):456-460.
- Mackie, R. J. 1964. Montana deer weights. Montana Wildl. Winter: 9-14
- Montana Fish and Game Depart. Annual Reports. 1942-1969.
- Morton, G. H., and E. L. Cheatum. 1946. Regional differences in breeding potential of white-tailed deer in New York. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 10(3): 242-248.
- Morton, J. N., and J. B. Sedam. 1938. Cutting operations to improve wildlife environment on forest areas. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 2(4):206-214.
- Nellis, C. H. 1964. The mule deer of the National Bison Range: population dynamics, food habits, and physical condition. M. S. Thesis. Montana State Univ., Missoula. 146 pp.
- Norris, J. J. 1943. Botanical analyses of stomach contents as a method of determining forage consumption of range sheep. Ecology 24:244-251.
- Olsen, O. 1938. Winter range as a limiting factor in big game management. Univ. Idaho Bull. 33(22):20-22.
- Pengelly, W. L. 1961. Factors influencing production of white-tailed deer on the Coeur d'Alene National Forest, Idaho. U. S. Forest Serv., Northern Region, Missoula, Montana. 190 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1963. Deer and timberlands in the northern Rockies. J. Forestry 6(10):734-740.
- Ranson, A. B. 1964. Deer Reproduction in Manitoba. M. S. Thesis. Univ. Alberta, Edmonton. 75 pp.

Ransom, A. B. 1965. Kidney and marrow fat as indicators of whitetailed deer condition. J. Wildl: Mgmt. 29(2):397-398.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1967. Reproductive biology of white-tailed deer in Manitoba. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 31(1):114-123.

- Reynolds, H. G. 1962a. Effect of logging on understory vegetation and deer use in a ponderosa pine forest of Arizona, U. S. Forest Serv., Rocky Mtn. Forest and Range Expt. Sta., Fort Collins, Colorado, No. 80. 7 pp.
- , 1962a. Use of natural openings in a ponderosa pine forest of Arizona by deer, elk, and cattle, U. S. Forest Serv., Rocky Mtn. Forest and Range Expt. Sta., Fort Collins, Colorado, No. 78. 4 pp.
- Riney, T., 1955. Evaluation conditon of free-ranging red deer (<u>Cervus</u> <u>elophus</u>), with special reference to New Zealand. New Zealand Jour. Sci Techol. 36(5):429-463.
- Rognrud, M. 1949. A study of big game in the continental and adjacent units. (unpubl. rep.). Montana Fish and Game Dept. 188 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1955. Western Montana big game surveys. (unpubl.), Montana Fish and Game Dept., Helena, annual report:90-107.
- Roseberry, J. L., and W. D. Klimstra. 1970. Productivity of whitetailed deer on Crab Orchard Wildlife Refuge. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 34(1):23-28.
- Ryel, L. A., L. D. Fay. 1961. Deer biological data 1960-61. Michigan Dept. Conserv. Report 2344. 25 pp.
- Severinghaus, C. W. 1949a. Tooth development and wear as criteria of age in white-tailed deer. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 13(2):195-216.
  - \_\_\_\_\_, 1949b. The live weight-dressed weight and live weightedible meat relationships (in deer). New York State Conserv. 4(2):26.

, and E. L. Cheatum. 1956. Life and times of the whitetailed deer. Pp. 56-186. W. P. Taylor (editor), The Deer of North America. Stackpole Co., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and Wildl. Mgmt. Inst., Washington, D. C. 668 pp.

Shaw, S. P., and C. L. McLaughlin. 1951. The management of white-tailed deer in Massachusetts. Massachusetts Div. Fisheries and Game Res. Bull. 13. 59 pp.

١

- Stickney, P. F. 1966. Browse utilization based on percentage of twig numbers browsed. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 30(1):204-206.
- Swift, E. 1953. Modification of forest practices in the Lake States for wildlife habitat betterment. J. Forestry 51(6):440-443.
- Taber, R. D., and R. F. Dasmann, 1958. The black-tailed deer of the chaparral/its life history and management in the North Coast Range of California. California Dept. Fish and Game, Game Bull. No. 8 163 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and M. T. Rognrud. 1959. On the use of antler development and kill-structure in the management of migratory big game. School of For. Mont. State Univ., Missoula. 7 pp. minio.
- , K. L. White, and N. S. Smith. 1959. The annual cycle of condition in the Rattlesnake, Montana mule deer. Proc. Montana Acad. Sci. 19:72-79.
- Taylor, W. P. 1956. (Editor). The Deer of North America. Stackpole Co., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and Wildl. Mgmt. Inst., Washington, D. C. 668 pp.
- Telfer, E. S. 1969. Twig weight-diameter relationships for browse species. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 33(4):917-921.
- U. S. Climatalogical Bulletins, U. S. Weather Bureau, Helena, Montana 1959-1970.
- Verme, L. J. 1965. Reproduction studies on penned white-tailed deer. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 29(1):74-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1969. Reproductive patterns of white-tailed deer related to nutritional plane. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 33(4):881-887.
- Webb, W. L. 1948. Environmental analysis of a winter deer range. Trans. 13th N. Am. Wildl. Conf. p.442-450.
- Westell, C. E., Jr. 1954. Available browse following aspen logging in lower Michigan. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 18(2):266-271.

IX

.

.

#### APPENDIX

.

.

.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

•.

Figure 1. Map of study area showing location of weather station, snow stations, and track-count transect lines.

•

٠

.

.



Figure 2. Twig length-diameter relationships for serviceberry. (dotted lines indicate 95% confidence limits).

•

.

•

•

•



Figure 3. Twig length-diameter relationships for mountain maple. (dotted lines indicate 95% confidence limits).

۰.

.

۹

-

.

1

.

,



Figure 4. Scatter diagram of percentage femur fat plotted against kidney fat indices of 25 white-tailed deer.

.

•

. •

.

•

.

.

• ·

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.



Percentage femur fot

Figure 5. Map of study area showing mid-winter distribution of whitetailed deer.

,



| Month    | Transect # | Paced<br>Distan | # Tracks per<br>Mature<br>nce Timber | 100 Faces<br>Immature<br>Timber | Grassland | Stream<br>Bottom | Clear<br>Cuts | Partial<br>Cuts |
|----------|------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| January  | 10         | 643             | 3.3(418)                             |                                 |           | 1.9(53)          | 2.9(.72)      |                 |
| February | r 1        | 271             | 0(88)                                | 0(183)                          | bay Bar   |                  |               |                 |
|          | 2          | 342             | 4.7(191)                             |                                 |           | 0.0(151)         | <b>-</b> -    |                 |
|          | 3          | 179             | 8.9(56)                              |                                 |           |                  | 0.0(123)      |                 |
|          | 4          | 366             | 0(140)                               |                                 |           | 0.0(34)          |               | 0(192)          |
|          | 5          | 367             | 0(150)                               |                                 |           | 0.0(217)         |               |                 |
|          | 6          | 1856            | 11.9(1035)                           | ana sias                        | 0.0(425)  | 2.7(300)         | 2.4(41)       | 1.8(55)         |
|          | 7          | 2120            | 2.4 (595)                            | 1.3(381)                        | 0.4(236)  | 0.0(261)         | 0.0(163)      | 0.2(484)        |
|          | 9          | 270             | 0(39)                                |                                 |           | 0.0(231)         |               |                 |
|          | 12         | 718             | 9.0(522)                             |                                 |           |                  |               | 15.8(196)       |
|          | 14         | 333             | 19.8(333)                            |                                 |           |                  |               |                 |
|          | 16         | 386             | 5.2(213)                             |                                 |           | <b></b>          | 0.6(173)      |                 |
|          | 17         | 472             | 25.3(170)                            |                                 |           | 5.6(178)         |               | 14.5(124)       |
|          | 18         | 680             | 6.3(320)                             | 0(35)                           | ÷ -       | 24.5(49)         | 3.5(200)      | 0.0(76)         |
|          | 19         | 726             | 13.1(183)                            |                                 |           | 11.3(337)        |               | 20.4(206)       |
|          | 21         | 774             | 16.4(609)                            | - <b>-</b>                      | 0.0(55)   |                  |               | 0.0(110)        |
|          | 22         | 213             | 20.2(213)                            |                                 |           |                  |               |                 |
|          | 23         | 1794            | 0.3(678)                             |                                 | ~ -       | 0.0(402)         |               | 0.0(714)        |
|          | 24         | 2483            | .04 (1977)                           | 0.0(29)                         | 0.0(160)  |                  | 0.0(90)       | 0.0(227)        |
| March    | 8          | 1305            | 2.4(255)                             |                                 | 0.0(160)  | 1.2(169)         | .7(271)       | .4(450)         |
|          | 11         | 570             | 0.0(488)                             |                                 | -         |                  | 0.0(82)       |                 |
|          | 13         | 1727            | 3.9(956)                             |                                 |           | 3.4(298)         | 0.0(364)      | 0.0(109)        |
|          | 15         | 1196            | 9.0(721)                             |                                 |           |                  | 0.0(475)      |                 |
|          | 20         | 1100            | 0.3(760)                             |                                 | 1.1(176)  | <b>a a</b>       |               | 0.0(164)        |

# Table 21. Track Counts by Cover Types, 1970

.

.

.

٠

| Month    | Transect # | #<br>Paced<br>Distance | Trails Per<br>Mature<br>Timber | 100 Pace<br>Immature<br>Timber | s<br>Grassland | Stream<br>Bottom | Clear<br>Cuts | Partial<br>Cuts |
|----------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| January  | 10         | 643                    | 1.00(418)                      |                                |                | 1.9(53)          | 2.3(172)      | **              |
| February | y 1        | 271                    | 0(88)                          | 0(183)                         |                |                  |               |                 |
|          | 2          | 342                    | 3.1 (191)                      |                                |                | 0.0(151)         |               |                 |
|          | 3          | 179                    | 8.9(56)                        |                                |                |                  | 0.0(123)      | ****            |
|          | 4          | 366                    | 0.0(140)                       |                                |                | 0.0(34)          |               | 0.0(192)        |
|          | 5          | 367                    | 0.0(150)                       |                                |                | 0.0(217)         |               |                 |
|          | 6          | 1856                   | 1.6(1035)                      |                                | 0.0(425)       | 0.3(300)         | 0.0(41)       | 1.8(55)         |
|          | 7          | 2120                   | 0.7(595)                       | 0.3(381)                       | 0.0(236)       | 0.4(261)         | 0.0(163)      | 0.0(484)        |
|          | 9          | 270                    | 0.0(39)                        |                                |                | 0.0(231)         |               |                 |
|          | 12         | 718                    | 2,9(522)                       |                                |                |                  |               | 0.5(196)        |
|          | 14 '       | 333                    | 3.0(333)                       |                                |                |                  |               |                 |
|          | 16         | 386                    | 1.4(213)                       |                                |                |                  | 0.0(173)      |                 |
|          | 17         | 472                    | 2.9(170)                       |                                |                | 0.0(178)         |               | 0.0(124)        |
|          | 18         | 680                    | 0.6(320)                       | 0.0(35)                        | ·              | 2.0(49)          | 0.0(200)      | 0.0(76)         |
|          | 19         | 726                    | 3.8(183)                       |                                |                | 0.9(337)         |               | 1.5(206)        |
|          | 21         | 774                    | 3.0(609)                       |                                | 1.8(55)        |                  |               | 0.9(110)        |
|          | 22         | 213                    | 6.1(213)                       |                                |                |                  |               |                 |
|          | 23         | 1794                   | 0.1(678)                       |                                |                | 0.0(402)         |               | 0.0(714)        |
|          | 24         | 2483                   | 0.0(1977)                      | 0.0(29)                        | 0.0(160)       |                  | 0.0(90)       | 0.0(227)        |
| March    | 8          | 1305                   | 0.4(255)                       |                                | 0.0(160)       | 0.0(169)         | 0.0(271)      | 0.0(450)        |
|          | 11         | <b>57</b> 0            | 0.6(488)                       |                                |                |                  | 0.0(82)       |                 |
|          | 13         | 1727                   | 0.9(956)                       |                                |                | 0.7(298)         | 1.1(364)      | 0.0(109)        |
|          | 15         | 1196                   | 0.3(721)                       |                                |                |                  | 0.0(475)      |                 |
|          | 20         | 1100                   | 0.1(760)                       |                                | 0.0(176)       |                  |               | 0.0(164)        |

### Table 22. Trail Counts by Cover Types, 1970.

•

> 1

•

•

÷

.

| Table | 23.  | Food | Habits    | During | January | 1970 |
|-------|------|------|-----------|--------|---------|------|
|       | . v. | 1004 | TIGO T CO | During | oundary | 1210 |

•

| Compound                    |      |             |      |              |        |      |            |      |           |
|-----------------------------|------|-------------|------|--------------|--------|------|------------|------|-----------|
| Species                     | 1000 | 1001        |      |              | Number | 1005 | 1000       | 1007 | V         |
| opeeres                     | 1000 | 1001        | 1002 | 1005         | 1004   | 1005 | 1006       | 1007 | λ         |
| Jucom                       | 2    | tr          | 5    | 41           | 6      | 1    | _          | _    | 6 9       |
| Picon                       | -    | -           | 2    | -            | -      | -    | 63         | 1    | 83        |
| Pipon                       | 2    | · •••       | -    | tr           | -      | _    | -          | -    | 2 5       |
| Psme                        | 1    | 1           | -    | -            | 1      | tr   | Δ          | 14   | 2.6       |
| Thp1                        | tr   | -           | _    | -            | -      | -    | -          | -    | 2.0<br>tr |
|                             |      |             |      |              |        |      |            |      |           |
| Conifer Total               | 5    | 1           | 7    | 41           | 7      | 1    | 67         | 15   | 18.00     |
| Acgl                        | 5    | -           | 1    | -            | 2      | -    | -          | -    | 1.0       |
| Amal                        | 3    | 7           | 1    | 2            | -      | tr   | -          | 1    | 1.8       |
| Aruv                        | tr   | 3           | 1    | 17           | 2      | -    | -          | -    | 2.9       |
| Bere                        | 69   | 83          | 62   | 3            | 66     | 27   | 1          | -    | 38.9      |
| Beoc                        | -    | -           | 4    | -            | -      | -    | · <b>–</b> | -    | .5        |
| Ceve                        | -    | -           | -    | 35           | -      | 51   | 1          |      | 10.9      |
| Cost                        | -    | <del></del> | -    |              |        | -    | -          | 8    | 1.0       |
| Liho                        | -    | -           | tr   | -            | -      | -    | -          | -    | tr        |
| Losp                        | -    | -           | 3    |              | -      | -    | -          | -    | .4        |
| Rosp                        | tr   | -           | -    | <del>~</del> | -      | -    | -          | 2    | .3        |
| Sasp                        | -    | -           | 2    |              | -      | tr   | -          | -    | .3        |
| Sysp                        | -    | -           | -    | -            | -      | 2    | -          | tr   | .3        |
| Unid. Browse                | 12   | 4           | -    | -            | 11     | 8    | 30         | 74   | 18.6      |
| Total Browse                | 89   | 97          | 84   | 57           | 81     | 88   | 32         | 85   | 76.62     |
| Cesp                        | -    | -           | -    | -            | -      | 4    | -          | -    | .5        |
| Unid forbs                  | 5    | 2           | 3    | 1            | 12     | 7    | 1          | -    | 3.9       |
| Total Forbs                 | 5    | 2           | 3    | 1            | 12     | 11   | 1          | -    | 4.4       |
| Grass & Grasslike<br>Plants | -    | tr          | 6    | 1            | tr     | -    | _          | -    | .8        |
| Other Lichen                | 1    | -           | -    | -            | -      | -    | -          | -    | .1        |

.

| Component      |      |      |    |    | Colle | ction Nu | umber |      |      |      |            |
|----------------|------|------|----|----|-------|----------|-------|------|------|------|------------|
| Species        | 21   | 28   | 31 | 35 | 36    | 1008     | 1009  | 1010 | 1011 | 1012 | <u>x</u>   |
| Abar           |      | -    | _  | -  | _     | 33       | _     | _    | _    | _    | <b>z</b> z |
| Laoc           | -    | _    | _  | _  | _     | -        | 3     | -    | _    | _    | 3          |
| Pico           | -    | 40   | _  | -  | 66    | **       | tr    | 2    | _    | -    | 10.8       |
| Pino           | -    | -    | -  | 25 | -     |          | -     | -    | -    | 28   | 5:3        |
| Psme           | 51   | 34   | 13 | 32 | 17    | 5        | 17    | 62   | 18   | -    | 24.9       |
| Unid. Conifer  | -    | -    | -  | -  | -     | 41       | -     | -    | -    | -    | 4.1        |
| Total Conifer  | 51   | 74   | 13 | 57 | 83    | 79       | 20    | 64   | 18   | 28   | 48.7       |
| Acg1           | -    | -    | _  | -  | -     | -        | 12    | _    | _    | -    | 1.2        |
| Alte           | 5    | -    | 1  | -  | -     | -        | -     | -    | -    | -    | .6         |
| Ama1           | -    | -    | -  |    | 3     | 2        | 6     | 3    | -    | -    | 1.4        |
| Bere           | -    |      | 2  | -  | -     | -        | -     | -    | -    | -    | .2         |
| Cost           | -    | 1    | 1  | -  | -     | 6        | -     | 4    | -    | -    | 1.2        |
| Posp           | -    | -    | 5  | -  | -     | -        |       | -    | -    | -    | .5         |
| Vasp           |      | -    | -  | -  | tr    | -        | -     | -    | -    | -    | ~          |
| Unid. browse   | 37   | 16   | 52 | 37 | 13    | 12       | 41    | 29   | 36   | 60   | 33.3       |
| Total Browse   | 42   | · 17 | 61 | 37 | 16    | 20       | 59    | 36   | 36   | 60   | 38.4       |
| Ptao           | z    | _    | -  | _  |       | -        | _     | _    | _    | _    | 0.3        |
| Fragariasn     | -    | -    | -  | -  | -     | -        | -     | -    | -    | tr   | tr         |
| Unident. forb  | 3    | 2    | 3  | 2  | -     | -        | -     | -    | 12   | 4    | 2.6        |
| Total Forb     | 6    | 2    | 3  | 2  | -     | -        | -     | -    | 12   | 4    | 2.9        |
| Grass & Grass1 | ike  |      |    |    |       |          |       |      |      |      |            |
| Plants         | 1    | 7    | 23 | 4  | 1     | -        | -     | tr   | 34   | 8    | 7.8        |
| Other Lichen   | tr . | -    | tr | -  | -     | 1        | 21    | tr   | ~    | -    | 2.2        |

| Table | 24. | Food | Habits | during | February | 1970 |
|-------|-----|------|--------|--------|----------|------|
|-------|-----|------|--------|--------|----------|------|

,

,

| Component        |     |      | ollection | Number |      |      |   |
|------------------|-----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|---|
| Species          | 41  | 1013 | 1014      | 1015   | 1016 | X    |   |
| Laoc             | -   | -    | _         | -      | 3    | .6   |   |
| Pico             | -   | -    | -         | -      | tr   | tr   |   |
| Pipo             | 36  | 6    | 4         | tr     | -    | 9.2  |   |
| Psme             | 5   | 3    | -         | 4      | 18   | 6.0  |   |
| Thpl             | -   | -    | -         | 2      | -    | .4   |   |
| Unident. Conifer | 20  | -    | -         | -      | -    | 4.0  | • |
| Total Conifer    | 61  | 9    | 4         | 6      | 21   | 20.2 |   |
| Acgl             | -   | 3    | _         | 1      | · _  | .8   |   |
| Amal             | -   | 1    | -         | 5      | -    | 1.2  |   |
| Aruv             | 11  | -    | -         | -      | 7    | 3.6  |   |
| Bere             | 8   | -    | 1         | 2      | 33   | 8.8  |   |
| Libo             | -   | 1    | -         |        | -    | .2   |   |
| Posp             | 1   | -    | -         | -      | -    | .2   |   |
| Rosp             | -   | -    | 2         | 2      | -    | .8   |   |
| Shca             | tr  | 10   |           | -      | -    | 2.0  |   |
| Sysp             | -   | -    | tr        | 1      | -    | .2   |   |
| Unident. browse  | . 9 | 43   | 54        | 53     | 9    | 33.6 |   |
| Total Browse     | 29  | 58   | 57        | 64     | 49   | 51.4 |   |
| Fren             | _   | _    | _         | 1      | _    | 2    |   |
| Unident. forbs   | -   | 21   | 19        | 18     | 5    | 12.6 |   |
| Total forbs      | -   | 21   | 19        | 19     | 5    | 12.8 |   |
| Grass & Grass-   |     |      |           |        |      |      |   |
| like Plants      | 2   | 12   | 20        | 11     | 25   | 13.8 |   |
| Other Lichen     | . 8 | -    | -         | -      | -    | 1.6  |   |
|                  |     |      |           |        |      |      |   |

Table 25. Food Habits During March 1970

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1

| Component                              |              | Coli              | lection          | Number            |                        |                  |                               |  |
|--|--------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Species                                | 68           | 1017              | 1018             | 1019              | 1020                   | 1021             | X                             |  |
| Psme<br>Unident conifer                | 2<br>-       | 58<br>-           | -<br>9           | 20                | 1<br>-                 | -<br>-           | 13.5<br>1.5                   |  |
| Total conifer                          | 2            | 58                | 9                | 20                | 1                      | -                | 15.0                          |  |
| Amal<br>Aruv<br>Bere                   | -<br>1<br>91 | -<br>-<br>-       | -<br>1<br>77     | 1<br>-<br>2       | 94                     | -<br>52          | .2<br>.3<br>52.7              |  |
| Cost<br>Libo<br>Pamy<br>Unident browse | -<br>-<br>-  | -<br>5<br>-<br>24 | -<br>2<br>1<br>6 | -<br>-<br>-<br>34 | tr<br>-<br>1<br>2<br>1 | -<br>5<br>1<br>- | tr<br>.8<br>1.3<br>.7<br>10.8 |  |
| Total browse                           | 92           | 29                | 87               | 37                | 98                     | 58               | 66.8                          |  |
| Frsp<br>Unident forbs                  | tr<br>6      | -<br>3            | 1<br>-           | <br>11            | -<br>1                 | 20<br>13         | 3.5<br>5.7                    |  |
| Total forbs                            | 6            | 3                 | 1                | 11                | 1                      | 33               | 9.2                           |  |
| Grass-like plants                      | tr           | 10                | 3                | 32                | tr                     | 9                | 9.0                           |  |
| Other Lichen                           | -            | -                 | -                | -                 | tr                     | -                | -                             |  |

Table 26. Food Habits During April 1970

.

.

•

| Component              |      | Collection | Number |      | <u></u>  |  |
|------------------------|------|------------|--------|------|----------|--|
| Species                | 1022 | 1023       | 1024   | 1025 | <u> </u> |  |
| Psme                   | tr   | 2          | -      | -    | .5       |  |
| Total conifer          | tr   | 2          | -      | -    | .5       |  |
| Bere                   | -    | 1          | 2      | -    | .8       |  |
| Sysp                   | -    | 18         | 9      | 13   | 10.0     |  |
| vasp<br>Unident browse | -    | ~          | -<br>5 | 4 -  | 1.0      |  |
| Total Browse           | -    | 19         | 16     | 17   | 13.0     |  |
| Ergr                   | 80   | 2          | 2      | -    | 21.0     |  |
| Frsp                   | 11   | 13         | 15     | 4    | 10.8     |  |
| Lusp                   | 5    | 7          | 2      | -    | 3.5      |  |
| Thve                   | 1    | -          | -      | -    | .3       |  |
| Unident forb           | -    | 55         | 53     | 71   | 44.8     |  |
| Total forbs            | 97   | 77         | 72     | 75   | 80.3     |  |
| Grasslike plants       | 3    | 1          | 12     | 8    | 6.0      |  |
| Other (lichen)         | -    | 1          | -      | -    | .3       |  |
|                        |      |            |        |      |          |  |

Table 27. Food Habits During May 1970

•

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

.

.

ı.

#### Table 28. Counts and weights of fetuses from female white-tailed deer collected in the Swan Valley

.

.

| Number                                 | Age             | Date    |     | Fetus | es  |      |         | We      | ights (gr | oss)    |
|--|-----------------|---------|-----|-------|-----|------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|
|  | of              |         | Rig | ght   | Lef | ťt   | Unknown | Right   | Left      | Unknown |
| •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | Doe             |         | No. | Sex   | No. | Sex  |         |         |           |         |
| 1000                                   | 1 1/2           | 1 ( 20  |     |       | -   |      |         |         | N 1 4 .   |         |
| 1000                                   | 1 1/2           | 1-6-70  | T   | N.D   | 1   | N.D. |         | No data | No data   |         |
| 1001                                   | 3 1/2           | 1-6-70  | 1   | N.D.  | 1   | N.D. |         | No data | No data   |         |
| 1006                                   | 4 1/2           | 1-29-70 | 1   | F     | 1   | F    |         | 61.8    | 56.6      |         |
| 1010                                   | 4 1/2           | 2-12-70 | 1   | М     | 1   | F    |         | 156.0   | 135.0     |         |
| 1011                                   | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2-20-70 | 1   | F     | 0   | N.D. |         | 223.0   | N.D.      |         |
| 1012                                   | 6 1/2+          | 2-26-70 | 1   | М     | 1   | F    |         | 208.2   | 187.7     |         |
| 1013                                   | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3-5-70  | 0   | N.D.  | 1   | F    |         | N.D.    | 226.7     |         |
| 1015                                   | 4 1/2           | 3-12-70 | 1   | М     | 1   | М    |         | 420.5   | 432.8     |         |
| <b>10</b> 16                           | 4 1/2           | 3-24-70 | 1   | F     | 1   | М    |         | 605.6   | 636.0     |         |
| 1017                                   | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4-2-70  | 1   | F     | 0   | N.D. |         | 493.3   | N.D.      |         |
| 1019                                   | 31/2            | 4-15-70 | 1   | М     | 1   | М    |         | 1009.0  | 932.0     |         |
| 1020                                   | 6 1/2+          | 4-22-70 |     |       |     |      | 1       |         |           | N.D.    |
| 1021                                   | 2 1/2           | 4-29-70 |     |       |     |      | 1       |         |           | N.D.    |
| 1024                                   | 3 1/2           |         |     |       |     |      | 2       |         |           | 1994    |
|  |                 |         |     |       |     |      |         |         |           | 1909    |
|  |                 |         |     |       |     |      |         |         |           |         |

1/ No data

.

.

| Table 29. | Weights, | measurement | Ę | condition | indexes | from | Swan | Valle | y white-tailed | deer. |
|-----------|----------|-------------|---|-----------|---------|------|------|-------|----------------|-------|
|-----------|----------|-------------|---|-----------|---------|------|------|-------|----------------|-------|

| No.   | Sex    |        | Age             | Whole<br>Weight | Dressed<br>Weight | Heart<br>Girth | Height of<br>Shoulder | Body<br>Length | llind Foot<br>Length | Tail<br>Length | Liver<br>Wt. | Spleen<br>Wt. |
|-------|--------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Janua | ry 1   | 970    | 0               |                 |                   |                |                       | (1)            |                      |                |              |               |
| 1000  | F<br>F | 1<br>3 | $\frac{1}{2}$   | 120<br>127      | 88<br>95          | -<br>37.4      | 36.2                  | 56.7           | 18.1<br>18.1         | 10.0           | 720          | 110           |
| 1002  | M      | Ť      | 1/2             | 83              | 55                | 29.9           | 34.8                  | 48.0           | 17.1                 | 9.8            | 545          | 95            |
| 1003  | М      | 4      | 1/2             | 185             | 134               | 40.1           | -                     | 59.4           | 19.7                 | 13.0           | 1445         | 215           |
| 1004  | F      |        | 1/2             | 72              | 52                | 29.5           | 34.8                  | 47.3           | 17.1                 | 11.4           | 520          | 70            |
| 1005  | М      | 4      | 1/2             | 195             | 135               | 42.3           | 40.1                  | 57.7           | 20.1                 | 13.0           | 1500         | 185           |
| 1006  | F      | 4      | 1/2             | 108             | 78                | 34.6           | 35.4                  | 60.6           | 17.3                 | 10.6           | 810          | 200           |
| 1007  | М      | 2      | 1/2             | 140             | 102               | 38.4           | 38.2                  | 56.7           | 19.7                 | 12.6           | 1015         | 185           |
| Febru | ary    | 19'    | 70              |                 |                   |                |                       |                |                      |                |              |               |
| 1008  | М      | 5      | 1/2             | 152             | 110               | 38.0           | 40.9                  | 59.6           | 19.3                 | 11.6           | 1210         | 178           |
| 1009  | M      | 1      | 1/2             | 159             | 117               | 40.6           | 41.7                  | 64.6           | 19.5                 | 11.8           | 1175         | 202           |
| 1010  | F      | 4      | 1/2             | 130             | 95                | 35.8           | -                     | 61.4           | 19.1                 | 10.6           | -            | 120           |
| 1011  | F      | 1      | 1/2             | 115             | 72                | 38.8           | 37.2                  | 52.0           | 18.7                 | 11.6           | 525          | 130           |
| 1012  | F      | 6      | 1/2+            | 120             | 75                | 36.8           | 38.6                  | 53.1           | 18.5                 | 10.6           | 715          | 105           |
| 21    | F      |        | 1/2             | -               | -                 | -              | -                     | -              | -                    | -              | -            | -             |
| 28    | M      | _      | 1/2             | -               | -                 | -              | -                     | -              | -                    | -              | -            | -             |
| 31    | F      | 2      | 1/2             | **              | -                 | -              | -                     | -              | -                    | -              | 665          | 160           |
| 35    | М      |        | 1/2             | 72              | 52                | 30.3           | 35.4                  | 47.8           | 18.1                 | 10.6           | 340          | 95            |
| March | ı 197  | 0      |                 |                 |                   |                |                       |                |                      |                |              |               |
| 1013  | F      | 1      | 1/2             | 85              | 60                | 31.7           | 36.6                  | 55.1           | 18.1                 | 11.0           |              | 350           |
| 1014  | F      | -      | $\frac{1}{1/2}$ | 58              | 40                | 28.5           | 31.3                  | 40.9           | 16.1                 | 9.8            | 380          | 70            |
| 1015  | F      | 4      | 1/2             | 100             | 70                | 34.1           | 38.2                  | 53.0           | 18.5                 | 10.8           | 595          | 135           |
| 1016  | F      | 4      | 1/2             | 105             | 75                | 36 2           | 37.6                  | 53.1           | 17.9                 | 11.0           | 661          | 134           |
| 37    | -<br>- | -1     | 1/2             | 105             | -                 | 23 2           | 28.7                  | 39.4           | 15.0                 | 7.9            | -            | -             |
| 38    | F      | 3      | 1/2             | 85              | -                 | 30.7           | 33.5                  | 47.4           | 17.3                 | 12.2           | -            | -             |
| Apri1 | . 197  | 0      |                 |                 |                   |                |                       |                |                      |                |              |               |
| 1017  | F      | 1      | 1/2             | 93              | 68                | 33.7           | 37.6                  | 55.5           | 19.5                 | 11.0           | 560          | 120           |
| 1018  | F      | 4      | 1/2             | 110             | 80                | 35.6           | 40.2                  | 64.2           | 19.3                 | 12.2           | 765          | 125           |
| 1019  | F      | 3      | 1/2             | 105             | 72                | 34.1           | 39.0                  | 55.7           | 18.9                 | 12.2           | 665          | 180           |
| 1020  | F      | 6      | 1/2+            | 105             | 70                | 32.3           | 37.0                  | 60.4           | 18.5                 | 10.2           | 690          | 110           |
| 1021  | F      | 2      | $\frac{1}{2}$   | 93              | 65                | 32.7           | 38.0                  | 51.8           | 18.3                 | 10.6           | 565          | 140           |
| 68    | F      | 2      | 1/2             | . –             |                   | 33.9           | 36.4                  | 54.7           | 17.7                 | -              | 545          | 140           |
| May 1 | 970    |        |                 |                 |                   |                |                       |                |                      |                |              |               |
| 1022  | F      |        | 1/2             | 52              | 38                | 27 8           | 32 1                  | 46.1           | 16.9                 | 10 6           | 490          |               |
| 1023  | M      | 2      | 1/2             | 112             | 85                | 32 5           | 37 4                  | 54.3           | 18 9                 | 11 6           | 1025         | 425           |
| 1023  | ដ      | 2<br>7 | 1/2             | 127             | 85                | 32.5           | 36.2                  | 56.7           | 18 5                 | 12 0           | 1120         | 155           |
| 1025  | E<br>L | с<br>С | 1/2             | 90              | 68                | 32.5           | 36.8                  | 54.5           | 18 5                 | 12.2           | 860          | 115           |
| 1020  | 1.     | 2      | 1/4             |                 | 00                | <i>ULL</i> 1   | 00.0                  | VTIV           | *0.0                 |                | 000          | 110           |

 $\underline{1}$ / Tip of nose to base of tail along curvature of spine.

•

|          |                  |                             |              | Нож         |               | Per cent    |
|----------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Number   | Sex              | Age                         | Month        | Obtained    | Ether Extract | Compression |
| 12       | $N D \frac{1}{}$ | 1/2                         | Ian          | рк 2/       | 83 8          | 1 0         |
| 14       | N.D. —           | 1/2                         | Jan.         | R.R         | 84 5          | 1.0         |
| 14<br>17 | F<br>F           | 1/2                         | Jan.         | К.К.<br>D V | 04.5          | 1.0         |
| 13       | r<br>M           | 2 1/2                       | Jan.         | K.K.        | 90.0          | 1.0         |
| 1005     | M                | 4 1/2                       | Jan.         | Shot        | 02.9          | 0.0         |
| 1006     | F                | 4 1/2                       | Jan.         | Shot        | 92.9          | 0.0         |
| .007     | м                | 2 1/2                       | Jan.         | Snot        | 00./          | 0.0         |
| 19       | F                | 1/2                         | Feb.         | R.K.        | 83.7          | 0.0         |
| 21       | F                | 1/2                         | Feb.         | R.K.        | 81.1          | 2.0         |
| 24       | F                | $\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{1/2}$  | Feb.         | R.K.        | 93.0          | 0.0         |
| 26       | F                | $2 \frac{1}{2}$             | Feb.         | R.K.        | 95.7          | 0.0         |
| 27       | M                | 1/2                         | Feb.         | R.K.        | 60.0          | 11.0        |
| 28       | M                | $\frac{1}{1}$               | Feb.         | R.K.        | 75.9          | 1.0         |
| 29       | F                | $\frac{1}{2}$ 1/2           | Feb.         | R.K.        | 95.7          | 0.0         |
| 35       | M                | 1/2                         | Feb.         | R.K.        | 0.53          | 32.0        |
| 36       | F                | 3 1/2                       | Feb.         | R.K.        | 94.2          | 0.0         |
| 1008     | М                | 5 1/2                       | Feb.         | Shot        | 86.4          | 0.0         |
| 1000     | M                | $1 \frac{1}{2}$             | Feb.         | Shot        | 64.3          | 10.0        |
| 1005     | F                | $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ | Feb.         | Shot        | 94.1          | 0.0         |
| 1011     | 1 ·              | $\frac{1}{1}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ | Feb.         | Shot        | 89.5          | 0.0         |
| 1012     | F                | 6 1/2+                      | Feb.         | Shot        | 87.7          | 0.0         |
| 70       | E                | 7 1/2                       | Mar          | R.K.        | 51.8          | 17.0        |
| 38<br>70 | Г<br>И           | $\frac{3}{1}\frac{1}{2}$    | Mar.         | R K         | 84.1          | 1.0         |
| 59<br>40 | M                | 1 1/2+                      | Mar.         | R K         | 44.7          | 22.0        |
| 40       | M                | 1/2                         | Mar.<br>Mar  | R K         | 48.7          | 20.0        |
| 41       | M                | 1/2                         | Mar.         | R K         | 33 5          | 20.0        |
| 43       | P1 .<br>M        | J 1/2                       | nai .<br>Mor | R K         | 56.9          | 16.0        |
| 47       | PI<br>E          | 1 1/6<br>1 1/0±             | Mar.         | R K         | 20.0          | 48.6        |
| 4/       | r<br>r           | I 1/2T                      | Mar.         | R K         | 63 1          | 7.0         |
| 48<br>50 | r<br>r           | 5 1/2                       | Mar.         | R K         | 40 1          | 37.0        |
| 50       | F                | 1/2                         | Mar.         | D V         | 17 7          | 37.0        |
| 51       | M                | 1/2                         | Mar.         | D K         | 27 1          | 26.0        |
| 57       | М.               | 1/2                         | Mar.         | IX . IX .   | JJIL          | 20.0        |
| 2        | М                | 6 1/2+                      | Mar.         | Carcass     | 0.20          | 60.0        |
| 1013     | F                | 1 1/2                       | Mar.         | Shot        | 2.9           | 34.0        |
| 1014     | F                | 1/2                         | Mar.         | Shot        | 76.0          | 1.0         |
| 1014     | F                | 4 1/2                       | Mar.         | Shot        | 60.7          | 10.0        |
| 1016     | F                | 4 1/2                       | Mar.         | Shot        | 39.7          | 10.0        |

Table 30. Chemical analyses of femur marrow from white-tailed deer.

.

٠

|          |     |                             |       | How      |               | Per Cent    |
|----------|-----|-----------------------------|-------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| Number   | Sex | Age                         | Month | Obtained | Ether Extract | Compression |
| 64       | м   | 4 1/2                       | Anr   | рк       | 21 2          | 22 0        |
| 04<br>66 | F   | 1/2                         | Apr.  | R.K.     | 24.2          | 42.0        |
| 67       | F   | 1/2                         | Apr.  | R K      | 89 0          | -2.0        |
| 68       | F   | $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ | Apr.  | R.K.     | 3.2           | 30.0        |
| 69       | F   | 1 1/2+                      | Apr.  | R.K.     | 2.9           | 30.0        |
| 1017     | F   | 1 1/2                       | Apr.  | Shot     | 0.19          | 38.0        |
| 1018     | F   | 4 1/2                       | Apr.  | Shot     | 18.9          | 26.0        |
| 1019     | F   | 3 1/2                       | Apr.  | Shot     | 6.0           | 25.0        |
| 1020     | F   | 6 1/2+                      | Apr.  | Shot     | 1.9           | 25.0        |
| 1021     | F   | 2 1/2                       | Apr.  | Shot     | 4.5           | 27.0        |
| 1022     | F   | . 1/2                       | May   | Shot     | 0.4           | 35.0        |
| 1023     | М   | 2 1/2                       | May   | Shot     | 11.6          | 25.0        |
| 1024     | F   | 3 1/2                       | May   | Shot     | 50.1          | 10.0        |
| 1025     | F   | 2 1/2                       | May   | Shot     | 14.4          | 23.0        |

Chemical analyses of femur marrow from white-tailed deer. (cont.)

 $\frac{1}{2}/\frac{3}{3}/\frac{4}{4}$ No data.

٠

Road kill.

Reported as percent of whole sample (including moisture)

Greer (1968).

| Collection<br>Number Month Age |         | Kidney Fat<br>Index |       | Ether<br>Extract                        | Percent<br>Compression |                |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------|---|------------------------|----------------|
| A. Males                       | <u></u> |                     |       | ~ * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * |                        |                |
| 1,002                          | Jan.    | 1/2                 | 100.8 | (100.8)                                 | ,<br>                  |                |
| 1,007                          | Jan.    | 2 1/2               | 23.9  | - ,                                     | 88.7                   | 0              |
| 1,003                          | Jan.    | 4 1/2               | 14.6  | (19.1)                                  | (85.8)                 |                |
| 1,005                          | Jan.    | 4 1/2               | 18.9  |   | 82.9                   | 0              |
| 27                             | Feb.    | 1/2                 |       | (28.8)                                  | 60.0                   | 11             |
| 28                             | Feb.    | 1/2                 | 37.5  |   | 75.9 (45.1)            | 1              |
| 35                             | Feb.    | 1/2                 | 20.0  |   | 0.5                    | 32             |
| 1,009                          | Feb.    | 1 1/2               | 13.6  | (17.9)                                  | 64.3 (75.4)            | 10             |
| 1,008                          | Feb.    | 5 1/2               | 21.1  |   | 86.4                   | 0              |
| 40                             | Mar.    | 1/2                 |       |   | 44.7                   | 22             |
| 41                             | Mar.    | 1/2                 |       |   | 48.7 (36.1)            | 20             |
| 51                             | Mar.    | 1/2                 |       |   | 17.7                   | 37             |
| 57                             | Mar.    | 1/2                 |       |   | 33.1                   | 26             |
| 46                             | Mar.    | 1 1/2               |       |   | 56.9                   | 16             |
| 39                             | Mar.    | 1 1/2+              |       |   | 84.1 (58.2)            | 1              |
| 45                             | Mar.    | 3 1/2               |       |   | <b>3</b> 3.5           | 20             |
| 2                              | Mar.    | 6 1/2+              |       |   | 0.2                    | 60             |
| 64                             | Apr.    | 4 1/2               |       |   | 24.2 (24.2)            | 22             |
| 1,023                          | Мау     | 2 1/2               | 10.0  | (10.0)                                  | 11.6 (11.6)            | 25             |
| B. Females                     | 5       |                     |       |   |                        |                |
| 14                             | Jan.    | 1/2                 |       |   | 84.5 (84.5)            | 0              |
| 1,004                          | Jan.    | 1/2                 | 68.5  | (68.5)                                  |                        |                |
| 1,000                          | Jan.    | 1 1/2               | 120.0 |   |                        | tion was built |
| 15                             | Jan.    | 2 1/2               |       | (83.6)                                  | 90.8                   | 1              |
| 1,001                          | Jan.    | 3 1/2               | 75.3  |   | (91.9)                 |                |
| 1,006                          | Jan.    | 4 1/2               | 55.6  |   | 92.9                   | 0              |
| 19                             | Feb.    | 1/2                 |       | (27.7)                                  | 83.7 (82.4)            | 0              |
| 21                             | Feb.    | 1/2                 | 27.7  |   | 81.1                   | 2              |
| 1,011                          | Feb.    | 1 1/2               | 52.3  |   | 89.5                   | 0              |
| 26                             | Feb.    | 2 1/2               |       | (43.8)                                  | 95.7                   | 0              |
| 29                             | Feb.    | 2 1/2               |       |   | 95.7                   | 0              |
| 31                             | Feb.    | 2 1/2               | 45.5  |   | (92.8)                 |                |
| 24                             | Feb.    | 3 1/2               |       |   | 93.0                   | 0              |
| 36                             | Feb.    | 3 1/2               |       |   | 94.2                   | 0              |
| 1,010                          | Feb.    | 4 1/2               | 58.8  |   | 94.1                   | 0              |
| -                              | F ).    | 6 1/2.              | 10 7  |   | 87 7                   | 0              |

| Table 31. | Comparative condition indices of Swan Valley white-tailed deer. |
|-----------|---|
|           | (Monthly averages for fawns and adults in parentheses.)         |
|           | •   |

## Table 31. (Continued)

.

.

٠

| Collection<br>Number Month Age |      | Age            | Kidney Fa<br>Index | it     | Ether<br>Extrac | et     | Percent<br>Compression |  |
|--------------------------------|------|----------------|--------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------------------|--|
| 50                             | Mar. | 1/2            |                    | (7.2)  | 40.1            | (58.1) | 37                     |  |
| 1,014                          | Mar. | 1/2            | 7.2                |        | 76.0            |        | 1                      |  |
| 1,013                          | Mar. | 1 1/2          | 30.8               |        | 2.9             |        | 34                     |  |
| 47                             | Mar. | 1 1/2+         |                    |        | 20.0            |        | 49                     |  |
| 38                             | Mar. | 3 1/2          |                    |        | 51.8            | (39.7) | 17                     |  |
| 1,015                          | Mar. | 4 1/2          | 14.3               | (23.1) | 60.7            | · ·    | 10                     |  |
| 1,016                          | Mar. | 4 1/2          | 14.2               | •      | 39.7            |        | 10                     |  |
| 48                             | Mar. | 5 1/2          | -                  |        | 63.1            |        | 7                      |  |
| 66                             | Apr. | 1/2            |                    |        | 0.3             | (44.6) | 42                     |  |
| 67                             | Apr. | 1/2            |                    |        | 89.0            |        | 0                      |  |
| 1,017                          | Apr. | 1 1/2          | 5.0                |        | 0.9             |        | 38                     |  |
| 69                             | Apr. | 1 1/2+         |                    | (9.6)  | 2.9             |        | 30                     |  |
| 68                             | Apr. | 21/2           |                    |        | 3.2             |        | 30                     |  |
| 1.021                          | Apr. | 2 1/2          | 6.8                |        | 4.5             | (5.5)  | 27                     |  |
| 1.019                          | Apr. | 3 1/2          | 9.3                |        | 6.0             |        | 25                     |  |
| 1,018                          | Apr. | 4 1/2          | 14.4               |        | 18.9            |        | 26                     |  |
| 1.020                          | Apr. | 6 1/2+         | 12.5               |        | 1.9             |        | 25                     |  |
| 1.022                          | May  | 1/2            | 8.9                | (8.9)  | 0.4             |        | 35                     |  |
| 1.025                          | May  | $2\frac{1}{2}$ | 10.9               | (8.1)  | 14.4            | (21.6) | ) 23                   |  |
| 1,024                          | May  | 3 1/2          | 5.2                |        | 50.1            | ·      | 10                     |  |

.

•

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

•.

Table 32. List of plant names and abbreviations.

| AbgrAbies grandisacglAcer glabrumAlteAlnus tenuifoliaAmalAmelanchier alnifoliaAruvArctostophylos uva-ursiBeocBetula occidentalisBereBerberis repensCespCentaurea spp.CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCorpus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSymphoricarpos spp.Thuja plicataThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.   | Abbreviation | Scientific Name          |
|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| acg1Acer glabrumAlteAlnus tenuifoliaAmalAmelanchier alnifoliaAruvArctostophylos uva-ursiBeocBetula occidentalisBereBerberis repensCespCentaurea spp.CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCornus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspPamyPaamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus contortaPipoPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.SaspSalix spp.SyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp. | Abgr         | Abies grandis            |
| AlteAlnus tenuifoliaAmalAmelanchier alnifoliaAruvArctostophylos uva-ursiBeocBetula occidentalisBereBerberis repensCespCentaurea spp.CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCornus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspPamyPamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.SaspSalix spp.SyspSymphoricarpos spp.Thuja plicataThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.  | acgl         | Acer glabrum             |
| AmalAmelanchier alnifoliaAruvArctostophylos uva-ursiBeocBetula occidentalisBereBerberis repensCespCentaurea spp.CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCornus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspPanyParyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.Thuja plicataThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.  | Alte         | Alnus tenuifolia         |
| AruvArctostophylos uva-ursiBeocBetula occidentalisBereBerberis repensCespCentaurea spp.CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCornus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqRosa spp.Salix spp.Salix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.   | Amal         | Amelanchier alnifolia    |
| BeocBetula occidentalisBereBerberis repensCespCentaurea spp.CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCornus stoloniferaErgrFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPoulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveYaccinium spp.  | Aruv         | Arctostophylos uva-ursi  |
| BereBerberis repensCespCentaurea spp.CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCornus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Beoc         | Betula occidentalis      |
| CespCentaurea spp.CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCornus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Bere         | Berberis repens          |
| CeveCeanothus velutinusCostCornus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.Thp1Thuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.  | Cesp         | Centaurea spp.           |
| CostCornus stoloniferaErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspLupinus spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.   | Ceve         | Ceanothus velutinus      |
| ErgrErythronium grandiflorumFrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspLupinus spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.  | Cost         | Cornus stolonifera       |
| FrspFragaria spp.JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspLupinus spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.  | Erg <b>r</b> | Erythronium grandiflorum |
| JucomJuniperus communisLaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspLupinus spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.  | Frsp         | Fragaria spp.            |
| LaocLarix occidentalisLiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspLupinus spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.   | Jucom        | Juniperus communis       |
| LiboLinnaea borealisLospLonicera spp.LuspLupinus spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.   | Laoc         | Larix occidentalis       |
| LospLonicera spp.LuspLupinus spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospSalix spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Libo         | Linnaea borealis         |
| LuspLupinus spp.PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.   | Losp         | Lonicera spp.            |
| PamyPachistima myrsinitesPicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveVaccinium spp.   | Lusp         | Lupinus spp.             |
| PicoPinus contortaPipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Pamy         | Pachistima myrsinites    |
| PipoPinus ponderosaPospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Pico         | Pinus contorta           |
| PospPopulus spp.PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.  | Pipo         | Pinus ponderosa          |
| PsmePseudotsuga menziesiiPtaqPteridium aquilinumRospRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.  | Posp         | Populus spp.             |
| PtaqPteridium aquilinumRospRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Psme         | Pseudotsuga menziesii    |
| RospRosa spp.SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.ThplThuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.  | Ptaq         | Pteridium aquilinum      |
| SaspSalix spp.ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.Thp1Thuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Rosp         | Rosa spp.                |
| ShcaSheperdia canadensisSyspSymphoricarpos spp.Thp1Thuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Sasp         | Salix spp.               |
| SyspSymphoricarpos spp.Thp1Thuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Shca         | Sheperdia canadensis     |
| Thp1Thuja plicataThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.  | Sysp         | Symphoricarpos spp.      |
| ThveThalictrium venulosumVaspVaccinium spp.   | Thp1         | Thuja plicata            |
| Vasp Vaccinium spp.   | Thve         | Thalictrium venulosum    |
|   | Vasp         | Vaccinium spp.           |

•

.

.

3