



Ecology of mule deer on a sagebrush-grassland habitat in northeastern Montana  
by Scott Donald Jackson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Fish and Wildlife Management  
Montana State University  
© Copyright by Scott Donald Jackson (1990)

Abstract:

The ecology of a mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) population inhabiting native big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) - grass rangeland in northeastern Montana was studied during 1985-1987 using aerial surveys and radioed and neckbanded deer. Habitat use, including distribution, movements, use and selection of cover types, and food habits, was described and related to topography, physiography, weather, vegetation, and land use. Deer appeared to be yearlong residents of traditional home ranges, except under severe winter conditions when most moved to areas of rougher terrain. Mule deer used topographic relief for shelter, security, and foraging opportunity during all seasons. Small, deeply eroded cuts were extremely important in this role, especially during summer, in this otherwise open environment. Polygon seasonal home range size for adult females during summer varied from 0.35 km<sup>2</sup> to 12.93 km<sup>2</sup> (mean = 4.66 km<sup>2</sup>). Home range sizes ranged from 2.76 km<sup>2</sup> to 321.37 km<sup>2</sup> (mean = 66.53 km<sup>2</sup>) during the extremely harsh winter in 1985-86, while during the relatively mild winter of 1986-87 home ranges varied only from 0.90 km<sup>2</sup> to 4.60 km<sup>2</sup> (mean = 2.74 km<sup>2</sup>). Nocturnal movements determined by triangulation during, summer 1986 also increased home range size. Use of cover types by marked deer during daytime generally corresponded to availability. Shale hills and deeply cut drainageways were used significantly more than expected. Deer occurred more often than expected in rested cattle pastures during autumn and winter and less often than expected in pastures grazed early or late in the season. Population characteristics, including size and trends, structure, group size, productivity and recruitment, adult mortality, dispersal, and condition were described. In 1986, preharvest density was estimated as 2.0/km<sup>2</sup>, down from 4.25/km<sup>2</sup> in autumn 1984, but similar to estimates of 2.0/km<sup>2</sup> and 1.5/km<sup>2</sup> in 1981 and 1982, respectively. Fawn:doe ratios in autumn ranged from 47:100 for October 1985 to 71:100 in October 1986.

ECOLOGY OF MULE DEER ON A SAGEBRUSH-GRASSLAND HABITAT  
IN NORTHEASTERN MONTANA

by  
Scott Donald Jackson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science

in

Fish and Wildlife Management

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Bozeman, Montana

July 1990

N378  
J138

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Scott Donald Jackson

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

July 23, 1990  
Date

Richard J. Machie  
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

8 August 1990  
Date

Robert S. Moore  
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

August 9, 1990  
Date

Henry J. Parsons  
Graduate Dean

## STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Dean of Libraries when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature



Date

2 July 1990

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Dr. R. Mackie for his guidance and patience. Drs. L. Irby, R. Eng, and C. Marlow, and T. Lonner reviewed the manuscript. Special thanks also go to biologists R. Stoneberg, H. Nyberg, A. Rosgaard, R. Mule', G. Dusek, H. Jorgensen, K. Hamlin, and especially H. Wentland, who assisted in the project. I appreciate Dr. A. Wood's friendship and help with data analysis. The skill of pilots G. Martin, P. Johnson, G. Mendel, and R. Stordahl is recognized, as is the helicopter expertise of L. Schweitzer. I especially thank pilot C. Jensen for his consistency. Dr. J. Rumely assisted in plant identification. I acknowledge the help of M. Fisher and S. Klessens, Bureau of Land Management. I am very grateful for the friendship and hospitality of R. Fox, J. O'Neil, and D. O'Rourke. The persistence of M. Morelli and C. Woodbury in typing the final report is greatly appreciated. Finally, and most of all, I wish to thank my family, Claudia, and especially my sons Tanner, Kyle, and Logan for their confidence, support, laughter, and love. My study was funded by the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL.....	ii
STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE.....	iii
VITA.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
ABSTRACT.....	xiv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA.....	3
Location and General Description.....	3
Geology and Soils.....	7
Climate.....	8
Land Use.....	10
METHODS.....	13
RESULTS.....	21
Habitat Characteristics.....	21
Habitat Use.....	25
Spatial Distribution.....	25
Movements and Home Range.....	33
Use and Selection of Cover Types.....	42
Selection for Specific Habitat Characteristics.....	44
Deer Response to Cattle Operations.....	48
Food Habits.....	51
Summer (June - early September).....	51
Autumn (late September - October).....	53
Winter (December - early March).....	54
Spring (late March - April).....	54

## TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

	Page
Population Characteristics and Trend.....	55
Population Estimates.....	55
Population Trends 1981-1987.....	58
Population Structure.....	60
Group Size.....	63
Productivity.....	67
Fawn Recruitment.....	69
Adult Mortality.....	70
Dispersal/Emigration.....	72
Physical Condition.....	73
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	80
Habitat Use Relationships.....	80
Distribution.....	80
Summer.....	80
Autumn.....	81
Winter.....	82
Spring.....	87
Movements and Home Range.....	88
Population Characteristics.....	92
MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	96
REFERENCES CITED.....	99
APPENDIX.....	105

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Mean polygon home range sizes and average activity radii (AAR) for marked deer on the Dog Creek study area by year, season, age, and sex.....	34
2 Mean nocturnal polygon home range sizes and average activity radii (AAR) for eight radio-collared adult female mule deer on the Dog Creek study area during summer 1986.....	38
3 Relative occurrence of habitat characteristics in blocks used by marked mule deer on the Dog Creek study area in daytime during summer and winter, 1985-1987 (see text). The number of blocks analyzed is in parentheses.....	45
4 Relative occurrence of habitat characteristics in blocks used by marked mule deer on the Dog Creek study area during daylight and at night during summer, 1985-1986 (see text). The number of blocks analyzed is in parentheses.....	46
5 Relative occurrence of habitat characteristics in all blocks occupied and unoccupied by marked mule deer on the Dog Creek study area during summer, 1985-1986 (see text). The number of blocks analyzed is in parentheses.....	47
6 Relative occurrence of habitat characteristics in all blocks occupied and unoccupied by marked mule deer on the Dog Creek study area during the winters of 1984-85, 1985-86, and 1986-87 (see text). The number of blocks analyzed is in parentheses.....	48
7 Mule deer locations in cattle pastures in relation to the previous summer's grazing regime based on 14 total coverage aerial surveys of the Dog Creek study area, 1984-1987. + = use > expected, - = use < expected, and o = no difference from expected.....	49

## LIST OF TABLES - Continued

Table	Page
8 Mule deer locations in occupied and unoccupied cattle pastures during 6 total coverage aerial surveys, 1984-1987. + = use > expected, - = use < expected, and o = no difference from expected.....	50
9 Use of plant species by mule deer on the Dog Creek study area based on analysis of 46 rumen samples, 1985-1986. Data are recorded as frequency of occurrence/volume percentage within seasons.....	52
10 Lincoln Index estimates of the number of mule deer on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1987.....	55
11 Seasonal observability indices (number of marked deer observed/number of marked deer on the study area x 100) for mule deer on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1987. Data are for fixed-wing surveys except where noted.....	56
12 Mule deer population density estimates and population structure on the Dog Creek study area from March 1981 to April 1987.....	61
13 Summary of ages, ovary status, and fetuses produced by 34 female mule deer examined on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1986.....	68
14 Mean kidney fat index (KFI) for 46 mule deer from the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1986. Sample sizes are in parentheses.....	74
15 Mean percent femur marrow fat content for 38 mule deer from the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1986. Number of samples in parentheses.....	75
16 Mean seasonal whole weights (kg) of 45 mule deer collected on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1986. Numbers of samples are in parentheses.....	77

## LIST OF TABLES - Continued

Table	Page
17 Mean and range in seasonal whole body weights (kg) for 27 female mule deer $\geq$ 3 years of age on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1986.....	78
18 Summary of average hog-dressed weights (kg), antler beam circumferences (cm), and main antler beam lengths (cm) of mule deer harvested in vicinity of the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1986. Sample sizes are in parentheses.....	79
19 Number of antler points on 44 male mule deer harvested in vicinity of the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1986. Sample sizes are in parentheses.....	79
20 Plant species composition in the 7 cover types on the Dog Creek study area based on a commonness index (frequency x presence x 100). Cover types are: 1) big sagebrush-grass, 2) shale hills, 3) Nuttall saltbush, 4) greasewood, 5) meadow, 6) silver sagebrush, and 7) creek bottom.....	106
21 Aerial survey data for mule deer observed on the Dog Creek study area, 1985 to 1987.....	110
22 Flight conditions and relative observability of marked mule deer during full-coverage aerial population surveys on the Dog Creek study area, January 1985 to April 1987.....	111

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1 Map of the Dog Creek study area showing area boundaries, major drainages, reservoirs, roads, and fences.....	4
2 Map of study area and vicinity showing the area used by marked mule deer during winter 1985-86 in relation to Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge boundary, major drainages, major reservoirs, and roads.....	5
3 View of the Dog Creek study area looking southwest across Pearson Coulee showing the big sagebrush - grass cover type in the fore and mid-ground and the shale hills cover type in the background .....	6
4 Monthly precipitation during the period January 1985 - June 1987 compared to 30-year average for Glasgow airport located 30 km northeast of the study area.....	9
5 Average depth of snow on the ground by week during the winters of 1984-85, 1985-86, and 1986-87 at the Glasgow airport, 30 km northeast of the study area.....	9
6 Average monthly temperatures during the period January 1985 - June 1987 compared to 30-year average for Glasgow airport located 30 km northeast of the study area.....	11
7 Annual precipitation and temperature 1975-1986 as percentages of the respective 30-year averages at the Glasgow airport located 30 km northeast of the study area.....	11
8 Late summer distribution of mule deer groups on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1987. Each point represents 4.0 deer, based on 3 surveys and observation of 155 mule deer groups.....	27

## LIST OF FIGURES - Continued

Figure		Page
9	Autumn distribution of mule deer groups on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1987. Each point represents 5.7 deer, based on 3 surveys and observation of 77 mule deer groups.....	28
10	Winter distribution of mule deer groups on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1987. Each point represents a mean group size of 7.3 deer, based on 5 surveys and observation of 153 mule deer groups...	29
11	Distribution of marked mule deer from the Dog Creek study area, 1 January - 15 March 1986.....	31
12	Spring distribution of mule deer groups on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1987. Each point represents a mean group size of 5.3 deer, based on 4 surveys and observation of 113 mule deer groups...	32
13	Nocturnal polygon home ranges compared to daytime seasonal polygon home range of radio-collared mule deer #1212 during summer on the Dog Creek study area.....	35
14	Nocturnal polygon home ranges compared to daytime seasonal polygon home ranges of radio-collared mule deer #0837 and #1062 during summer on the Dog Creek study area.....	36
15	Nocturnal polygon home ranges compared to daytime seasonal polygon home ranges of radio-collared mule deer #1187, #1087, and #1287 during summer on the Dog Creek study area.....	37
16	Distance and direction of movement by three radio-collared female mule deer during winter 1985-86 in relation to their "traditional" home ranges on the Dog Creek study area.....	41

## LIST OF FIGURES - Continued

Figure	Page
17 Availability and seasonal use by mule deer of cover types on the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1987.....	42
18 Estimated mule deer densities on the Dog Creek study area during autumn and winter, 1981-1987....	59
19 Ages, assigned by tooth eruption and wear, of mule deer captured by drive-netting on the study area during December 1984.....	62
20 Ages, assigned by tooth cementum analysis, of mule deer collected on the study area, 1985 and 1986...	64
21 Ages, assigned by tooth cementum analysis, of mule deer examined at opening day hunter check stations on the Dog Creek study area, 1985 and 1986.....	65
22 Mean monthly mule deer group sizes on the Dog Creek study area during September - April 1981-1987. Numbers above each bar indicate the number of groups observed during the month.....	66
23 Monthly mean kidney fat index and femur marrow fat content for mule deer from the Dog Creek study area, 1985-1986.....	76
24 View of Two Forks Reservoir and vicinity during January 1986 looking northwest toward the Dog Creek study area in the background. The snow-free zone provided "emergency" winter range for mule deer from the study area.....	86

## ABSTRACT

The ecology of a mule deer (Odocoileus hemionus) population inhabiting native big sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata) - grass rangeland in northeastern Montana was studied during 1985-1987 using aerial surveys and radioed and neckbanded deer. Habitat use, including distribution, movements, use and selection of cover types, and food habits, was described and related to topography, physiography, weather, vegetation, and land use. Deer appeared to be yearlong residents of traditional home ranges, except under severe winter conditions when most moved to areas of rougher terrain. Mule deer used topographic relief for shelter, security, and foraging opportunity during all seasons. Small, deeply eroded cuts were extremely important in this role, especially during summer, in this otherwise open environment. Polygon seasonal home range size for adult females during summer varied from 0.35 km<sup>2</sup> to 12.93 km<sup>2</sup> (mean = 4.66 km<sup>2</sup>). Home range sizes ranged from 2.76 km<sup>2</sup> to 321.37 km<sup>2</sup> (mean = 66.53 km<sup>2</sup>) during the extremely harsh winter in 1985-86, while during the relatively mild winter of 1986-87 home ranges varied only from 0.90 km<sup>2</sup> to 4.60 km<sup>2</sup> (mean = 2.74 km<sup>2</sup>). Nocturnal movements determined by triangulation during summer 1986 also increased home range size. Use of cover types by marked deer during daytime generally corresponded to availability. Shale hills and deeply cut drainageways were used significantly more than expected. Deer occurred more often than expected in rested cattle pastures during autumn and winter and less often than expected in pastures grazed early or late in the season. Population characteristics, including size and trends, structure, group size, productivity and recruitment, adult mortality, dispersal, and condition were described. In 1986, pre-harvest density was estimated as 2.0/km<sup>2</sup>, down from 4.25/km<sup>2</sup> in autumn 1984, but similar to estimates of 2.0/km<sup>2</sup> and 1.5/km<sup>2</sup> in 1981 and 1982, respectively. Fawn:doe ratios in autumn ranged from 47:100 for October 1985 to 71:100 in October 1986.

## INTRODUCTION

Rocky Mountain mule deer (Odocoileus hemionus hemionus) occupy a diversity of habitats in Montana (Egan 1971). Comparative studies across the state (Mackie et al. 1980, 1985) indicate that patterns of habitat use, biological characteristics, and population dynamics of deer vary widely in relation to attributes of individual habitats occupied. Thus, knowledge obtained through the description of various populations and their respective habitats provides the best framework for determining broad-based management opportunities and practices.

Intensive studies of mule deer have been conducted in mountains and mountain-foothills, river breaks, mixed-prairie/forest, upland prairie/ponderosa pine (Pinus ponderosa), prairie-agriculture, mixed-grass prairie, and short-grass prairie. However, little or no research has been conducted in non-timbered sagebrush-grass rangelands.

Native rangeland dominated by big sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata) and various grasses occurs extensively in eastern Montana (Ross and Hunter 1976) and, at least locally, supports significant populations of mule deer. My study was established to provide data on range use and

population characteristics for management of one of these populations in northeastern Montana. Specific objectives were to determine seasonal distribution and movements, habitat use, and population characteristics. Special emphasis was also directed toward developing guidelines for conducting and interpreting results of aerial population trend surveys and evaluating relationships between mule deer and domestic livestock operations on the area.

The study was conducted full time during the summers of 1985 and 1986 and the winter of 1985-86. Biologists with the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (MDFWP) cooperated in trapping and marking deer during December 1984 and 1985, and in collecting data during other periods from January 1985 through June 1987.

## DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

### Location and General Description

The 261 km<sup>2</sup> Dog Creek study area was located 30 km southwest of Glasgow in southern Valley County, Montana (Fig. 1). Boundaries were defined to include all areas used by marked deer during all seasons except the winter of 1985-86 when most deer moved off the primary study area. Land ownership was primarily federal, administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior (USDI) Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (95%), with small sections of state (4%) and private (1%) lands included (USDI 1985). The area was adjacent to the Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge (CMR) (Fig. 2).

Major drainages included Lone Tree and Little Beaver Creeks which flowed southeasterly into Willow Creek, a northeasterly flowing tributary of the Milk River. Several minor drainages also emptied to the southeast into Willow Creek. This pattern formed a landscape of gently rolling uplands interspersed with wide flat drainages deeply incised by meandering creek bottoms. Areas of relatively rough

























































































































































































































