

**IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**

**Steven M. Huffaker, Director**

**Project W-160-R-31**

**Subproject 35**

**Progress Report**



**MULE DEER ECOLOGY**

Study I: Winter Fawn Survival

Study II: Mule Deer Database

July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

By:

Mark Hurley, Wildlife Research Biologist  
Hollie Miyasaki, Regional Wildlife Biologist

September 2004  
Boise, Idaho



Findings in this report are preliminary in nature and not for publication without permission of the Director of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game adheres to all applicable state and federal laws and regulations related to discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, gender, or handicap. If you feel you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, or if you desire further information, please write to: Idaho Department of Fish and Game, PO Box 25, Boise, ID 83707; or the Office of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC 20240.

This publication will be made available in alternative formats upon request. Please contact the Idaho Department of Fish and Game for assistance.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

WINTER FAWN SURVIVAL .....	1
ABSTRACT .....	1
STUDY AREA .....	3
JOB 1. OVER-WINTER SURVIVAL RATES AND CAUSE-SPECIFIC MORTALITY OF MULE DEER FAWNS .....	4
OBJECTIVE .....	4
METHODS .....	4
CAPTURE AND RADIO-COLLARING FAWNS .....	4
MORTALITY MONITORING AND DETERMINING CAUSE OF DEATH .....	4
STATISTICAL METHODS .....	5
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	5
SURVIVAL .....	5
CAUSE-SPECIFIC MORTALITY .....	6
FAWN MASS, CHEST GIRTH, AND HIND FOOT LENGTH .....	6
JOB 2. ANNUAL RATE OF INCREASE (NET RECRUITMENT) OF MULE DEER POPULATIONS .....	7
OBJECTIVE .....	7
METHODS .....	7
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	7
MULE DEER POPULATION MODELING .....	18
ABSTRACT .....	18
STUDY AREA .....	19
JOB 1. GIS LAYERS OF MULE DEER POPULATION PARAMETERS AND LANDSCAPE FEATURES .....	20
OBJECTIVE .....	20
METHODS .....	20
GIS LAYER OF POPULATION PARAMETERS .....	20
GIS LAYERS OF SELECTED LANDSCAPE ATTRIBUTES .....	20
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	21
JOB 2. POPULATION MODELING .....	21
OBJECTIVE .....	21
METHODS .....	22

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)**

DIFFERENCES IN POPULATION PARAMETERS .....22  
MODELING OVER-WINTER FAWN SURVIVAL .....22  
PROJECTING FUTURE POPULATION TRENDS .....22  
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....23  
LITERATURE CITED .....24

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1. Winter range study areas for monitoring mule deer fawn mortality, 1998-2004. ....8  
Table 2. Results of mule deer fawn capture using helicopter drive nets and net guns in central and south Idaho, December and January 1998 through 2004. ....9  
Table 3. Results of mule deer doe and buck capture using helicopter drive nets and net guns in central and south Idaho, December and January 1998 through 2003. ....10  
Table 4. Winter survival rates and standard errors (SE) of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho. ....11  
Table 5. Logistic regression survival results from radio-collared mule deer fawns ( $n = 809$ ) monitored at least four of five winters, 1998-1999 through 2002-2003, in eight study areas.....12  
Table 6. Over-winter fates of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho.....13  
Table 7. Mean mass (SE) in kg of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho. ....14  
Table 8. Mean hind foot length (SE) in cm of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho. ....15  
Table 9. Mean chest girth (SE) in cm of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho.....16

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1. Location of winter range study areas for monitoring mule deer fawn mortality in central and south Idaho, 2002-2003.....17

**PROGRESS REPORT  
STATEWIDE WILDLIFE RESEARCH**

**STATE:** Idaho                      **JOB TITLE:** Mule Deer Ecology  
**PROJECT:** W-160-R-31  
**SUBPROJECT:** 35                      **STUDY NAME:** Winter Fawn Survival  
**STUDY:** I  
**JOBS:** 1-2  
**PERIOD COVERED:** July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004

**WINTER FAWN SURVIVAL**

**Abstract**

Mule deer fawns were captured and radio-collared on ten study areas across central and southern Idaho during December 2003 - January 2004 ( $n = 253$ ). During the winters of 1998-1999 through 2003-2004, six study areas were monitored all six winters. The overall fawn survival rate during winter 2003-2004 was 0.54 (SE = 0.032). The five previous over-winter survival rates were 0.644 (SE = 0.037) in 1998-1999, 0.570 (SE = 0.036) in 1999-2000, 0.707 (SE = 0.031) in 2000-2001, 0.401 (SE = 0.031) in 2001-2002, and 0.69 (SE = 0.035). No difference in survival was observed between sexes ( $\chi^2 = 0.1568$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P = 0.692$ ), but survival was significantly different between study areas ( $\chi^2 = 39.42$ ,  $df = 9$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Total predator losses varied from 17-28% of the fawns each winter. Verified coyote predation accounted for 10-14% of the fawns, mountain lions took 4-12%, and other predators (bobcat, dog, wolf, unknown predator) 1-4%. An additional 3-19% died from malnutrition, and 4-12% of the fawns died of other causes (reservoirs, road-kills, trains, unknown). Fawn size and condition was assessed at the time of capture by measuring mass (kg), chest girth (cm), and hind foot length (cm). Pooled data from five winters, 1999-2003, ( $n = 934$ ) indicated that fawns surviving the winter were heavier than fawns that died ( $F = 69.49$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), male fawns were larger than female fawns ( $F = 108.67$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), fawn mass varied among the study areas ( $F = 11.07$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), and fawns were heavier in 1998-1999 than in the subsequent three winters ( $F = 14.76$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). The simplest model which effectively explained fawn survival ( $\chi^2 = 226.64$ ,  $df = 39$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) included sex, mass, study area, winter, and a study area\*winter interaction term.

Mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) are affected by a variety of factors that cause populations to fluctuate widely. Weather variables cause the most dramatic year-to-year variation in survival and recruitment while habitat changes probably have the greatest long-term impact. Unaltered habitat types may also vary in quality annually in response to ungulate and livestock densities and weather. Predation is a common mortality cause, but often compensates for other forms of mortality. Determining the extent to which predators may limit population growth is very difficult. Expanding predator populations coupled with declining deer populations have initiated heated debate among biologists and sportsmen as to the role of predators. Harassment, disease, and parasites can cause animals to be more susceptible to other forms of mortality. These

numerous factors collectively have a much greater impact on mule deer populations than harvests. The extent to which mule deer populations are influenced by hunting depends on season structure and timing as well as road densities and vehicle access. The myriad of factors that effect mule deer are complex, making the wildlife manager's job difficult.

A recent decline in mule deer populations across the West, with relatively low recruitment in following years, has caused concern among biologists and sportsmen alike (Unsworth et al. 1999). Severe weather during the 1992-1993 winter apparently spurred the decline by causing high mortality. Fawn survival ranged from 0-38% during that winter among three study areas in southwest Idaho. There is little consensus as to why populations have not recovered more rapidly, likely because many interacting factors affect mule deer populations. In many cases, wildlife managers cannot prevent high mortality and subsequent low recruitment. However, it is imperative that managers detect population changes when they occur. Disagreements between the Department and sportsmen could be alleviated with more communication and better information. Improved monitoring of populations will enable managers to make better decisions regarding harvest and allow hunters to be more informed.

Aside from hunting, the many variables influencing deer survival have the greatest impact on fawns. Fawns accumulate less fat reserves than adults during the summer and fall, making them more susceptible to weather severity, poor quality habitat, predators, harassment, disease etc. This results in fawns having higher mortality rates than adult deer (Bartmann 1984, White et al. 1987, Pac et al. 1991, White and Bartmann 1998, Unsworth et al. 1999). Unsworth et al. (1999) found that annual variation in fawn survival could impact the annual rate of increase of mule deer populations. White and Bartmann (1998) and Unsworth et al. (1999) recommended that managers monitor over-winter fawn survival, adult doe survival, December age and sex ratios, and population size on an annual basis. The Department has traditionally monitored population size and age and sex ratios on a statewide level, but not survival rates. Adult doe survival is much less variable from year to year than fawn survival (Unsworth et al. 1999). Given the expense associated with estimating survival rates on a statewide basis, managers should focus efforts on survival of fawns rather than does. We, therefore, incorporated estimates of over-winter fawn survival into the Department's monitoring program, following the current Mule Deer Management Plan (Idaho Department of Fish and Game [IDFG] 1998), to develop more accurate population models for management purposes.

Improved monitoring of mule deer will help managers meet specific goals of herd size and composition by altering doe harvests according to annual changes in survival, recruitment, and population size (Unsworth et al. 1999). White and Bartmann (1998) developed a model based on over-winter fawn survival, annual doe survival, and December fawn/doe ratios to calculate a population's annual rate of increase,  $\lambda$ . In recent years throughout southwest Idaho, over-winter fawn survival has ranged from 0.22 to 0.76, while December fawn/doe ratios have ranged from 49-77/100 (Unsworth et al. 1999). By collecting these data annually, managers can determine whether the population is decreasing, stable, or increasing. In years where low December fawn/doe ratios are coupled with high winter fawn mortality, poor yearling recruitment could initiate a decline. Restrictive doe harvests would improve the likelihood or rate of population recovery. Based on long-term averages of over-winter fawn survival (0.444) and annual adult

female survival (0.853) in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana, Unsworth et al. (1999) estimated that 0.662 fawns/doe (in December) was necessary to maintain populations.

Another difficulty for wildlife managers is that much of the deer monitoring data is collected after harvest regulations have been determined for the following hunting season. Managers submit big game season recommendations for the upcoming year by early January, and final harvest regulations are adopted by the Commission in March (L. Nelson, IDFG, personal communication). Decisions are based primarily on harvest surveys and December herd composition. When capturing and radio-collaring fawns to monitor survival, the mass of each animal can be measured with relative ease. Early winter mass can be used to predict over-winter fawn survival (Bishop 1998, Unsworth et al. 1999). After several years of obtaining baseline data, managers should be able to predict winters in which mortality rates will be large. Managers can then make more informed decisions regarding doe harvests by comparing December fawn/doe ratios with a prediction of upcoming winter fawn survival.

### Study Area

Six winter range trend areas plus the two study areas in the southeast Idaho mule deer study were selected as permanent study areas across central and southern Idaho in Regions 3-7 (Table 1, Figure 1). The McCall study area (44°45', 116°53') is located in Game Management Units (GMUs) 22 and 31 near Brownlee Reservoir. Terrain comprises steep canyon breaks with several benches; elevations range from 1,700-5,000 feet. Vegetation is dominated by sagebrush (*Artemisia* spp.) and grassland habitat types with occasional mountain brush sites. Cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*), aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), and conifers occur in some drainage bottoms. The Boise study area (43°35', 116°02') is located in GMU 39 on the Boise River Wildlife Management Area (WMA) to the northwest of Lucky Peak Reservoir. Terrain consists of relatively steep canyon breaks and elevations range from 3,100 feet at Lucky Peak Reservoir to 5,200 feet near Lucky Peak. Vegetation comprises sagebrush-grass habitat types, and a portion of the area burned in 1992 and 2000. The Twin Falls study area (42°21', 114°21') is located in Unit 54 in the South Hills. Terrain comprises rolling hills dissected by several major drainages with elevations ranging from 4,150-5,900 feet. Vegetation is composed of sagebrush-grass habitat types with scattered pockets of bitterbrush (*Purshia tridentata*). The Pocatello study area (42°43', 111°43') is located in Unit 72 in the Soda Hills. Terrain consists of rolling hills and open valleys; elevations range from 5,800-6,800 feet. Vegetation consists of sagebrush-grass habitat types at lower elevations with juniper (*Juniperus* spp.) and mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus* spp.) habitats above; aspen and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) sites occur on north slopes and high ridges. The Idaho Falls study area (43°40', 111°25') is located in Unit 67 near the South Fork of the Snake River. Terrain is moderate to steep with elevations from 5,000-6,700 feet. Vegetation is dominated by sagebrush and mountain shrub with some juniper habitat types. The Challis study area (44°26', 114°15') is located in Unit 36B around Centennial Flat. Terrain comprises rolling foothills cut by small drainages with steep mountain slopes above; elevations range from 5,200-8,300 feet. Vegetation consists of sagebrush-grass habitat types and occasional mountain mahogany with conifer patches at higher elevations. Units 56 and 73A are the two study areas in the southeast Idaho mule deer research project; refer to Hurley and Unsworth (1999) for study area descriptions. These two areas are referred to as the SE Idaho

research areas. In addition to the permanent study areas, other sites in various areas have been investigated for one or more winters. Fawns were monitored in Units 30, 60A, and 32 in addition to the permanent study areas.

## **JOB 1. OVER-WINTER SURVIVAL RATES AND CAUSE-SPECIFIC MORTALITY OF MULE DEER FAWNS**

### **Objective**

Our goal is to evaluate over-winter fawn survival and cause-specific mortality as part of an ongoing management program to monitor mule deer populations in Idaho (IDFG 1998). Our specific objectives are to determine whether: 1) over-winter fawn survival rates differ between sexes, years, or among study areas; 2) the probability that mortality is related to early winter mass, chest girth, or hind foot length of fawns; and 3) different mortality causes occur in equal frequency among study areas, sexes, or years. Within the framework of these objectives, we developed two specific a priori null hypotheses: 1) early winter mass, chest girth, and hind foot length of fawns in southeast Idaho do not differ from fawns in other regions, and 2) over-winter survival rates of fawns in southeast Idaho do not differ from fawns in other regions. Since the widespread deer decline in 1992-1993, populations in southeast Idaho have recovered more slowly than populations in the central and western portions of the state, yet habitat quality in southeast Idaho appears to be quite good. This report contains methods and results from the first five years of monitoring and addresses our objectives and hypotheses in a preliminary manner.

### **Methods**

#### **Capture and Radio-collaring Fawns**

From 185 to 253 mule deer fawns were captured and radio-collared each winter (Table 2). Helicopter drive-nets (Beasom et al. 1980) were used to capture the fawns except in the Hells Canyon area where fawns were also net-gunned from a helicopter (Barrett et al. 1982, Van Reenen 1982) and clover-trapped. Drive-netting enabled volunteers from the public to assist in capture efforts which was a goal of the project. Nine to 34 fawns were captured, radio-collared, fitted with plastic ear tags, and measured in each fawn monitoring study area. Two types of radio-collars were used: expandable collars and belt collars. All collars were equipped with mortality sensors and fastened with temporary attachment plates or surgical tubing, causing the collars to fall off the animals after approximately 6-8 months. We retrieved the shed collars for use on next year's fawns. Fawn weight (kg), chest girth (cm), and hind foot length (cm) were measured to assess early winter body size and condition. Adult does captured opportunistically with drive-nets were ear-tagged, aged, measured, and some were bled for pregnancy testing and nutritional analysis (Table 3).

#### **Mortality Monitoring and Determining Cause of Death**

Fawn radio signals were monitored for mortality from the ground approximately every other day throughout the winter. Relocations of live fawns were not obtained. Aerial monitoring was used

on occasion if radio signals could not be detected from the ground. When a mortality signal was detected, the fawn was located and cause of death was determined using the following protocol:

1. Site evaluation – tracks, scat, broken vegetation, blood, drag trails, etc.
2. Collar assessment – condition, mortality or live signal, location.
3. Carcass description – intactness, relative position of body parts, missing body parts.
4. External necropsy – abnormalities, wounds, canine punctures, degree of consumption, chewed or fragmented bones, etc.
5. Internal necropsy – hemorrhaging, bruises, canine punctures, abnormalities, fat deposits, broken bones, etc.
6. Femur marrow fat – white, hard, and waxy; pink to red and firm; red to pink and soft; deep red and gelatinous.

The latitude and longitude in decimal minutes, or Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates were recorded at each mortality location. All latitude and longitude coordinates were converted to UTM coordinates. A point coverage will be created in ARC/INFO<sup>®</sup> (Environmental Systems Research Institute [ESRI] 1995, 1997) using all mortality locations.

## **Statistical Methods**

Over-winter fawn survival curves and rates (December-May) were estimated using the staggered entry Kaplan-Meier procedure (Kaplan and Meier 1958, Pollock et al. 1989). A chi-square analysis (Program CONTRAST: Sauer and Williams 1989) was used to compare survival rates and the log-rank test (Cox and Oakes 1984, Pollock et al. 1989) to compare survival functions among sexes, study areas, and years. We used Program CONTRAST (Sauer and Williams 1989) to test our a priori null hypothesis that fawn survival rates were not different between southeast Idaho study areas (Units 67, 69, 73A, 72) and all others (Units 32, 36B, 39, 54). Fawns dying within seven days of capture were excluded from all analyses to prevent any capture-related mortalities from influencing the sample. Fawns that shed their collars prior to the ending date of the study were right-censored (Kaplan and Meier 1958, Kalbfleisch and Prentice 1980, Cox and Oakes 1984, Pollock et al. 1989) at the estimated date of collar loss. Winter fawn survival was modeled as a function of sex, study area, capture mass, chest girth, and hind foot length with a logistic regression using JMP statistics package.

Using JMP, a multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) type linear model was used to test for differences in early winter mass, chest girth, and hind foot length of fawns between sexes, study areas, fates (i.e., lived or died), and years.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Survival**

Mule deer fawns ( $n = 253$ ) were radio-collared on ten study areas across central and southern Idaho during December 2003 - January 2002 (Table 2). One fawn died within seven days of capture and was removed from the data set; thus 252 fawns were used in analyses. The overall fawn survival rate from December 16, 2003, through May 15, 2004, was 0.54 (SE = 0.032).

Survival rates varied among study areas and the overall comparison was significant ( $\chi^2 = 39.42$ ,  $df = 9$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) (Table 4). Survival was similar among male and female fawns ( $\chi^2 = 0.1568$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P = 0.6921$ ). Study areas could be placed in 3 distinct groups based on survival rates: Units 54 and 60A (survival 0.84-0.85); Units 22, 30, 67, 72, and 73A (survival 0.52-0.57); Units 32, 36B, and 39 (survival 0.32-0.38). Overall survival was different between these groups ( $\chi^2 = 37.39$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) and each group was different from each other ( $<0.001$ ) based on a posthoc contrast. The lowest survival group was within central Idaho.

Survival rates varied between the 1998-1999, 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002, 2002-2003, and 2003-2004 field seasons with significant differences for overall fawn survival ( $\chi^2 = 55.22$ ,  $df = 5$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ).

Including fawns from the eight study areas monitored at least four of five field seasons ( $n = 809$ ), the simplest model which effectively explained fawn survival ( $\chi^2 = 226.64$ ,  $df = 39$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) included sex, mass, and winter both as a main effect and as an interaction effect with study area (Table 5). Higher survival was associated with greater mass, being female, and living in the Southwest Region. Specific mortality cause models were similar to the whole model, except that study area was not generally significant, except as an interaction term with winter. Fawn sex was not a significant contributor to the mountain lion mortality model.

### **Cause-specific Mortality**

Winter predation totaled 17-28% of the fawns each winter (Table 6). Coyotes took 10-14%; mountain lions 4-12%; and other predators (bobcat, eagle, unknown predator) took 1-4%. During the three mild winters of the study, malnutrition losses accounted for 3-19% of the fawns. In 2003-2004, winter malnutrition accounted for 10% of fawn deaths. Four to 12% of the fawns died from other causes (vehicles, fences, hay bloat, accidents, unknown causes) each winter.

### **Fawn Mass, Chest Girth, and Hind Foot Length**

Male fawns were heavier than female fawns ( $F = 108.67$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), had longer hind feet ( $F = 111.99$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), and had larger chest girths ( $F = 34.58$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). Fawn mass ( $F = 11.07$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), hind foot length ( $F = 7.02$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), and chest girth ( $F = 5.12$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) varied among the 15 study areas (Tables 7-9). Overall, 1998-1999 fawns were heavier ( $F = 14.76$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), had longer hind feet ( $F = 3.10$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $P = 0.0150$ ), and larger chest girths ( $F = 7.52$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) than fawns in the next three winters.

Pooled data from five winters, 1999-2003 ( $n = 934$ ) indicate that, in general, fawns surviving the winter were larger than fawns that died. Surviving fawns weighed more ( $F = 69.49$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), had longer hind feet ( $F = 39.66$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), and larger chest girths ( $F = 35.77$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) than fawns that died.

Fawn mass is correlated with hind foot length ( $r^2 = 0.42$ ,  $F = 755.04$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) and chest girth ( $r^2 = 0.35$ ,  $F = 559.63$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). Chest girth is weakly associated with hind foot length ( $r^2 =$

0.16,  $F = 204.57$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). The linear regression fit of weight to hind foot length and chest girth is significant (weight =  $-46.27 + 1.24$  hind foot +  $0.37$  chest girth,  $r^2 = 0.56$ ,  $F = 642.22$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). Although the sex of the fawn is a statistically significant addition to the model, it does not constitute an important contribution to model fit;  $r^2 = 0.565$  compared to  $r^2 = 0.558$  without sex in the model.

## **JOB 2. ANNUAL RATE OF INCREASE (NET RECRUITMENT) OF MULE DEER POPULATIONS**

### **Objective**

To estimate the annual rate of increase, or net recruitment, of the mule deer population in each fawn monitoring study area in central and south Idaho.

### **Methods**

Over-winter fawn survival, December fawn/doe ratios, and mean annual adult female survival are necessary to estimate a population's annual rate of increase. Estimates of over-winter fawn survival were obtained in Job 1. December fawn/doe ratios will be estimated annually with herd composition surveys conducted during late December and early January using a helicopter. Areas surveyed will include the study areas in which over-winter fawn survival is monitored. Protocol for herd composition surveys will follow standard Department procedures already in place. Survival of adult female deer varies little from year to year in terms of natural mortality (Unsworth et al. 1999). Unsworth et al. (1999) estimated that adult doe survival will be  $<0.8$  only 7% of the time, and mean annual doe survival in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana was 0.853. Prior mean estimates of annual doe survival will be used for each study area (trend population) in this analysis. Harvest surveys will be used to estimate hunter-caused mortality for areas with doe harvests, and mean annual survival estimates will be adjusted accordingly.

A Leslie matrix model (Leslie 1945, 1948; Lefkovich 1965) will be used to estimate population annual rate of increase or net recruitment. Assuming a two age-class model (fawns/adults), White and Bartmann (1998) defined the annual rate of increase ( $N_{t+1}/N_t$ ) as

$$\lambda = \frac{RS_F + 2S_A}{2},$$

where  $R$  is the December fawn/doe ratio,  $S_F$  is the over-winter fawn survival rate, and  $S_A$  is the mean annual adult female survival rate. This model will be used to determine whether a population is decreasing, static, or increasing.

### **Results and Discussion**

No progress.

Table 1. Winter range study areas for monitoring mule deer fawn mortality, 1998-2004.

Region	Study area reference name	Unit(s)	Study area location
3	Hells Canyon	22/31	Brownlee and Oxbow Reservoirs
3	Dodson Pass	32A	Dodson Pass
3	Sulphur Gulch	32	Sulphur Gulch
3	Boise	39	Boise River WMA
4	Twin Falls	54	South Hills
4	SE ID Research	56	Most of Unit 56
5	SE ID Research	73A	Most of Unit 73A
5	Pocatello	72	Soda Hills
6	Idaho Falls	67	Table Rock / Heise Hot Springs
6	Medicine Lodge	59A	Medicine Lodge
6	Marsh Canyon	50	Marsh Canyon
6	Sand Creek WMA	60A	Sand Creek WMA
6	Wolverine Canyon	69	Wolverine Canyon
7	Salmon	28	Smedley
7	Salmon	30	Warm Springs and Reese Creek
7	Challis	36B	Centennial Flat

Table 2. Results of mule deer fawn capture using helicopter drive nets and net guns in central and south Idaho, December and January 1998 through 2004.

Location	Unit(s)	Number of fawns <sup>a</sup>					
		1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
Hells Canyon	22/31	24	20	20	14	-	25
Dodson Pass	32A	-	-	21	-	-	-
Sulphur Gulch	32	-	-	-	25	25	25
Boise	39	20	20	20	25	26	25
Twin Falls	54	26	17	24	24	25	26
SE ID Research	56	29	30	30	30	-	-
SE ID Research	73A	34	29	25	30	9	26
Pocatello	72	26	20	25	25	25	25
Idaho Falls	67	22	25	20	26	25	26
Medicine Lodge	59A	-	-	16	-	-	-
Marsh Canyon	50	-	-	-	24	-	-
Wolverine Canyon	69	-	-	-	-	26	-
Salmon	28	21	-	-	-	-	-
Salmon	30	-	21	-	-	-	23
Challis	36B	24	32	26	27	24	26
Sand Creek WMA	60A	-	-	-	-	-	26
<b>Total</b>		<b>226</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>253</b>

<sup>a</sup> Fawns were radio-collared, ear-tagged, weighed, and measured for chest girth and hind foot length. Approximately ten fawns from each area were bled for nutritional analysis in 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

Table 3. Results of mule deer doe and buck capture using helicopter drive nets and net guns in central and south Idaho, December and January 1998 through 2003.

Location	Unit(s)	Year/Number of does <sup>a,b</sup>						Year/Number of bucks <sup>b,c</sup>					
		98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04
Hells Canyon	22/31	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Dodson Pass	32A	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-
Sulphur Gulch	32	-	-	-	8	9	21	-	-	-	0	2	0
Boise	39	14	11	3	6	12	18	1	0	2	1	1	1
Twin Falls	54	25	19	8	12	9	4	9	0	3	2	3	2
SE ID Research	56	15	18	19	4	-	-	0	1	0	0	-	-
SE ID Research	73A	22	24	14	6	7	13	3	0	0	0	0	0
Pocatello	72	16	14	9	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho Falls	67	15	20	5	7	8	8	1	1	0	0	0	1
Medicine Lodge	59A	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-
Marsh Canyon	50	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Sand Creek WMA	60A	-	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	0
Wolverine Canyon	69	-	-	-	-	24	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Salmon	28	9	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-
Salmon	30	-	12	-	-	-	10	-	2	-	-	-	1
Challis	36B	10	14	5	6	9	4	1	0	4	0	0	1
Total		126	132	73	66	90	81	15	4	9	4	7	6

<sup>a</sup> Does were ear-tagged, measured for chest girth and hind foot length, and bled for pregnancy testing and nutritional analysis.

<sup>b</sup> Number of does and bucks captured in 2001-02 are minimums because some adult deer were released without processing.

<sup>c</sup> Bucks in Twin Falls (Unit 54) were radio-collared and ear-tagged in 1998-99, 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03.

Table 4. Winter survival rates and standard errors (SE) of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho.

Category/Group	Year					
	1998-1999 Survival rate (SE) <sup>a</sup>	1999-2000 Survival rate (SE)	2000-2001 Survival rate (SE)	2001-2002 Survival rate (SE)	2002-2003 Survival rate (SE)	2002-2003 Survival rate (SE)
Dates	12/17 - 5/31	12/13 - 5/12	12/15 - 5/15	12/12 - 5/15	12/18 - 5/15	12/16 - 5/15
Number of fawns	223	208	225	243	185	253
Sex						
Females	0.65 (0.055)	0.57 (0.052)	0.70 (0.043)	0.42 (0.044)	0.70 (0.051)	0.54 (0.046)
Males	0.64 (0.050)	0.56 (0.049)	0.72 (0.046)	0.39 (0.045)	0.68 (0.048)	0.54 (0.044)
Overall	0.64 (0.037)	0.57 (0.036)	0.71 (0.031)	0.40 (0.031)	0.69 (0.035)	0.54 (0.032)
Study areas						
Hells Canyon-22/31	-	-	0.53 (0.138)	-	-	-
Dodson Pass-32A	-	-	-	0.68 (0.093)	0.64 (0.103)	0.32 (0.093)
Sulphur Gulch-32	0.88 (0.126)	0.85 (0.082)	0.90 (0.067)	0.48 (0.100)	0.57 (0.100)	0.38 (0.098)
Boise-39	0.75 (0.141)	0.59 (0.134)	0.63 (0.099)	0.59 (0.105)	0.80 (0.089)	0.85 (0.071)
Twin Falls-54	0.71 (0.083)	0.54 (0.095)	0.76 (0.081)	0.30 (0.084)	-	-
SE ID Research-56	0.73 (0.076)	0.86 (0.064)	0.76 (0.085)	0.26 (0.080)	0.89 (0.105)	0.50 (0.098)
SE ID Research-73A	0.60 (0.115)	0.79 (0.096)	0.75 (0.088)	0.08 (0.056)	0.76 (0.085)	0.56 (0.099)
Pocatello-72	0.62 (0.121)	0.62 (0.115)	0.74 (0.114)	0.36 (0.096)	0.92 (0.054)	0.54 (0.098)
Idaho Falls-67	-	-	0.81 (0.098)	-	-	-
Medicine Lodge-59A	-	-	-	0.38 (0.105)	-	-
Marsh Canyon-50	-	-	-	-	-	0.84 (0.073)
Sand Creek WMA	-	-	-	-	0.73 (0.087)	-
Salmon-28	0.62 (0.128)	-	-	-	-	-
Salmon-30	-	0.32 (0.188)	-	-	-	0.57 (0.103)
Challis-36B	0.36 (0.110)	0.36 (0.092)	0.77 (0.085)	0.77 (0.083)	0.39 (0.102)	0.34 (0.096)

<sup>a</sup> Survival rates and SEs were calculated following Pollock et al. (1989).

Table 5. Logistic regression survival results from radio-collared mule deer fawns ( $n = 809$ ) monitored at least four of five winters, 1998-1999 through 2002-2003, in eight study areas.

Variable	Likelihood ratio chi-square probability values				
	All sources mortality model	Malnutrition mortality model	Coyote mortality model	Mountain lion mortality model	All predation mortality model
Individual effect tests					
Weight	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Sex	0.007	0.013	0.006	0.501	0.008
Study area	0.060	1.000	0.175	0.029	0.262
Winter	0.000	0.000	0.002		0.000
Study area*winter interaction	0.000	0.001	0.014	0.066	0.000
Whole model tests					
Model chi-square (df = 33)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Lack of fit chi-square	0.015	1.000	0.999	1.000	0.299
Percent correct predictions					
McFadden's rho-squared	0.207	0.350	0.209	0.247	0.205

Table 6. Over-winter fates of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho.

Fate	Year					
	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
Possible capture-related mortality <sup>a</sup>	3	5	2	8	1	1
Collars shed prior to May	46	24	10	2	2	7
Collars retained to May	107	108	150	99	127	129
Coyote predation	22	25	25	28	25	33
Mountain lion predation	15	15	10	29	11	16
Other predation	5	3	4	10	1	10
Malnutrition	19	16	6	45	5	25
Other <sup>b</sup>	9	17	20	29	13	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>253</b>

<sup>a</sup> Mortality occurred within 7 days of capture. In 2001-02 it includes one fawn that had the magnet left on the collar.

<sup>b</sup> “Other” mortality causes include automobiles, trains, fences, hay bloat, and unknown causes of mortality.

Table 7. Mean mass (SE) in kg of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho.


Category	Group	Dec 1998 – Jan 1999	Dec 1999 – Jan 2000	Dec 2000 – Jan 2001	Dec 2001 – Jan 2002	Dec 2002 – Jan 2003	Dec 2003 – Jan 2004
Overall	All fawns	37.4 (0.33)	34.8 (0.32)	34.5 (0.31)	34.6 (0.27)	35.2 (0.35)	34.9 (0.27)
Fate	Lived	38.0 (0.39)	35.6 (0.39)	35.1 (0.35)	35.4 (0.39)	36.5 (0.38)	35.8 (0.34)
	Died	36.0 (0.57)	33.3 (0.53)	32.7 (0.59)	34.0 (0.36)	32.1 (0.58)	33.7 (0.40)
Sex	Males	39.0 (0.44)	35.9 (0.42)	36.0 (0.43)	35.9 (0.40)	36.8 (0.46)	36.1 (0.36)
	Females	35.8 (0.44)	33.6 (0.46)	33.1 (0.40)	33.5 (0.32)	33.3 (0.45)	33.4 (0.36)
Study areas	Hells Canyon-22/31	38.3 (1.01)	35.1 (0.98)	36.4 (1.07)	34.4 (0.88)	----	34.3 (0.82)
	Dodson Pass-32A	----	----	35.7 (0.96)	----	----	----
	Sulphur Gulch-32	----	----	----	35.1 (0.98)	35.0 (1.03)	33.7 (0.73)
	Boise-39	35.6 (1.01)	36.0 (0.93)	34.0 (0.99)	36.1 (0.62)	33.0 (0.82)	34.4 (0.86)
	Twin Falls-54	35.4 (0.88)	32.5 (1.01)	32.3 (0.92)	35.8 (0.70)	33.2 (0.83)	35.6 (0.80)
	Pocatello-72	38.0 (0.92)	36.7 (0.95)	35.7 (0.92)	34.0 (0.81)	38.1 (0.84)	36.1 (0.82)
	Idaho Falls-67	41.2 (1.01)	37.6 (0.83)	36.0 (0.99)	36.3 (0.75)	38.5 (0.77)	39.5 (0.66)
	Medicine Lodge-59A	----	----	32.5 (1.10)	----	----	----
	Marsh Canyon-50	----	----	----	30.5 (0.75)	----	----
	Wolverine Canyon-69	----	----	----	----	36.5 (0.86)	----
	Sand Creek-60A	----	----	----	----	----	35.1 (0.83)
	Salmon-28	37.7 (0.98)	----	----	----	----	----
	Salmon-30	----	31.5 (0.93)	----	----	----	32.2 (0.69)
	Challis-36B	34.7 (0.94)	31.6 (0.73)	32.2 (0.86)	33.2 (0.75)	31.9 (0.57)	32.2 (0.64)
	SE ID Research-56	38.8 (0.87)	35.5 (0.76)	34.2 (0.82)	36.8 (0.79)	----	----
SE ID Research-73A	37.3 (0.80)	36.9 (0.78)	35.9 (0.88)	33.5 (0.68)	35.1 (1.55)	35.2 (0.76)	

Table 8. Mean hind foot length (SE) in cm of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho.

Category	Group	Dec 1998 – Jan 1999	Dec 1999 – Jan 2000	Dec 2000 – Jan 2001	Dec 2001 – Jan 2002	Dec 2002 – Jan 2003	Dec 2003 – Jan 2004
Overall	All fawns	43.1 (0.14)	42.7 (0.14)	42.6 (0.12)	42.7 (0.11)	42.7 (0.12)	42.7 (0.10)
Fate	Lived	43.4 (0.16)	43.0 (0.16)	42.7 (0.14)	43.0 (0.15)	42.9 (0.13)	42.9 (0.12)
	Died	42.5 (0.26)	41.8 (0.23)	42.2 (0.22)	42.5 (0.16)	42.2 (0.22)	42.5 (0.16)
Sex	Males	43.6 (0.19)	43.1 (0.19)	43.2 (0.16)	43.2 (0.16)	43.3 (0.14)	43.1 (0.14)
	Females	42.6 (0.19)	42.1 (0.19)	42.0 (0.15)	42.3 (0.15)	42.0 (0.16)	42.3 (0.14)
Study areas	Hells Canyon-22/31	----	----	42.6 (0.38)	42.6 (0.76)	----	43.1 (0.24)
	Dodson Pass-32A	----	----	42.5 (0.37)	----	----	----
	Sulphur Gulch-32	----	----	----	43.2 (0.44)	43.9 (0.35)	43.0 (0.21)
	Boise-39	42.6 (0.44)	42.9 (0.39)	43.0 (0.38)	43.3 (0.31)	42.6 (0.28)	43.5 (0.37)
	Twin Falls-54	42.9 (0.37)	42.2 (0.42)	41.8 (0.35)	42.8 (0.32)	42.1 (0.31)	43.0 (0.32)
	Pocatello-72	43.7 (0.37)	43.2 (0.39)	43.3 (0.35)	42.7 (0.38)	43.2 (0.24)	43.0 (0.30)
	Idaho Falls-67	43.4 (0.54)	43.5 (0.35)	42.8 (0.38)	42.6 (0.27)	42.8 (0.25)	43.6 (0.21)
	Medicine Lodge-59A	----	----	41.9 (0.43)	----	----	----
	Marsh Canyon-50	----	----	----	41.7 (0.36)	----	----
	Wolverine Canyon-69	----	----	----	----	43.2 (0.23)	----
	Sand Creek-60A	----	----	----	----	----	43.0 (0.24)
	Salmon-28	43.0 (0.41)	----	----	----	----	----
	Salmon-30	----	41.0 (0.38)	----	----	----	41.2 (0.25)
	Challis-36B	42.2 (0.39)	41.5 (0.31)	42.0 (0.34)	42.4 (0.33)	41.3 (0.24)	41.2 (0.31)
SE ID Research-56	43.9 (0.35)	43.3 (0.32)	42.6 (0.31)	43.3 (0.27)	----	----	
SE ID Research-73A	43.0 (0.32)	43.5 (0.32)	43.0 (0.34)	42.5 (0.28)	42.4 (0.57)	42.3 (0.27)	

Table 9. Mean chest girth (SE) in cm of radio-collared mule deer fawns in central and south Idaho.

Category	Group	Dec 1998 – Jan 1999	Dec 1999 – Jan 2000	Dec 2000 – Jan 2001	Dec 2001 – Jan 2002	Dec 2002 – Jan 2003	Dec 2003 – Jan 2004
Overall	All fawns	78.4 (0.33)	77.3 (0.35)	76.7 (0.34)	76.3 (0.34)	75.9 (0.36)	76.6 (0.29)
Fate	Lived	79.2 (0.37)	77.6 (0.42)	77.2 (0.40)	77.0 (0.46)	77.0 (0.40)	77.5 (0.38)
	Died	76.6 (0.59)	76.7 (0.62)	75.4 (0.65)	75.8 (0.47)	73.5 (0.65)	75.6 (0.44)
Sex	Males	79.0 (0.46)	78.0 (0.48)	77.8 (0.49)	77.7 (0.45)	76.9 (0.49)	77.4 (0.40)
	Females	77.9 (0.46)	76.6 (0.50)	75.8 (0.46)	75.1 (0.46)	74.8 (0.51)	75.8 (0.43)
Study areas	Hells Canyon-22/31	----	----	79.4 (1.13)	81.3 (1.33)	----	79.5 (1.12)
	Dodson Pass-32A	----	----	79.4 (1.10)	----	----	----
	Sulphur Gulch-32	----	----	----	76.1 (1.11)	76.4 (1.06)	74.5 (0.67)
	Boise-39	80.0 (1.06)	79.6 (1.00)	76.0 (1.13)	77.3 (0.85)	72.5 (0.82)	75.6 (0.88)
	Twin Falls-54	78.3 (0.88)	75.3 (1.09)	75.0 (1.03)	77.8 (0.77)	76.0 (0.81)	77.0 (0.91)
	Pocatello-72	77.4 (0.88)	79.9 (1.00)	76.6 (1.01)	75.9 (1.06)	79.6 (0.90)	77.0 (0.82)
	Idaho Falls-67	78.5 (1.30)	80.3 (0.92)	77.2 (1.13)	78.2 (1.16)	78.9 (0.61)	80.5 (0.83)
	Medicine Lodge-59A	----	----	76.5 (1.26)	----	----	----
	Marsh Canyon-50	----	----	----	73.9 (0.95)	----	----
	Wolverine Canyon-69	----	----	----	----	75.0 (0.76)	----
	Sand Creek-60A	----	----	----	----	----	77.7 (0.74)
	Salmon-28	79.5 (0.98)	----	----	----	----	----
	Salmon-30	----	74.1 (0.98)	----	----	----	74.0 (0.75)
	Challis-36B	77.4 (0.94)	75.9 (0.79)	75.2 (0.99)	74.7 (0.72)	72.5 (0.87)	73.0 (0.74)
	SE ID Research-56	78.2 (0.84)	76.8 (0.82)	76.1 (0.92)	76.2 (1.28)	----	----
SE ID Research-73A	78.9 (0.77)	77.2 (0.83)	76.9 (1.01)	74.4 (0.76)	77.2 (1.54)	77.2 (0.79)	



## Fawn Monitoring Study Areas 2003 - 2004

Ten study areas located  
within GMUs:  
22, 30, 32, 36B, 39, 54,  
60A, 67, 72, 73A

Figure 1. Location of winter range study areas for monitoring mule deer fawn mortality in central and south Idaho, 2002-2003.

**PROGRESS REPORT  
STATEWIDE WILDLIFE RESEARCH**

<b>STATE:</b>	<u>Idaho</u>	<b>JOB TITLE:</b>	<u>Mule Deer Ecology</u>
<b>PROJECT:</b>	<u>W-160-R-31</u>		
<b>SUBPROJECT:</b>	<u>35</u>	<b>STUDY NAME:</b>	<u>Mule Deer Population</u>
<b>STUDY:</b>	<u>II</u>		<u>Modeling</u>
<b>JOBS:</b>	<u>1-2</u>		
<b>PERIOD COVERED:</b>	<u>July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004</u>		

**MULE DEER POPULATION MODELING**

**Abstract**

Population and harvest data have been collected for the past year but not integrated into a geographical information system (GIS). A number of GIS layers of landscape attributes have been integrated into a GIS projected in Idaho Transverse Mercator (ITM) coordinates. These layers include the 1998 Idaho vegetation layer (GAP Analysis) (30 m cell size), Digital elevation models (DEM) (90 m cell size), InterColumbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEM) precipitation model, GMUs, and Idaho's rivers, roads, and cities. Other layers will be incorporated based on potential relevance to mule deer population dynamics. Winter and summer range layers of the selected trend populations used for fawn monitoring will be developed as well. Population modeling objectives are long-term and will not be addressed before several years of data have been accumulated.

The purpose of GIS is to organize and store large amounts of spatial information in a computer. With recent technological advances in computer resources, GIS has become an effective tool for wildlife management. A GIS can be used to classify and integrate landscape features such as habitats, soils, topography, geological features, precipitation regimes, rivers, roads, etc. into a single computer database. A GIS can be constructed at any spatial scale dictated by the precision of data collected.

With the statewide change in mule deer population monitoring (IDFG 1998), as described in Study I, the Department has a unique opportunity to look at meta-population dynamics at a landscape level. Similar population data will be collected simultaneously from trend areas across the state. By incorporating a statewide GIS database of various landscape attributes, biologists can begin assessing how large-scale differences in habitats, precipitation, terrain, etc. affect mule deer population performance. Evaluating the role of habitat is very important because mule deer habitat quality may be declining in many of our historic deer ranges. Use of GIS technology is the most efficient and effective means to analyze large-scale deer habitat use. A GIS database will also improve our ability to model populations by considering a greater number of variables which may explain substantial variation between differing populations.

A GIS is also the best means for the Department to summarize, organize, and store mule deer population and habitat data. Any type of data can be incorporated into the database; a GIS is not limited to spatial information. For example, harvest data can be included for each GMU which can then be associated with habitat types, road densities, elevation, slope, land ownership, sex and age ratios, and so on. Once the GIS has been developed, ArcView<sup>®</sup> software (ESRI 1996) will enable biologists to view and analyze the data.

Much of the spatial data necessary to construct a GIS for mule deer is already available. GIS layers of roads, rivers, counties, GMUs, terrain, etc. already exist. Other layers such as habitats, soils, and precipitation have been created as well, but at a variety of spatial scales with variable accuracy. A statewide GIS database has already been developed for elk, much of which can be applied to mule deer. Capitalizing on current GIS technology will improve our ability to manage mule deer on a statewide basis.

Through coordinated efforts in collection of mule deer population data, a statewide GIS database will provide a means to enter data into a single database referenced to a number of habitat-related variables. Modeling efforts will be improved by incorporating a greater number of variables which may explain variation among differing population dynamics. Department biologists will be able to access statewide mule deer population and habitat data from a single database.

### **Study Area**

Nine winter range trend areas were selected as study areas across central and southern Idaho in Regions 3-7. The McCall study area (44°45', 116°53') is located in GMUs 22 and 31 on the Cecil Andrus WMA near Brownlee Reservoir. Terrain comprises steep canyon breaks with several benches and elevations range from 1,700-5,000 feet. Vegetation is dominated by sagebrush (*Artemisia* spp.) and grassland habitat types with occasional mountain brush sites. Cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*), aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), and conifers occur in some drainage bottoms. The Boise study area (43°35', 116°02') is located in GMU 39 on the Boise River WMA to the northwest of Lucky Peak Reservoir. Terrain consists of relatively steep canyon breaks and elevations range from 3,100 feet at Lucky Peak Reservoir to 5,200 feet near Lucky Peak. Vegetation comprises sagebrush-grass habitat types and a portion of the area burned in 1992. The Twin Falls study area (42°21', 114°21') is located in Unit 54 in the South Hills. Terrain comprises rolling hills dissected by several major drainages with elevations ranging from 4,150-5,900 feet. Vegetation is composed of sagebrush-grass habitat types with scattered pockets of bitterbrush (*Purshia tridentata*). The Pocatello study area (42°43', 111°43') is located in Unit 72 in the Soda Hills. Terrain consists of rolling hills and open valleys; elevations range from 5,800-6,800 feet. Vegetation consists of sagebrush-grass habitat types at lower elevations with juniper (*Juniperus* spp.) and mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus* spp.) habitats above; aspen and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) sites occur on north slopes and high ridges. The Idaho Falls study area (43°40', 111°25') is located in Unit 67 near the South Fork of the Snake River. Terrain is moderate to steep with elevations from 5,000-6,700 feet. Vegetation is dominated by sagebrush and mountain shrub with some juniper habitat types. The Challis study area (44°26', 114°15') is located in Unit 36B around Centennial Flat. Terrain comprises rolling foothills cut by small drainages with steep mountain slopes above; elevations

range from 5,200-8,300 feet. Vegetation consists of sagebrush-grass habitat types and occasional mountain mahogany with conifer patches at higher elevations. The Salmon study area changed from Unit 28 near Smedley (45°11', 113°56') to Unit 30 on the outskirts of Salmon near Warm Springs and Reese Creek (45°01', 113°34') in 1999-2000. Vegetation consists of sagebrush-grass habitat types in the foothills with conifer patches at higher elevations; elevation ranges from 4,700-9,000 feet. Units 56 and 73A are the two study areas in the southeast Idaho mule deer research project; refer to Hurley and Unsworth (1999) for study area descriptions. These two areas are referred to as the SE Idaho research areas.

## **JOB 1. GIS LAYERS OF MULE DEER POPULATION PARAMETERS AND LANDSCAPE FEATURES**

### **Objective**

To synthesize mule deer population monitoring and harvest data from across the state into a GIS layer referenced to GMUs, and to compile coverages of various landscape attributes potentially relevant to mule deer fitness.

### **Methods**

Existing GIS layers of landscape features relevant to mule deer ecology will be integrated into one GIS. Mule deer population monitoring and harvest data from across the state will be referenced to the GIS in terms of GMUs, or sub-units if appropriate. The GIS will be constructed using ARC/INFO<sup>®</sup> software (ESRI 1995, 1997). Once completed, various statistical analyses will be used to model population performance and changes across the state. Our efforts will be focused on the trend areas where estimates of over-winter fawn survival are obtained.

### **GIS Layer of Population Parameters**

Population size and age and sex ratios will be estimated using aerial flights in randomly selected sub-units (within selected GMUs) in each IDFG region. We will fly herd composition in late December and early January and conduct population counts in mid-winter and early spring. Program Aerial Survey (Unsworth et al. 1994) will be used to correct population counts for visibility bias. We will follow protocol described in Study I to estimate over-winter fawn survival rates and net recruitment. Harvest data will be obtained through telephone surveys, check stations, and/or hunter mandatory report forms. Once surveys are completed for the year, data will be obtained from the wildlife manager in each region. Population and harvest data for each GMU will be synthesized into a database and linked to a GIS coverage of GMUs using ARC/INFO<sup>®</sup> (ESRI 1995, 1997). The Department has already created a geo-referenced coverage of GMUs for the state.

### **GIS Layers of Selected Landscape Attributes**

A variety of statewide GIS coverages of landscape features are available on the Internet. Some of these data layers have a relatively large resolution (~ 1 km<sup>2</sup>) but are acceptable for a landscape-level analysis. The 1998 Idaho vegetation layer (Gap Analysis) has a 30 m cell size

and will be used to model habitat features among the fawn monitoring trend areas. DEMs will be used to obtain elevations, slopes, and aspects of the trend areas. The Gap vegetation data and DEMs will be downloaded from the University of Idaho's Landscape Dynamics Lab website (<http://www.uidaho.wildlife.edu>) along with GIS layers of Idaho land ownership, roads, and rivers and streams. Additional GIS data from adjacent states (OR, UT, MT, WY) will also be used, including GAP layers of vegetation/landcover and DEMs, to encompass summer and winter ranges of mule deer that cross state boundaries. We will obtain climate (precipitation, minimum/maximum temperatures, freeze potential) and fire (location, extent) data from the ICBEM website (<http://www.icbemp.gov/spatial/html/gis-theme.html>). We will also download other GIS layers from the ICBEM website which may be relevant to mule deer. These include potential vegetation, nutrient availability, net primary productivity, grazing allotments, and other political boundaries. The Idaho Department of Water Resources website (<http://www.idwr.state.id.us/idwr/idwrhome.htm>) contains relevant GIS data which may be used as well. Additional bioclimatology GIS data may be obtained from the National Center for Atmospheric Research (<http://www.ntsug.umt.edu/bioclimatology/daymet>).

These various GIS layers will be projected in ITM coordinates using ARC/INFO<sup>®</sup> (ESRI 1995, 1997) and combined with the GMU coverage containing mule deer population data. Mule deer winter ranges will be delineated using 95% kernel home ranges. Summer ranges will be defined by four km radius buffers around summer deer locations. The mule deer GIS database will then be used to model mule deer populations across central and southern Idaho (described in Study II, Job 2).

## **Results and Discussion**

A number of GIS layers of landscape attributes have been integrated into a GIS projected in ITM coordinates. These layers include the 1998 Idaho vegetation layer (GAP Analysis) (30 m cell size), DEMs (90 m cell size), Oregon and Utah GAP vegetation and DEM layers, ICBEM precipitation model, GMUs, and Idaho's rivers, roads, and cities. Other layers will be incorporated based on potential relevance to mule deer population dynamics. Winter range layers of the selected trend populations used for fawn monitoring have been generated and queried for vegetation type, elevation, and slope. Summer range layers are being developed as well.

## **JOB 2. POPULATION MODELING**

### **Objective**

The purpose of this job is to identify variables which influence mule deer recruitment and population growth and to project future population trends using statistical modeling techniques. Our long-term objectives are to determine whether: 1) population size, over-winter fawn survival rates, or age and sex ratios vary across selected GMUs in central and south Idaho; 2) differences in habitat types or mean seasonal precipitation influence mule deer fawn survival or recruitment across central and southern Idaho; 3) mule deer densities on winter range influence over-winter fawn survival; and 4) harvest rates of adult female mule deer influence net annual recruitment.

## Methods

### Differences in Population Parameters

Over-winter fawn survival rates will be estimated and contrasted among trend areas as described in Study I. Program CONTRAST (Sauer and Williams 1989) will be used to test for differences in fawn:doe ratios between GMUs encompassing each trend area. The standard error for each ratio estimate will be calculated following Krebs (1989:205-209). Similar to Program CONTRAST, Program Aerial Survey (Unsworth et al. 1994) will be used to test for differences in corrected population estimates between GMUs corresponding to each trend area.

### Modeling Over-winter Fawn Survival

Stepwise logistic regression (Hosmer and Lemeshow 1989, Menard 1995) will be used to model the probability of over-winter fawn mortality throughout central and southern Idaho. The mortality model will be developed using PROC LOGISTIC in SAS with the events/trials syntax (SAS Institute 1989). Events represent the number of mortalities while trials represent the sample size of deer in each study area. Each study area will be treated as one sample. Independent variables will be evaluated with the Wald chi-square and removed from the model at the 0.15 level of significance (Menard 1995). Variables considered in the model will include: early winter fawn mass (kg); fawn hind foot length (cm); fawn chest girth (cm); December-April precipitation (cm); December-April temperature (°C); deer density (no./km<sup>2</sup>); elevation (m); aspect (°); and percent conifer, juniper, mountain brush, big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*), low sagebrush (*A. arbuscula*), and grass. With the exception of cover types, independent variables represent a mean value for the study area. A multivariate statistical technique may be used to reduce the large number of variables to a smaller, meaningful set of variables to prevent over-dispersion in the logistic regression model. Model fit will be evaluated with the Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of fit statistic and the  $-2 \log$  likelihood statistic,  $G_M$  (Hosmer and Lemeshow 1989, Menard 1995). Individual model coefficients will be evaluated based on their fully standardized values (Menard 1995).

### Projecting Future Population Trends

An existing Leslie matrix model (Leslie 1945, 1948; Lefkovitch 1965) for mule deer (J. Unsworth, IDFG, unpublished) will be used to model population change through time by incorporating key parameters from this study. There is a separate model for females and males. Necessary population parameters for the model include fawn survival, adult female survival, adult male survival, yearling and adult female reproductive rates, and initial age structure. The model is flexible and intended to be used as a tool for wildlife managers. For instance, survival rates can be entered as an average rate over time to project a long-term population trend. To more accurately model year-to-year population fluctuations, annual estimates of survival can be entered when sufficient data has been collected. When long-term survival data is not available, stochasticity can be factored into the model by allowing survival rates to fluctuate randomly following a normal distribution. As more data is collected in this study, managers will be able to tailor the model specifically to their study area(s). The model will provide managers with a

means of predicting population changes in response to different management options. In particular, the model can be used to evaluate different rates of doe harvest on the population.

### **Results and Discussion**

No progress.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Barrett, M. W., J. W. Nolan, and L. D. Roy. 1982. Evaluation of a hand-held net-gun to capture large mammals. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 10:108-114.
- Bartmann, R. M. 1984. Estimating mule deer winter mortality in Colorado. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 48:262-267.
- Beasom, S. L., W. Evans, and L. Temple. 1980. The drive net for capturing western big game. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 44:478-480.
- Bishop, C. J. 1998. Mule deer fawn mortality and habitat use, and the nutritional quality of bitterbrush and cheatgrass in southwest Idaho. Thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA.
- Cox, D. R. and D. Oakes. 1984. *Analysis of survival data*. Chapman and Hall, New York, New York, USA.
- Environmental Systems Research Institute. 1995. *Understanding GIS: the ARC/INFO® method*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, New York, USA.
- Environmental Systems Research Institute. 1996. *ArcView GIS Version 3.0*. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, California, USA.
- Environmental Systems Research Institute. 1997. *PC ARC/INFO Version 3.5.1*. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, California, USA.
- Hosmer, D. W. and S. Lemeshow. 1989. *Applied logistic regression*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, New York, USA.
- Hurley, M. A. and J. W. Unsworth. 1999. Southeast mule deer ecology. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, Job Progress Report, Project W-160-25. Boise, Idaho, USA.
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 1998. White-tailed deer, mule deer, and elk management plan. Draft II. Boise, Idaho, USA.
- Kalbfleisch, J. D. and R. L. Prentice. 1980. *The statistical analysis of failure time data*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, New York, USA.
- Kaplan, E. L. and P. Meier. 1958. Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 53:457-481.
- Krebs, C. J. 1989. *Ecological methodology*. HarperCollins Publishers, New York, New York, USA.

- Lefkovitch, L. P. 1965. The study of population growth in organisms grouped by stages. *Biometrics* 21:1-18.
- Leslie, P. H. 1945. On the use of matrices in certain population mathematics. *Biometrika* 33:183-212.
- Leslie, P. H. 1948. Some further notes on the use of matrices in population mathematics. *Biometrika* 35:213-245.
- Menard, S. 1995. Applied logistic regression analysis. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-106. Sage Publications, Thousand Oakes, California, USA.
- Pac, D. F., R. J. Mackie, and H. E. Jorgensen. 1991. Mule deer population organization, behavior and dynamics in a northern Rocky Mountain environment. Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, Job Completion Report, Project W-120-R-7-18. Helena, Montana, USA.
- Pollock, K. H., S. R. Winterstein, C. M. Bunck, and P. D. Curtis. 1989. Survival analysis in telemetry studies: the staggered entry design. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 53:7-15.
- SAS Institute. 1989. SAS/STAT<sup>®</sup> user's guide, version 6, fourth edition. Volume 2. SAS Institute, Cary, North Carolina, USA.
- Sauer, J. R. and B. K. Williams. 1989. General procedures for testing hypotheses about survival or recovery rates. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 53:137-142.
- Van Reenen, G. 1982. Field experience in the capture of red deer by helicopter in New Zealand with reference to post-capture sequela and management. Pages 408-421 *in* L. Nielsen, J. C. Haigh, and M. E. Fowler, editors. Chemical immobilization of North American wildlife. Wisconsin Humane Society, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA.
- White, G. C. and R. M. Bartmann. 1998. Effect of density reduction on over-winter survival of free-ranging mule deer fawns. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 62:214-224.
- White, G. C., R. A. Garrott, R. M. Bartmann, L. H. Carpenter, and A. W. Alldredge. 1987. Survival of mule deer in northwest Colorado. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 51:852-859.
- Unsworth, J. W., F. A. Leban, D. J. Leptich, E. O. Garton, and P. Zager. 1994. Aerial Survey: User's manual, second edition. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, ID, USA.
- Unsworth, J. W., D. F. Pac, G. C. White, and R. M. Bartmann. 1999. Mule deer survival in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 63:315-326.

Submitted by:

*Mark Hurley*

---

Senior Wildlife Research Biologist

Approved by:


IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

---

Dale E. Toweill  
Wildlife Program Coordinator  
Federal Aid Coordinator

---

James W. Unsworth, Chief  
Bureau of Wildlife



**IDAHO**  
**GAME MANAGEMENT UNITS**

## FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

The Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Program consists of funds from a 10% to 11% manufacturer's excise tax collected from the sale of handguns, sporting rifles, shotguns, ammunition, and archery equipment. The Federal Aid program then allots the funds back to states through a formula based on each state's geographic area and the number of paid hunting license holders in the state. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game uses the funds to help restore, conserve, manage, and enhance wild birds and mammals for the public benefit. These funds are also used to educate hunters to develop the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to be responsible, ethical hunters. Seventy-five percent of the funds for this project are from Federal Aid. The other 25% comes from license-generated funds.

